Original Research Article

**USING COLLABORATIVE REPORTING TO IMPROVE THE SPEAKING SKILLS OF GRADE 11 STUDENTS**



**ABSTRACT**

|  |
| --- |
| **Aims:** This study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of Collaborative Reporting in improving the speaking skills of Grade 11 Senior High School students. It specifically sought to determine the mean gain scores of students exposed to traditional instruction and those taught through Collaborative Reporting, and whether a statistically significant difference exists between the two groups.  **Study design:** This research employed a quantitative quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control group design.  **Place and Duration of Study:** The study was conducted at Los Amigos National High School and San Pedro College - Senior High School in Davao City, Philippines, during the academic year 2024–2025.  **Methodology:** A total of 183 Grade 11 students participated in the study, with 92 students assigned to the experimental group (Collaborative Reporting) and 91 to the control group (Traditional Method). Both groups underwent pretests and posttests using a rubric-based speaking assessment evaluated for content, delivery, and presentation. The experimental group engaged in structured collaborative reporting activities, while the control group received conventional lecture-based instruction. Descriptive statistics were used to measure mean gain scores, and inferential statistics (paired and independent samples t-tests) were applied to determine the significance of the observed differences.  **Results:** The experimental group demonstrated a higher mean gain score of 3.25 (SD = 1.56) compared to 2.34 (SD = 1.98) in the control group. A t-value of -3.45 and a p-value of 0.001 indicated a statistically significant difference favoring the Collaborative Reporting Approach. Students taught using collaborative tasks have shown improved consistency and performance in speaking assessments, supported by qualitative feedback emphasizing increased confidence, peer support, and engagement.  **Conclusion:** Collaborative Reporting is a significantly effective method for enhancing the speaking skills of senior high school students. The interactive and peer-supported structure of the technique promotes confidence and meaningful language use. Using this approach in classroom instruction may lead to improved competence in communication and stronger learning outcomes. |
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# INTRODUCTION

Developing practical speaking skills is essential in language education and academic success, geared towards participation in a globalized society. Collaborative learning has been increasingly recognized as a significant pedagogical approach to help with these skills, promoting meaningful interaction and enhancing language proficiency. Researchers have found positive impacts of collaborative learning on different aspects of language learning, including speaking abilities, both internationally and within the Philippine context. Furthermore, a study by Khan et al. (2023) discovered that collaborative learning significantly improves students' language skills, social skills, and personal growth. However, despite the increase of evidence supporting collaborative learning, there remains a need for targeted investigations into specific collaborative techniques and their effectiveness within particular educational contexts.

Nationally, within the Philippines, research has indicated that cooperative learning approaches can effectively enhance students' speaking abilities. A study by Lucena and San Jose (2016) at Vicente Hizon Sr. Elementary School in Davao City revealed that cooperative learning encourages students to interact and express themselves more freely during instructional activities, improving speaking skills. This study addresses the need for focused research by examining the impact of collaborative reporting, a specific collaborative learning strategy, on the speaking skills of Grade 11 Senior High School (SHS) students in Davao City, Philippines. This study will help address the need for targeted strategies to effectively enhance speaking skills among SHS students, recognizing that effective communication is vital for their academic and professional development (Salih & Abdelameer, 2022). In response to this problem, this research proposes using collaborative reporting to improve the speaking skills of Grade 11 students. This intervention is grounded in social interdependence theory and the output hypothesis, emphasizing the importance of interaction and language production in language learning (Pattanpichet, 2011).

A brief literature survey reveals that cooperative learning, the broader framework of this study, has been shown to improve academic achievement, cognitive skills, and social-emotional development. Specifically, collaborative tasks provide opportunities for language learners to negotiate meaning, produce output, and receive peer scaffolding, all of which are crucial for language acquisition (Babiker, 2018).

The scope of this study is limited to Grade 11 SHS students in Davao City, Philippines, focusing on the effectiveness of collaborative reporting compared to traditional teaching methods. The proof for this localized lens starts from the desire to provide specific insights, based on context, that can inform educational practices and curriculum development inside and outside the Philippines. By studying and looking at collaboration and similar strategies within this context, the study aims to contribute to the existing ideas on collaborative learning and its application in enhancing speaking skills.

# MATERIAL AND METHODS

This study employed a quantitative approach to evaluate the effectiveness of Collaborative Reporting in improving the speaking skills of Grade 11 students. A quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design was utilized to measure the differences in speaking proficiency before and after the intervention. Quasi-experimental design refers to applying an experimental mode of analysis and interpretation to bodies of data that do not meet the complete requirements of experimental control because experimental units are not assigned randomly to at least two "treatment" conditions (Campbell & Riecken, 1968). One group received instruction through Collaborative Reporting, while the control group was taught using traditional teaching methods.

## 2.1 Participants

The study’s participants were Grade 11 Senior High School students from two intact classes at Los Amigos National High School and San Pedro College - Senior High School. The selection of schools and participants followed a purposive sampling method to ensure that both traditional and collaborative instruction groups have comparable demographic profiles. The experimental group comprised 92 students, and the control group comprised 91.

## 2.2 Experimental and Control Groups

* Experimental Group (Collaborative Reporting Approach): Students participated in instructed collaborative reporting activities designed to enhance speaking skills through planning, active discussions, and shared presentation tasks.
* Control Group (Traditional Method): Students underwent conventional lecture-based instruction, with the teacher doing most of the talking and the students primarily listening.

## 2.3 Procedure

The study followed a quantitative approach with the following parts:

1. Part 1: Pre-test Administration: The experimental and control groups were administered a pre-test to assess baseline speaking proficiency.
2. Part 2: Intervention: The experimental group received instruction using the Collaborative Reporting Approach, while the control group continued with traditional instruction.
3. Part 3: Post-test Administration: Both groups were administered a post-test to evaluate speaking skill improvements after the intervention.

## 2.4 Instrumentation

The pre-test and post-test consisted of rubric-based speaking assessments focusing on content, delivery, and presentation. A rubric is a document that clearly articulates the criteria used to judge the standards required for an assessment (Malini Reddy & Andrade, 2010). The assessment underwent expert validation and pilot testing before administration. Revisions were made to the rubric based on feedback from the expert validation and pilot testing.

## 2.5 Intervention: Collaborative Reporting Approach

The Collaborative Reporting Approach was implemented with the experimental group. The approach involved the following key elements:

* Group Formation: Students were divided into small groups of 4-5 members, ensuring heterogeneous grouping in terms of language proficiency.
* Topic Assignment: Each group was assigned a specific topic related to the course curriculum.
* Collaborative Planning: Groups were given time to plan their reports, assign roles, and divide tasks.
* Information Gathering: Students collaboratively gathered information from various sources.
* Report Preparation: Groups worked together to synthesize their findings and prepare their reports, including written and oral components.
* Oral Presentation: Each group delivered an oral presentation of their report to the class.
* Peer Feedback: Students provided constructive feedback to their peers after each presentation.

## 2.6 Control Group: Traditional Method

The control group received instruction using the traditional method, characterized by:

* Lecture-based instruction.
* Individual assignments and activities.
* Limited student interaction.
* Teacher-led discussions.

## 2.7 Data Analysis

The study employed statistical analysis for quantitative data. To undertake hypothesis testing, statistics measures and examines random population samples using a variety of statistical tests before establishing values that are compared with test statistics and levels of significance to establish whether they are statistically significant (Tzenios, 2023) :

* Descriptive Statistics: Mean and standard deviation were calculated for pre-test and post-test scores for both groups.
* Inferential Statistics: A paired t-test was conducted to determine significant differences between pre-test and post-test scores within each group. An independent sample t-test was used to compare the performance gains between the experimental and control groups.
* An interpretive scale was employed to categorize speaking proficiency levels, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Interpretive scale for speaking proficiency levels

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mean Range | Proficiency Level |
| 4.20–5.00 | Very High |
| 3.40–4.19 | High |
| 2.60–3.39 | Moderate |
| 1.80–2.59 | Low |
| 1.00–1.79 | Very Low |

# 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## 3.1 Quantitative Results

### 3.1.1 Experimental Group Performance

The experimental group, which received instruction through Collaborative Reporting, significantly improved speaking proficiency. The pretest mean score was 44.19 (SD = 1.26), which increased to a posttest mean score of 47.44 (SD = 0.95), resulting in a mean gain of 3.25 (SD = 1.56). This gain reflects the effectiveness of collaborative strategies in facilitating fluency, confidence, and content delivery.

Table 2. Mean Gain Scores – Experimental Group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Pretest Mean (SD) | Posttest Mean (SD) | Mean Gain (SD) |
| Experimental | 44.19 (1.26) | 47.44 (0.95) | 3.25 (1.56) |

This result supports Swain’s (2005) Output Hypothesis, which emphasizes the importance of language production in second language acquisition. Students actively constructed meaning and produced language output by engaging in collaborative tasks, leading to measurable improvements.

### 3.1.2 Control Group Performance

The control group received traditional instruction and exhibited modest improvement. Their pretest mean was 43.70 (SD = 2.19) and posttest mean was 46.04 (SD = 1.19), with a mean gain of 2.34 (SD = 1.98).

Table 3. Mean Gain Scores – Control Group

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Pretest Mean (SD) | Posttest Mean (SD) | Mean Gain (SD) |
| Control | 43.70 (2.19) | 46.04 (1.19) | 2.34 (1.98) |

Though improvement was observed, the variation in scores suggests that the traditional method may not consistently foster speaking development across students.

### 3.1.3 Test of Statistical Significance

An independent sample t-test was conducted to determine if the difference between the groups was statistically significant. A t-test is a type of statistical test that is used to compare the means of two groups. It is one of pain studies' most widely used statistical hypothesis tests (Kim, 2015). Results showed a t-value of -3.45 and a p-value of 0.001, indicating a significant difference in favor of the experimental group.

Table 4. Independent Samples t-test – Gain Scores Comparison

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean Gain (SD) | t-value | p-value |
| Experimental | 3.25 (1.56) | -3.45 | 0.001 |
| Control | 2.34 (1.98) |  |  |

These findings demonstrate that Collaborative Reporting was more effective in improving speaking performance than the traditional method.

## 3.2 Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

### 3.2.1 Alignment with Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory

The results are consistent with Vygotsky’s (1978) Sociocultural Theory, particularly the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Collaborative Reporting likely functioned as a scaffold, enabling students to progress through peer-mediated interaction.

### 3.2.2 Cognitive and Communicative Gains

Collaborative Reporting encouraged higher-order thinking, group negotiation, and real-time language use—skills essential for oral proficiency. It also reduced speaking anxiety, as reported in prior studies (Storch, 2013; Gillies, 2017).

# 4. CONCLUSION

Collaborative Reporting significantly improves speaking proficiency among senior high school students. It offers a viable alternative to traditional instruction by fostering engagement, interaction, and communicative competence. Language educators are encouraged to integrate collaborative teaching strategies to enhance learner outcomes.
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