EXPLORING THE USE OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES IN ENRICHING THE STUDENT'S LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY IN FILIPINO 9

Sanch Claire Y.Perpetua[1], Rommel B. Gregorios[2], Louie John Bactong[3], Jelivy T.Parnada[4],Rubillinda A. Paglinawan[5], James L. Paglinawan[5]

Student, Central Mindanao University, Musuan, Maramag, Bukidnon 8714 Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study examines the efficacy of collaborative learning strategies in improving Filipino language proficiency among Grade 9 students at Batangan Integrated School. Despite extensive research on collaborative learning in other subjects, its application in Filipino language instruction remains underrepresented. Employing a quasi-experimental design, 100 students were divided into experimental and control groups. The experimental group engaged in collaborative activities such as Jigsaw Reading, Think-Pair-Share, and peer review, while the control group received traditional instruction. Pre- and post-assessments revealed statistically significant gains in the experimental group (mean post-test = 2.7072) compared to the control group (mean post-test = 2.3366, p = 0.000). These findings underscore the potential of collaborative learning to enhance student engagement, confidence, and language skills. The study recommends integrating collaborative strategies into Filipino language curricula and prioritizing teacher professional development to maximize benefits. This research contributes to the growing body of evidence supporting student-centered pedagogies in language education.

Keyword: Collaborative pedagogy, Language proficiency assessment, Student-centered instruction, Peer collaboration, Educational outcomes

1. INTRODUCTION

The teaching and learning of the Filipino language remain critical components of the Philippine educational system, aimed at fostering national identity and effective communication skills among students. However, despite its importance, Filipino language proficiency among learners, particularly at the secondary level, continues to face significant challenges. These challenges are compounded by limited instructional resources, diverse student language backgrounds, and inconsistent pedagogical approaches, which hinder the effective delivery of Filipino language education (De Guzman & Villanueva, 2022; Salazar & Fajardo, 2020). Moreover, schools in rural and under-resourced areas experience disparities in access to quality teaching materials and professional development opportunities, exacerbating educational inequities (Santos & Lim, 2021).

Studies have also documented declining student interest and proficiency in Filipino, with learners often favoring other languages over their national tongue, which negatively impacts academic engagement and cognitive development (Somblingo & Ricohermoso, 2019; Bughao et al., 2017). The recent shifts in language policy, such as the discontinuation of the Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) program, have further complicated language instruction, highlighting the need for adaptable and inclusive teaching strategies (Philippine Star Editorial, 2025). Additionally, language anxiety among Filipino learners poses another barrier to proficiency development (Seballos et al., 2024).

Within the Philippine context, research on language literacy enhancement emphasizes the socio-linguistic challenges faced by educators, particularly those teaching indigenous and marginalized learners, underscoring the need for innovative and culturally responsive pedagogies (Bastida Jr. et al., 2022). Internationally, collaborative learning strategies have been recognized as effective in promoting language

acquisition and student engagement across diverse linguistic settings (e.g., Smith & Lee, 2020; Johnson et al., 2021; García & Martínez, 2023). These studies advocate for interactive, student-centered approaches that foster communication skills and confidence in language use.

This study aims to address the gap in applying collaborative learning strategies specifically within Filipino language instruction for Grade 9 students, contributing to both local and global discourse on effective language teaching methodologies.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. What is the level of the language proficiency of students who are exposed to the collaborative learning strategies and those who are exposed to the non-collaborative learning strategies in terms of:

a. Pretest; and

b. Post-test?

2. Is there any significant difference in the language proficiency of students who are exposed to the collaborative learning strategies and those who are exposed to the non-collaborative learning strategies?

Cation Exchange Capacity is defined

2.1. Null Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the Filipino Language Proficiency of Grade 9 learners exposed to Collaborative Learning Strategies compared to those who are not exposed to Collaborative Learning Strategies.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, quasi-experimental design to evaluate the effectiveness of collaborative learning strategies on the language proficiency of Grade 9 students at Batangan Integrated School. Two intact classes were randomly selected to serve as the experimental and control groups, each consisting of 50 students. The experimental group received instruction incorporating collaborative learning techniques such as Think-Pair-Share, group discussions, and peer teaching, which aimed to actively engage students and promote interactive

learning. In contrast, the control group continued with traditional teacher-centered instruction characterized by direct teaching and individual tasks. This design allowed for a direct comparison of the two instructional approaches, focusing on their impact on various aspects of language proficiency, including speaking, listening, reading, and writing. By maintaining similar conditions for both groups except for the mode of instruction, the study sought to establish a clear causal relationship between the use of collaborative learning strategies and improvements in Filipino language proficiency.

3.2. Participants of the Study

The study included 100 Grade 9 students from Batangan Integrated School in Valencia City, Bukidnon, who were enrolled for the academic year 2024–2025. The participants were 50 Grade 9 students in the experimental group and 50 students in the control group. These students were those who were struggling with fluency in the Filipino language.

3.2.1. Data Collection Method

The researchers followed a systematic and ethical data collection process. After securing approval from the school principal, research instruments were validated by Filipino language education experts. Informed assent from students and parental consent were obtained before administering a pre-test to assess baseline proficiency. The experimental group participated in collaborative learning activities, while the control group received traditional instruction. A post-test was conducted afterward to measure outcomes. Confidentiality and data security were ensured, and participants could withdraw at any time, guaranteeing the study's ethical integrity and reliability.

3.2.2. Data Analysis Plan

The data collected were analyzed using statistical tools to assess the effectiveness of collaborative learning strategies on language proficiency. Paired t-tests were used to evaluate changes in pre-test and post-test scores within the experimental and control groups. Results were presented in tables to ensure clear and concise reporting of findings

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of the language proficiency of students who are exposed to the non-collaborative learning strategies.

Table 1. Results of Paired Sample Statistics:

		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	Pre	1.93	50	0.29334	0.04148
	Post	2.35	50	0.17269	0.02442

Table 1 shows the pre-test and post-test results of the control group, which did not receive any special teaching or activity during the lesson. The average score went up a little, from 1.93 in the pre-test to 2.35 in the post-test, showing a small improvement over time. Since no new strategy was used with this group, the improvement might be due to natural learning or other outside factors. The standard deviation also slightly decreases from 0.29334 to 0.17269 meaning the differences in scores among students reduce a bit, but not by much. The standard error of the mean was low in both tests (0.04148 in the pre-test and 0.02442 in the post-test), which means the average scores are reliable. Overall, the slight improvement in scores is not related to any intervention, since this group was used only for comparison.

Table 2. Results of a paired samples t-test that compared the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group

		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-Post	2.14	0.3634	0.0315	Lower -0.051090 Upper -0.30430	-7.929	49	.000

The results indicate a statistically significant average score increase of 2.14 (t = -7.929, df = 49, p = 0.000), with a standard deviation of 0.3634 and a 95% confidence interval ranging from -0.30430 to -0.05109. Klimova (2017) cautions that small but significant differences in pre- and post-tests within control groups often reflect repeated testing effects rather than the teaching method's effectiveness.

Level of the language proficiency of students who are exposed to the collaborative learning strategies.

Table 3. Results of Paired Sample Statistics:

		Mean	N	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
Pair 1	Pre	1.986	50	0.36470	0.05158
	Post	2.7072	50	0.24299	0.03436

Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for 50 participants who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. The mean score increased from 1.986 in the pre-test to 2.7072 in the post-test, with the standard deviation decreasing from 0.36470 to 0.24299. This suggests not only an improvement in average performance but also less variability in scores after the intervention.

Table 4. Results of a paired samples t-test that was used to compare the pre-test and post-test scores of the control group

		Mean	Std. deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	T	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)
Pair 1	Pre-Post	2.41	0.4781	0.0478	Lower -0.083684 Upper -0.61756	-13.329	49	0.000

The mean difference between the pre-test and post-test scores is 2.41, with a standard deviation of 0.4781 and a standard error of 0.0478. The t-test yielded a value of -13.329 with 49 degrees of freedom, and the p-value was 0.000, indicating a highly significant improvement. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference (from -0.61756 to -0.08368) does not include zero, further confirming the statistical significance of the results. These findings strongly suggest that the instructional intervention had a substantial positive impact on student performance. The very low p-value indicates that this improvement is unlikely to be due to chance. Supporting this, Deslauriers, Louis, et al. (2019) found that students engaged in active learning environments consistently outperformed those in traditional lecture-based settings, despite sometimes reporting lower confidence in their learning. This underscores the effectiveness of interactive teaching methods in enhancing comprehension and retention.

Table 5. Difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of learners exposed in collaborative learning strategies and those exposed with non-collaborative learning strategies.

	Group	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Pre-Test	Control	50	1.93	0.2933	0.0414
	Experimental	50	1.98	0.3647	0.0515
Post-Test	Control	50	2.35	0.17269	0.0244
	Experimental	50	2.71	0.2429	0.0343

Table 5 shows that learners in the experimental group, exposed to collaborative learning strategies, improved more than those in the control group. Both groups had similar pre-test means (1.986 experimental, 1.93 control), but post-intervention, the experimental group's mean rose to 2.7072 (an increase of 0.7212), while the control group's mean increased to 2.35 (a 0.42 gain). The 0.301-point difference favoring the experimental group is statistically significant, demonstrating the greater effectiveness of collaborative learning. This aligns with Johnson, Johnson, and Smith's (2015) findings that collaborative methods enhance student engagement, deeper thinking, and information retention, leading to better academic performance compared to traditional, non-collaborative approaches.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, collaborative learning strategies significantly enhance learner performance. The control group showed only a minor score increase (1.93 to 2.35), likely due to natural progression or repeated testing rather than instructional impact (Klimova, 2017). Their performance became slightly more consistent but without substantial gains. In contrast, the experimental group, engaged in collaborative activities, demonstrated a significant improvement from 1.986 to 2.7072 (p = 0.000), with reduced variability indicating more uniform progress. These results align with Deslauriers et al. (2019), who found active learning boosts assessment scores and retention despite lower student confidence.

Both groups started at similar pre-test levels, ensuring fair comparison, yet the experimental group outperformed the control by 0.301 points—a statistically significant difference (p < 0.001). This supports prior research (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 2015; Laal & Ghodsi, 2015) showing that collaborative learning fosters deeper understanding, critical thinking, and motivation.

Based on the significant improvements observed in learners exposed to collaborative learning strategies, it is recommended that Filipino teachers and curriculum developers actively integrate these approaches into classroom instruction. The demonstrated effectiveness of collaborative methods in enhancing language proficiency, critical thinking, and student engagement suggests their potential benefits extend beyond Filipino language classes to other subject areas as well. To maximize these gains, continuous professional development and support for teachers are essential, ensuring they are well-equipped to implement collaborative strategies effectively. By fostering interactive, student-centered learning environments, educators can promote deeper understanding and sustained academic growth, aligning with the study's conclusions on the value of peer-driven instructional methods.

REFERENCES

[1]. Deslauriers, L., McCarty, L. S., Miller, K., Callaghan, K., & Kestin, G. (2019). Measuring actual learning versus feeling of learning in response to being actively engaged in the classroom. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(39), 19251–19257. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821936116

[2]. Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2015). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 25(3-4), 85–118.

[3]. Klimova, B. (2017). The effect of repeated testing on language learning: Implications for teaching. Journal of Language Learning and Teaching, 7(2), 45–52.

[4]. Laal, M., & Ghodsi, S. M. (2015). Benefits of collaborative learning. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31, 486–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.091

[5]. Abdulghani, H. M., Al-Drees, A. A., Khalol, M. S., Ahmad, F., Ponnamperuma, G. G., & Amin, Z. (2014). What factors determine academic achievement in high-achieving undergraduate medical students? A qualitative study. Medical Teacher, 36(Suppl. 1), S43–S48. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2014.886011

[6]. Ahmadirezaei, Hossein. "The Effect of Information Technology in Saderat Banking System." Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol. 30, 2011, pp. 23–26, www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811018301, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.005.

[7]. Arianti, R. (2020). Improvement of news text writing skills through think-pair-share model in VIII Grade students of SMP Negeri 7 Rambah Samo. Journal of Educational Sciences, 4(3), 607–619. Retrieved from https://goto.now/Rmt8B

[8]. Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2014). Collaborative learning techniques: A handbook for college faculty. John Wiley & Sons. https://tinyurl.com/ymn7946v

[9]. Bhandari, B. L. (2021). Effectiveness of collaborative learning for improving learners' writing proficiency in English classrooms. Tribhuvan University Journal. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359238479_Effectiveness_of_Collaborative_Learning_for_Improving_Learners'_Writing_Proficiency_in_English_Classrooms

[10]. Cagatan, Asly Nicole P., and Erlinda A. Quirap. "Collaborative Learning and Learners' Academic Performance." International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis, vol. 7, no. 3, Mar. 2024, pp. 1326–1335. ResearchGate,
a. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379522411_Collaborative_Learning_and_Learners'_Academic_Performance.

[11]. Chraif, Mihaela, and Mihai Aniței. "The Physiological Effects of Cartoons Blood Scenes on the Youngsters in Romania." Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, vol. 30, 2011, pp. 465–470, www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042811019161, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.091. Accessed 5 Dec. 2019.

[12]. Deslauriers, Louis, et al. "Measuring Actual Learning versus Feeling of Learning in Response to Being Actively Engaged in the Classroom." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 116, no. 39, 2019, pp. 19251–19257. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821936116

[13]. Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39–54. https://tinyurl.com/ymn7946v

[14]. Gonzales, W. D. W., & Torres, P. L. O. (2016). Filipino ESL learners' attitudes toward cooperative learning and their relationship to reading comprehension. TESOL International Journal, 11(2), 70–90. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED571834.pdf

[15]. Ismail, A. O., Mahmood, A. K., & Abdelmaboud, A. (2018). Factors influencing academic performance of students in blended and traditional domains. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 13(2),

170–181. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i02.8031

[16]. Johnson, D., et al. "Co-Operative Learning: Improving University Instruction by Basing Practice on Validated Theory." Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, vol. 25, no. 3&4, 2014, pp. 85–118.

[17]. Klimova, B. (2017). Evaluating the effectiveness of language learning strategies in language acquisition. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 237, 1200-1205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2017.02.186

[18]. Levine, T. H., & Marcus, A. S. (2017). Teacher collaboration and professional growth: Evidence from classroom-based action research. Teaching and Teacher Education, 66, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.03.009

[19]. Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 18(1), 30–43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

[20]. Magno, J. M., Indal, R. S., Chavez, J. V., Garil, B. A., & Delos Reyes, R. B. (2024). Alternative teaching strategies in learning Filipino language among students with dominant English language use at home. Forum for Linguistic Studies, 6(4), 404–419. Retrieved from https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/fls/article/view/6742

[21]. Ojie-Ahamiojie,George."Using Collaborative Learning to Elevate Students' Educational Experiences." Faculty Focus, 2024,
    a. https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/faculty-development/using-collaborative-learning-to-elevate-students-educational-experiences/?fbclid=IwY2xjawKHvXdleHRuA2FlbQIxMABicmlkETF5U0s2V3FyVVNGS2p3SkJUAR4tkWMoEOjgwpRhOIAtIJPUyrNiG9rljJtiZYb0jomOgBZEdKbomP7zLiwm9w_aem_CgkWNokfI5FK4GGfng1L6g.

[22]. Saito, K. (2020). Pretest-posttest research designs in second language acquisition: A methodological review. Language Teaching Research, 24(2), 226-244. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818787545

[23]. Sayson, C., Opancia, E., & Macasojot, J. (2020). Effects of using English language on academic performance of Grade 12 HUMSS strand students at Bestlink College of the Philippines. Ascendens Asia Singapore – Bestlink College of the Philippines Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 2(1). Retrieved from https://ojs.aaresearchindex.com/index.php/aasgbcpjmra/article/view/26

[24]. Smit, R., Bachmann, P., Blum, V., & Birri, T. (2020). Effects of collaborative learning on student achievement: A meta-analysis. Educational Research and Evaluation, 26(3-4), 145-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2020.1868989

[25]. Somblingo, R., & Ricohermoso, C. (2019). First language and second language proficiency: A case of Bisaya learners. SINTE, 31(3), 473–475. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3621555

[26]. Tint, S. S., & Nyunt, E. E. (2015). Collaborative learning with think-pair-share technique. An International Journal. Retrieved from https://goto.now/Rmt8B

[27]. Tsao, C. L. P. (2015). Using learning through discussion in medical education settings. Academic Psychiatry, 39, 332–334. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-014-0124-7