

The Effectiveness Of Focus Group Discussions (Collaborative Learning Techniques) To Teach English Is Viewed From The Students' Motivation

Erina Hastuti

PGMI, UNUGHA Cilacap

Corresponding author's email: erinarizaly@gmail.com

Abstract

The objectives of the research are;(1) to Analyse whether FGD Collaborative Learning Technique is more effective than cooperative Learning Technique in teaching English skill for the sixth semester students of Tarbiyah of UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto in the academic year of 2023/2024, (2) to analyse whether the English skill of the students having high motivation is better than that of those having low motivation; and (3) to analyse whether there is an interaction between teaching technique and motivation in teaching English for the sixth semester students of Tarbiyah of UIN Prof. K.H Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto. The technique that was applied in this research was an experimental study. It was conducted at Tarbiyah by UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto in the academic year 2023-2024. The population of the research is the sixth semester of Tarbiyah at UIN, Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, in the academic year 2023-2024. The samples were divided into two classes. In taking the sample, the cluster random sampling technique was used. Each class was divided into two groups (the students who have high motivation and the students who have the students who have low motivation). The researcher obtained quantitative data. They are the students 'scores on the' English test after having eight times of treatment for each class. The researcher analyzed the data using ANOVA and the Turkey test. Based on the results of the data analysis, the research findings are: (1) the FGD collaborative learning technique is more effective than the cooperative learning technique to teach English for the sixth semester of UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto; (2) the English skill achievement of the students with high motivation is better than that of those with low motivation; and (3) there is an interaction between teaching technique and motivation. Based on these research findings, it can be concluded that FGD Collaborative Learning Technique is an effective technique to teach English in the sixth semester of UIN Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto.

Keywords: English skill, FGD collaborative learning technique, and motivation

INTRODUCTION

English as an international language is learned by many people in four skills, one of which is speaking in order to be able to speak English fluently. Brumfit in Ur (1991: 103) states that if a learner masters a language successfully, he or she can understand and produce it accurately, correctly, and fluently when receiving and conveying message easily. In Indonesia, English is a foreign language subject that must be taught and studied from junior high school to university level. It is intended to enrich and prepare themselves for science and technology development as a means of international communication. English encompasses language skills and language elements.

The language skills are listening, speaking, reading, and writing, while the language elements are pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, structure, and fluency. Of all the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), speaking seems intuitively the most important; people who know the language are referred to as “speakers” of that language, as if speaking includes all other kinds of knowing, and many, if not most, foreign language learners are primarily interested in learning to speak. Therefore, this study is concerned with one of the skills, which is speaking. Speaking is an active language action from the language user that demands the real initiation in language employing to express oneself orally.

Speaking skills are very important for university students to develop themselves as thinking human beings, but in fact, there are many students at the university who have low ability in speaking English. In the sixth semester of the Tarbiah program at UIN, Prof. K.H. Saizu Purwokerto. Wallace (2003: 4) defines reading as interpreting, which means reacting to a written text as a piece of communication. She also states that reading is related with the need to work out the meaning of a written text with the purpose of being able to take some kind of action as a result. In other words, it can be assumed that there is some communicative intent on the writer's part that the reader has some purpose in attempting to understand.

Grabe and Stoller (2002: 9) express a similar view of reading, stating that reading is the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret this information appropriately. Furthermore, they also state that reading for general comprehension is the ability to understand information in a text and interpret it appropriately. Teaching and learning are two activities where one reflects the other, so it's preferable to use the term "Teaching and Learning Methods" rather than "Teaching Methods." As we all know, the outcome of teaching is learning; therefore, the separation of the two activities is not appropriate (Tom, 1997). The criteria for measuring good teaching are the amount and quality of learning the students get (Shahida, 2011). Making the case for collaborative learning seems almost too easy.

More research exists on learning in small groups than on any other instructional technique, including lecturing (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991; Simon, 1989–90). English is built up as one of the compulsory worldwide dialects being instructed at both formal and casual instruction, setting up a changed strategy of moving forward under studies learning involvement of its four abilities: speaking, listening, writing, and reading. One of these strategies is focus group discussion (FGD), which's well suited for making strides in the previously mentioned aptitudes. This uncommon strategy of FGD facilitated the under studies in getting the fabric and effortlessly moving forward with their English aptitudes.

Mancho-Barés & Arnó-Macià (2015) plan an inquiry in which they demonstrate that FGD can be utilized for members of diverse degrees as well as sharing their views and encounters. In this dialog, students' actions can be more persuaded and eager for learning since they can trade data and talk about the issue. Subsequently, instructors must create discourse strategies to move forward students' English aptitudes. Annamalai & Kumar (2020) studied that bunch discourse by utilizing portable gadgets as a means by which understudies will get openings to contribute to themselves in understanding shared issues, indeed, in spite of the fact that they are from diverse states. In this talk strategy, understudies are instructed on how to characterize the obligation and certainty of being in a bunch.

The instructor must also have a procedure to draw in students' consideration by making viable application and great talk strategies for understudies, so understudies can take the learning comfortably. Focus group discussion is a technique that is often used by teachers when learning in schools. Focus group discussions are systematic and focused activities that involve many people. In general, focus group discussions discuss social events or problems in society that can create a bad stigma for certain individuals or groups. Some people have a variety of definitions of interaction in groups. Interaction is also defined as communication, but in this research, the dialog also comprises a few sorts, to be specific, little discourse and huge discourse. A little discourse could be a discussion that examines a specific subject, like examining almost all lessons in school or examining their experience; a huge talk could be a talk that includes a few individuals to fathom a troublesome issue. There were a few conclusions from authors who were talking about almost how to fathom certain issues; one of them that related to my inquiry is the focus gathering dialog strategy to move forward students' perusing ability. In this discourse, we are able to discover how to utilize viable discourse strategies to extend students' information within the field of perusing. The creators have shown that the focus group talk strategy, which gets information or data from a source based on the environment or bunches, expects to illuminate certain issues collectively (Lehoux, Poland, & Daudelin, 2006).

In language teaching, students are unique; they have their own competences or capacities of the mind, and they also have some other differences among them. Those differences are determined according to various parameters. According to Ur (1996: 273) those differences are: "...whether they are beginners, intermediate, or advanced; whether they are young, children, adolescent or adult; their objectives in learning the language, and how they are motivated, whether their environment outside the classroom is target language or mother tongue; the size of the group and many more ". Based on the statement above, it can be inferred that the important learners' differences are learner's motivation, learner's different ages, and heterogeneous classes. Motivation has a strong relationship to language learning. It is needed to exploit the capacity of the mind to make a sense of the environment. Ur states that motivation is very strongly related to achievement in language learning (1996: 274).

The importance of learner's motivation is learner makes choices to find out the goals of teaching-learning process. Harmer in accordance with Brown states that motivation is some kind of internal drive which pushes someone to do things in order to achieve something (2004: 51). He also defines that motivation stems from basic internal drives; it is a strong desire or energy in people to do things and to achieve something. Motivation includes some factors. According to Brown in Harmer (2004: 4): "...motivation includes factors such as the need for exploration, activity. Stimulation, new knowledge,

and ego enhancement. Ego enhancement is defined as the desire as the desire for the self to be known and to be accepted and approved of by others. For example, the students who start going to a learning a language may hope that they are able to use in a new language fluency and accuracy, perhaps it will aid ego enhancement and be stimulated by the active nature, of this, new undertaking". Based on the statement above, it can be inferred that students' motivation is influenced by ego enhancement. In this case they will have a high motivation that the ego enhancement is facilitated. There is another way to improve students' motivation that is by giving opportunity to decide what to do and to think. Brown (2001: 75) states "motivation is highest when one can make one's own choices". However, to make the students' motivation highest they should be given a chance to make their own decision what to think, to feel, and to do.

Collaborative Learning technique is intentional design. All too often, teacher simply tell students to get into groups and work. In addition to intentional design, co-labouring is an important feature of collaborative learning. Collaborative learning is that meaningful learning takes place. As students work together a collaborative assignment, they must increase their knowledge or depend their understanding of course curriculum. Collaborative learning theory involves peer-to-peer learning that fosters deeper thinking in the classroom. Collaborative learning theory suggests that group learning helps students develop their higher-level thinking, oral communication, self-management and leadership skills. The most straight forward definition of cooperative learning is "the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each others' learning" (Smith, 1996,p.71).

Cooperative learning, as the name implies, Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other's learning. Cooperative learning is based on two theories: Structure-Process-Outcome theory and Social Interdependence theory

Research Methodology

The study is an experimental design, since it described the quantitative degree to which variables were related. It is also reasonable that the writer intends to examine the cause and effect among the variables, those are collaborative learning Technique (FGD) and cooperative learning technique in teaching English skill viewed from student's motivation. According to Johnson and Christensen (2000: 23) the purpose of experimental research is to determine cause-and-effect relationship.

The research design used in this research is simple factorial design. The study tried to describe the effect of treatment of collaborative learning technique (FGD) and cooperative learning technique in teaching English viewed from student's motivation. This research design has several characteristics; (1) it has two groups of experimental subjects or treatment group and control group; (2) the two groups are compared with respect two measurements of observation on the dependent variable, (3) both groups are measured using post-test; (4) measurement on the dependent variable for both groups will be done at the same time with same test, and (5) the experimental group is manipulated with particular treatment.

According to Christensen (2007: 57) population refers to the events, things or individual to be presented. The target population of the study is all of the sixth semester of tarbiyah of UIN saizu in the academic year of 2023/2024. Those are 6PGMI A and 6PGMI B. from all the population, the writer took only 80 students as the sample of the

study. Class 6PGMI A was an experimental group and 6 PGMIB was control group. Each class consist of 40 students. Each class was divided into two groups, students who have high motivation and those who have low motivation. To classify the students in each class into those who have high and low motivation, the writer used median of motivation scores. Therefore, there were 20 students who have high motivation and 20 students who have low motivation in each class. One of the two classes was taught by using collaborative learning Technique (FGD) and another class was taught by using cooperative learning technique.

It means that there were four groups; (1) the students with high motivation who were taught by using collaborative learning technique (FGD); (2) the students with low motivation who were taught by using collaborative learning technique (FGD); (3) the students with high motivation who were taught by using cooperative learning technique (Lecture role model); (4) the students with low motivation who were taught by using cooperative learning technique (Lecture role model) Data Description The data were divided into 8 groups as follows: (1) the data of the students who are taught using Collaborative Learning technique (FGD); (2) the data of the students who are taught using cooperative learning technique (Teacher's model) ; (3) the data of the students having high motivation;(4) the data of students having low motivation; (5) the data of students having high motivation who are taught using Collaborative learning technique (FGD); (6) the data of students having low motivation who are taught using cooperative learning technique (Teacher's model); (7) the data of the students having low motivation who are taught using collaborative learning technique (FGD); (8) the data of he students having low motivation who are taught using cooperative learning technique (teacher's model)

The score of students who are taught using Collaborative Learning Technique (FGD) are; 30, 36, 40, 40, 42, 46, 46, 48, 48, 48, 48, 48, 48, 48, 50, 50, 50, 52, 52, 52, 54, 54, 56, 56, 58, 58, 58, 60, 60, 60, 60, 62, 64, 64, 66, 66, 68, 68, 68, 70. The mean is 54.55, the mode is 51.25, the median is 53.5, and the standard deviation is 9.35.

The score if students who are taught using Cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) are; 36, 38, 38, 40, 40, 40, 42, 44, 46, 46, 46, 46, 46, 46, 48, 50, 50, 50, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 53, 54, 54, 56, 56, 56, 56, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 60, 60, 60. The mean is 51, the mode is 56,59, the median is 53.5, and the standard deviation is 7.11.

The score of students who have high motivation are; 36, 38, 40, 44, 46, 46, 46, 46, 48, 48, 48, 50, 50, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 52, 53, 54, 56, 56, 56, 56, 56, 58, 60, 60, 60, 60, 62, 64, 64, 66, 66, 68, 68, 68, 70. The mean is 54.75, the mode is 56.61, the median is 54.88, and the standard deviation is 8.44.

The score of students who have low motivation are; 30, 36, 38, 40, 40, 40, 40, 42, 42, 46, 46, 46, 46, 48, 48, 48, 48, 48, 50, 50, 50, 50, 52, 52, 54, 54, 54, 56, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 60, 60, 60. The mean is 50.13, the mode is 55.13, the median is 50.61, the standard deviation is 7.31.

The score of students having high motivation who are taught using collaborative learning technique (FGD) are; 36, 48, 48, 52, 56, 56, 58, 60, 60, 60, 60, 62, 64, 64, 66, 66, 68, 68, 68, 70. The mean is 59.45, the mode is 62.5, the median is 60.64, and the standard deviation is 7.95.

The score of students having low motivation who are taught using collaborative learning technique (FGD) are; 30, 40, 40, 42, 46, 46, 48, 48, 48, 48, 48, 50, 50, 50, 52, 52, 54, 54, 58, 58. The mean is 49.03, the mode is 51.5, the median is 49.5, and the standard deviation is 4.92.

The score of students having high motivation who are taught using collaborative learning technique (Teacher's models) are; 38, 40, 44, 46, 46, 46, 46, 48, 50, 50, 52, 52, 52, 52, 54, 56, 56, 56. The mean is 48.25, the mode is 49.5, the median is 48.79, and the standard deviation is 5.82.

The score of students having low motivation who are taught using cooperative learning technique (Teacher's model) are; 36, 28, 40, 40, 42, 46, 46, 50, 54, 56, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 58, 60, 60, 60. The mean is 50.55, the mode is 51.5, the median is 50.93, and the standard deviation is 4.74.

The test can be conducted after the result of normality and homogeneity test are calculated and fulfilled. The data analysis is conducted by using multifactor analysis of variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2. H_0 is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t ($F_o > F_t$). It means that there is significant difference. After knowing that H_0 is rejected, the analysis is also continued to know the difference between the two groups and cells using Turkey test. To know which group is better, the mean scores of the groups and cells are compared. The 2x2 ANOVA and Turkey Tests are listed as follows; Because F_o between columns (41.40) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.97) the difference between columns is significant.

It can be concluded that the technique of teaching English to the sixth semester students of Tarbiyah of UIN Prof. K.H Saizu differ significantly. Because the mean score of the students who are taught using Collaborative Learning Technique (FGD) (53.8) is higher than that of those who are taught using cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) (50.57), teaching English using FGD is more effective than teacher's model. Because F_o between rows (8.332) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.97), the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that students having low motivation differ significantly from those having high motivation in their English skill.

Because the mean score of the students who have high motivation (54.48) is higher than that of those who have low motivation (49.9), the students who have high motivation have better English skill than those who have low motivation. Because F_o interaction (16.543) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.97), there is interaction effect between the two variables, the teaching technique and motivation in teaching English. The researcher continued analysis the data using Turkey test.

The following is the result of analysis of the data using Turkey test; Because q_o between columns (9.49) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.86), using collaborative learning technique (FGD) differs significantly from cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) to teach English. Because the mean of A1 (53.8) is higher than A2 (50.57), it can be concluded that Collaborative learning technique (FGD) is more effective than cooperative learning technique to teach English skill. Because q_o between rows (11.21) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.86), it can be concluded that the students who have high and those who have low motivation are significantly different in their English ability. Because the mean of B1 (54.48) is higher than B2 (49.9), it can be concluded that the students who have high motivation have better English skill than those who have low motivation. Because q_o between cells A1B1 and A2B1 (29.18) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.95) using collaborative learning technique differs significantly from cooperative learning technique to teach English skill to students who have high motivation. Because the mean of A1B1 (59.5) is higher than A2B1 (49.45), it can be concluded that collaborative learning technique (FGD) is more effective than cooperative learning technique

(teacher's model) for teaching English skill to the students having high motivation. Because q_0 between cells A1B2 and A2B2 (22,21) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2,95), using Collaborative learning technique (FGD) differs significantly from cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) for teaching English skill to the students having low motivation. Based on findings, it is known that cooperative learning technique is more effective than collaborative learning technique for teaching English skill to the students having low motivation and collaborative learning technique (FGD) is more effective than cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) for teaching English skill to the student having high motivation, so it can be concluded that there is an interaction between teaching technique and the students' motivation in teaching English skill.

Discussion of the findings

FGD (collaborative Learning Technique) is more effective than Teacher model (Cooperative Learning Technique) in teaching English skill. FGD (Collaborative Learning Technique) is one of technique to teach English to make students interested in learning. Another technique used for teaching English is using Teacher model cooperative learning technique. If it is compared, using FGD is more effective for teaching English for the sixth semester students of Tarbiyah of UIN Prof Saizu Purwokerto. This technique emphasizes on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language based on the situation and place and an introduction of authentic materials into the learning situation. When teacher uses FGD (Collaborative Learning Technique) the class atmosphere changes and the students are creative and motivated to learn.

Based on treatment, the student are interested in learning speaking using FGD (Collaborative Learning Technique) Based on the collection of data from this classroom action research, the authors concluded that the students' reading ability by applying the focus group discussion method was very helpful and also can be a good method to improve students' reading skill. Focus group discussions not only improve students' reading skill but also increase students' self-confidence.

This method also enhances communication and interaction with other students. This research has findings that are almost the same as (Küçüköğlu: 2017) which states that the results of action research using the focus group discussion method can improve students' skills in the field of reading. During this research process, authors collaborated with teachers in schools to implement the learning media discussed previously. From this study, the authors found that the application of the focus group discussion method in the classroom is still a good solution for teachers and students.

Focus group discussions can influence the thinking patterns of students and their surroundings because most students interact with others. Jannah (2015) learning media is a tool to improve the effectiveness and achieve in teaching. This research does not only affect students but also authors. The authors feels that authors can see directly the class situation and develop strategies in the classroom. This strategy can also attract more student interaction, which increases students' self-confidence and interest that can improved their understanding of the text or story (Oczkus, 2003).

Apart from feeling comfortable, the authors also concluded that students could maintain unity and integrity during the focus group discussion process. Therefore, students are more confident, and easier to convey information and opinions. The students having high motivation have better speaking ability than those having low

motivation. Having high motivation is necessary for students, if they are motivated, they will be able to demonstrate their creativity when they link the personal unconscious in joining the teacher learning process. Motivated students are remarkable for their ability to adapt to almost any situation to reach their goals. Motivated students also have a great deal of physical energy in learning, but they are also often quite and at rest. They study and work long hours, with great concentration, while projecting an aura of freshness and enthusiasm. In contrast, the students' having low motivation tend to be passive in joining the class. They are lazy, shy, and afraid to do something because they are afraid of making mistakes. The students who have low motivation will only sit tidily on their chair without talking anything when the teacher asks the students to do something. They do not feel hard to study seriously, So that is way the teacher should treat them by controlling intensively during the class, so the students will enjoy the teaching and learning process. That is way the students will enjoy the teaching and learning process. There is an interaction between teaching technique and students' motivation in teaching English. The students having high motivation are creative, active, curious, having good participation, and have their own spirit to study for getting competency and skill.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that in general collaborative learning technique (FGD) is more effective than cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) to teach English skill and there is an interaction between teaching technique and the students' motivation, for the students who have high motivation , collaborative learning technique (FGD) is more effective than teacher's model but for the student who have low motivation, cooperative learning technique (teacher's model) is more effective than collaborative learning technique.

REFERENCES

- Adityo. (2020). Dynamics System Analysis in Measuring English Language Performance. *ELITE JOURNAL*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Barbour, R. , & Kitinger, J. (1999). Developing focus group research, politics, theory and practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carey, M. , & Smith, M. (1994). Capturing the group effect in focus groups: A special concern in analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 4(1), 123-127.
- Carey, M. (1994). The group effect in focus groups: Planning, implementing and interpreting focus group research. In J. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 225–241). London, England: Sage.
- Carey, M.A. (1994). The group effect in focus groups: planning, implementing, and interpreting focus group research. In *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods* (Morse J.M., ed.). Sage: Thousand Oaks, 225-241.
- Davis, R.W. (2010). *Creative Teaching (Strategi Pengajaran Kreatif)*. Jakarta: Esensi Erlangga Group
- Djumhar, and Surya, M. (1975). *Bimbingan dan Penyuluhan di Sekolah (Guidance & Counseling)*. Bandung: CV. Ilmu.
- DiGiacomo, M., Phillips, J., Davidson, PM., Halcomb, EJ., Gholizadeh, L. (2007). Literature review: considerations in undertaking focus group research with culturally and

- linguistically diverse groups, <https://doi.org/10.1111.1365-2702.2006.01760.x>
- Duggleby, W. (2005). What about focus group interaction. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(6), 832–840.
- Franklin, J., & Bloor, M. (1999). Some issues arising in the systematic analysis of focus group materials. In R. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research, politics, theory and practice* (pp. 144-155). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hollander, J. A. (2015). The Social Contexts of Focus Groups (Issue October 2004). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241604266988>
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 16(1), 103-121.
- Lehoux, P., B. Poland, and G. Daudelin. (2006). "Focus Group Research and „the Patient’s View”." *Social Science & Medicine* 63: 2091–2104.
- McLafferty, I. (2004). Focus group interviews as a data collecting strategy. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 48, 187-194.
- Nagaraj, Geetha. 1998. *English language Teaching: Approaches, Methods, and Techniques*. India: Sangam Books.
- Oller, John W. 1997. *Language Testing School*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Ur, Penny. 1991. *A Course in Language Teaching*. Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Zakon, A. M. (2002). *Team Building Exercise-tag-team tic tac toe*. Retrieved November 21, 2003, from: http://www.angezakon.com/articles/tag_team_tic_tac_toe.html.