

# Systematic Review: The Use of Collaborative Learning to Develop Students' Guided Writing and Oral Performance in Poetry

Rebecca Kamala & Azlina Abdul Aziz

Faculty of Education, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia Email: rebecca6830@gmail.com, azlina1@ukm.edu.my

To Link this Article: http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v9-i2/7663 DOI:10.6007/IJARPED/v9-i2/7663

Published Online: 29 July 2020

## Abstract

This paper presents a systematic review of relevant published studies on the use of collaborative learning to develop students' guided writing and oral performance in poetry from year 2000 to 2020. This systematic review attempts to address two research questions; i.e. how does the use of collaborative learning help to develop students guided writing of poetry and also how does the use of collaborative learning help to develop students guided writing that collaborative learning helps students to develop better writing and oral skills by developing their confidence and language skills in creative learning helped improve students in their guided writing and oral performance in language arts like drama, musical and poetry. The limitations of past related studies and future directions for research and practice were being further discussed.

Keywords: Collaborative Learning, Guided Writing, Oral Performance, Poetry, Language Arts

## Introduction

English is known as the global language and accepted as one of the major lingua franca of the world. It is one of the commonly used means of communication in various fields including education, social media, international trade, business, politics, history, entertainment, science and technology (Kagan, 1984). It is also the firm base of one's thinking and experience on where the remaining academic knowledge is built upon (Miguel et al. ,2006). Thus, people need to have good understanding and the ability to speak the language well. Being fluent and proficient in the English language among our students in Malaysia has been emphasized by the Ministry of Education Malaysia. As stated in the Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025), one of the six key qualities outlined as needed by every Malaysian student to be of global competent is to be well spoken in English as it is the lingua franca of the world. Students' who have good proficiency in English are more likely to perform better academically in higher level educational institutions (Pardeep, 2014).

Proficiency in English gives student the confidence to interact freely with their language teachers, and furthermore creates a conducive learning environment. In addition, since

Malaysia is a multicultural society, increasing their English literacy would help students to communicate better with people from different ethnicities and nationalities, able to enter the workforce in an English language environment and have better career choices and job security in the future. According to the National Education Blueprint (2013-2025) which was officiated by the then Prime Minister, Datuk Seri Najib Tun Razak one of the main objectives of the Blueprint was to provide a well-planned strategy for a quick and sustainable education system until 2025. It strategy was also to highlight on teaching and learning quality, allowing opportunity to trusted and meaningful information and having accountabilities that are clear and direct. The eleven shifts would need to occur to provide the changes in outcomes to be seen by all Malaysians. The second shift particularly focuses on making sure that every child is capable in both Bahasa Malaysia and English Language (National Education Blueprint 2012, E10). This move to boost the English Language was to enlarge the LINUS program which includes literacy, teach extra skills to English teachers and by making sure students have a compulsory pass in the English language SPM paper and widening the opportunities which allows for greater influence of the language.

In the Malaysian primary and secondary school curriculum, English Literature is important and is vital in playing two important rules that is literature as a study and resource (Subramaniam, 2003). Literature is seen as a shift in the Blueprints where it is accepted as an instrument and resource to promote English. The Literature component in English contributes to the all-rounded progress of an individual is a resource for language learning (Chitravelu, Sithamparam & Teh, 1995) and shows itself as a valuable language experience (Rosli, 1995). Techniques that is language based uses texts based on literature as a resource that is applied for practice in language through a volume of activities involving language more than literature study for the reason of getting facts and information (Lazar, 1993). According to Ganakumaran (2003), the teaching of literature in our Malaysia classroom was applied to improve and upskill the level of English proficiency and also facilitate students in the building of their character and developing themselves personally. This in turn enlarges their perspective globally through reading about world view and various cultures.

Another problem that is commonly faced by non-native speakers is the lacking of vocabulary in English such as learning new words, understanding and pronouncing a new word and its meaning, using the words correctly and being able to memorize and spell the new words. Similarly, Rusli et al. (2018) found that students seldom participated in oral lessons even though they knew the answers because they were afraid of being judged as less capable by their peers. Therefore, it is important for teachers to always look for better learning approaches and use more effective learning materials that can encourage students to be more participative during the learning process while improving their proficiency in English. This can be done by incorporating poetry in the teaching lesson plans. The use of poetry in teaching English can be a creative strategy to expose students to quality yet short, fun and non-threatening pieces of literature while improving their ability to master the language.

Oral skill is seen as the most important skill to acquire in the study of English language since this helps learners to perform well in real life situations (Brown & Yule, 1983). In the modern world, having good oral or speaking skills help people to get better job opportunities, help them to settle down well in their professions and enhance their career. People who are eloquent in speaking can gain the complete attention of the audience when making speeches, delivering presentations or participating in group discussions. Many previous studies related to oral and writing skills have shown that poetry used in the teaching of English can be a good strategy in improving students' oral and writing fluency.

For example, Deswita (2014); Aryusmar & Putria (2014), had proven that the use of poetry as authentic material was effective in minimizing students' difficulties in writing descriptive text and enriching their vocabularies. Adam and Babiker (2015) revealed that teaching English literature can intensify students' creative writing, assist them to develop creative imagination and language use when writing, and improve their literary techniques, figures of speech and literary elements in creative writing. As highlighted by Collie and Slater (1987), "... using poems in the classroom can lead naturally on to freer and creative written expression." Therefore, by learning how to write poetries, students would be able to improve their creative thinking and consequently improve their ability in producing a good writing.

In addition, since poetries are usually a short text and the patterns rhyming in poetry provide good qualities which is helpful in predicting words and phrase, they can be an amazing tool for developing students' oral skills. According to Hadaway, Vardell and Young (2002), by reading poetries aloud, allows for encouraging oral fluency and laying a firm base for being able to read in a new language, practice of recognising words and pronunciation. It is also a wonderful and encouraging way of supporting students in learning of new language. Furthermore, a mixture of poetry multi culturally shows the wide knowledge and backgrounds of English language learners.

Another advantage of using poetry in English teaching is that it is an activity that benefits and include instructional activity that is practical to inculcate students' creative thinking and help them show their feelings (Nowak-Fabrykowski, 2000); to improvise students' oral reading fluency (Newsome, 2008), reading comprehension (Newsome, 2008), expressive reading and skills involving word recognition (Kuhn, 2005); to increase students' attitudes towards English learning (Newsome, 2008). Other than that, poetry promotes students' self-awareness and language appreciation, gives them pleasure and enjoyment in the learning process, encourages them to explore ideas and helps them to identify their emotions, fears, hopes and imagination. Other challenges faced by most teachers in using poetry in teaching English are: difficult to get students interested in poetry learning (Marimutu, 2007); inadequate knowledge and comprehension about metaphorical words used in poetry (Marimutu, 2007), and lack of confidence (Subramaniam, Hamdan & Koo, 2003). Also, some students may not look forward to literature lessons as they view it as a difficult subject to understand especially the literal and figurative meanings of a poem. Adding to it, the background and culture of certain poetries is peculiar to students when they are set in a background other than Malaysia. As such, it is challenging for most students to relate and understand the literature materials. Although there is a few research that have been carried out with regards to the benefits of poetry in English teaching, not much has been done to find out the success of the use of poetry learning on students' oral and writing fluency as well as their attitudes towards learning the language, especially in the context of Malaysian primary schools. Overall in the literature reviewed, most studies were more particular about evaluating the effects of learning poetry on the skills and characters of students from secondary school or university in foreign settings (Sinha, 2017). Only few studies considered investigating the use of poetry in Malaysian school settings yet they were mostly focused on the techniques and approaches implemented by teachers in using literature components like poetry to teach English (Tan, 2014; Sidhu, Chan & Kaur 2010). Therefore, this study was carried out as an effort to analyse the success of the use of poetry and collaborative poetry learning in enhancing English language acquisition among primary school students in Malaysia in terms of their oral performance, writing skills and their attitude in language learning.

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Vol. 9, No. 2, 2020, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2020

## **Research Objectives and Research Questions**

The main objective of this systematic review is to present a synthesis of empirical evidence found in the past related studies on the use of collaborative learning to develop student's guided writing and oral performance in poetry so that further intervention development and research in this area can be conducted. Specifically, the research objectives are:

RO1: To analyze the effectiveness of the use of collaborative learning in improving students' guided writing skills of poetry.

RO2: To analyze the effectiveness of the use of collaborative learning in improving students' oral performance skills of poetry.

This study is also conducted to answer two research questions,a) How does the use of collaborative learning help to develop students' guided writing of poetry? b) How does the use of collaborative learning help to develop students' oral performance of poetry?

## **Literature Review**

## **Definitions of Collaborative Learning**

Collaborative learning is a condition in which two or more people learn or do something together (Dillenbourg, 1999). The "two or more" could be a pair, a small group (3-5 people), a class (20-30 people), a community (usually involving a few hundreds or thousands of people), or a society (several thousands or millions of people) performing learning activities to accomplish shared learning goals. More specifically, collaborative learning is rooted on the model that knowledge can be created in a population in which their members interact with each other and embark on roles that are asymmetric Mitnik et al. (2009).

In other words, collaborative learning is referred to methods and environments in which learners participate in a common task where each individual lean on and are accountable to each other. According to Chandra (2015), collaborative learning happens either in 'peer-to-peer' or in bigger groups. Peer learning and instruction is defined as a type of learning involving students as pairs or in a small group to talk about concepts or finding an answer to a question/problems. This happens in a classroom session after they are given an introduction to the materials of the course done with reading or media session before and throughout the class lesson.

## Benefits of Collaborative Learning

Among the benefits of collaborative learning according to Sawant (2016) include:

- Development of higher-level thinking, oral communication, leadership skills and selfmanagement
- Increase of interaction in student-faculty
- Increase in retention of student, responsibility and self-esteem
- More exposure and increase of understanding in various perspectives
- Readiness to face real life and happenings in employment

In collaborative learning, students acquire to cooperate together with all groups of people. During small-group connections, there any many chances to ponder and answer to the differing answers by other students on the questions asked. Smaller groups permit students to voice their points to a problem based on their cultural experiences. This act of giving and receiving information will eventually help students to comprehend other cultures and acknowledge different points of view. Other than that, this learning approach is also useful for students who lack social skills. As they work together with other people as a team, they can boost their confidence by participating more actively in the discussion. In addition, as

mentioned by Chandra (2015) since its happens that students share opinions and facts in smaller groups, students would embrace more personal opinions on their responses. This exchange of information is usually impossible in a big group setting, in which only one or two students share their ideas and the remaining of their peers merely are listeners.

In a study conducted by Pattanpichet (2011), on how collaborative learning effect was on students' English speaking achievement, the results indicated positive outcomes both in how the students showed an improvement on their English oral performance and their feelings in the usage of collaborative learning as strategy of instruction in a classroom with English as medium of instruction. Working together helps students by collaborating and having a sense of unity amongst them. It also helps by making the task more approachable together. This takes away the fear that the student may have towards the assignment given. Teachers have better class control and manage more efficiently as the students can now cooperate in pairs or in groups. It will in return produce a knowledge sharing atmosphere.

Collaborative activities also encourage students to be more supportive with each other in the learning process, thus promoting their circle of social support (Tinto & Pusser, 2006). It also helps student to manage their learning better by having peers that they can rely on (McCabe, 2003 in Wilmer 2008) as they usually feel comfortable discussing with their peers. In addition, when the learning process is done in a fun yet educational way, students will learn better (Khairiyah & Mimi, 2003; Seng, 2006) and this will in turn lead to improved results. In other words, collaborative learning in English classrooms can have a profound effect on students' academic achievement, cognitive development and a better attitude towards the language.

## **Poetry Definition**

The word 'poetry' is originated from a Greek word "to make" which refers to specially made objects in words to say something about ideas, feelings, places, people and events. According to Finch (2003), though many language educators agree that poetry encourages language acquisition, they will also mention that concepts of poetic elements and cultural acceptance are usually difficult for EFL learners to comprehend. However, Utami (2012) adds on that EFL learners should not worry about understanding poetry as some can be enjoyed and understood on the first seeing. These poems will in turn motivate students to improve their English through its varied structure of its form, vocabulary, pronunciation, contextual meaning and grammar. Poems are authentic texts and is a great tool in teaching of oral and writing skills.

## **Approach in Poetry Learning**

Previous studies have shown that various approaches can be taken by teachers to conduct poetry learning in English classrooms. Straw et al. (1993) claimed that there are two fairly predictable patterns of dealing with poetry in literature. First is by using an expanded Directed Reading Activity or Directed Reading/Thinking Activity format. This include introducing a poem to students then conducting some exercises around predicting what the poem will be about. The poem reading session can be conducted either silently or aloud by the teacher. Group reading of the poem (chorally or individually by students), and some comprehension questions about the poem to be answered by the pupils.

Another approach is by using collaborative learning. For example, through dialogue with their peers, groups of students are asked to make sense of a series of poems. This has also been emphasised by Ferris (2003), where there is an increase use of peer collaboration in L2 writing classrooms is supported by feedback, revision and audience. This works well with method

which is traditionally the teacher written feedback. Peer collaboration would work well with cycles of writing, multiple drafting, and vast revision move through the dealing of product to a process in writing pedagogy and is good which is a main feature in the way of writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Finch (2003) presented several methods to conduct poetry learning in English classrooms. One of them is by using picture poems. Picture poems offer a visual look of how words are arranged, and is an effective way of encouraging students to work with the vocabulary targeted. As such, students can feel success immediately in terms of expressing themselves in English (improved self-esteem), and stress or anxiety can be decreased (reduction of affective filters). These poems will further encourage students to combine and try them out with the target language in a safe learning environment, and can be displayed on the classroom walls and at the same time providing accreditation of the students' efforts and their abilities.

Another method proposed by Finch (2003) is haiku. Haikus helps in promoting brainstorming and collaborative expression, and make the expression without the heaviness or focus of sentence structure. The expression in haikus is immediate, visual, and meaningful, and enables students to develop their confidence and creativity. Vocabulary, spelling and dictionary skills could be a focus, as students looks for words that describes concepts and impressions. Pattern poems can be applied to all age and learners group. The *patterns* in these poems usually made of grammatical items (adjectives, adverbs, verbs etc.), phrases, sentence structures like acronyms, alphabetical sequencing, frameworks that are metrical and other types of patterning.

## **Poetry Writing**

Poetry writing is even more difficult for non-native English speakers. Among main issues commonly encountered are incomplete sentences, poor grammar, attempting to be pretentious with their writing, lack of understanding of imagery use, and poor vocabulary and word usage (University of Richmond Writing Centre). Kidder (2019), listed eight fundamentals for poetry writing which are: poem forms/structure, imagery, sound, meaning, goals, originality (avoid cliché), minimalistic and refine poem to perfection. She also mentioned that writing poetry can benefit in strengthening students' skills in writing solid imagery, understand how to compose an impactful writings and connect with their emotions.

Collins (2020), suggested that in order to write good poetry, students should read a lot of poetry to familiarize themselves with poems structure and forms. Listening to poetry can help them to understand concept of sounds and rhyme in poems. He also suggested beginners to start small with short poems like haiku which is easier and faster to compose. Also poems such as shape poems and patterns poems are relatively easy to be written in a simple language. A thesaurus or dictionary can be used as a tool to enrich the word usage. Literary devices like like metaphor, imagery, allegory etc. can also be used to enhance the poetic form.

## **Oral Performance**

Among the problems commonly faced by students in poetry recitation (or reading out aloud) are incorrect pronunciation, negative attitude towards English literature, lack of teachers' feedback on mispronounced or misread words and lack of understanding on phonetic sounds. To address these problems according to Picpican-Bell (2005), teachers must comprehend their students' diverse cultural backgrounds and learning goals. This is to provide them with

suitable motivation and why they need to improve their oral fluency. By having good fluency when reading poems out aloud, students will gain more confidence to speak in English. Teachers should also conduct activities that can develop phonological awareness especially in primary school students. The Glasgow City Council's literacy improvement program (2003) enumerated the following activities as suggestions:

- The teaching and learning of traditional nursery rhymes
- Acting out rhymes using puppets
- Rhymes recitals in groups or individually
- Usage of media such as tapes for children to follow in nursery rhymes in books and big books
- Promoting listening skills by reading story and communicating with texts

For example, Hedge (2000); Yager.et al. (1985) claimed collaborative learning helps students to expand their abilities to communicate. This will improve their oral communication skills. According to Hughes (2007), the meaning of sound is accredited to the reading and performing of poetry purpose through oral language development. When the poem is read aloud with sounds of the word, the students acquires a better comprehension and the meaning of the writing activity. It provides space for students in feeling and playing with the words of the poem. Adding to that, Wang (2017) cited that collaborative learning is found to be correlated with oral skills in three aspects, including students' scores oral test, oral production and the quality of English spoken. These will in turn help pupils in their oral performance in poetry.

## Methods

The procedure involves the main strategy which is collaborative learning and the activities that supports poetry which is guided writing and oral performance. The first stage involved the planning of the review that was carried out to identify the need of the review. I then proceeded with the next stage which is conducting the review to identify relevant researches that explored the use of collaborative learning to develop students' guided writing and oral performance in poetry so that primary studies could be extracted and synthesized the data. The third stage involved carrying out to report the review by communicating the results.

The following international online bibliographic databases namely Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, Springer e-journals, Ebscohost, ProQuest Education Journals, Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC), JSTOR, SAGE, and Scopus were used to identify peer-reviewed research studies or articles written in English published between years 2000 and 2020(research carried out over the past twenty years). The combination of terms used to search for the past related studies in the keywords fields of the above databases were: (collaborative learning) and (writing OR guided writing skills) and (oral performance OR oral skills) in (poetry) and (ESL learners OR EFL learners). Later, the title and abstract of these studies were screened with regard to the inclusion criteria as following:

1. All the participants or respondents in the study could be at their primary, secondary, or tertiary level.

2. The studies should be conducted in teaching English as second language (ESL) or teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) context.

3. The studies should focus on teaching writing strategies and oral skills/ performance in poetry.

4. English language must be utilised with the components of reading comprehension.

5. The studies could employ qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method research design as more methodologically rigorous studies are needed.

6. The setting of the intervention conducted must be school-based.

However, it tough to exclude journals or articles based on the title and abstract of the studies solely. Hence, the introduction and conclusion sections of the full article were read through so that a wider range of studies could be selected, and twelve articles were being shortlisted.

## **Results and Discussions**

After following the above-mentioned procedures of conducting the systematic review, a total of four systematic reviews and nine past related studies on collaborative learning in poetry and writing and oral skills from year 2000 to 2020 were shortlisted. Out of the thirteen shortlisted published articles, one was published each year between 2000,2002 and 2004. The remaining ten articles were published between 2011 and 2020; with one in year 2011 and 2013 respectively and two in year 2012, 2014, three in 2015 being the highest, and one in year 2020. The empirical evidence to support collaborative learning in developing students' guided writing and oral skills in poetry are in Table 1, 2, 3 and 4 as follows:

| Article / Study  | Number of<br>participants/<br>studies             | Research Design                      | Results (Strategies found effective)  |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Davies, Jindal-<br>Snape, Collier,<br>Digby, Hay,<br>Howe (2012) | 210 studies                                       | Comprehensive<br>review              | There were enough evidence<br>that supported the importance<br>of the following factors such as;<br>materials available were<br>appropriate ; exposure outside<br>of the classroom/school<br>environment; game-based<br>approach allowing learner to<br>take responsibility; relationships<br>that respects teachers and<br>learners; opportunities for peer<br>collaboration; relationship with<br>outside agencies; awareness of<br>learners' needs; and non-<br>methodological planning in<br>supporting creative skills<br>development in children and<br>young people. |
| Lockney,<br>Proudfoot<br>(2013)                                  | 31 participants                                   | Action research<br>qualitative study | The project suggests 'thinking<br>aloud protocols' relating on<br>class teacher role on developing<br>the pupils' confidence in poetry<br>writing and time spent on<br>redrafting process. It works with<br>pupils' reading skills:<br>communicating their thought<br>process with their work and in<br>turn helps their skills and<br>confidence in reading poetry.<br>The project was carried out in<br>pairs and results was<br>collaborative writing helps to<br>increase the pupils' confidence.   |
| Hanjani, Lili<br>(2014)  | 12 participants<br>from a pool of<br>135 students | Comprehensive<br>review              | Collaborative revision involving<br>peer interactions and examines<br>the effect caused to the quality<br>of the participants' L2 writing<br>proficiency by the use of joint<br>revision. It was noted in the<br>study that the scaffolding done<br>was useful and beneficial to the<br>joint revision task without<br>regarding their level of L2  |

|                 |            |               | writing proficiency. The findings<br>suggest that to do better in<br>writing and revision skills,<br>collaborative revision can be<br>embedded in EFL writing<br>pedagogy as a method. |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|--|
| Affendi F.R. &  | 18 studies | Comprehensive | Relating challenges with the   |
| Aziz A.A (2020) |            | Review        | teaching of English Literature<br>such as text selection, contexts   |
|                 |            |               | and themes, language style,  |
|                 |            |               | teacher's method of teaching,  |
|                 |            |               | teaching approaches  |
|                 |            |               | implemented in Literature  |
|                 |            |               | lessons. The approaches are  |
|                 |            |               | 'information-based approach,   |
|                 |            |               | moral-philosophical approach,  |
|                 |            |               | paraphrastic approach,<br>language-based approach and  |
|                 |            |               | personal-response approach'.   |
|                 |            |               | Mentioned that teachers have a   |
|                 |            |               | task of improving literature   |
|                 |            |               | lessons by planning various  |
|                 |            |               | teaching approaches while also   |
|                 |            |               | considering the students'  |
|                 |            |               | differences. Integration of  |
|                 |            |               | technology in literature<br>classrooms made it easier for  |
|                 |            |               | them to acquire information on   |
|                 |            |               | the poems compared to  |
|                 |            |               | learning them for their teacher  |
|                 |            |               | and help them to understand  |
|                 |            |               | the poem better.   |
|                 |            |               |  |

Table 1: Summary of systematic reviews on collaborative learning and environment suitable for students learning in poetry.

| Article/S<br>tudy | Number of<br>participants/<br>studies | Research<br>Design | Type of<br>intervent<br>ion | Strategies<br>Targeted | Total hours<br>intervention | Results   |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Van               | 40 students                           | Experime           | Influence                   | Pre and                | -Five weeks                 | The       |
| Boxtel,           | from 2 Physic                         | ntal study         | of task                     | post- test             | Pre-test (35-45             | correlati |
| Van der           | classes                               | (1)                | character                   | of                     | minutes)                    | on was    |
| Linden            |                                       | concept            | istics on                   | measured               | One week                    | found     |
| and               |                                       | map with           | the                         | individual             | -Post-test (35              | between   |
|                   |                                       | individual         | elaborati                   |                        | minutes)                    | collabora |

| Kanselaa |           | preparati  | on of     | learning    | tive           |
|----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| r (2000) |           | on; (2)    | conceptu  | outcomes.   | elaborati      |
|          |           | concept    | al        | A coding    | on and         |
|          |           | map        | knowled   | scheme      | individua      |
|          |           | without    | ge in     | that        | l learning     |
|          |           | individual | social    | focuses     | outcome        |
|          |           | preparati  | interacti | on          | s which        |
|          |           | on; (3)    | on.       | communic    | indicates      |
|          |           | poster     |           | ative roles | that           |
|          |           | with       |           | and         | student        |
|          |           | individual |           | propositio  | connecti       |
|          |           | preparati  |           | nal         | on is          |
|          |           | on, and    |           | context of  | consider       |
|          |           | (4) poster |           | utterance   | ed             |
|          |           | without    |           | s and on    | elaborati      |
|          |           | individual |           | elaborativ  | ve and         |
|          |           | preparati  |           | e           | collabora      |
|          |           | on         |           | episodes.   | tive. The      |
|          |           |            |           |             | interacti      |
|          |           |            |           |             | on is          |
|          |           |            |           |             | classified     |
|          |           |            |           |             | by             |
|          |           |            |           |             | understa       |
|          |           |            |           |             | nding          |
|          |           |            |           |             | and            |
|          |           |            |           |             | building       |
|          |           |            |           |             | of             |
|          |           |            |           |             | mutual         |
|          |           |            |           |             | understa       |
|          |           |            |           |             | nding          |
|          |           |            |           |             | which          |
|          |           |            |           |             | could be       |
|          |           |            |           |             | applied        |
|          |           |            |           |             | in all task    |
|          |           |            |           |             | found          |
|          |           |            |           |             | especiall      |
|          |           |            |           |             | y .            |
|          |           |            |           |             | ,<br>challengi |
|          |           |            |           |             | ng for         |
|          |           |            |           |             | students       |
| Laal, M. | Learners  | Compreh    | Review    | Key issues  | - Social       |
| &        | generally | ensive     | of        | were        | benefits;      |
| Ghodsi , |           | review     | benefits  | identified  | CL helps       |
| S.M.(201 |           |            | of        | through     | developi       |
| 2)       |           |            | collabora | review of   | ng social      |
|          |           |            | tive      | literature  | support        |

| learning  | on the     | system             |
|-----------|------------|--------------------|
| into four | Collaborat | for                |
| categorie | ive        | learners;          |
| s of;     | Learning   | leading            |
| social,   | and on its | to                 |
| psycholo  | benefits   | diversity          |
| gical,    | of         | understa           |
| academic  | learning.  | nding              |
| , and     |            | among              |
| assessme  |            | students           |
| nt        |            | and staff;         |
| benefits. |            | CL                 |
|           |            | establish          |
|           |            | es a               |
|           |            | positive           |
|           |            | environ            |
|           |            | ment for           |
|           |            | modellin           |
|           |            | g and              |
|           |            | cooperat           |
|           |            | ion                |
|           |            | practice,          |
|           |            | and;               |
|           |            | develops           |
|           |            | learning           |
|           |            | communi            |
|           |            | ties.<br>Beuchala  |
|           |            | Psycholo           |
|           |            | gical<br>benefits: |
|           |            | Student-           |
|           |            | centred            |
|           |            | instructio         |
|           |            | n that             |
|           |            | increases          |
|           |            | students'          |
|           |            | self -             |
|           |            | esteem;            |
|           |            | Cooperat           |
|           |            | ion                |
|           |            | reduces            |
|           |            | worries,           |
|           |            | and; CL            |
|           |            | develops           |
|           |            | positive           |
|           |            | attitudes          |
|           |            |                    |
|           |            |                    |

|   |   |                             |   |   |   | towards   |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |                             |   |   |   | teachers.   |
|   |   |                             |   |   |   | Academi   |
|   |   |                             |   |   |   | C   |
|   |   |                             |   |   |   | benefits;<br>CL<br>Encourag<br>es critical<br>thinking<br>skills and<br>students'<br>involvem<br>ent.<br>Results<br>are<br>improve<br>d;<br>Models<br>appropri<br>ate for<br>student<br>problem                             |
|   |   |                             |   |   |   | solving<br>techniqu   |
|   |   |                             |   |   |   | es.   |
| Ibrahim,<br>N., Shak,<br>M.S.Y.,<br>Mohd,<br>T., Zaidi,<br>A., &<br>Yassin,<br>S.M.A.<br>(2015) | Not stated<br>(Malaysian<br>students in<br>general) | Compreh<br>ensive<br>Review | Collabor<br>ative<br>Learning<br>Method | Implemen<br>tation of<br>Collaborat<br>ive<br>Learning<br>Method in<br>English<br>language<br>classroom | 5 steps<br>- Positive<br>interdep<br>endence<br>- Individu<br>al<br>Account<br>ability<br>- Face-to-<br>face<br>promoti<br>ve<br>reaction<br>- Interper<br>sonal<br>and<br>small<br>group<br>skills | Improve<br>ment<br>noted in<br>the use<br>of<br>collabora<br>tive<br>learning<br>activity<br>in<br>students'<br>improve<br>ment in<br>speaking<br>performa<br>nce.<br>Students<br>also gave<br>positive<br>feedback<br>when |

| ng cc<br>- d<br>w<br>is<br>in | done<br>compare<br>d to<br>when it<br>s done<br>ndividua<br>ly. |
|-------------------------------|---|
|-------------------------------|---|

Table 2: Summary of the past related studies which focused on collaborative learning.

| Article/St<br>udy | Number of<br>participants/s<br>tudies | Resea<br>rch<br>Desig<br>n | Type of<br>interventi<br>on | Strategies<br>Targeted | Total<br>hours<br>interventi<br>on | Results      |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Vass,E            | Pairs of four 8                       | Case                       | Understan                   | Naturalistic           | 2 weeks                            | The          |
| (2002)            | year-old girls                        | Study                      | ding how                    | observatio             |                                    | identificati |
| . ,               | , 0                                   |                            | the                         | ns of                  |                                    | on of        |
|                   |                                       |                            | collaborati                 | poem-                  |                                    | communic     |
|                   |                                       |                            | ng writers                  | writing                |                                    | ation        |
|                   |                                       |                            | participate                 | activities             |                                    | linked to    |
|                   |                                       |                            | in talk to                  | (acrostics             |                                    | the          |
|                   |                                       |                            | cope with                   | and                    |                                    | processes    |
|                   |                                       |                            | the needs                   | limericks)             |                                    | beneath      |
|                   |                                       |                            | of the task,                | of the four            |                                    | writing,     |
|                   |                                       |                            | and how                     | children.              |                                    | and the      |
|                   |                                       |                            | they use                    | Their                  |                                    | study of     |
|                   |                                       |                            | communic                    | collaborati            |                                    | how these    |
|                   |                                       |                            | ation to                    | ve work                |                                    | communic     |
|                   |                                       |                            | support                     | was                    |                                    | ation        |
|                   |                                       |                            | different                   | observed               |                                    | functions    |
|                   |                                       |                            | parts of                    | and                    |                                    | are shown    |
|                   |                                       |                            | the joint                   | recorded               |                                    | by talking   |
|                   |                                       |                            | writing                     | with video             |                                    | in pairs.    |
|                   |                                       |                            | process                     | and audio              |                                    | Results      |
|                   |                                       |                            | compared                    | equipment              |                                    | indicate     |
|                   |                                       |                            | to when                     | in the                 |                                    | that the     |
|                   |                                       |                            | working                     | literacy               |                                    | friendship   |
|                   |                                       |                            | individuall                 | classroom              |                                    | pair's       |
|                   |                                       |                            | у.                          | (two                   |                                    | discourse    |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | occasions              |                                    | showed       |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | each) and              |                                    | more         |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | in the IT              |                                    | 'collective  |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | suite (one             |                                    | thinking'    |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | occasion               |                                    | which was    |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | each) of               |                                    | an           |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | the school.            |                                    | important    |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | The                    |                                    | element      |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | recordings             |                                    | making       |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | were                   |                                    | difference   |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | transcribed            |                                    | between      |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | and the                |                                    | the pairs.   |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | conversatio            |                                    | is an        |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | nal turns              |                                    | advanced     |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | were                   |                                    | form of      |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | counted in             |                                    | mutual       |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | each                   |                                    | engageme     |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             | transcript.            |                                    | nt and       |
|                   |                                       |                            |                             |                        |                                    | effect to    |

|                                |   |                        |  |  |                     | collaborati<br>on that is<br>purposeful<br>in the<br>context of<br>creative<br>writing.   |
|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|--|---------------------|---|
| Ferguson<br>-Patrick<br>(2014) | A small group<br>of 12 year olds<br>in a classroom. | Action<br>Resea<br>rch | Approache<br>s in<br>collaborati<br>on done to<br>increase<br>writing<br>productivit<br>y and<br>written<br>quality. | Focus on<br>the<br>compositio<br>n of<br>meaning,<br>conformati<br>on to the<br>convention<br>s and<br>structures<br>of written<br>language.<br>Considerin<br>g the social<br>purpose of<br>their<br>writing.<br>Engage<br>students to<br>reach<br>independe<br>nt<br>achieveme<br>nt with<br>guidance<br>through<br>cycle of<br>modelled,<br>guided and<br>independe<br>nt writing. | 6<br>mo<br>nth<br>s | Results<br>show that<br>by letting<br>children to<br>work<br>collaborati<br>vely, they<br>think aloud<br>and in<br>order think<br>about their<br>thought<br>processes.<br>This leads<br>to the<br>writing<br>processes,<br>more<br>wholly<br>than<br>working<br>alone.<br>Suggest<br>that group<br>of mixed-<br>ability<br>which also<br>enables<br>pairing to<br>vary.<br>When the<br>student<br>involves<br>with a<br>higher<br>ability<br>partner,<br>peer<br>coaching |

would happen and teachers should change their partnershi ps and at times permits the child to (peer collaborate ) with someone who has similar strengths and help each other in various ways. Cooperativ е behaviours here includes takingturn, helping and supporting

•

| Amel,S<br>(2015) | Second year<br>Students of<br>English at<br>Mohamed<br>Kheider<br>University of<br>Biskra | Case<br>Study | Descriptive<br>method<br>and<br>questionna<br>ire as a<br>data<br>collecting<br>tool for its<br>practical<br>and useful<br>particularly | 2 types of<br>questionna<br>ire were<br>utilised:<br>1)The<br>students'<br>questionna<br>ire -To<br>understand<br>assumption<br>of the<br>writing | Not<br>mentione<br>d | The<br>students<br>are aware<br>of their<br>level in<br>writing<br>where they<br>rated their<br>writing as<br>average.<br>These<br>students |
|------------------|---|---------------|---|---|----------------------|---|

## INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Vol. 9, No. 2, 2020, E-ISSN: 2226-6348 © 2020

| in our  | skill, the         | also know                |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| context | collaborati        | their main               |
|         | ve                 | problems                 |
|         | technique          | (grammar,                |
|         | and                | spelling)                |
|         | teacher's          | as it is                 |
|         | role in the        | known as a               |
|         | classroom,         | first step in            |
|         | using a            | improving                |
|         | variety of         | their                    |
|         | question           | writings.                |
|         | types:             | When                     |
|         | yes/no             | students                 |
|         | questions,         | know their               |
|         | multiple           | weaknesse                |
|         | choice             | s they may               |
|         | questions,         | reduce                   |
|         | and open           | them                     |
|         | ended              | through                  |
|         | questions.         | practice.                |
|         |                    | 1)On the                 |
|         | 2)The              | other                    |
|         | teachers'          | hand, mos                |
|         | questionna         | of                       |
|         | ire used for       | students'                |
|         | teachers in        | favour                   |
|         | section of         | learning ir              |
|         | English at         | collaborat               |
|         | Mohamme            | on since                 |
|         | d Kheider          | most of                  |
|         | University         | the                      |
|         | on the             | students                 |
|         | effect of          | admitted                 |
|         | the                | that they                |
|         | implement          | prefer                   |
|         | ation of the       | working ir               |
|         | collaborati        | group tha                |
|         | ve learning        | individual               |
|         | technique          | у.                       |
|         | while              | ,<br>2)The               |
|         | teaching           | ,<br>majority o          |
|         | writing,           | teachers                 |
|         | and how            | confirmed                |
|         | they see           | that                     |
|         | ,                  |                          |
|         | their              | collaborat               |
|         | their<br>learners' | collaborat<br>ve writing |

| after using | for       |
|-------------|-----------|
| this        | students' |
| technique   | writing   |
|             | level     |
|             | improvem  |
|             | ent.      |
|             |           |

Table 3: Summary of the past related studies which focused on collaborative learning in writing skills.

| Article/S<br>tudy | Number of<br>participants/s<br>tudies | Research<br>Design | Type of<br>interventi<br>on | Strategies<br>Targeted | Total<br>hours<br>intervent<br>ion | Results            |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Reppert<br>(2004) | Fifteen native<br>Chinese-            | Experime<br>ntal   | About 21<br>poems           | Involves<br>pre-       | Two to<br>three                    | Suggests selection |
| (2004)            | speaking                              | study              | and 15                      | treatment              | week                               | of                 |
|                   | graduate                              | ocady              | children's                  | data                   |                                    | materials          |
|                   | students or                           |                    | picture                     | collection             |                                    | carefully          |
|                   | professionals                         |                    | ,<br>books                  | where                  |                                    | ,<br>bearing in    |
|                   | associated                            |                    | were                        | students fill          |                                    | mind the           |
|                   | with                                  |                    | selected                    | out the                |                                    | learners           |
|                   | Iowa State                            |                    | for use.                    | backgroun              |                                    | need. It           |
|                   | University                            |                    | More                        | d                      |                                    | can be an          |
|                   |                                       |                    | poems                       | questionna             |                                    | interesting        |
|                   |                                       |                    | than                        | ire and                |                                    | and useful         |
|                   |                                       |                    | books                       | make three             |                                    | texts for          |
|                   |                                       |                    | were                        | short                  |                                    | the                |
|                   |                                       |                    | chosen                      | recordings             |                                    | learning of        |
|                   |                                       |                    | because                     | of their               |                                    | language,          |
|                   |                                       |                    | the books                   | speech.                |                                    | though it          |
|                   |                                       |                    | were                        | Post-                  |                                    | may not            |
|                   |                                       |                    | usually                     | treatment              |                                    | be a direct        |
|                   |                                       |                    | more                        | data                   |                                    | need of            |
|                   |                                       |                    | longer                      | collection             |                                    | the                |
|                   |                                       |                    | than the                    | Was                    |                                    | student.           |
|                   |                                       |                    | poems,<br>thus              | completed              |                                    | This type<br>of    |
|                   |                                       |                    | taking                      | using a<br>questionna  |                                    | literature         |
|                   |                                       |                    | longer to                   | ire and                |                                    | interaction        |
|                   |                                       |                    | read and                    | recording              |                                    | enforcing          |
|                   |                                       |                    | work                        | samples of             |                                    | is useful          |
|                   |                                       |                    | with.                       | their                  |                                    | for the            |
|                   |                                       |                    |                             | speech                 |                                    | language           |

|                            |  |                           |   | (Answer<br>which<br>pieces of<br>literature<br>the<br>participant<br>s most and<br>least<br>enjoyed<br>and their<br>attitudes<br>about using |   | classroom.<br>The<br>findings<br>included<br>sessions in<br>classroom<br>and<br>working<br>with a<br>group can<br>help lesser<br>the              |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Pattanpic<br>het<br>(2011) | 35<br>undergraduat<br>e students<br>enrolled in a<br>fundamental<br>English course<br>at Bangkok | Experime<br>ntal<br>study | The use<br>of<br>collaborat<br>ive<br>learning<br>to<br>enhance | literature<br>for English<br>language<br>study).<br>Completion<br>of a<br>student<br>diary after<br>finishing<br>each task.                  | (One<br>week for<br>each<br>process)<br>-3<br>speaking<br>tasks   | problem of<br>comprehe<br>nding<br>difficult<br>poetry.<br>The<br>findings<br>revealed<br>that most<br>of the<br>students<br>gave                 |
|                            | University.  |                           | students<br>speaking<br>achievem<br>ents.                       | Filling in a<br>four scale<br>rating<br>questionna<br>ire<br>Joining a<br>semi-<br>structured<br>interview                                   | (one at a<br>time)<br>-Pre test<br>-<br>Collabora<br>tive<br>interventi<br>on<br>-Post-test<br>-        | positive<br>feedback<br>in the<br>usage of<br>collaborati<br>ve learning<br>as a<br>method of<br>instruction<br>s in an                           |
|                            |  |                           |   | at the end<br>of the<br>course.  | Students'<br>diary and<br>filling up<br>a<br>question<br>naire<br>-Semi-<br>structure<br>d<br>interview | English<br>speaking<br>classroom.<br>This<br>method is<br>useful in<br>developing<br>students'<br>ability and<br>provided<br>positive<br>learning |

|   |   |                              |  |  |                                | atmospher<br>e in<br>classroom.   |
|---|---|------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Luh Ayu<br>Freniawa<br>ti Murda,<br>Flora,<br>Huzairin<br>( 2015) | 37 students in<br>a class of<br>ninth grade | Quantita<br>tive<br>Research | Individual<br>task- Pre<br>test<br>Collabora<br>tive<br>learning<br>-Post test | Test of<br>speaking<br>ability<br>Pre-test<br>and post-<br>test<br>Aspects of<br>speaking<br>such as<br>pronunciati<br>on,<br>grammar,<br>vocabulary,<br>fluency,<br>and<br>Comprehe<br>nsion.<br>1)Group<br>Problem<br>Solving<br>2)Think-<br>Pair-Share<br>3) Case<br>Study<br>classroom<br>activity | Conducte<br>d in 5<br>meetings | An<br>increase in<br>the post-<br>test score<br>in the<br>aspects of<br>speaking<br>and<br>pronunciat<br>ion.<br>Significant<br>difference<br>in the<br>post-test<br>after<br>Collaborati<br>ve learning<br>was<br>implement<br>ed. |

Table 4: Summary of the past related studies which focused on collaborative learning in oral skills.

## **Collaborative Learning and Environment Suitable for Students Learning in Poetry**

Four relevant systematic reviews were identified (Davies, Jindal-Snape, Collier, Digby, Hay, Howe 2012; Lockney and Proudfoot 2013; Hanjan and Lili 2014; Affendi and Aziz 2020) and the findings of these systematic review shed light on collaborative learning as an environment suitable for poetry learning. "Creative learning environments in education" by Davies, Jindal-Snape, Collier, Digby, Hay, Howe 2012 has examined 210 studies related to creative environments for learning in schools, commissioned by Learning and Teaching Scotland (LTS). The team of six reviewers found comparatively few empirical studies published in the period of 2005–2011.However, there were sufficient evidence that supported the importance of the following factors such as; materials available were appropriate ; exposure outside of the classroom/school environment; game-based approach allowing learner to take responsibility; relationships that respects teachers and learners; space for peer collaboration; relationships

with outside agencies; knowledge of learners' needs; and non-methodological planning in supporting creative skills development in children and young people.

Lockney and Proudfoot (2013), carried out an action research on a project that suggested 'thinking aloud protocols' which is an example of developing the pupils' confidence in poetry writing and the time they spent on redrafting process. The project that comprised 31 participants was carried out in pairs where collaborative writing helps to increase the pupils' confidence. Hanjani and Lili (2014), did a comprehensive review on "Exploring L2 writers' collaborative revision interactions and their writing performance" and the study main focus was on sociocultural theory. It's about collaborative revision involving peer interactions and examines the effect caused to the quality of the participants' L2 writing proficiency by the use of joint revision. It was noted in the study that the scaffolding done was useful and beneficial to the combined revision task disregarding their level of L2 writing proficiency. These findings suggest that to do better in writing and revision skills, collaborative revision can be embedded in EFL writing pedagogy as a method.

The evidence of the use of collaborating techniques Malaysian ESL learners is much limited. Affendi and Aziz (2020) did a systematic review on the "Challenges and Approaches in the teaching of English Literature in enhancing English proficiency. The paper was a comprehensive review on 18 studies on the challenges with the teaching of English Literature such as text selection, contexts and themes, language style, teacher's method of teaching, teaching approaches implemented in Literature lessons. Some of the approaches as mentioned by Rashid, Vethamani & Rahman (2010), are information-based approach, moralphilosophical approach, paraphrastic approach (Thalif,1995), language-based approach (Carter, 1988) and personal-response approach (Vacca and Vacca, 2005). It was also mentioned that teachers have a task of improving literature lessons by planning various teaching approaches while also considering the students' differences. Muthusamy et al. (2017) clarified that the best way to learn literature is through collaborative learning as students learn better by sharing ideas and opinion during discussion. Teachers need to vary teaching approaches that could be implemented in teaching literature in activities that is done in class to make sure the lessons are not boring and enjoyable.

## **Collaborative Learning**

In collaborative learning, Chandra (2015) cited that students will eventually learn to work with all groups of people. There are many opportunities for them to ponder and reply when asked upon in a diverse setting during group discussion. This in turn permit them to voice out their ideas based on the differences of culture. This will help them to understand other cultures and admit different points of view. Other than that, this learning approach is useful for students who lack social skills. As they work together with other people as a team, they can boost their confidence by taking part more actively in the discussion. This is especially so when handling a difficult task as mentioned by Boxtel, Linden and Kanselaar (2000) where students used concept map and poster to interpret the task that was given to them by having discussion that is well planned and detailed. This is of importance for learning concept. This interaction is reflected in a focus on understanding and the building of a mutual understanding which could be applied in all task found especially challenging for students.

In another paper "The Importance of Implementing Collaborative Learning in the English as a Second Language (ESL Classroom) in Malaysia" by Ibrahim et.al (2015) found proof that students engaging in process involving collaborative learning shows higher or sophisticated levels of thinking and are able to retain information longer. The researchers cited Fung (2010)

stating that majority Malaysian students are exposed to rote learning concept or also known as 'spoon feeding' by the teachers. These students must become more independent learners. Thus, the model of collaborative learning should be provided in the ESL classroom to enhance learning. The collaborative framework consists of 5 steps which is: positive interdependence, individual accountability, face-to-face promotive reaction, interpersonal and small group skills and group processing. The significance of collaborative learning according to Hedge (2000) was mentioned. Also as mentioned by Ibrahim et.al.(2015), when students who are from differing performance levels or are from mixed ability classroom work together to achieve a purpose they want to achieve, students are in charge of not only their learning but indirectly to their friend's learning process.

In another research on collaborative learning by Laal, M. & Ghodsi, S.M. (2012) on the article 'Benefits of Collaborative Learning' main problems are established through literature review on collaborative learning and the effects and importance of collaborative learning style. Collaborative learning when it is student-centred, leads to a focus on the teaching and learning and allows students to be responsible for their individual learning (Lowman 1987). This method is useful in the developments of the students' competence and creates a healthy learning atmosphere in the classroom. The findings revealed the improvement noted in the use of collaborative learning activity in improving students speaking performance. Students also gave positive feedback when this is done compared to when it is done individually.

#### **Collaborative Learning in Writing Skills**

A case study by Vass (2002) answered the first research question, i.e. how does collaborative learning help in developing students' guided writing of poetry. The researcher looks for an understanding on how the writers collaborate and participate in talk to deal with the demand of the task, and how the use of discourse could support the differing sessions of the joint writing process compared to when working individually by choosing 4 pair of 8 year-olds in a normal classroom environment. It was done with four children where the poem-writing activities of naturalistic observation (acrostics and limericks) was carried out. Their collaboration was watched and recorded using video and audio equipment which was then turned into a transcript. This could be done in smaller number group of students and in the case of bigger sample size, purposive sampling could be used. In the end, the results indicate that the friendship pair's discourse showed more 'collective thinking' which was an important element in making a difference between the pairs. It was seen as an advanced form of agreed involvement and the effect to collaboration that is purposeful in creative writing.

As studies regarding collaborative in writing skills in poetry were limited, similar studies of collaboration in writing skills were selected. In a classroom with mixed ability, children who share their writing will be able to challenge it and become engaged on a good writing skills as they see mistakes as continuous learning (Cicalese, 2003). Ferguson-Patrick (2014) in her study concluded that by working collaboratively allows children on how to think aloud and this allow them in thinking on their thought processes. It essentially leads to the process of writing, more wholly than working alone. The researcher goes on to suggest that group of mixed-ability allow teachers to be able to vary their pairing. When this student engages with a partner who has more ability, peer coaching would happen and so teachers should change their pairing and sometimes permits the child to (peer collaborate) with someone who has similar strengths and help each other in various ways. Cooperative behaviours here includes turn-taking, helping and supporting.

In another study on second year students of English at Mohamed Kheider University of Biskra, researcher Amel (2015), involved students and teachers of the writing division. It mentioned that the students are realise their writing level (69.38%) and students said their writing as average. They acknowledge their main problems were (grammar, spelling) which is good as weakness is identified in improving their writings, it will help them to lessen it through practice. Also, students prefer collaboration learning since (89.71%) of the students mentioned preference for group work than individual work. Collaborative learning provides the position for them to speak about their thinking and exchanging of ideas with their peers. It lowers the worries and the stress when learning together. Furthermore, some of them think that they enjoy the task when they do it with their friends. The majority of teachers on the other hand (50%)mentioned that collaborative writing is useful for students' writing level improvement. Collaborative learning helps students in churning ideas well and also provides peer-feedback. A number of research has shown that collaborative language acquisition in classrooms can improve students' writing abilities. According to Herreman (1988), the group communication in collaborative learning is an effective supplement to the writing process. This concurs with Amel (2015), and in his study on the how effective collaborative learning is on the writing skills.

## **Collaborative Learning in Oral Skills**

Collaborative learning is learning together cooperatively through oral speaking or communication lessons carried out in the classroom. Therefore, many researches have backed up the effectiveness of this approach in terms of enhancing oral performance in language acquisition classrooms. For example, Hedge (2000) claimed that collaborative learning helps students to develop communicative abilities thus strengthening their oral communication skills. In a study by Pattanpichet (2011), in his experimental study on 35 undergraduate students at Bangkok University showed that the students scored higher in oral test after the intervention of collaborative learning. Most of the students also gave positive feedback in the usage of collaborative learning as a method of instructions in a classroom that speaks English. The method can useful in development of the students' ability and provided positive learning environment in classroom.

As there are limited studies relating to collaborative learning in oral performance in poetry, the closest skills that could be assessed was for oral skills. The study carried out on 'Literature and the development of oral fluency: a study using poetry and children's literature in adult ESL instruction' by Reppert (2004), suggests selection of materials carefully bearing in mind the learners needs. It can be an interesting and useful texts for the learning of language, though it may not be a direct need of the student. The experimental study was conducted on fifteen native Chinese-speaking graduate students or professionals attached with Iowa State University. This type of literature interaction enforcing can be useful for the language classroom. The findings included sessions in classroom and working with a group can help lessen the problem of comprehending difficult poetry.

Aspects of oral skills includes pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension can be taken into account when conducting such skills. Activities suggested includes group problem solving, think-pair-share and case study classroom activity. This was also mentioned in the research by Murda, Flora, Huzairin (2015) in a study comprising of 37 students in a class of ninth grade. There was an increase in the post-test score in the aspects of speaking and pronunciation. There was significant difference in the post-test after collaborative learning was implemented. The good cooperation with their pair is really

important in order for students to check on any mistakes and be able to read the poetry confidently in the classroom.

## Conclusion

The findings of this review had highlighted on the important aspects of collaborative learning in writing and oral skills with ESL/ EFL learners through different proficiency level. This could be applied across all fields of Language Arts whether it is poetry, drama or story-telling. Learning process using Collaborative Learning was effective in developing the students' competence and providing positive learning atmosphere in the classroom (Pattanpichet, 2011). This is because working together or in pairs brought a sense of unity and familiarity among the students and making them became more comfortable working with the tasks and with one another. This will result in having better confidence thus helping students to be more relaxed and able to enjoy themselves in the learning process.

Through dialogue with their peers, groups or pair of students could be asked to work together to make sense of a series of poems. In a study conducted by Dias (1979) to compare the effects of a collaborative learning model to teacher-centred approach in poetry reading and interpreting, the findings were those involved in collaborative exercises scored significantly higher on the quality of their responses to sight poetry than students who were engaged in teacher-led activities. Dias concluded that the teacher-centred approaches break students' initial responses and prevented them from developing a "sure sense of their own response" (p. 206).

Many researchers and teachers support the use of poetry in learning English because it provides a risk-free learning environment where students have improved their oral skills in a relaxed and enjoyable way (Hadaway et al. 2001). Poetry learning helps students in developing phonemic awareness, speaking ability and listening skills by the promotion of oral language skills. The topics and powerful imagery in poetry helps learners focus on the content and its meaning, not just the language itself. This will enable pupils to build their personal oral language through poems when students hear and enjoy the rich vocabulary in poetry. In addition, discussions and conversations about poems as a whole class or in small groups provides personal opinions and narrations from the students themselves (Hadaway et al. 2001).

A number of studies have shown that collaborative learning in language acquisition classrooms can enhance students' writing abilities. According to Herreman (1988), the group communication process in collaborative learning is an effective complement to the writing process. It concurs with the writings of Amel (2015) and Ferguson-Patrick (2014) in their study concluding that by collaborating, they also think aloud and in allows them thinking about their thought processes, which leads to the writing processes, more wholly compared to working alone. Thus, collaborative learning in guided writing in poetry would facilitate students to work together and put on their thinking caps together to write better especially in a classroom with mixed ability.

Collaborative learning is a thought about learning as a naturally social act in which the students discuss among themselves during the learning process. Therefore, many scholars have supporting the effectiveness of this approach in terms of enhancing oral performance in language acquisition classrooms. For example, Hedge claimed that collaboration helps students to enhance communicative abilities and improving their oral communication skills. This was also mentioned by Murda, Flora and Huzairin (2015), who found that there was a great improvement in students' speaking skills after they were taught using collaborative

learning approach. From the result of the post-test scores, the researchers found that the students could pronounce the words and sentence better than in the pre-test. Their fluency also improved as the students were no longer hesitant in expressing some words in English. Hence, students will develop better oral performance skills when they could practice with their pair and identify if there was a mistake in their pronunciation or grammar usage before they recite their poetry.

In conclusion, the findings of past systematic reviews (Davies, Jindal-Snape, Collier, Digby, Hay, Howe 2012; Lockney, Proudfoot 2013 ; Hanjani, Lili 2014 and Affendi & Aziz 2020) and past related studies which employed different research designs, i.e case study (Vass, E 2002 ; Saoula Amel 2015), experimental study (Van Boxtel, Van der Linden and Kanselaar 2000 ; Reppert 2004; Pattanpichet 2011), quantitative research (Murda, Flora, Huzairin 2015), action research (Ferguson-Patrick 2014 ) and comprehensive review (Ibrahim, Shak, Zaidi & Yassin) indicate the use of collaborative learning to develop students' writing and oral skill in ESL/EFL learners. This could be also incorporate in the guided writing and oral performance skills of pupils in poetry.

## Limitations

Though the results of this systematic review demonstrated that collaboration can be incorporated in students' writing and oral skills, two primary limitations of this review will be acknowledged. The first limitation is the field of studies as it was generalised as the teaching of English. There were only 2 researchers (Reppert 2004 and Vass, E 2002) who explored the usage of collaborative learning in the teaching of poetry. Although there are a number of studies that have been carried out with regards to collaborative approach in developing students' writing skills, not much has been done to look into the effectiveness of this learning approach in poetry.

Also, overall in the literature reviewed, only few studies considered looking into the use of collaborative learning on oral performance of poetry. For example, Dias (1979) concluded that collaborative learning model facilitated the students' abilities to respond to a poem openly and confidently. In short, more research needs to be carried out to explore the effectiveness of collaborative learning on students' oral performance in poetry recitation. Likewise, the studies in which the researchers explored the teacher's perspectives towards the use of collaborative strategy was also limited (Amel, 2015). Another limitation would be the short time frame fixed for this systematic review.

## Recommendation

It is recommended that studies involving various types of poetry could be done. It is recommended that more studies of collaborative learning using different forms of poems like haiku or sonnet be used in developing students guided writing and oral performance in poetry. This could provide for an expression of creativity in writing poetry in its different form. As the study focusing on collaborative learning in poetry writing and poetry recital are limited, more researches need to be carried out on this area of creative writing. This would further encourage students to embrace poetry without any limitations or fear.

Further studies involving various research designs and bigger sample size need to be undertaken. Since most previous studies interventions were limited in time, it is proposed that longitudinal studies be conducted over a longer period of time to monitor the effectiveness of collaborative learning.

## References

- Affendi, F. R., & Aziz , A. A. (2009). Systematic Review : The Challenges and Approaches in The Teaching of English Literature in Enhancing English Proficiency.
- Adam, A. A. S., & Babiker, Y. O. (2015) The Role of Literature in Enhancing Creative Writing from Teachers' Perspectives. *English Language and Literature Studies*, *5*(1), 109.
- Amel, S. (2015). The Collaborative Learning Strategy as a Tool to Enhance EFL Learners' Writing Skills. A case Study: Second year Students of English at Mohamed Kheider University of Biskra. Master, Dissertation. Mohamed Kheider University of BISKRA.
- Aryusmar, A., & Putria, W. (2014) The Effectiveness of Teaching Creative Writing Using Cinquain Poetry. *Humaniora*, *5*(2), 1037-1048.
- Chandra, R. (2015). Collaborative learning for educational achievement. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 5(3), 2320-7388.
- Chitravelu, N., Sithamparam, S., & Teh, S. C. (2005). *ELT Methodology: Principles and Practice.* Oxford Fajar.
- Cicalese, C. (2003). Children's Perspectives on Interactive Writing versus Independent Writing in Primary Grades.
- Collins, B. (2020). Writing the poems. https://www.masterclass.com/classes/billy-collins-teaches-reading-and-writing-poetry/chapters/writing-the-poem\_
- Davies, D., Jindal-Snape, D., Collier, C., Digby, R., Hay, P., & Howe, A. (2012). Creative environments for learning in schools. *Thinking Skills and Creativity* 8(1),80-91.
- Deswita, S. (2014). Teaching Writing a Descriptive Text by Using the Bio-Poems Strategy to Junior High School Students. *JELT* 2, 2, Serie C. March (2014), 234-239.
- Dias, P. (1979). Developing independent readers of poetry: An approach in the high school. *McGill Journal of Education*, 14, 199-214.
- Dillenbourg, P. (1999) What do you mean by collaborative learning.
- Ferguson-Patrick, Kate. (2007). Writers develop skills through collaboration: An action research approach. *Educational Action Research*, 15(2), 159-180.
- Freniawati, L. A., Nainiggolan, F., & Huzairin, H. (2015). The Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning in Improving Students' Speaking Skills. PhD. Dissertation, Lampung University.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge.
- Finch, A. (2003) Using poems to teach English. English Language Teaching. 15(2), 29-45. English Language Teaching ,15(2), 29-45.
- Fung, L. Y. (2010). A study on the learning approaches of Malaysian students in relation to English language acquisition. *American Journal of Scientific Research* 9, 5-11.
- Hadaway, N. L., Vardell, S. M., & Young, T. A. (2001). Scaffolding oral language development through poetry for students learning English. *The Reading Teacher* 54(8), 796–806.
- Hanjani, A. M., & Li, L. (2014). Exploring L2 writers' collaborative revision interactions and their writing performance. *System*, *44*, 101-114.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Herreman, D. (1988). None of Us Is as Smart as All of Us. In Golub, J. (1988), *Focus on Collaborative Learning. Classroom Practices in Teaching English*, National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, pp.5-12.
- Hughes, J. (2007). Poetry: A powerful medium for literacy and technology development.

- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching 39*(2), 83-101.
- Ibrahim, N., Shak, M. S. Y., Mohd, T., Zaidi, A., & Yasin, S. M. A. (2015). The importance of implementing collaborative learning in the English as a second language (ESL) classroom in Malaysia. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, *31*, 346-353.
- Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1985). Relationships Between Black and White Students in Intergroup Cooperation and Competition. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 125(4), 421-428.
- Kagan, J. (1984). The nature of the child. Basic Books.
- Khairiyah, M. Y., & Haryani, M. H. (2003). Cooperative learning in process dynamics and control course for undergraduate chemical engineering students. In Proc. 7<sup>th</sup> Triennial AEESEAP Conf. on Engineering Education (pp.115-121)
- Kidder, H. L. (2019). How to Write a Poem: 8 Fundamentals for Writing Poetry That's Meaningful. https://self-publishingschool.com/how-to-write-a-poem/\_.
- Lazar, G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: A guide for teachers and trainers*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Lockney, K., & Proudfoot, K. (2013). Writing the Unseen Poem: Can the writing of poetry help to support pupil's engagement in the reading of poetry? *English in Education* 47(2),147 162.
- Marimutu, S. (2007). Challenges faced by teachers in teaching poetry. Degree. Dissertation, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Mitnik, R., Recabarren, M., Nussbaum, M., & Soto, A. (2009). Collaborative Robotic Instruction: A Graph Teaching Experience. *Computers & Education 53*(2),330–342.
- Ministry of Education Malaysia. (2013). Malaysia Education Blueprint (2013-2025).
- Murda, L. A., & Flora, H. (2015). The Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning in Improving Students Speaking Skill. *Lampung University: Teacher Training and Education*.
- Nowak-Fabrykowski, K. (2000). The role of poetry and stories of young children and their process of learning. *Journal of Instructional Psychology* 27(1), 59-65.
- Newsome, K. E. (2008). Using Poetry to Improve Fluency and Comprehension in Third-Grade Students. *Georgia Educational Researcher* 6(1),1-21.
- Pattanpichet, F. (2011). The Effects of Using Collaborative Learning to Enhance Students English Speaking Achievement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning 8*(11),1-10.
- Picpican-Bell, A. (2005) Developing oral proficiency through poem recitation in elementary English as a second language.
- Rashid, R. A., Vethamani, M. E., & Rahman, S. B. A. (2010) Approaches Employed by Teachers in Teaching Literature to Less Proficient Students in Form 1 and Form 2. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4),87-99.
- Miguel, S. J., Barraquio, D., & Revilla, R. (2006). Smart English: More Than a Work Test for Grammar and Syntax, Introduction. C&E Publishing.
- Sawant, S. (2016). Collaborative Online Learning Tools and Types: Few Perspectives of Its Use in Academic Library. In *Human Development and Interaction in the Age of Ubiquitous Technology* (pp.94-119). IGI Global.
- Seng, T. H. (2006). Cooperative learning and achievement in English language acquisition in a literature class in a secondary school. *Unpublished Master Dissertation, University Technology Malaysia.*
- Sidhu, G. K., Fook, C. Y., & Kaur, S. (2010). Instructional Practices in Teaching Literature: Observations of ESL Classroom in Malaysia. *English Language Teaching 3*(2), 54-63.

- Sinha, Y. K. (2017). Teaching Poetry in English-Medium-Instruction Universities in the Middle-East: A Linguistically Oriented Model. *PONTE International Scientific Research Journal.* 73,245-250.
- Straw, S. B., Craven, L., Sadowy, P., & Baardman, P. (1993). Poetry in the Primary Classroom: Collaboration and Response. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts:34* (2).

Subramaniam, G. (2003). Literature programmes in Malaysian school: A historical overview.

- Subramaniam, G., Hamdan, S. I., & Koo, Y. L. (2003). The incorporation of the literature component in the Malaysian ESL syllabus for secondary schools: A study of pedagogical implications. *Teaching of literature in ESL/EFL contexts. Petaling Jaya: Sasbadi Sdn. Bhd.*
- Talif, R. (1995). *Teaching literature in ESL: The Malaysian context*. Penerbit Universiti Pertanian Malaysia.
- Tinto, V., & Pusser, B. (2006). Moving from Theory to Action: Building a Model of Institutional Action for Student Success. *National Postsecondary Education Cooperative*, 1-51.
- Utami, I. L. P. (2012): Learning English through Poetry for EFL students. *Bahasa dan Seni : Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni dan Pengajarannya, 40*(1).
- Vacca, R. T. & Vacca, J. A. L.(1981). *Content Area reading*-Boston: Little.
- Van Boxtel, C., Van der Linden, J., & Kanselaar, G. (2000). Collaborative learning tasks and the elaboration of conceptual knowledge. *Learning and Instruction 10*(2000),311–330.

Vass, E. (2002). Friendship and collaborative creative writing in the primary classroom. *Journal* of Computer Assisted Learning, 18(1), 102-110.

- Wang, W. (2017). Improving Students' Oral Skills through A Cooperative Learning Approach to Teaching Chinese College English.
- Wilmer, E. (2008). Student Support Services for the Underprepared Student. *Inquiry: The Journal of the Virginia Community Colleges 13*(1) Art. 2,5-20.