

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter describes the theoretical framework of the study, namely collaborative learning in language acquisition, jigsaw tasks, dictogloss tasks, the place of output in language acquisition, and describes some related research in the area of implementing collaborative tasks in language classrooms.

#### Collaborative Learning in Language Acquisition

In teaching, teachers have a duty to organize classroom activities well. Setting up good classroom activities could help enhance the effectiveness of classroom management and classroom organization. There are many classroom activities that teachers can apply and adapt for use in their classes to help their students learn the target language.

Collaborative learning activities are one kind of teaching technique that teachers can use in their class. Bassano and Christison (1988 cited by Nunan, 1992) suggest that collaborative learning techniques in ESL classrooms are important elements in successful classroom management. They point out that there are at least three areas in which collaborative learning can figure:

social tasks, process tasks such as peer tutoring and goal setting, and progress monitoring and evaluative tasks. Collaborative learning encourages students to take partial or full responsibility for their successful work. Wajnryb (1990) states that if one thing has successfully emerged from the last decade of language teaching, it is the experiential factor. Students learn best by the activity of doing, by trying out language, by being actively engaged in tasks that have been carefully designed to generate specific language patterns.

Richards and Lockhart (1994) also state the importance of the implementation collaborative learning in class. Despite the need for the whole-class teaching and individual work in language classrooms, without other kinds of interaction, students are deprived of many useful and motivating opportunities for using and learning the new language. Various alternatives to whole-class teaching and individual work have been proposed which emphasize the use of pairs and small groups in the classroom (e.g., cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and communicative language teaching). Richards and Lockhart also conclude that through interacting with other students in pairs or groups, students can be given the opportunity to draw on their linguistic resources in a nonthreatening situation and use them to complete different kinds of tasks. Collaborative learning can motivate students to learn and use new language to share their

ideas within their groups. Definitions of collaborative learning and discussion about its benefits in the language classroom are given in the next section.

### Collaborative Learning and Its Benefits in Language Learning

In practical terms, collaborative learning entails students working together to achieve common learning goals (Nunan, 1992). Brown (1994) states that collaborative learning is a learning in which students work together in pairs and groups, they share information and come to each other's aid. The students act as a team whose players must work together in order to achieve goals successfully. Nunan (1992) claims that collaboration encourages learners to learn about learning, to learn better and to increase their awareness about language, and about self.

According to Brown (1994) collaboration creates interaction among students which benefits student's learning. Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or the output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem – solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language, all they have learned or casually absorbed in real-life exchanges. Even at an elementary stage,

ideas within their groups. Definitions of collaborative learning and discussion about its benefits in the language classroom are given in the next section.

### Collaborative Learning and Its Benefits in Language Learning

In practical terms, collaborative learning entails students working together to achieve common learning goals (Nunan, 1992). Brown (1994) states that collaborative learning is a learning in which students work together in pairs and groups, they share information and come to each other's aid. The students act as a team whose players must work together in order to achieve goals successfully. Nunan (1992) claims that collaboration encourages learners to learn about learning, to learn better and to increase their awareness about language, and about self.

According to Brown (1994) collaboration creates interaction among students which benefits student's learning. Through interaction, students can increase their language store as they listen to or read authentic linguistic material, or the output of their fellow students in discussions, skits, joint problem – solving tasks, or dialogue journals. In interaction, students can use all they possess of the language, all they have learned or casually absorbed in real-life exchanges. Even at an elementary stage,

they learn in this way to exploit the elasticity of language (Brown, 1994).

Johnson and Johnson (1994) also point out that student-student interaction generally creates opportunities for students to participate in meaning-focused communication, to perform a range of language functions, to participate in the negotiation of meaning, to engage in both planned and unplanned discourse, to attend to both language forms and functions. Student-student interaction in second language classrooms will more than likely have a positive impact upon students' opportunities for both classroom learning and second language acquisition. Johnson and Johnson also conclude that student-student interaction, if structured and managed appropriately, can play an important role in students' cognitive development, educational achievement, and emerging social competencies. It can induce cognitive conflict, and thus foster cognitive restructuring and development. It can foster the use of more exploratory language and encourage informal learning styles and strategies among students. It can enhance students' abilities to work collaboratively. It may actually be more important for educational success than teacher-student interaction.

In addition, collaborative learning increases the amount of talking for individual students and encourages broader skills of cooperation and negotiation. It promotes student autonomy by

allowing them to make their own decisions in the group without being told what to do by the teacher (Harmer, 2001). It can give students a more active role in learning. It increases the opportunities for individual student to practice and use new features of the target language (Richards & Lockhart, 1994).

Many research studies have reported work on the benefits of collaborative tasks. One is the study of Mattos (2000). He conducted his study based on the Vygotskian concepts of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), scaffolding, private speech, and task and activity. The study had two purposes. The first was to find examples of scaffolding between subjects during the performance of a co-operative task. The second was to find evidence of language learning resulting from scaffolding interaction. Mattos conducted the research in four volunteers whose level of English competence was around Cambridge First Certificate in English. The volunteers worked in pairs to complete the task. The researcher found many examples of scaffolding interaction between subjects. Each helped and supported each other (e.g. by providing English words, guiding each other through the pictures, helping to make sense of the drawings, etc). The researcher also found that all four subjects demonstrated some internalization of scaffolding they received. For example, they used words that they learnt from their peers during the interaction. It supported the hypothesis that language

development took place as a result of scaffolding. The subjects learnt both language form and meaning while they are interacting in collaborative tasks. The researcher stated that it was possible to learn a foreign language from one's peers. It was perfectly possible for an L2 learner to internalize, that is, to learn, what he or she had heard from another learner in a mutually collaborative situation.

Additional research into collaborative interaction is reviewed by Seedhouse (1999). He analyzed and evaluated the interaction produced by tasks in the classroom. He concluded that there were three characteristics of the task-based interaction. The first was that the turn-taking system was constrained by the nature of the task. The participants used a turn-taking system suited to the efficient accomplishment of the task. In effect, the task constrained the nature of the turn-taking system which the students used: the nature of the task pushed one student to make statements to which another will provide feedback, clarification or repetition requests. Second was a tendency to minimalization and indexicality. There was a general tendency to minimize the volume of language used and to produce only that which was necessary to accomplish the task. Turns tended to be relatively short with simple syntactic constructions. The last characteristic stated that tasks generated many instances

of clarification requests, confirmation checks, comprehension checks and self-repetitions.

Following Long (1985), Seedhouse (1999) summarized the relationship between the modified interaction and second language acquisition. Interactional modification made input comprehensible. Comprehensible input promoted acquisition; therefore, interactional modification promotes acquisition. However, Seedhouse stated that despite the seemingly impressive theoretical arguments put forward to promote task-based learning, it remained to be proven that task-based interaction is more effective than other varieties of classroom interaction. Nunan (cited by Seedhouse 1999) also stated that tasks appear to be particularly good at training learners to use the L2 to accomplish tasks, and this will prepare them for accomplishing some tasks in the world outside the classroom. "Task could also form part of a general English approach if one is able to identify target tasks which one would like the learners to be able to perform in the world outside the classroom" (p. 154).

However, alongside of the benefits of collaborative learning in language classroom stated above, some researchers argue that not all students enjoy working collaboratively since they would prefer to be the focus of the teacher's attention rather than working with their peers. Some learners prefer to work alone and students' errors might be reinforced in small groups



(Harmer, 2001). Teachers should find ways to prevent these situations which might occur in class. One way is to find tasks that arouse student interest to work collaboratively or find tasks where every members in the group have a duty to take responsibility for a part. This might motivate them to learn and participate with their classmates.

There are many collaborative tasks which teachers could implement in class to create student-student interaction. Jigsaw and dictogloss tasks have been selected to be the focus of the current study. Since this study aimed to research the effects of these two tasks on students' language learning, part of this literature review will include information on these two tasks.

### Jigsaw Task

Jigsaw learning was first developed in the early 1970s by Elliot Aronson and his colleagues at the University of Texas and the University of California. Research studies in a wide range of settings and across content areas showed that jigsaw cooperative learning enhanced cooperative learning by making each student responsible for teaching some of the material to the group (Aronson, 1978 cited by Baz, 2004). The jigsaw approach has been adapted to achieve a number of goals. The main goals are to develop interdependence, to develop skills of autonomous learning and for students to develop a knowledge base for

teaching and learning through group projects (Kegan, 2004). With schoolchildren, jigsaw tasks have been reported to reduce racial conflict, promote better learning, improve students' motivation, and increase enjoyment of the learning experience (Aronson, 1978).

Since the jigsaw task encourages the students to work collaboratively, the students might have a chance to discuss their ideas about the target language with their peers. It may help students to enhance their language learning. There is much potential value in implementing jigsaw tasks in the language classroom.

According to Aronson (1978) the jigsaw technique was a remarkably efficient way to learn the material. But even more important, the jigsaw process encourages listening, engagement, and empathy by giving each member of the group an essential part to play in the academic activity. Group members must work together as a team to accomplish a common goal. No student can succeed completely unless everyone works well together as a team. This cooperation by design facilitates interaction among all students in the class, leading them to value each other as contributors to their common task.

Moreover, jigsaw learning encourages the development of communication skills between students, since they have to discuss

the tasks. In addition, Aronson (1978) states that most teachers find that jigsaw tasks are easy to learn and they enjoy working with them because they can be used with other teaching strategies. From the discussion above, jigsaw might be one kind of task that teachers can apply to use in their teaching, since it has much value in language learning.

### Dictogloss Task

Dictation has a long history in literacy education, particularly second language education. In the standard dictation procedure, the teacher reads a passage slowly and repeatedly. Students write exactly what the teacher says. Dictation in this traditional form has been criticized as a rote learning method in which students merely make a copy of the text the teacher reads without doing any thinking, thus producing a mechanical form of literacy (Jacobs & Small, 2003).

Wajnryb (1990) is credited with developing a new way to do dictation, known as dictogloss. She explains that dictogloss is a task-based procedure designed to help language learning students towards a better understanding of how grammar works on a text basis. Since the students are obligated to create their own parallel text, created out of the students' own grammatical and linguistic resources, it is designed to expose where language students shortcomings and needs are, so that teaching can be

directed more precisely towards these areas. In this sense it is eminently learner-needs based. There are many aims in implementing dictogloss in classes. Wajnryb (1990) mentions that dictogloss aims to provide an opportunity for students to use their productive grammar in the task of text creation. Students' linguistic resources are called upon as they pool their fragmented notes and consider the various language options available to them.

Dictogloss also aims to encourage students to find out what they know and do not know about English. This is realized in the attempts to reconstruct the text and in the subsequent analysis of those attempts. It aims to upgrade and refine the students' use of the language through a comprehensive analysis of language options in the correction of the learners' approximate texts.

There are four stages of dictogloss which the teachers can apply in classes. The first is the preparation stage, when the students find out about the topic of the text and are prepared for some of the vocabulary. Jacobs and Small (2003) suggests that the text can be selected by teachers from newspapers, textbooks, etc., or teachers can write their own or modify an existing text. The text should be at or below students' current overall proficiency level, although there may be some new vocabulary. It may even be a text that students have seen before. The length of the text depends on students' proficiency level.

Second is the dictation stage. The teacher reads the passage two times in normal speech. The first time the students have to listen and are not allowed to write anything down. The second time each student takes notes on its content. Third is reconstruction. Students work in groups of two to four to reconstruct the text in full sentences. This reconstruction seeks to retain the meaning and form of the original text but is not a word-for-word copy of the text read by the teacher. Instead, students work together to create a cohesive text with correct grammar and other features of the relevant text type.

Last stage is analysis and correction. Students, with the teacher's help, identify similarities and differences in terms of meaning and form between their text reconstruction and the original, which is displayed on an overhead projector or shown to students in another way.

Also dictogloss helps to encourage students to work collaboratively, so the students might get some benefit from learning language through this task. There are many benefits of dictogloss. The main one is to encourage students to be active learners. Through active learner involvement students come to confront their own strengths and weaknesses in target language use. In so doing, they find out what they do not know, then they find out what they needed to know. It is through this process that they improve their language skills.

Dictogloss offers a unique blending of the twin functions of testing and teaching. The testing function acts as a means of diagnosing the students' current language understanding. It also provides a balance between the role of memory and the role of creativity, since the students have to reconstruct the text based on the content of an original text. Dictogloss motivates students to learn. Wajnryb (1990) states that students are most motivated to learn when they consider that the teaching to which they are being exposed is pitched to meet their individual needs. Moreover, students expect teachers to provide them with feedback on the appropriateness of the language options they have chosen.

While the students participate in groups and try to complete the tasks, they have a chance to interact and exchange their ideas with their classmates. Input will be provided when they are doing the task and they can get new knowledge from the discussion which will be of benefit in their language learning as stated above. In the reconstruction stage, each pair has to produce one written text which is the output. Also, when the students are helping each other to write a paragraph, oral output is also required since the students will exchange their idea about the form, the sentences, and the appropriate vocabulary. This exchange may enhance the students' language learning.

Both the jigsaw and dictogloss tasks require learners to produce language. This output is important in language learning,

since it promotes students' target language acquisition, as discussed in the following section.

### The Place of Output in Language Acquisition

According to Ellis (1997), input can become implicit knowledge when the students notice, compare and integrate the target language. Noticing occurs when the students pay attention to specific linguistic features in the input and comparing occurs when the students compare the noticed features with the features they typically produce in output. Integrating means when the students construct new hypotheses in order to incorporate the noticed features into their interlanguage system.

As Ellis (1997) suggests, students' noticing can promote language acquisition, so tasks that involve production may promote language acquisition since through producing language the students may be forced to pay attention to syntactic processes. According to Swain (1985), the output which comes from the activities of talking or writing, is important in promoting acquisition, since it requires learners to process syntax; they have to pay some attention to form. Ellis (2003) supports Swain's idea that "production causes learners to engage in syntactic processing and in so doing promotes acquisition" (Ellis, 2003, p. 113).

Swain (1995 cited by Ellis, 1997) points that when students are pushed to produce output that is concise and appropriate, they are forced into making use of the kind of syntactical processing needed for acquisition. She also states that pushed output aids students' acquisition in three principal ways. First, it promotes noticing-the-gap. Schmidt and Frota (1986 cited by Swain, 1995) mention that a second language students will begin to acquire the target like form if and only if it is present in comprehended input and noticed in the normal sense of the word, that is consciously. Through trying to produce the target language, students discover that there is a gap between what they want to say and what they are able to say, or what they do not know, or know only partially. While the students attempt to produce the target language they may notice that they do not know how to say or write precisely the meaning they wish to convey. In other words, under some circumstances, the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language students to recognize consciously some of their linguistic problems. It may bring to their attention something they need to discover about their second language.

A second way in which producing language may serve the language learning process is through hypothesis formulation and testing. Swain (1985 cited by Ellis, 2003) states that some errors which appear in students' written and spoken production reveal



hypotheses held by them about how the target language works. To test a hypothesis, students need to do something, and one way is to say or write something. A student may try out rules by using his or her output as a way of trying out new language forms and structures as they stretch their interlanguage to meet communicative needs; they may use output to see what works and what does not. Students are able to obtain useful information for testing their hypotheses from other sources, as when external feedback has been available, students have also modified, or reprocessed their output (Swain, 1985). Pica (1989 cited by Swain, 1995) found that in response to clarification and confirmation requests, over one-third of the students' utterances were modified either semantically or morphosyntactically.

A third function of output is a metalinguistic function or conscious reflection. Under certain task conditions, students will not only reveal their hypotheses, but reflect on its metalinguistic function of using language to reflect on language, allowing students to control and internalize it (Swain, 1985). Students have been observed to reflect sometimes on their output and, as a result develop a metalingual understanding of how it is problematic. In this case, the students' own language indicates an awareness of something about their own, or their interlocutor's, use of language, that is, they use language to

reflect on language use. In this way, output can also contribute to the development of explicit knowledge (Swain, 1985).

Swain (1985) explains that the process of reflection is stimulated when learners engage in collaborative tasks that lead to talk about linguistic form in the context of meaning-focused activity. Students may come to notice the gaps between the forms they use in their output and the forms present in input. In these three ways, pushed output can help to create new linguistic knowledge and also to increase the accuracy with which existing knowledge is used.

The theory described above supports the view that collaborative tasks can promote students' language acquisition, since the students have to participate with their classmates they have a chance to consult and help each other in completing the tasks. They also have a chance to discuss the input and produce language. These processes might help them to understand more about their target language. Among the research on collaborative tasks is a study on jigsaw and dictogloss tasks and their effect on students' target language learning (Swain and Lapkin, 2001). This is discussed in the following section.

## Review of Related Study

This study is a replication of Swain and Lapkin (2001). Some information about the research has been reviewed before such as the meaning of language-related episodes, jigsaw task, and dictogloss tasks. This part includes more information about how the researchers conducted the study and discusses the research results.

The research explored the effects of two communicative tasks, jigsaw and dictogloss tasks, through language learning of students who studied in a French immersion program. The students had to work collaboratively in order to complete the tasks. Swain and Lapkin (2001) hypothesized from previous research that there would be less focus on form by the students who did the jigsaw task. They anticipated that the students who did the jigsaw task would have more emphasis on meaning or more on lexis-based LREs, while the emphasis in the dictogloss would be on form. In other words, the dictogloss task would provide more opportunities for language learning. The results showed that no significant differences were found in LREs between the pairs of the students doing the dictogloss task and the pairs of students doing the jigsaw task. The results did not support their initial hypothesis that there would be more form-based LREs in the dictogloss task relative to the jigsaw task.

Swain and Lapkin (2001) also counted the average amount of time the students took to do the tasks and the average amount of time students remained on task. The result showed that no significant differences were found between two classes. However they indicated that class D (dictogloss groups) had a much smaller range of total time on task than class J (jigsaw groups). This might have been expected given the more open-ended nature of the jigsaw task, since the students have to discuss their pictures.

Once again, no statistically significant differences were observed between the stories written by the students in class D and class J. They compared the average core post-test scores of class J and class D and found no statistically significant differences. They also compared the average core pre- and post-test scores for each class, indicating that neither class made any measurable gain.

In the discussion, they pointed out that the two tasks used in the study generated fewer differences than they had expected. The most salient difference was that the dictogloss task imposed a set of constraints that were not imposed by the jigsaw task. The dictogloss task appeared to have constrained the range of student time on task, the range in the total number of language-related episodes produced, and the range of student performance in their written narratives, in particular with respect to vocabulary use.

This smaller range of behavior observed among pairs of students in the dictogloss class suggested that the use of the dictogloss task may focus students' attention, thus constraining student output somewhat more than the jigsaw task, which is more open-ended linguistically.

Swain and Lapkin summarized the results of assessing language learning in the collaborative dialogue of pairs of students. They provided two examples of the students' collaborative dialogues. One of the example supported that students had make progress in their language learning as one student got the pre-test item wrong and the other got it right but on the post-test, both students got the correct choice. This might have resulted from things that the students discussed in collaborative dialogues.

However their results did not imply that one task was better than another for pedagogical purposes. Both tasks generated a similar and substantial proportion of form-focused language-related episodes. Swain and Lapkin suggested that the value of the tasks depended upon the instructional goals of the teacher.

#### Summary of the Chapter

The literature reviewed above suggests that language learning acquisition can take place in student-student interaction through collaborative tasks, since the students will have a chance

to discuss and share about things that they have learnt in class. Tasks also increase the amount of students' talking. Moreover in order to complete the tasks, students have to help and support each other, so tasks can motivate students to learn. Furthermore language acquisition also takes place while the students are doing the tasks since they will notice the gap between their first and their second language and they will have a chance to practice using English both orally and in writing with the help of their peers. This is support for teachers to implement kinds of collaborative tasks in class. However the teachers should consider their students' levels and the learning goals, as this will help them to find the appropriate collaborative tasks to apply in their classes.