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Abstract

There are many methods to teach English as foreign language, either implicitly or explicitly. Teaching is not only telling or transferring the knowledge to the student, but the important one is how to make the student active and learn by themselves. One of the methods to do that is collaborative dialogue building among students. The method engages the students to interact with others by giving task to do with their friends and it makes student active. This method derives from Mariel Swain’s collaborative dialogue (2001). Drawing upon an experimental design, this present study entitled “Investigating the Effects of Collaborative Dialogue Building on the Students’ Lexical and Grammatical Mastery: A Study at the Second Grade Student of SMKN 1 Kotaraja - East Lombok” focusing in finding is there any effect of collaborative dialogue building on lexical and grammatical mastery of English as Foreign Language learners. Forty two Indonesian students of English as Foreign Language learners at SMKN 1 Kotaraja – East Lombok was as sample of this study, and were randomly divided into two groups: collaborative and individual groups. The learners in the collaborative group performed the tasks in groups of 4-5, while their counterparts in the individual group consist of 21 students performed all the tasks individually, no interaction with the others. The learners’ vocabulary and grammar knowledge and mastery were assessed using Oxford Placement Test, Vocabulary Test and researcher-made test in two occasions: pre-test and post-test. A set of independent sample t-test from Arikunto (2007) was run to compare the groups’ mastery of lexical and grammatical. The results revealed that the collaborative dialogue building method had significantly influence on lexical and grammatical mastery of the group after giving the treatment. But it still needs to do the further research at different setting for the comparison of the current research result.
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Abstraksi

Kata kunci: Dialog Kolaborasi, Leksikal, Gramatikal, Penguasaan Leksikal dan Gramatikal
INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary and grammar in any foreign language is fundamental in conducting conversation. Skills to master vocabulary and grammar of foreign language are an essential part of the second language learning and teaching. Especially in Indonesia, people are realizing the necessity of English competence at the very beginning of school level until the university since the country is starting to take more roles in international community such as ASEAN free market. Indonesian students have been struggling to acquire foreign language competence especially vocabulary and grammar of English.

One of the main rationales offered in the literature for using communicative task or collaborative dialogue in language teaching is that second language mastery enhanced through the negotiation of meaning (Swain, 2005: 104). Language learning is assisted through the social interaction of learners and their interlocutors, particularly when they negotiate toward mutual comprehension of each other's message meaning. This is very often neglected by the teachers of foreign language to support their students in social interaction, not exception at SMKN 1 Kotaraja East Lombok. Teachers who teach English seem to focus on grammatical by formal and traditional teaching and it makes students passive. Due to that the writer is conducting this research in where the lexical and grammatical are regarded not only can be thought and mastered by students by applying formal and traditional method of teaching but also by interaction or collaborative dialogue among the EFL learners.

The importance of collaborative dialogue has long been emphasized and recognized as it is one method that can establish a comfortable and low-threat learning environment in the foreign language classroom. It is widely believed that the less anxious and more relaxed the learner is, the better his language acquisition proceeds. Moreover, many scholars have supported the effectiveness of the method in terms of learning achievement and learner satisfaction. Allowing students to do dialogue and interaction is to maximize their own and other. Thus when engaged in collaborative dialogue, the learners guide and support each other through discussion and interaction.

In a recent paper by Khodamoradi et al. (2013), the effect of teacher’s scaffolding versus peer collaborative dialogue on the acquisition of English tenses was studied. The scaffolding group and collaborative group of the study received different treatments. The students in the former group received teacher’s assistance, while those in the latter group worked with their partners. A pre-posttest design was employed to assess the students learning. The comparison of test results showed no significant difference between the groups’ performance.

The importance of collaborative dialogue as a mediating tool in learner-learner interaction has been investigated by others previous research (Donato, 1994; Swain and Lapkin, 1998; Lantolf, 2000; Swain, 1995, 2000). Among the extensive body of research in this field, acquisition of grammatical items has been the central focus (Swain and Lapkin, 1998; Storch, 1999; Kuiken and Vedder, 2002), while vocabulary learning has not received equal attention (Kim, 2008).

Collaborative dialogue building is based on the idea that learning is a naturally social act in which the participants talk among themselves. It is through the talk and dialogue that learning occurs without any special or formal teaching activity. Oxford, (1997: 443) stated that collaborative learning is a re acculturative process which supports learners to become members of the knowledge communities whose common property is different from the common property of knowledge communities they already belong to, students put into groups are only students grouped and are not
collaborators, unless a task that demands consensual learning unifies the group activity thus teachers should foster positive attitudes in group members that will result in interactive and productive group learning.

Nevertheless, despite the fact that many studies have indicated benefits and success in using this method of teaching foreign language, studies focusing on the use of the method in an English classroom seem to be marginalized. And despite this theoretical and practical propositions by the expert, debate still exist regarding the effectiveness of using collaborative dialogue in foreign language context. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the effects of using collaborative dialogue in lexical and grammatical mastery both cognitive and affective aspects at SMKN 1 Kotaraja East Lombok.

The writer is interested in discovering whether, through output (the activities of talking and interaction), learners notice gaps in their foreign language knowledge, mainly in lexical and grammatical mastery.

The key point of mastery foreign language based on the writer idea is lexical and grammar, the more vocabulary the students have and grammar mastery, the more able they are in speaking, writing, and understanding the language. Importance of the lexical and grammatical mastery of English has reached new heights in the present context of the globalized world. But the question is: how far are the students at SMKN 1 Kotaraja will prepare for it? Students’ proficiency of mastering lexical and grammatical English is very poor here. A large majority of students at the school cannot access English textbooks prescribed in their syllabus for their lack of required proficiency of lexical and grammatical skills in English. Therefore, they depend only on Indonesian books and teachers’ guidance, and the vast resources in the libraries being in English remain unutilized. As results, the students suffer miserably, it falls far below the international standard and it seems that there are many students at SMKN 1 Kotaraja who lack in English lexical and grammatical mastery.

Based on the description above, it appear research question: Is there any effect of using collaborative dialogue building method and individual dialogue building work in teaching English on lexical and grammatical mastery of students at SMKN 1 Kotaraja?. There will be two formulated hypothesis in this study to be tested out:
1. The null hypothesis (H0): There is no significant difference between using collaborative dialogue method and individual work on lexical and grammatical mastery of SMKN 1 kotaraja Students.
2. The alternate hypothesis (H1): There is significant difference between using collaborative dialogue building method and individual work on lexical and grammatical mastery of SMKN 1 Kotaraja students.

METHOD
Quantitative research is explaining phenomena by collecting numerical data that are analyzed mathematically based methods (in particular statistics (Muijs, 2004:1). It is relevant with the design used in this paper. A number of 42 students, male and female aged between 16-17 attending SMKN 1 Kotaraja in the second grade of the fourth semester , school year 2015/2016, were selected to take part in this study. The participants are evenly and randomly put into two groups: an experimental and a control group. Each has 21 participants and there were four or five students in each sub group of experimental group. After the two groups receiving the treatment and proceed the post test, it can be seen the different score in mastery the lexical and grammatical, in where the collaborative group has the higher score than the control one.

The treatment consisted of 10 meeting, one and half -hour sessions (totally 13 hours), two times a week held in a time span of one month with the amount of target word 80 words. Pre and post test were constructed by the writer to get valid and
reliable data. For that goal the vocabulary test was taken from vocabulary test and exercise book by L, A Hill (1985) and grammar test was taken from Oxford Placement Test (OPT) added with questions taken from “inti sari bahasa Inggris untuk SMA” (2006). The tests comprised the target words and tenses that have been learnt. Vocabulary test were 25 and the grammar test were 25, so the total question are 50 and in the form of multiple choice.

After collecting all scores from pre and post test, then the writer counted the deviation score, mean score, and the square mean deviation score. After getting the mean score of experimental and control group, then the writer used t-test formula from Arikunto (2014:354-356) to count the degree of significance as follow:

\[
test = \frac{M_X - M_Y}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2}{N_X + N_Y} \left( \frac{1}{N_X} + \frac{1}{N_Y} \right)}}
\]

In where:
- \(M=\) The mean score of experimental group
- \(N=\) Number of sample
- \(X=\) the square mean deviation score of experimental group
- \(Y=\) The square mean deviation score of control group

At last it was counted the degree of freedom by using:

\[
df = (N_X + N_Y - 2)
\]

\[
df = Degree \ of \ freedom
\]

\[
N_X = Number \ sample \ of \ experimental \ group
\]

\[
N_Y = Number \ sample \ of \ control \ group
\]

**RESULT**

From the data calculation of both groups, it can be obtained result for the experimental group: the minimal score of experimental group= 26, maximal score=54. And the same pattern is followed in post-test results, the minimal score = 52, maximal score= 80. Meanwhile for the

\[
\sum \text{deviation score} = 570, \quad \sum \text{square deviation score} \quad (\sum X)^2 = 16124.
\]

Mean deviation score in the experimental group \(M_X= 27.14\).

For the control group the maximal score in the pre test= 54, in the post test = 54. In the post test, the maximal score = 72 and the minimal score = 46. Deviation score \(\sum Y = 358\), mean deviation score \(MY = 17.04\), square deviation score \((\sum Y)^2 = 6666\) and the square mean deviation score \((\sum Y^2) = 564.96\)

After that the writer uses t-test formula to count the degree of significance. If the result of calculation of the t-test is higher than t-table, it means that the collaborative dialogue building has effect in improving students’ ability in mastering foreign language in term of lexical and grammatical. So the researcher is succeed in conducting the experiment. To prove that, the writer applied the formula:

\[
test = \frac{M_X - M_Y}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2}{N_X + N_Y - 2} \left( \frac{1}{N_X} + \frac{1}{N_Y} \right) \right)}}
\]

\[
= \frac{27.14 - 17.04}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{652.58 + 564.96}{21 + 21 - 2} \left( \frac{1}{21} + \frac{1}{21} \right) \right)}}
\]

\[
= \frac{27.14 - 17.04}{\sqrt{\left( \frac{1217.54}{40} \right) \left( \frac{2}{21} \right)}}
\]

\[
= \frac{10.09}{\sqrt{30.43 \times 0.09}}
\]

\[
= 5.93
\]

At last the writer counted the degree of freedom by applying the formula:

\[
df = (N_X + N_Y - 2)
\]

\[
= 21 + 21 - 2
\]

\[
= 40
\]

Having the computed the mean score of both groups, it can be seen on the table that the mean score of experimental group is higher than the control group. With
significance level is in the degree of freedom (df) is 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>t-table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the result above, it can be seen that participants in the collaborative dialogue building may differ from those who performed individually on the tasks in terms of their foreign language lexical and grammatical mastery. The comparison of test results indicated a significant difference between the two groups. The collaborative group’s scores on the post-test drastically increased, this can be regarded as convincing evidence that collaborative dialogue building and interactions between the peers and group member can mediate their language learning. This finding is in line with some previous studies in Storch’s (1999) findings that learners perform better in tasks when they work together rather than working alone. One of the reasons for this can be the facilitative effect of negotiation of meaning on mastery the language, as stated by Long (1996:139). He maintains that such an effect results from the fact that negotiation connects input, learners’ capabilities, and output. Collaborative dialogue building, as one of the forms of interaction, among the students can function as instructional conversations between experts and learners (Swain, 1995). This kind of dialogue provides the learners with “opportunities to co-construct a complex linguistic structure by focusing their attention and providing opportunities to revise their own language use” (Swain & Watanabe, 2013: 321).

Lexical and grammatical items are essential components in a language. In this regard, Long (1981, 1983) proposes that learners can understand words beyond their present level of competence by negotiating their meanings with other learners. This collaborative act, can promote language mastery since learners eventually can incorporate the negotiated items in their production. To summarize, the findings of the current study support the positive effect of employing the collaborative dialogue building techniques for group at the same level of proficiency on the lexical and grammatical mastery.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study show that a more social technique like collaborative dialogue building in the context of language learning can benefit the learners’ mastery of foreign language. The collaborative learning environment enables the learners to construct their knowledge collaboratively in the presence of group member at the same level of proficiency and conceptual understanding. These results can have pedagogical implications for implementing collaborative dialogue building method in language classes, suggesting that learners can solve linguistic problems more effectively when they receive support from their peers rather than when they work alone. This can aid EFL teachers who are required to manage language classes with a large number of learners. In such classes, the use of pair or group work can be a beneficial resource for the learners in promoting foreign language (lexical and grammatical) mastery, and for teachers in managing the classes. Though this posed a challenge to the learners, it was observed that when the responsibility of learning vocabulary is given to the learners, they can make the given input comprehensible through interacting with peers (interactionally modified input). This finding can benefit the teachers in that when faced with time constraints they can share the task of teaching with the learners. Further research is also needed to investigate possible impacts of gender and different proficiency levels as important variables in the effectiveness of the collaborative dialogue building method.
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