

Enhancing English Language Learning Through the Cooperative Learning Method: A Study Among Communication Studies Students at UMI

Andi Hudriati

Corresponding Authors' Email: andi.hudriati@umi.ac.id
 Sastra Inggris, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia

Rahmat

Email: rahmat.sastra@umi.ac.id
 Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia

Husnul Mujaddidah

Email: husnul.mujaddidah@umi.ac.id
 Sastra Inggris, Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Indonesia

Received:
 November 2024
 Accepted:
 December 2024
 Published:
 December 2024

Abstract

This Classroom Action Research (CAR) investigated the effectiveness of cooperative learning in enhancing student motivation and academic performance in an English course for first-semester Communication Studies students at the Faculty of Letters, Universitas Muslim Indonesia (UMI). A total of 25 students participated in two iterative cycles, each comprising planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. Data were collected through observation sheets that tracked classroom activities and assignments designed to evaluate improvements in listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. The results from Cycle 1 showed a moderate increase in student engagement, from 67% to 78%, but did not meet the predetermined mastery criterion (average score of 72, below the minimum of 75). In contrast, Cycle 2 revealed a marked improvement, with engagement levels rising from 84% to 90%, and the average score increasing to 86. Observational data indicated that shifting to a student-centered classroom environment and regulating mobile phone use for academic purposes boosted students' confidence and collaboration. Students also demonstrated enhanced comprehension and fluency, aligning with broader findings in cooperative learning literature. Overall, these findings underscore the potential of cooperative learning to address the limitations of conventional lecture-based instruction. By engaging students in structured group activities, fostering peer support, and offering consistent feedback, cooperative learning can significantly improve motivation and learning outcomes. The success of this approach suggests that it may be beneficial for adoption in other higher education contexts seeking to elevate student participation and language proficiency.

Keywords: Cooperative Learning, English Language Learning, Classroom Action Research, Learning Outcomes, Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

English language instruction at the tertiary level is fundamentally aimed at equipping students with robust proficiency in the four essential language skills: listening, speaking, reading,

and writing (Wijaya, 2015). These interconnected skills are vital for both academic pursuits and practical communication within an increasingly globalized world. While mastering grammatical structures (e.g., tenses) remains important, effective English learning requires students to cultivate substantial vocabulary, engage in consistent practice, and develop the confidence to express ideas orally as well as in writing. According to Susanthi (2021), the quality of English instruction is heavily influenced by two factors: the professionalism and preparedness of the instructor, and the balance between theory-oriented content and experiential learning activities. When these elements are thoughtfully aligned, students are more likely to achieve the desired competency level to meet both personal and professional demands.

At Universitas Muslim Indonesia (UMI), the integration of English as a compulsory course for undergraduate students, particularly within the Communication Studies Program, reflects the increasing importance of English proficiency in contemporary academic and professional landscapes. English serves as a critical tool for accessing a plethora of electronic databases, peer-reviewed literature, and global research networks, which are essential for students aiming to remain informed about current trends in communication, media, and cultural studies. Research indicates that English proficiency significantly correlates with academic achievement, suggesting that students with higher levels of English proficiency tend to perform better academically (Devi, 2023; Eriani, 2023). This proficiency not only enhances their ability to comprehend complex academic texts but also facilitates effective communication in both oral and written forms, thereby enriching their overall educational experience (Budiman, 2023).

In the context of the digital revolution, the internet has emerged as an indispensable platform for academic collaboration, international job opportunities, and scholarship programs. Students proficient in English are better equipped to navigate these resources, which can lead to enhanced academic and career prospects. For instance, studies have shown that English language skills are crucial for securing scholarships offered by various institutions, thereby broadening students' educational horizons (Siddiqui, 2024; Giampapa & Canagarajah, 2017). Furthermore, the ability to communicate effectively in English is increasingly recognized as a vital competency in the global job market, where employers often prioritize candidates with strong English skills (Wijayanto, 2023). This trend underscores the necessity for educational institutions to prioritize English language instruction, ensuring that students are adequately prepared for both academic and professional challenges.

Moreover, the role of technology in language learning cannot be overlooked. The incorporation of technology-enhanced learning strategies, such as gamification and interactive tools, has been shown to improve language acquisition and retention among students (Ali & Abdalgane, 2022; Zhou & Wei, 2018). These strategies not only make learning more engaging but also provide immediate feedback, which is crucial for language development (Zhou & Wei, 2018). Additionally, the use of authentic materials and real-life communication scenarios in English language courses fosters an immersive learning environment, allowing students to practice their language skills in contexts that mirror real-world applications (Budiman, 2023; Menggo et al., 2019). This approach is particularly beneficial in preparing students for the demands of the global workforce, where effective communication in English is often a prerequisite for success.

Despite the clear importance of English, numerous constraints hinder effective learning outcomes at the university level. One key factor is the limited vocabulary that many students bring to the classroom, which often manifests as a reluctance to speak or engage in discussions (Akbari

in Sutrisna, 2021). The resultant low self-confidence can become an additional barrier to active participation in English-speaking environments. Compounding this issue is the heterogeneity of students' educational backgrounds, as enrollees may have had varying levels of exposure to formal English instruction prior to entering university. Such diversity can lead to uneven participation and hesitation when students are required to articulate opinions or collaborate in group work. Another challenge is the relatively weak literacy culture found among some undergraduates, who may rarely read academic texts or articles in English, thus limiting both their reading comprehension and their ability to model correct sentence structures or vocabulary usage. Moreover, a heavy reliance on traditional lecture-based instruction often restricts opportunities for students to practice their language skills in dynamic, communicative contexts that mirror real-world interactions.

Preliminary observations in the Communication Studies Program at UMI, particularly among the B1-class students in the 2024/2025 academic year, validate many of these broader trends. Course assessments and informal interviews reveal that the average English proficiency scores tend to fall between 60 and 74, which is classified as a moderate range. Moreover, many students report feeling anxious or self-conscious when asked to speak in English or read aloud from English texts, citing fears of mispronunciation and confusion arising from applying Indonesian language patterns to English sentence structures. These issues collectively impede students' ability to participate fully in classroom discussions, to interpret scholarly articles written in English, and ultimately to enhance their overall academic and professional skill sets.

Given these challenges, this study adopts the cooperative learning approach in order to create a more interactive, student-centered environment that can better address the diverse needs and skill levels within the B1-class. Cooperative learning is characterized by its emphasis on collaboration and mutual support, wherein students are grouped heterogeneously to discuss assigned topics, share resources, and solve problems collectively (Rusman, 2018). The instructor takes on the role of facilitator and motivator, offering guidance while ensuring that each group remains focused on achieving the specified learning objectives (Chan in Hudriati, 2023). Wena (2009) notes that cooperative learning provides two critical sources of knowledge acquisition: (1) direct instruction from the teacher and (2) peer-based interaction, which encourages students to learn from one another's experiences, perspectives, and skill sets.

Furthermore, Hasanah and Ahmad in Hudriati (2023) outline the key characteristics of cooperative learning—team-based study, cooperative management, collaborative skill-building, and problem-solving—that can be adapted to a variety of classroom settings. In practice, the method proceeds through six phases: articulating learning goals and motivation, presenting instructional content, organizing cooperative groups, guiding group work, evaluating the learning outcomes, and finally, rewarding high-performing groups or individuals (Hasanah & Ahmad, 2021). By centering on mutual interaction and a sense of shared responsibility, cooperative learning has the potential to simultaneously boost students' self-confidence, deepen their understanding of course material, and foster the practical communication skills so essential to Communication Studies.

Therefore, the present Classroom Action Research (CAR) aims to fulfill three primary objectives: (1) enhance students' motivation and engagement in English language courses, (2) improve their mastery of core language competencies—particularly in speaking and reading—and (3) analyze the efficacy of cooperative learning as an instructional method for first-year Communication Studies students at UMI. Addressing these goals not only helps to elevate the

immediate academic performance of B1-class students but also has implications for broader teaching practices across other faculties or universities grappling with similar issues. By systematically documenting and evaluating the results, this study aspires to offer valuable insights into how interactive, student-focused methods can revitalize English language instruction in non-English-speaking regions. Through effective implementation of cooperative learning, we hope to bridge the gap between theoretical teaching approaches and the practical skills needed in an increasingly interconnected and English-driven world.

METHOD

This study adopted a Classroom Action Research approach designed to enhance the teaching process and improve students' learning quality. Consistent with the perspective of Rahmat and Andi Puspitasari (2021), the research proceeded in cyclical stages involving planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. Each cycle allowed for iterative evaluation and revision of instructional practices, ensuring a responsive and adaptive learning environment.

The study took place in an English course offered to students enrolled in the Communication Studies Program at the Faculty of Letters, Universitas Muslim Indonesia. A total of 25 students in one class served as both research participants. Two categories of data were collected, capturing both the process of learning and the learning outcomes. Process-related data encompassed all student activities in class, focusing on how the cooperative learning method supported engagement, motivation, and peer collaboration. Outcome-related data included task and assignment scores from the English course, which served as measurable indicators of students' proficiency and progress.

Observation sheets were used to document the frequency and quality of student participation, the way they interacted in groups, and any notable behaviors or challenges arising during the lessons. These sheets were aligned with the cooperative learning framework to ensure that feedback directly reflected the pedagogical method in use. Additionally, English tests and assignments were crafted based on the material that students had been taught. Scores from these tasks provided quantitative insights into students' progress over the course of the action research cycles.

Data obtained through observation were analyzed using descriptive qualitative techniques, offering an in-depth view of classroom dynamics and the effectiveness of peer interaction. Students' test scores and assignment results were analyzed through descriptive quantitative methods, primarily to detect patterns of improvement and measure overall gains in English language competence. By integrating both qualitative and quantitative perspectives, the research offered a comprehensive understanding of how cooperative learning influenced students' engagement, confidence, and academic performance in English. Through multiple cycles of planning, acting, observing, and reflecting, the study generated actionable insights into the benefits of an interactive, student-centered teaching approach for Communication Studies undergraduates.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

1. Cycle I

a. Implementation of the Cooperative Learning Method in Meeting 1, Cycle I

During the first meeting of Cycle 1, the cooperative learning method was introduced to the B1-class students in the Communication Studies Program, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Muslim Indonesia (UMI). The session focused on sentence structure (video-based materials) and self-introduction activities. Observations showed that students’ overall engagement was categorized as “inactive,” with only 67% of the class demonstrating active participation.

Several factors contributed to this outcome. Some students appeared unfocused during the opening prayer, while others continued to use their mobile phones despite the lecturer’s instructions. In the group discussion phase, only a few students participated proactively; most were still unfamiliar with cooperative learning. Many displayed low self-confidence or nervousness when asked to share their ideas. Consequently, only a small number of students received positive reinforcement from the lecturer at the end of the session. The lecturer offered motivation and encouragement to those who had been reluctant to present group discussion results in front of the class.

Table 1. Student Activity Data, Meeting 1, Cycle I

No.	Observed Activity	Frequency (Active)	Active	Frequency (Inactive)	Inactive Aktif
1	Students respond to the lecturer’s greeting and participate in the opening prayer.	14	56%	11	44%
2	Students pay attention to the lecturer’s motivational introduction.	17	68%	8	32%
3	Students answer questions related to the previous week’s material.	15	60%	10	40%
4	Students listen to the indicators or learning objectives to be achieved.	20	80%	5	20%
5	Students acknowledge the roll call read by the lecturer.	20	80%	5	20%
6	Students carefully follow the lecturer’s explanations on the main learning material.	15	60%	10	40%
7	Students listen to and follow instructions on forming discussion groups (4–5 members).	20	80%	5	20%
8	Lecturer supports and supervises students in completing their tasks.	18	72%	7	28%
9	Students present their group discussion results in front of the class.	16	64%	9	36%
10	Students receive recognition or rewards from the lecturer.	16	64%	9	36%
11	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (First instance)	15	60%	10	40%

12	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (Second instance)	20	80%	5	20%
----	---	----	-----	---	-----

b. Implementation of the Cooperative Learning Method in Meeting 2, Cycle I

The second meeting in Cycle 1 explored self-introduction scripts and a reading passage about Makassarese foods. Observations indicated a higher level of engagement compared to the first meeting, with 78% of students categorized as active. Although not fully optimal, this represented a clear improvement from the previous session. Students demonstrated a more positive response, along with greater motivation and enthusiasm for learning. Even so, some students remained hesitant or lacked confidence when asked to introduce themselves in English, and many stumbled over words while reading paragraphs in English.

Table 2. Student Activity Data, Meeting 2, Cycle I

No.	Observed Activity	Frequency (Active)	Active	Frequency (Inactive)	Inactive
1	Students respond to the lecturer’s greeting and participate in the opening prayer.	18	72%	7	28%
2	Students pay attention to the lecturer’s motivational introduction.	19	76%	6	24%
3	Students answer questions related to the previous week’s material.	18	72%	7	28%
4	Students listen to the indicators or learning objectives to be achieved.	20	80%	5	20%
5	Students acknowledge the roll call read by the lecturer.	22	88%	3	12%
6	Students carefully follow the lecturer’s explanations on the main learning material.	20	80%	5	20%
7	Students listen to and follow instructions on forming discussion groups (4–5 members).	22	88%	3	12%
8	Lecturer supports and supervises students in completing their tasks.	20	80%	5	20%
9	Students present their group discussion results in front of the class.	18	72%	7	28%
10	Students receive recognition or rewards from the lecturer.	18	72%	7	28%
11	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (First instance)	16	64%	9	36%



12	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (Second instance)	22	88%	3	12%
----	---	----	-----	---	-----

c. Analysis of English Learning Outcomes in Cycle I

Following the cooperative learning approach, the average score for English tasks and assessments in Cycle 1 was 72. This evaluation covered listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Since the average did not meet the minimum passing criterion (75), it was concluded that the learning outcomes in Cycle 1 did not yet indicate mastery.

Table 3. English Learning Outcomes, Cycle I

Category	Score Range	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	85-100	0	0%
Good	75-84	5	20%
Fair	65-74	20	80%
Poor	55-64	0	0%
Total		25	100%

Students’ low average scores stemmed from limited confidence and motivation. Many had little practice with student-centered learning, as they were used to the conventional lecture method from high school, where the teacher or lecturer plays the primary role. Some students felt overwhelmed because of their limited English vocabulary, which made them reluctant to present group findings. Others needed extra time to reread English texts to ensure comprehension, and many struggled to write accurately because of insufficient grammar knowledge.

Table 4. Minimum Mastery Criterion (Cycle I)

Score	Frequency	Percentage
Passed (≥ 75)	5	20%
Not Passed (≤ 75)	20	80%
Jumlah	25	100%

These findings indicate that only 20% of the students met the passing standard, while 80% scored below it. Thus, English language learning in Cycle 1 using cooperative learning was deemed “incomplete” or “unsuccessful.”

The overall student activity level remained in the “inactive” category, likely due to students’ strong familiarity with traditional lecture methods in high school. Their lack of self-confidence also hampered their willingness to present group discussion outcomes in class. Additionally, students were not restricted from using their mobile phones during the lessons, which interfered with their concentration. The average score of 72 in Cycle 1 fell below the minimum mastery criterion of 75. Based on these observations, the lecturer and researcher agreed to proceed to Cycle 2, emphasizing several improvements, including stricter focus on the opening prayer and learning objectives, reducing mobile phone usage without direct permission from the lecturer, and encouraging more active practice of the four main language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing.



2. Cycle II

a. Implementation of the Cooperative Learning Method in Meeting 1, Cycle II

The first meeting in Cycle 2 began with a group prayer, followed by motivational remarks to spark student enthusiasm. Students appeared calmer and more focused during the lecturer’s explanation of course objectives compared to their demeanor in the previous cycle. After taking attendance, the lecturer introduced listening materials from “Listening Session Everyday English” (Cambridge Book A2) and speaking exercises using “Ask and Answer Daily Conversation” (Cambridge Book A2).

Observation revealed a marked improvement in student engagement in Cycle II, Meeting 1, with 84% demonstrating active participation. Despite the overall progress, a few challenges remained. One student refused to join a predetermined group, while others still felt uneasy presenting in front of the class. Students also struggled with rapid English conversations and correct intonation. Nevertheless, these issues showed some improvement compared to Cycle I.

Table 5. Student Activity Data, Meeting 1, Cycle II

No.	Observed Activity	Frequency (Active)	Active	Frequency (Inactive)	Inactive
1	Students respond to the lecturer’s greeting and participate in the opening prayer.	21	84%	4	16%
2	Students pay attention to the lecturer’s motivational introduction.	20	80%	5	20%
3	Students answer questions related to the previous week’s material.	20	80%	5	20%
4	Students listen to the indicators or learning objectives to be achieved.	22	88%	3	12%
5	Students acknowledge the roll call read by the lecturer.	22	88%	3	12%
6	Students carefully follow the lecturer’s explanations on the main learning material.	22	88%	3	12%
7	Students listen to and follow instructions on forming discussion groups (4–5 members).	22	88%	3	12%
18	Lecturer supports and supervises students in completing their tasks.	24	96%	1	4%
9	Students present their group discussion results in front of the class.	20	80%	5	20%
10	Students receive recognition or rewards from the lecturer.	16	64%	9	36%
11	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (First instance)	18	72%	7	28%



12	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (Second instance)	23	92%	2	8%
----	---	----	-----	---	----

b. Implementation of the Cooperative Learning Method in Meeting 2, Cycle II

The second meeting in Cycle 2 covered writing exercises based on daily conversations and reading passages focusing on “World Markets.” Students were observed to be more active overall. They had grown accustomed to the cooperative learning steps and seemed more enthusiastic about group discussions. The conversations they practiced were topic-based, guided by the lecturer, and involved substantial peer-to-peer interaction. Engagement reached 90%, reflecting a more lively and interactive learning atmosphere.

Table 6. Student Activity Data, Meeting 2, Cycle II

No.	Observed Activity	Frequency (Active)	Active	Frequency (Inactive)	Inactive
1.	Students respond to the lecturer’s greeting and participate in the opening prayer.	23	92%	2	8%
2.	Students pay attention to the lecturer’s motivational introduction.	22	88%	3	12%
3.	Students answer questions related to the previous week’s material.	20	80%	5	20%
4.	Students listen to the indicators or learning objectives to be achieved.	24	96%	1	4%
5.	Students acknowledge the roll call read by the lecturer.	23	92%	2	8%
6.	Students carefully follow the lecturer’s explanations on the main learning material.	24	96%	1	4%
7.	Students listen to and follow instructions on forming discussion groups (4–5 members).	24	96%	1	4%
8.	Lecturer supports and supervises students in completing their tasks.	22	88%	3	12%
9.	Students present their group discussion results in front of the class.	22	88%	3	12%
10.	Students receive recognition or rewards from the lecturer.	20	80%	5	20%
11.	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (First instance)	23	92%	2	8%
12.	Students and lecturer engage in a reflection on the day’s learning. (Second instance)	24	96%	1	4%



c. Analysis of English Learning Outcomes in Cycle 2

In Cycle II, the average score in English tasks rose to 86, surpassing the minimum passing criterion of 75. The evaluation included listening, speaking, reading, and writing exercises. Students were observed to be more adept at listening to and responding to group conversations, and they showed better command of daily conversation scripts. Their reading comprehension also improved, as did their ability to organize sentences with appropriate grammar.

Table 7. English Learning Outcomes, Cycle II

Category	Score Range	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	85-100	14	56%
Good	75-84	11	44%
Fair	65-74	-	-
Poor	55-64	-	-
Total		25	100%

Table 8. Minimum Mastery Criterion (Cycle II)

Score	Frequency	Percentage
Passed (≥ 75)	25	100%
Not Passed (≤ 75)	-	-
Total	25	100%

Since the average score met and exceeded the set standard, the application of cooperative learning in Cycle 2 was deemed successful. The class average of 86 marked a significant improvement from the 72 recorded in Cycle 1. Students demonstrated better speaking skills, more accurate grammar usage in their written work, and greater overall fluency.

The observations and data from Meetings 1 and 2 in Cycle 2 showed a clear positive trend in student engagement. Students exhibited increased confidence and actively followed the steps of cooperative learning. This translated into overall improvements in their English language skills. In Cycle 1, the average score stood at 72, which rose to 86 in Cycle 2. The instructor and researcher jointly concluded that the study, titled “Implementing the Cooperative Learning Method in English Language Teaching for B1-Class Students in the Communication Studies Program at the Faculty of Letters, UMI,” had achieved its instructional goals and thus did not require further cycles.

Discussion

This study set out to enhance student motivation and learning outcomes in an English course offered to first-semester Communication Studies students at the Faculty of Letters, Universitas Muslim Indonesia (UMI). By employing a Classroom Action Research design, the intervention focused on implementing the cooperative learning method to address two primary objectives: increasing student engagement and improving overall proficiency in English language skills. The findings from two consecutive cycles provide important insights into how cooperative learning fosters a more interactive and student-centered classroom environment.

During Cycle 1, the students’ average engagement level reached only 67% in the first meeting and 78% in the second, suggesting that while some students began to adapt to the interactive approach, many continued to exhibit low motivation and self-confidence. In line with Rahmat and Andi Puspitasari (2023), who argue that lecture-based methods can result in passive



learners, the students in this course appeared to have been conditioned by traditional teaching approaches used in their previous educational experiences. These methods frequently place the instructor at the center of the learning process, offering limited opportunities for students to develop their oral and written skills.

The average score of 72 in this cycle fell short of the 75-point minimum mastery criterion, further highlighting students' limited vocabulary and grammar skills, as well as their apprehension about participating in front of peers. Such findings are consistent with Susanthi's (2021) assertion that mastering English involves four interrelated skills—reading, writing, speaking, and listening—each of which requires strong foundational elements (i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar). Students' reluctance to speak up was compounded by factors such as fear of making mistakes and minimal exposure to interactive pedagogies, reflecting the broader concerns noted by Putra et al. (2021) regarding the disruptive potential of mobile phones during class time. In this context, continuous use of smartphones for non-academic purposes diverted attention away from the lesson, curbing the intended benefits of cooperative learning.

In Cycle 2, several instructional refinements were introduced. The researcher and lecturer collaborated to minimize distractions by encouraging students to use mobile phones primarily for essential tasks, such as accessing course materials in Kalam UMI and consulting English-language dictionaries or translators. This approach resonates with Nuraliyah et al. (2022), who emphasize the detrimental effects of uncontrolled device use and highlight the value of channeling technology toward academically relevant activities.

The first meeting of Cycle 2 documented an 84% engagement rate, which rose to 90% in the second meeting, indicating that students grew increasingly comfortable with the cooperative learning framework. In small-group discussions, learners actively asked questions, clarified their peers' ideas, and participated in presenting group outcomes to the class. Their higher level of engagement corresponded to improved performance on English tasks, with an average final score of 86. Students demonstrated greater competence in essential language domains, including correct intonation in oral communication, consistent application of grammar in written conversation scripts, and better comprehension of reading passages. These results substantiate the claims made by Megawati in Susanthi (2021) regarding the pivotal role of pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar in language mastery.

The cooperative learning method is grounded in the principle that collaboration and peer interaction can significantly enhance language acquisition (Wahyuni & Abadi in Ramdhani & Izar, 2016). By organizing students into heterogeneous groups, this approach leverages both stronger and weaker learners' experiences. Students not only gain feedback from the lecturer but also from one another, thereby cultivating greater confidence in their speaking, reading, and writing abilities. Consistent with these theoretical underpinnings, the successful progression in Cycle 2—from moderate engagement and average scores in Cycle 1 to surpassing mastery benchmarks in Cycle 2—indicates that cooperative learning effectively bolstered both student motivation and achievement.

Moreover, the structured activities in each cycle—planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting—aligned with the objectives of Classroom Action Research to refine and adapt teaching strategies. The iterative process enabled the researcher and the lecturer to make timely adjustments, such as stricter guidelines for mobile phone use and more scaffolded tasks that addressed students' initial anxieties.

The findings shed light on the potential of cooperative learning to revitalize the teaching of English in higher education settings where students may have relied heavily on teacher-centered methods. Through guided group discussions, reciprocal peer teaching, and consistent faculty support, learners can overcome their initial reluctance and demonstrate marked improvements in linguistic competencies. Nonetheless, it remains crucial to regulate technological distractions and offer targeted feedback, especially when students' low vocabulary or grammar skills impede their willingness to engage in group tasks.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this Classroom Action Research demonstrate that implementing the cooperative learning method effectively enhances both student motivation and academic performance in an English course offered to first-semester Communication Studies students at the Faculty of Letters, Universitas Muslim Indonesia (UMI). Through two cycles of iterative planning, implementation, observation, and reflection, students showed a marked improvement in engagement—from relatively low activity levels in Cycle 1 to a significantly higher percentage of active participation in Cycle 2. Simultaneously, their average English test scores rose above the minimum mastery criterion, indicating measurable progress in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Several key factors contributed to these positive outcomes. First, shifting to a student-centered framework encouraged active participation and peer support, thereby reducing anxiety and boosting students' confidence in their language abilities. Second, the more controlled and purposeful use of mobile phones allowed students to leverage technology for academic needs while minimizing distractions. Third, the structure of cooperative learning—particularly in heterogeneous groups—gave students repeated opportunities to practice and refine their English skills in authentic, collaborative settings.

Overall, these results shed light on the potential of cooperative learning to address the limitations of traditional, lecture-based instruction and to create a more dynamic, interactive classroom environment. By aligning instructional strategies with the principles of collaboration, communication, and continual feedback, English language learning can be significantly enhanced, even among students who initially struggle with low motivation or limited language proficiency. The success of this intervention underscores its suitability for broader adoption in higher education contexts seeking to improve student engagement and learning outcomes in foreign language courses..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team would like to thank the Indonesian Muslim University Endowment Foundation (YW-UMI) through the Research and Resource Development Institute (LP2S UMI) for providing research funds for the 2024 Faculty Excellence scheme. In addition, we would also like to thank the Dean of the Faculty of Letters and the English course lecturers who have received and facilitated the researchers and team.

REFERENCES

- Ali, R. & Abdalgane, M. (2022). The impact of gamification “kahoot app” in teaching english for academic purposes. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(7), 18. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n7p18>
- Barnawi, R. (2014). *Model-Model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Budiman, B. (2023). Enhancing english language proficiency: strategies for improving student skills. *Journal of Scientific Research Education and Technology (Jsret)*, 2(3), 1118-1123. <https://doi.org/10.58526/jsret.v2i3.205>
- Devi, A. (2023). Relationship between english proficiency and academic achievement of indonesian efl postgraduate students. *Journal of English Language Learning*, 7(1), 303-308. <https://doi.org/10.31949/jell.v7i1.5566>
- Eriani, E. (2023). Students english proficiency at lembaga tahfiz quran. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Citra Bakti*, 10(2), 366-373. <https://doi.org/10.38048/jipcb.v10i2.1691>
- Giampapa, F. and Canagarajah, S. (2017). Skilled migration and global english. *Globalisation Societies and Education*, 15(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2017.1296658>
- Hasanah, Z., & Himami, A. S. (2021). Model pembelajaran kooperatif dalam menumbuhkan keaktifan belajar siswa. *Irsyaduna: Jurnal Studi Kemahasiswaan*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Hudriati, A., Sulastri, S., & Rahmat, R. (2023). Empowering English Language Learning: Unleashing the Potential of Cooperative Learning Model at SMKN 3 Takalar. *ELT Worldwide Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 463. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v10i2.53889>
- Menggo, S., Suastra, I., Budiarsa, M., & Padmadewi, N. (2019). Needs analysis of academic-english speaking material in promoting 21st century skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 739-754. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12247a>
- Nuraliyah, E., Fadilah, A., Handayaningsih, E., Ernawati, E., & Oktadriani, S. L. (2022). Penggunaan Handphone dan Dampaknya bagi Aktivitas Belajar. *Ideas: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, dan Budaya*, 8(4), 1585-1592.
- Putra, A. A., & Wahyuni, I. W. (2021). Pengaruh Penggunaan Handphone Pada Siswa Sekolah Dasar. *Al-Hikmah: Jurnal Agama Dan Ilmu Pengetahuan*, 18(1), 79-89. [https://doi.org/10.25299/al-hikmah:jaip.2021.vol18\(1\).6531](https://doi.org/10.25299/al-hikmah:jaip.2021.vol18(1).6531)
- Rahmat, R., & Puspitasari, A. (2021). Penerapan Model Problem Based Learning (PBL) Dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Karya Ilmiah. *Indonesia: Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(3), 111-116.
- Rahmat, P. A., & Puspitasari, A. (2021). Penerapan Teknik Pemodelan Dalam Pembelajaran Menulis Cerpen. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*. Vol. 4 No 2 june 2023.
- Ramadhani, S., & Izar, S. L. (2022). Pengembangan Bahan Ajar Mata Kuliah Bahasa Inggris Dasar dengan Model Kooperatif Learning Prodi PGSD FKIP UMSU. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(1), 1430-1434.
- Siddiqui, S. (2024). Developing proficiency in english language and embarking on the journey of global entrepreneurship: a pathway to achieving success. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Management and Innovation*, 5(5), 821-837. <https://doi.org/10.52633/jemi.v5i5.359>

- Susanthi, I. G. A. A. D. (2020). Kendala dalam belajar bahasa Inggris dan cara mengatasinya. *Linguistic Community Services Journal*, 1(2), 64-70. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22225/licosjournal.v1i2.2658>. 64-70
- Sutrisna, I. P. E. (2021). Integrasi Teori Krashen dalam Pengembangan Bahan Ajar Bahasa Inggris pada Pembelajaran Daring di Perguruan Tinggi. *Padma Sari: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 1(01), 46-55. <https://e-journal.iahn-gdepudja.ac.id/index.php/PS>
- Wijaya, I. K. (2015). Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di Sekolah Dasar. *BAHTERA: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 14(2), 120-128.
- Wijayanto, P. (2023). Exploring needs in english learning materials for visual communication design students and graduates: a mixed-methods approach. *Reila Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 5(2), 115-127. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v5i2.13536>
- Zhou, Y. and Wei, M. (2018). Strategies in technology-enhanced language learning. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 471-495. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sslt.2018.8.2.13>