Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561 P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume: 02 Issue: 02 February-2026

The Power of Peers: A Study of Unlocking Students Potential through Collaborative Speaking and Motivation

Hosein Siahpoosh
Department of English, Ard.C., Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

Maryam Aghdamie
PhD Student of TEFL, Department of English Language, Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran

Published Date: February 20, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E2/2026-09**

ABSTRACT: This study examined the impact of cooperative learning on the speaking ability and motivation of English language learners. 100 students, selected based on their Oxford Placement Test scores, were randomly assigned to either an experimental group (N=50) or a control group (N=50). Both groups completed pre-tests assessing speaking proficiency and language learning motivation (using the Language Learning Orientations Scale). The experimental group then engaged in cooperative learning activities using the Number Heads Together (NHT) technique, while the control group received traditional instruction. Post-tests were administered to both groups to measure changes in speaking ability and motivation. Results revealed a statistically significant improvement in speaking ability for the experimental group compared to the control group. However, no significant difference was found in motivation levels between the two groups. These findings suggest that cooperative learning, specifically the NHT technique, can effectively enhance speaking skills in English language learners, but its impact on motivation may be less pronounced.

KEYWORDS: Cooperative learning, Motivation, Speaking ability

INTRODUCTION

In today's globalized world, being able to communicate effectively in English is becoming more and more important. But a lot of students have trouble speaking confidently and fluently, especially when they're learning a second language. This problem emphasizes the need for creative teaching strategies that might improve students' public speaking abilities and provide a supportive learning environment. With its focus on peer contact and collaboration, cooperative learning has come to light as a viable approach to solve these issues (Cempaka, 2024; Lei, et al. 2023; Morán & Iza, 2024; Namaziandost, et al. 2020).

It is commonly known that cooperative learning, a student-centered strategy that promotes teamwork and shared accountability, has the ability to improve academic performance and foster healthy social relationships. Students can actively participate in the learning process, assist one another's knowledge, and build critical communication skills by working in small groups. Language learners who might be afraid to speak in front of the class can benefit greatly from this collaborative environment's ability to create a sense of community and belonging (al Hussaini, 2024; Barad, 2024; Tsay-Vogel & Brady, 2010).

While cooperative learning has many established advantages, more research is needed to determine how cooperative learning specifically affects students' motivation and speaking skills, according to Andrade Morán & Aguaiza Iza (2024) and Limones-Borbor (2023). Speaking fluently and confidently, along with accurate grammar, pronunciation, and fluency, are all important components of speaking proficiency. Furthermore, motivation plays a crucial role in language learning, as it influences students' engagement, effort, and overall success. Understanding how cooperative learning influences these aspects is essential for optimizing language teaching practices.

According to Meena (2020), Pérez-Cañar & Troya-Sánchez (2023), Sadeghi & Ganji (2020), and other researchers, speaking English fluently and confidently is a challenge that many students face. This research aims to explore a promising solution - cooperative learning - that may be able to tackle this challenge. By demonstrating the effectiveness of cooperative learning in enhancing speaking skills, this study can provide insightful information for educators seeking to enhance their teaching practices.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The current study can provide educators with useful advice on how to successfully include cooperative learning into their classes. Through emphasizing the particular advantages of the Number Heads Together (NHT) approach (Humairoh, et al. 2024; Kusuma & Rahayu, 2024), we can offer a tangible illustration of a cooperative learning tactic that teachers may easily implement.

Even though speaking skill is the study's main focus, motivation research is just as crucial. Teachers can foster a more stimulating and encouraging learning environment where students feel empowered to engage and achieve by having a better understanding of how cooperative learning affects student motivation (Huri, et al. 2024; Kasumi & Xhemaili, 2023; Sarwat, et al. 2024; Tamimy, et al. 2023).

The results of this study may have wider ramifications for educational policy and practice in terms of policy and practice implications. The results of this study may have an impact on the creation of curricula, teacher preparation initiatives, and the distribution of funding for collaborative learning environments (Abdol Jani, et al. 2024; Gillies, 2016; Liebech-Lien, et al. 2023; Muawanah, 2023).

Even though it's commonly acknowledged how important it is to speak English fluently, many students find it difficult to gain confidence and fluency. This problem is especially noticeable in situations where students are learning a second language, since they could run into linguistic and cultural obstacles that make it difficult for them to communicate clearly. There are few opportunities for students to practice speaking in a meaningful and engaging fashion because traditional teaching techniques frequently concentrate on grammar and vocabulary (Brainee, 2024; Ghafar & Raad, 2023; Haerazi, et al. 2023; Ork, et al. 2024).

Furthermore, according to Chen (2024), Tiu et al. (2023), Alisoy (2024), and Alshuraiaan & Almefleh (2023), it is clear that creative pedagogical techniques are needed to overcome the difficulties associated with speaking proficiency. Although many approaches have been put forth, research is still being done to determine which ones are most helpful in helping language learners become more fluent, self-assured, and motivated. This knowledge gap highlights the significance of investigating other teaching methods that can improve students' speaking abilities and foster a more encouraging learning atmosphere.

Another significant component of this study is motivation, which affects students' involvement, effort, and general success and is vital to language acquisition (Lăpădat & Lapadat, 2024). But a lot of students find it difficult to stay motivated when learning a language, especially when obstacles and disappointments arise. This lack of drive may result in disinterest, less effort, and eventually worse performance levels. A more successful and captivating learning environment can only be created by knowing how to maintain and encourage motivation in language learners (Dörnyei, 2020; Franchisca, et al. 2024; Krichker, et al. 2023).

Further research is necessary to determine the precise effects of cooperative learning on speaking skill and motivation in language learning, even though it has demonstrated promise in raising academic achievement and encouraging healthy social relationships. Our knowledge of cooperative learning's ability to enhance speaking proficiency is lacking because the majority of the study on the subject concentrates on other academic abilities like writing or reading comprehension (Altamimi & Attamimi, 2014; Namaziandost, et al. 2019).

According to Namaziandost et al. (2019), cooperative learning is a collection of instructional strategies that motivate students to work on academic assignments. It also refers to a method of instruction when students complete a task in groups with the intention of maximizing each other's learning and achieving particular objectives (Nasri & Biria, 2017). Under cooperative learning, students assist one another in acquiring academic material in small groups (Amedu & Gudi, 2017). The idea that CL has favorable impacts on many outcomes is central to a large portion of the recent research (Johnson & Johnson, 2003).

The majority of research on CL's impacts has consistently demonstrated that students' oral English proficiency (Pattanpichet, 2011), reading comprehension (Bolukbas et al., 2011), and writing proficiency (Nasri & Biria, 2017) all improve while using this method. When educators employ the CL approach, their function shifts from being information providers to learning mediators (Nasri & Biria, 2017). In this capacity, coaching, modeling, and facilitation are all involved. When taking on this position, educators should maintain a secure, non-threatening, and student-focused environment. Students will undoubtedly contribute to the cooperative activities assigned to their group in this learning environment (Ning, 2011).

Speaking is an exchange of ideas that moves forward based on what the listeners require (Saddhono, 2012). Speaking is mainly accomplished for communication. To effectively communicate thoughts, ideas, and willingness, the speaker must understand the significance of all they wish to convey. Learning from talking models, according to Saddhono & Slamet (2012) and Suprijono (2009), provides students the confidence to voice their opinions and attitudes. As a kind of heterogeneous learning, cooperative learning involves group members sharing ideas and solving issues together in an effort to succeed (Majid, 2013). The greatest way to address the issue of giving pupils from diverse ethnic backgrounds genuine opportunity for cooperative interaction is through cooperative learning.

Since they are aware that their contributions to teamwork can be individually recognized and assessed, students in CL groups are expected to put in more effort and assume greater accountability for their learning results (McCafferty, et al. 2006; Ning, 2011). These characteristics of CL set it apart from the traditional EFL teaching approach, which is typically defined by teacher-fronted direct instruction and views students as passive recipients of knowledge with minimal agency. According to learning motivation theorists, peer norms that are at odds with academic pursuits are formed in the conventional learning environment, where students are more likely to compete with one another for reinforcement. This is because peers usually do not support academic work, and one student's achievement lowers the likelihood of others' success.

Conversely, because of their positive interconnectedness, students in the CL classroom support one another (Kagan & Kagan, 2009; Slavin, 2000). As a result, group members make an effort to support one another and, more importantly, they motivate one another to work extremely hard. According to Dörnyei (2001), Jacobs & Goh (2007), Kagan & Kagan (2009), and other scholars, CL principles highlight the significance of creating a supportive, caring, and positively interdependent environment where students feel comfortable speaking and are strongly motivated to contribute to group objectives.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

According to several academics, the key components of CL cooperation can help to increase students' intrinsic motivation (Abedi et al. 2019; Kagan & Kagan, 2009; Ziafar & Namaziandost, 2019). These characteristics include students' greater sense of control and ownership over their education, as well as their joy from lending a hand to others and participating in group projects. The application of criterion-referenced calculation and peer evaluation, which are connected to their fundamental psychological demands for relatedness, competence, and autonomy, are also covered."The more cooperative individuals' views, the more they regard themselves as being intrinsically motivated," according to Johnson and Johnson (2009, p. 164), might further boost their perseverance in pursuing goals, joint efficacy, desire for achievement, and joy of learning. Numerous research have been conducted to determine the most effective ways to use cooperative learning to help tertiary students improve their speaking skills and attitudes.

Speaking English is one of the most crucial abilities that language learners need to work on developing and improving (Morozova, 2013). Speaking English fluently is crucial since it's a necessity for daily conversation. Learning English is linked to success in business, tourism, academia, and the workforce in Iran. Learning English is linked to success in Iran's commercial, tourism, education, and employment sectors, among other spheres. According to this viewpoint, English is crucial in many spheres of life. The teacher-centered approach has long been employed in Iran to teach English (Nasri & Biria, 2017), and it is possible that this strategy hindered students' behavior and speaking skills.

There was insufficient engagement and communication between students and teachers. In most Iranian classes, speaking is primarily done by the teachers, who are seen as the authority of the school. As a result, students are not given the chance to practice their language skills and find it difficult to convey their ideas and abilities in English (Al-Sohbani, 2013).

The transition from a teacher-centered to a learner-centered teaching approach has been one of the largest changes in foreign language pedagogy in recent years. With this modification, learners receiving English speaking instruction must now have the chance to speak the language. By encouraging speech and social contact, cooperative learning serves as an alternate method of instruction (Hernandez & Boero, 2018; Russell, 2018).

An approach to teaching English that attempts to create a more learner-centered environment where students' learning is developed independently is called cooperative language learning. Speaking is a difficult ability for learners of the English language because they have to adjust to a new vocabulary (Herrera et al., 2019). A great deal of research has been done on the use of cooperative learning to teach speaking (Al-Tamimi, & Attamimi, 2014; Bagheri, et al. 2013; Kandasamy, & Habil, 2018; Nasri & Biria, 2017). Numerous research have demonstrated that the use of cooperative learning strategies can lead to enhanced speaking abilities and favorable attitudes toward cooperative learning (Alharby, 2015; Nasri & Biria, 2017; Suhendan & Bengu, 2014).

The idea of motivation is among the most intriguing tools used to explain individual variances in the language learning process (Jahansouzshahi, 2009; Lim, 2007). Numerous research works in the field of language learning (Den Brok et al., 2006; Dorynei, 2001; Gardner, 2010) reveal that motivation is regarded as a prominent element in the learning process. Furthermore, motivation is of "particular interest to second/foreign language teachers, administrators and researchers, because it can be presumably enhanced in one specific learning context but weakened in another learning context," as Yuanfang (2009) rightly notes (p. 87). When it comes to studying a second or foreign language, motivation is mainly seen as how hard a student tries to learn the language out of a desire to do so (Kissau, 2006).

Moreover, motivational structures have an impact on students' involvement in the learning process, which in turn affects their achievement (Rezaee et al., 2015; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). When English as a foreign language learners' (EFL) primary language is used for thought and idea interchange, motivation for language acquisition emerges (Vohs, et al. 2008). It is understandable why research confirming motivation has a notably beneficial effect on L2 learning predominate in the literature related to ELT (e.g. Dornyei, 2005; Marashi & Tahan-Shizari, 2015; Vandergrift, 2005).

Being able to converse in a foreign language is the major goal of learning it. Nonetheless, it has been noted that EFL students struggle with English communication. There are several and diverse causes for learners' poor speech (Wang, 2014).

The purpose of this study was to improve students' standard English performances by implementing cooperative language learning in foreign language instruction. It attempted to throw some light on the role that social and affective aspects play in fostering a welcoming and easygoing learning atmosphere and, as a result, improving speaking abilities.

A key component of cooperative learning in ESL instruction is the way students of various proficiency levels collaborate and communicate with one another to finish the task; in this method, students share knowledge and make progress together. By giving students the opportunity to practice speaking English in the group through a variety of fundamental activities and social exchanges, such as asking or offering assistance to other students and carrying out specific roles assigned to different group members, cooperative learning supports each student's personal growth.

The purpose of this study is to look into how cooperative learning affects English language learners' motivation and speaking skills. In particular, we will investigate whether Number Heads Together (NHT) cooperative learning may boost students' enthusiasm to study languages and dramatically increase their speaking ability. This study's research questions are as follows:

RQ1. Does cooperative learning have any significant effect on developing students' speaking ability?

RQ2. Does cooperative learning have any significant effect on developing students' motivation?

METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants in the study were 100 Iranian female intermediate students from Ardabil's Farzanegan High School. The age range of the pupils was 16 to 18. In terms of sex, mother tongue, exposure to English, and cultural background, they were all the same. The participants' general English proficiency was evaluated and homogenized using the Oxford General Proficiency Test (2009) and Solution Placement Test. After selecting 100 intermediate-level participants from a total of 150, they were randomized into two groups: 50 students were placed in the experimental group and 50

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

students in the control group. Subsequently, the students were required to complete a motivation questionnaire (LLOS) and a speaking pre-test to gauge their motivation for CL prior to the experiment and to make sure they were nearly at the same level of speaking competence.

Instruments

The pupils were given the Oxford Placement Test in order to identify the intermediate ones. The exam was divided into four sections: writing, reading comprehension, grammar, and vocabulary. It included ten graded comprehension questions from a reading passage, fifty multiple-choice questions testing students' understanding of syntax and vocabulary, and an optional writing assignment testing students' ability to generate the language. Students' knowledge from primary to intermediate levels is evaluated. 47 was the cut-off point for this research.

This study measured and compared the participants' speaking abilities before and after the treatment using the Speaking portion of the FCE (2014) sample test. This exam was administered as a pretest and a posttest. The Speaking exam has four sections and lasts for fourteen minutes. The Cambridge General Mark Schemes scoring rubrics were used by the researcher and two additional EFL specialists to score the participants' performance. The assessors concentrated on the following areas: interactive communication, discourse management, pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, and pronunciation. For each area, there were five points available. This test had a total score of twenty. The speaking test's computed Cronbach alpha coefficient came out to be.79.

Self-determination theory served as the foundation for Dr. Kimberly Noels' development of the LLOS (Noels et al., 2000). The 42-item LLOS is designed to assess six factors: amotivation (four items), identified regulation (six items), introjected regulation (seven items), external regulation (seven items), and intrinsic motivation (10 items). The questionnaire was scored using a seven-point Likert scale, with one to seven signifying "does not correspond at all" and seven representing "corresponds exactly." Total scale scores fall between 42 and 294. The LLOS questionnaire's internal reliability was determined to have an alpha coefficient of.89.

Procedure

Initially, the subjects were administered the General Proficiency Test (OPT) to determine their homogeneity. 150 intermediate pupils from Ardabil's Farzanegan High School participated in the study. One hundred students were chosen based on the OPT, and they were split into two groups at random: fifty students were placed in the experimental group and fifty students were placed in the control group. A motivation questionnaire (LLOS) and a speaking pre-test were administered to the pupils.The treatment sessions started when the preliminary phases were finished. The 20-week online speaking sessions met twice a week, with 60 minutes dedicated to speaking exercises each time. Before the experimental group's therapy began, the researchers of the current study instructed the instructor in the use of CL instruction. In the current investigation, the researcher employed CL's Number Head Together (NTH) technique. The participants were made aware of the CL procedure that would be applied in their educational setting.

During the experiment, the two groups received the same number of hours to practice speaking skills, and they shared the same learning resources. For each group, the instructor offered comments. Not every student could participate in every session due to time constraints, and the teacher chose the participants at random for both the experimental and control groups.

The students completed the LLOS questionnaire and a posttest on speaking at the conclusion of the study. The SPSS program was used to examine the scores that were used to collect the data. The speaking scores of the participants were scored using a scoring rubric adapted from the Cambridge General Mark Schemes. An additional EFL specialist verified the assessment of the pupils' performance. By calculating the connection between the learners' speaking pre- and posttest scores, Pearson connection was used to determine the inter-rater reliability. For both groups, every training session and exam was conducted remotely.

Design of the Study

The design of the study was true-experimental in which all the participants were selected and assigned to the groups randomly (experimental and control). Then, the experimental group was given treatment. Participants' performances were measured both in pretest and posttest stages. This is a field study, in which the data were gathered via giving speaking test and questionnaire.

Data Analysis

SPSS package were used as the main data-analysis device for analyzing the data. To find out the effect of CL on speaking competence, descriptive statistics including mean scores and standard deviations of the pre-test and post-test were used. Inferential analysis was used to find out if there was any significant difference between the control and experimental groups in both the pre-test and post-test. The data were obtained through speaking test, the Language Learning Orientations Scale and general proficiency test. The collected data were analyzed using two Independent Samples t-Test.

Proficiency Test (OPT)

A homogeneous sample of participants was chosen for the study at the outset using the Oxford General Proficiency Test (2009). Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics for the proficiency test scores.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Scores on Proficiency Test

N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
150	45	69	64.1834	7.15914

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Speaking Pre-test

The researcher gave the pre-test to see if there were any differences between the two groups of students' speaking abilities. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine whether these scores had a normal distribution and satisfied the requirement for employing parametric testing (T-test). The normality check for the scores of the two groups is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Normality Check for Scores on Speaking Pre-test

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Experimental	.144	50	.099
Control	.146	50	.074

The data for the two groups are derived from normal distributions, as Table 2 shows. P-values exceed the threshold of.05. To compare the performance of the two groups on the speaking pretest, the researcher used an independent-samples T-test. The outcomes of this test's descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 3:

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Performance of Two Groups on Speaking Pre-test

	Group	N	Mean	SD
Speaking	Experimental	50	14.5161	1.60978
	Control	50	14.8485	1.30195

The experimental and control groups' mean scores are 14.51 and 14.84, respectively, as Table 3 illustrates. An Independent-sample T-test was performed to see if there was a difference between the groups (Table 4).

Table 4: Independent Samples T-test for Performance of the Groups on Speaking Pre-test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Speaking	Equal variances assumed	2.352	.130	-.911	62	.366
	Equal variances not assumed			-.905	57.753	.369

To perform the Independent-samples T-test in Table 4, the equality of variances must first be examined. Given that the significant rate in the "equal variances assumed" section is.13, which is higher than 0.05, it is assumed that the variances are equal, and the data in the first row are taken into account. Taking into account that the p-value is.36, higher than 0.05 (p-value =.36 >.05), it can be said that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups' mean speaking scores.

Motivation Questionnaire:

As previously stated, an Independent-samples T-test was used to see whether there was a significant difference in the groups' motivation for language learning prior to the lesson. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to determine whether these scores had a normal distribution. The findings of the LLOS questionnaire's normalcy assessment are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Normality Check for Scores on LLOS Pre-Questionnaire

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Experimental	.103	50	.200
Control	.131	50	.161

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

The results of this test were normally distributed, as Table 5 demonstrates (sig =.20,.16 >.05. As a result, the groups' LLOS pre-questionnaire scores were subjected to an Independent Samples T-test. The findings of the descriptive statistics for the students' LLOS questionnaire scores are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics for the Scores on LLOS Pre-Questionnaire

	Group	N	Mean	SD
Speaking	Experimental	50	185.3226	25.56219
	Control	50	183.4545	24.75264

Table 6 shows that the experimental group's overall mean value of the questionnaire during the pre-treatment stage was 185.32, whereas the control group's was 183.45. It suggests that prior to the treatment, the two groups may have had similar levels of motivation. The results of the Independent Samples T-test for the test scores are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7: Independent Samples T-test for the Scores on LLOS Pre-Questionnaire

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
LLOS	Equal variances assumed	.000	.987	.279	62	.767
	Equal variances not assumed			.279	61.438	.768

Table 7 displays the results of the Independent Samples T-test, which indicated that there was no significant difference in the pre-treatment stage students' motivation for language acquisition (p=.76 >.05).

The scores were submitted to the One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to determine whether they met the requirements for using parametric tests (T-test) and had a normal distribution. This was necessary to assess the study's hypotheses and determine the best statistical analysis to compare the performance of the groups on these tests. The findings of the normality check for the speaking posttest scores for the two groups are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8: Normality Check for Scores on Speaking Posttest

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Experimental	.128	50	.200
Control	.141	50	.096

Table 8's findings showed that the scores had a normal distribution (p-value=.200,.096 >.05. The inter-rater reliability of the speaking pre-test was established using Pearson Correlation (Table 9).

Table 9: Correlation between Scores Given by Rater 1 and Rater 2

		Speaking Ability	
		Rater 1	Rater 2
Rater 1	Pearson Correlation	1	.785**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Rater 2	Pearson Correlation	.785**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

Table 9's findings demonstrate that the ratings provided by the two raters had a substantial positive correlation (p=.000<0.05). Additionally, there was a strong connection (.785) between rater 1 and rater 2 ratings.

An Independent-Sample T-test was conducted to investigate the first hypothesis. The outcomes of the test's descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10: Descriptive Statistics for Performance of Two Groups on Speaking Posttest

	Group	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**
Speaking	Experimental	50	16.5806	1.60778
	Control	50	15.6667	1.38444

Speaking of the dependent variable, descriptive statistics show that the experimental group fared better than the control group in the posttest. The speaking test's overall mean score for the experimental group was 16.58, while the control group's score was 15.66. It is evident that the two groups' speaking abilities differed significantly from one another. The results of the Independent-Sample T-test on the performance of the two groups are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11: Independent Samples T-test for Performance of the Groups on Speaking Posttest

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		**t-test for Equality of Means**		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Speaking	Equal variances assumed	.849	.360	2.442	62	.017
	Equal variances not assumed			2.430	59.352	.018

Since the significant rate in the "equal variances assumed" section is.36, which is higher than 0.05 (p-value=.36 >.05), it is assumed that the variances are equal, and the data in the first row are taken into account. There was a significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups, as revealed by the t-test result, which also showed that the posttest p-value was.01. Stated differently, the findings demonstrated that the experimental group, trained using the CL approach, outperformed the control group, trained using the traditional method. Consequently, the study's initial null hypothesis was disproved.

It was necessary to run a second Independent-Sample T-test in order to investigate the second research hypothesis, which stated that cooperative learning has no significant effect on students' motivation development. To do this, the researcher used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to ascertain the normality of the LLOS scores as an assumption for the use of the Independent-Samples T-test (Table 12).

Table 12: Normality Check for the Scores on Post Questionnaire

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
Experimental	.127	50	.200
Control	.083	50	.200

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test result (Table 12) shows that the data were normally distributed with a p-value of.200 for the scores of the two groups. Given the normal distribution of the data, two groups were compared using a parametric test called the Independent-Sample T-test. Descriptive statistics for the LLOS post-questionnaire scores are displayed in Table 13.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for the Scores on Post Questionnaire

	Group	N	Mean	SD
LLOS	Experimental	50	195.3871	22.18960
	Control	50	186.7576	22.06387

Table 13 shows that the experimental group's overall mean score on the questionnaire was 195.38, while the control group's score was 186.75. It suggests that the motivation levels of the two groups may have been comparable. The results of the Independent-Samples T-test for the post-questionnaire scores are shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Independent Samples T-test for the Scores on Post Questionnaire

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Speaking	Equal variances assumed	.152	.698	1.559	62	.124
	Equal variances not assumed			1.559	61.704	.124

To use the independent samples t-test in Table 14, we must first test the equality of variances. Since the significant rate in the "equal variances assumed" section is.69, which is more than 0.05 (p-value=.69 >0.05), it is assumed that the variances are identical, and the data in the first row are taken into account. Based on the observation that the p-value is.12, indicating that the difference in mean motivation scores between the two groups is not statistically significant (p-value=.12>0.05). As a result, the second question's null hypothesis is not rejected because there was no discernible variation in the learners' scores regarding their desire for language acquisition.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to ascertain how cooperative learning affected students' motivation and speaking abilities. The Language Learning Orientations Scale and the First Speaking Test were the two testing tools used to evaluate participant performance in order to provide answers to these questions.

The Independent-Samples T-test findings showed that there was a significant difference in speaking ability across the groups (p=.01). Results, however, did not indicate that CL had a statistically significant impact on students' motivation.

In contrast to the second null hypothesis, which was not rejected, the first null hypothesis was rejected in light of these findings.

The performance of the experimental group following exposure to CL activity (NHT) revealed a significant difference between the findings of the experimental and control groups, indicating that the study aimed to determine whether CL has any influence on increasing speaking ability of the EFL students. Based on the results of this study, it can be said that the CL approach greatly improved the speaking skills of EFL students.

Stated differently, the application of the Numbered Heads Together CL approach greatly enhanced the speaking abilities of EFL students. However, CL did not statistically demonstrate a meaningful influence on students' motivation. Nonetheless, the experimental group's mean LLOS questionnaire score was marginally greater than that of the control group.

The results supported previous research on the positive effects of CL on students' speaking abilities (Alharby, 2015; Al-Sohbani, 2013; Herrera, et al. 2019; Johnson & Johnson, 2003; Meena, 2020; Namaziandost et al., 2019; Nasri & Biria, 2017; Ning & Hornby, 2010; Pattanpichet, 2011; Suhendan & Bengu, 2014). The present study's results also corroborate those of previous research (Chico Lema, 2017; Hong et al., 2022; Ning, 2011; Siahpoosh & Mahdavi, 2024; Siddique et al., 2020; Talebi & Sobhani, 2012; Yang, 2005), which have demonstrated that the CL approach can enhance students' speaking abilities.

The results of this study were consistent with those of Pattanpichet (2011), who looked into how employing CL could raise students' achievement in speaking. The findings demonstrated that CL improved students' speaking abilities. Similarly, Talebi and Sobhani (2012) investigated how CL affected the speaking proficiency of forty students, both male and female, who were learning English. The study's findings showed that, in terms of oral performance, the experimental group did better than the control group. In a study, Ariyani (2016) examined students' speaking abilities using the cooperative learning approach. The study's findings demonstrated that using the cooperative learning approach helped students' speaking abilities.

In contrast to the previous study, the current study's results did not show that the CL approach had any discernible impact on learners' motivation. The present investigation's outcomes were in opposition to those of previous studies (Altamimi & Attamimi, 2014; Johnson, 2017; Marashi & Khatami, 2017; Martinez, et al. 2024; Quinn, 2006; Sachs et al., 2003; Waugh, et al. 2005; Yang, 2005), which reported that the CL approach had a good impact

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

on enhancing the motivation of EFL learners. The results of this study also contradict those of Herrera, et al. (2019), who discovered that students are more driven and less reticent when cooperative learning practices are used.

Additionally, this study was in contrast to Gomleksiz's (2007) research, which looked at how CL affected students' attitudes toward learning English. The data analysis showed that there was a noteworthy improvement in students' attitudes toward learning as well as improved student communications. The results of this study did, however, have some resemblance to those of Namaziandost et al. (2019) and (2019), who showed an increase solely in intrinsic motivation and not in other types of motivation.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to look into how cooperative learning affected students' motivation and speaking abilities. The study's findings showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the experimental group's and the control group's mean speaking posttest scores, and the experimental group fared better than the control group that received traditional instruction.

The study's conclusion is that the experimental group's speaking skills significantly improved after they were taught utilizing the cooperative learning approach (NHT). Through the use of CL in the learning process, students are able to freely debate the text with their friends, express their opinions, and correct the pronunciation and grammar errors of their peers when speaking. Additionally, students will ask their friends and have a group discussion if they are having trouble understanding new words.

The results demonstrated how students' speaking skills are improved when they engage in small group discussions and problem-solving exercises rather than working alone. Nonetheless, the results showed no discernible difference in the two experimental and control groups with respect to CL's ability to raise students' motivation.

Additionally, there was a minor but discernible increase in the experimental group's mean LLOS questionnaire ratings following therapy. It could be related to the fact that teachers were unable to inspire as much in online sessions, or that students did not feel the good emotions that come from actually meeting their group members. In summary, the study's findings showed that the cooperative learning strategy—in this case, Numbered Heads Together—had a favorable impact on raising students' speaking proficiency.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Ideas for Further Research The current study offers proof of the CL method's impact on speaking proficiency but not on motivation. To validate the existing findings and see whether alternate study conditions yield similar outcomes, the study may be conducted again. It would be beneficial to carry out this study with students of various skill levels. Future studies on the effects of CL on other skills, such writing and reading, should also be a priority. Since this study only included female students, it is advised that future studies take into account the perspectives of all genders. More volunteers should be included in future research as well.

REFERENCES

1) Abdol Jani, W., & Razali, F & Ismail, N. (2024). Cooperative learning implementation among elementary Trust School Teacher Program. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*. 13. 1141. 10.11591/ijere.v13i2.26352.
2) Abedi, P., Keshmirshekan, M. H., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). The comparative effect of flipped classroom instruction versus traditional instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners‟ English composition writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 6*(4), 43–56.
3) al Hussaini, M. (2024). The Impact of Cooperative Learning on Students' Academic Achievement and Social Behavior. 8. 15.
4) Alharby, H. A. (2015). Improving Students‟ English-Speaking Proficiency in Saudi Public Schools. *International Journal of Instruction, 8*(1), 105–115.
5) Alisoy, H. (2024). ESL teaching methods and approaches: Essential strategies for encouraging effective language acquisition.. Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities. 1. 10.69760/jbc9s484.
6) Alshuraiaan, A., & Almefleh, H. (2023). Exploring Effective Pedagogical Approaches and Strategies for TESOL Education to Enhance English Language Learning in Kuwait. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*. 6. 250-158. 10.32996/ijllt.2023.6.8.25.
7) Al-Sohbani, Y. A. (2013). An Exploration of English Language Teaching Pedagogy in Secondary Yemeni Education: A Case Study. *International journal of English language & translation studies, 1*(3), 40–55.
8) Al-Tamimi, N. O. M., & Attamimi, R. A. (2014). Effectiveness of cooperative learning inenhancing speaking skills and attitudes towards learning English. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *6*(4), 27–45
9) Altamimi, N., & Attamimi, R. (2014). Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning in Enhancing Speaking Skills and Attitudes towards Learning English. *International Journal of Linguistics.* 6. 27. 10.5296/ijl.v6i4.6114.
10) Amedu, O. I., & Gudi, K. C. (2017). Attitude of students towards cooperative learning in some selected secondary schools in Nasarawa state. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8*(10), 29–34.
11) Andrade Morán , J ., & Aguaiza Iza , M. (2024). The cooperative learning in the English Speaking – fluency development . *Scientific Journal of Educational Innovation and Current Society "ALCON"* , 4 (2), 81–89. https://doi.org/10.62305/alcon.v4i2.105

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

12) Ariyani, D. (2016). *The Use Of Cooperative Learning Stad To Improve Speaking Skills Of Accounting Program Students Grade Xi In Smk N 1 Depok In The Academic Year Of 2013/2014* (Unpoblished master's thesis). Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia.
13) Bagheri, M. S., Dabaghmanesh, T., & Zamanian, M. (2013). The Effect of cooperative learning approach on Iranian EFL students‟ achievement among different majors in general English course. *International Journal of Linguistics, 5*(6), 1–11.
14) Barad, D. (2024). Enhancing Communication Skills Through Case Studies and Problem-Solving: A Comprehensive Approach for Undergraduate Students. 10.13140/RG.2.2.22947.05926.
15) Bolukbas, F., Keskin, F., & Polat, M. (2011). The effectiveness of cooperative learning in the reading comprehension skills in Turkish as a foreign language. *The Turkish online journal of educational technology, 10*(4), 330–335.
16) Brainee, H. (2024). Investigating the Impact of Cultural Awareness on Language Learners' Motivation and Proficiency. *Journal of Gender, Culture and Society*. 4. 29-38. 10.32996/jgcs.2024.4.1.4.
17) Cempaka, R. (2024). Enhancing English Speaking Proficiency through Group Discussions. *Research Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning*. 2. 162-174. 10.62583/rseltl.v2i3.49.
18) Chen, H. (2024). Innovative Approaches in English Language Teaching: Integrating Communicative Methods and Technology for Enhanced Proficiency. *Communications in Humanities Research*. 32. 10.54254/2753-7064/32/20240075.
19) Chico Lema, L. (2017). Cooperative Learning Strategies to develop the Speaking Skills in 1st International Baccalaureate Students. 10.13140/RG.2.2.20505.08808.
20) Den Brok, P., Levy. J., Brekelmans, M., & Wubbels, T. (2006). The effect of teacher interpersonal behaviour on students‟ subject-specific motivation. Retrievedfrom: http://tue.academia.edu/PerrydenBrok/Papers/170367/The_effect_of_teacher_interpersonal_behaviour_on_studentssubjectpecific_motivation.
21) Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation. Harlow*, UK: Pearson.
22) Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual Differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlb.
23) Dörnyei, Z. (2020). Innovations and Challenges in Language Learning Motivation. 10.4324/9780429485893.
24) Franchisca, S., Nurmalia Sari, M., Nurfitri, N., Kristine Nelloe, M., Mulyapradana, A., & Fitriani, N. (2024). The Impact of Motivation on Foreign Language Learning: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal on Education*, 6(2), 11082-11093. Retrieved from https://jonedu.org/index.php/joe/article/view/4911
25) Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition: The socioeducational model* (Vol. 10). New York: Peter Lang.
26) Ghafar, Z., & Raad, B. (2023). Factors Affecting Speaking Proficiency in English Language Learning: A general overview of the speaking skill. 10.57185/joss.v2i6.107.
27) Gillies, R. (2016). Cooperative Learning: Review of Research and Practice. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. 41. 39-54. 10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3.
28) Gomleksiz, M. N. (2007). Effectiveness of cooperative learning (jigsaw II) method on teaching English as a foreign language to engineering students (Case of Firat University, Turkey). *European Journal of Engineering Education*, *32*(5), 613– 625.
29) Haerazi, H., & Irawan, L., & Sotlikova, R. (2023). Interculture-Based Language Learning Model to Improve Prospective English Teachers' Speaking Skills Viewed From Linguistic Awareness. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*. 10. 471-497. 10.30762/jeels.v10i2.1763.
30) Hernández, T., & Boero, P. (2018). Explicit intervention for pragmatic development during short-term study abroad: An examination of learner request production and cognition. *Foreign Language Annals*, *51*(2), 389– 410.
31) Herrera Godoy, J. A; Rodriguez Lopez, J. B; & Arostegui Irias, N. U. (2019). *The effects of Cooperative Learning strategies to develop fluency in 9th grade students at Guillermo Cano National Institute in the first school term* (Diploma thesis).Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua, Managua.
32) Herrera Godoy, J. A; Rodriguez Lopez, J. B; & Arostegui Irias, N. U. (2019). *The effects of Cooperative Learning strategies to develop fluency in 9th grade students at Guillermo Cano National Institute in the first school term* (Diploma thesis).Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua, Managua.
33) Humairoh, S., & Roza, V., & Reflinda, R., & Melani, M. (2024). The Implementation of Numbered Heads Together (NHT) Technique in Teaching Speaking Skill at IX Grade of SMPN 7 Bukitinggi. Continuous Education: *Journal of Science and Research*. 5. 119-130. 10.51178/ce.v5i2.1935.
34) Huri, A. S., & Sahae, J. P., & Prince, A. M., & Srivastava, R. (2024). Collaborative Learning Communities: Enhancing Student Engagement and Academic Achievement, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(5), 7031-7036. Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.3624
35) Jacobs, G. M., & Goh, C. C. (2007). *Cooperative Learning in the Language Classroom*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
36) Jahansouzshahi, M. (2009). Anxiety in language learning. *ELT Weekly*, *1*(34), 19–33.
37) Johnson, D. (2017). The Role of Teachers in Motivating Students To Learn. *BU Journal of Graduate Studies in Education*, 9(1). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1230415.pdf

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

38) Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2003). Student Motivation in Co-operative Groups: Social Interdependence Theory. In *Cooperative Learning: The Social and Intellectual Outcomes of Learning in Groups*, edited by R. M. Gillies and A. F. Ashman, 137–176. London: Routledge Falmer.

39) Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

40) Kandasamy, C., & Habil, H. (2018). Exploring Cooperative Learning Method to Enhance Speaking Skills Among School Students. *LSP International Journal, 5*(2), 1–16.

41) Kasumi, H., & Xhemaili, M. (2023). Student Motivation and Learning: The Impact of Collaborative Learning in English as Foreign Language Classes. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education (IJCRSEE)*. 11. 301-309. 10.23947/2334-8496-2023-11-2-301-309.

42) Kissau, S. (2006). Gender differences in motivation to learn French. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 62*, 401– 422.

43) Krichker, O., & Minenko, O., & Yeremeieva, N. (2023). Strategies For Fostering Motivation To Learn English Language In Non-Language Students. *Humanities Science Current Issues*. 1. 289-294. 10.24919/2308-4863/68-1-46.

44) Kusuma, D., & Rahayu, E. (2024). The Implementation of Using Numbered Head Together (NHT) Learning Model to Improve Students' Speaking Achievement. Edunesia : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan. 5. 827-847. 10.51276/edu.v5i2.906.

45) Lăpădat, L., & Lapadat, M. (2024). The Importance of Motivation in Foreign Language Learning. Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timişoara Transactions on Modern Languages. 22. 142-152. 10.59168/VGLE2734.

46) Lei, Z., & Ismail, L., & Razali, F., & Ghazali, N. (2023). A Literature Review on Cooperative Learning to Improve EFL Students' Learning Motivation. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*. 8. e02636. 10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i6.2636.

47) Liebech-Lien, B., & Chiriac, E., & Davidson, N. (2023). Teachers' professional development for cooperative learning: A constructive controversy between long-term versus short-term professional development. *Autonomy and Responsibility Journal of Educational Sciences*. 8. 65-82. 10.15170/AR.2023.8.1.5.

48) Lim, H. Y. (2007). Effects of attributions and task values on foreign language use anxiety. *Education and Human Development, 1*(2), 1–20.

49) Limones-Borbor, J. (2023). Cooperative learning to enhance oral proficiency meta-analysis of research. *Ibero-American Journal of Education & Society Research.* 3. 150-155. 10.56183/iberoeds.v3i1.610.

50) Majid, A. (2013). *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

51) Marashi, H., & Tahan-Shizari, P. (2015). Using convergent and divergent tasks to improve writing and language learning motivation. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 3*(1), 99–117.

52) Marashi, H; & Khatami, H. (2017). Using Cooperative Learning to Boost Creativity and Motivation in Language Learning. *Journal of Language and Translation, 7* (13), 43–58.

53) Martinez, M. I., Díaz Lara, G., & Whitney, C. R. (2024). The role of teacher beliefs in teacher learning and practice: implications for meeting the needs of English learners/emergent bilinguals. *Language and Education*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2024.2362305

54) McCafferty, S. G., Jacobs, G. M; & DaSilva Iddings, A. C. (2006). *Cooperative Learning and Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

55) Meena, R. (2020). The Effect of Cooperative Learning Strategies in the Enhancement of EFL Learners' Speaking Skills. Asian EFL Journal. 27. 144-171. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349038410_The_Effect_of_Cooperative_Learning_Strategies_in_the_Enhancement_of_EFL_Learners'_Speaking_Skills

56) Morán, J., & Iza, M. (2024). The cooperative learning in the English Speaking – fluency development. 4. 81-89. 10.62305/alcon.v4i2.105.

57) Morozova, Y. (2013). Methods of enhancing speaking skills of elementary level students. *Translation Journal, 17*(1), Available at: http://translationjournal.net/journal/63learning.htm.

58) Muawanah, U. (2023). The Impact of Cooperative Learning Method on Learning Motivation and Academic Achievement of Elementary School Students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*. 06. 10.47191/ijmra/v6-i12-57.

59) Namaziandost, E., & Homayouni, M., & Rahmani, P. (2020). The impact of cooperative learning approach on the development of EFL learners' speaking fluency. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*. 7. 10.1080/23311983.2020.1780811.

60) Namaziandost, E., & Neisi, L., & Kheryadi, Kh., & Nasri, M. (2019). Enhancing oral proficiency through cooperative learning among intermediate EFL learners: English learning motivation in focus. *Cogent Education.* 6. 10.1080/2331186X.2019.1683933.

61) Namaziandost, E., & Shatelebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The Impact of Cooperative Learning on Developing Speaking Ability and Motivation Toward Learning English. *Journal of Language and Education.* 5. 83-101. 10.17323/jle.2019.9809.

62) Namaziandost, E., Hashemifardnia, A., & Shafiee, S. (2019). The impact of opinion-gap, reasoning-gap, and information-gap tasks on EFL learners‟ speaking fluency. *Cogent Social Sciences*, doi:10.1080/23311886.2019.1630150

63) Namaziandost, E., Nasri, M., & Rahimi Esfahani, F. (2019). Pedagogical Efficacy of Experience-Based Learning (EBL) Strategies for Improving the Speaking Fluency of Upper-intermediate Male and Female Iranian EFL Students. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 4*(2), 29–41.

64) Namaziandost, E., Neisi, L., Kheryadi, K., & Nasri, M. (2019). Enhancing oral proficiency through cooperative learning among intermediate EFL learners: English learning motivation in focus. *Cogent Education, 6*, (1), 1– 15.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

65) Namaziandost, E., Shatalebi, V., & Nasri, M. (2019). The Impact of Cooperative Learning on Developing Speaking Ability and Motivation toward Learning English. *Journal of Language and Education*, *5*(2), 83–101.
66) Nasri, M., & Biria, R. (2017). Integrating multiple and focused strategies for improving reading comprehension and l2 lexical development of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, *6*(1), 311–321.
67) Ning, H. (2011). Adapting cooperative learning in tertiary ELT.ELT *Journal*, *65*(1), 60–70. *To Chinese tertiary learners*. *Effective education*, *2*(2), 99–116.
68) Ning, H., & Hornby, G. (2010). The effectiveness of cooperative learning in teaching English to Chinese tertiary learner. *Effective Education*, *2*(3), 112–129.
69) Noels, K. A., Pelletier, G. L., Clement, R., & Vallerand, J. R. (2000). "Why Are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-determination Theory." *Language Learning*, *50*, 57–85.
70) Ork, Y., & Chin, P., & Em, S. (2024). Factors causing students' challenges in learning English speaking skills: A review. 10.13140/RG.2.2.31342.63040.
71) Pattanpichet, F. (2011). The Effects of using collaborative learning to enhance students‟ English-speaking achievement. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 8(11), 1–10.
72) Pérez-Cañar, J. S. & Troya-Sánchez, M. E. (2023). The effectiveness of cooperative learning on EFL first-year high school students' writing skills. *Issues in Educational Research*, 33(3), 1125-1147. http://www.iier.org.au/iier33/perez-canar.pdf
73) Quinn, P. (2006). Cooperative Leaing and Student Motivation (unpublished master's thesis). State University of New York College, Brockport.
74) Rezaee, A. A., Kaivanpanah, S., & Najibi, S. (2015). EFL learners‟ motivational beliefs and their use of learning strategies. *Applied Research in English Language*, *4*(7), 1–18.
75) Russell, V. (2018). Web-based pragmatics resources: Techniques and strategies for teaching L2Spanish pragmatics to English speakers. In D. Dumitrescu & P. Andueza (Eds.), *L2 Spanish pragmatics: From research to teaching* (Series: Advances in Spanish Language Teaching). New York: Routledge
76) Sachs, G. T., Candlin, C.N., Rose, K. R., & Shum, S. (2003). "Developing Cooperative Learning in the EFL/ESL Secondary Classroom." *RELC Journal 34*, 338–369.
77) Saddhono, K. (2012). *Meningkatkan keterampilan Berbahasa Indonesia Teori dan Aplikasi*. Bandung: Karya Putra Darwati.
78) Saddhono, K., & Slamet. St. Y. (2012). *Meningkatkan Keterampilan Berbahasa Indonesia: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Bandung: CV. Karya Putra Darwati.
79) Sadeghi, E., & Ganji, M. (2020). The Effects of Cooperative Learning on Iranian University Students' Class-engagement, Self-esteem, and Self-confidence. 7. 89-109. 10.30479/jmrels.2020.12867.1590.
80) Sarwat, S., & Iftikhar, I., & Khan, J., & Shahzad, W. (2024). Impact of Student Engagement in Language Support Classes Through Cooperative Learning: A Study of Pakistani Educational Institutions. 199-210. 10.56976/rjsi.v.
81) Siahpoosh H, Mahdavi Z. (2024). The Effect of Virtual Interactions in Pairs and Groups on the Development of Speaking Ability of Iranian EFL Learners. *IJREE*, 9 (1). http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-831-en.html
82) Siddique, G., & Yasmin, T., & Nadeem, M., & Farooq, S. (2020). Role of Cooperative Learning in Improving Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement in English of Elementary Students: An Experimental Study. *Journal of Business and Social Review in Emerging Economies*. 6. 1159-1164. 10.26710/jbsee.v6i3.1385.
83) Slavin, R. E. (2000). *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice* (6th ed). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
84) Sühendan, E. R., & Bengü, A. A. (2014). The attitudes of students towards cooperative learning in ELT classes. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching*, *1*(2), 31–45.
85) Suprijono, A. (2009). Cooperative Learning Teori dan Aplikasi Paikem. Surabaya: Pustaka Pelajar.
86) Talebi, F., & Sobhani, A. (2012). The impacts of cooperative learning on oral proficiency. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(3), 75–79.
87) Tamimy, M., & Rashidi, N., & Ling Koh, J. (2023). The use of cooperative learning in English as foreign language classes: The prevalence, fidelity, and challenges. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103915. (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X22002906)
88) Tiu, J., & Groenewald, E., & Kilag, O., & Balicoco, R., & Wenceslao, S., & Asentado, D. (2023). Enhancing Oral Proficiency: Effective Strategies for Teaching Speaking Skills in Communication Classrooms.
89) Tsay-Vogel, M., & Brady, M. (2010). A Case Study of Cooperative Learning and Communication Pedagogy: Does Working in Teams Make a Difference? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. 10. 78-89.
90) Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness, and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(1), 70–89.
91) Vohs, K., Baumeister, B., Jean, M., Twenge, J., Nelson, N., & Tice, D. (2008). Making choices impairs subsequent self-control: A limited resource account of decision making, self-Regulation, and active initiative. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(5), 883– 898.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

92) Wang, W. (2014). *Improving Students' Oral Skills through a Cooperative Learning Approach to Teaching Chinese College English* (Unpoblished master's thesis). University of Victoria, Tianjin Normal University.
93) Waugh, R. F., Bowering, M. H., & Chayarathee, S. (2005). "Cooperative Learning Versus Communicative Thai Teaching of English as a Second Language for Prathom (Grade) 6 Students Taught in Thailand." In *Frontiers in Educational Psychology, edited by R. F. Waugh* (221–232). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.
94) Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1), 116–119. doi:10.1006/ceps.1999.1015.
95) Yang, A. V. (2005). *Comparison of the effectiveness of cooperative learning and traditional teaching methods on Taiwanese college students' English oral performance and motivation towards learning* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). La Sierra University of Riverside, California.
96) Yao Hong, Y., & Chen, L., & Huang, J., & Tsai, Y., & Chang, T. (2022). The Impact of Cooperative Learning Method on the Oral Proficiency of Learners of the Training Program for English Tourist Guides. *Front Psychol*. 13. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.866863.
97) Yuanfang, Y. (2009). A study of foreign language learning motivation and achievement: From a perspective of sociocultural theory. *CELEA Journal*, *32*(3), 87–97.
98) Ziafar, M., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). Linguistics, SLA and lexicon as the unit of language. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* (IJLLT), 2(5), 245–250.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Maryam Aghdamie