

## Enhancing EFL Young Learners' Speaking Ability through Buzz Group Technique: Evidence from an Indonesian Elementary School

Muhammad Ulin Nuha<sup>1\*</sup>, Khoirul Huda<sup>2</sup>, Buyun Khulel<sup>3</sup>

English Language Education, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Islamic  
University of Darul 'Ulum, Lamongan, Indonesia<sup>1,2,3</sup>

\*Email Correspondence: [muhammadulin.2022@mhs.unisda.ac.id](mailto:muhammadulin.2022@mhs.unisda.ac.id)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Submitted 21-Juli-2026  
Received 22-Juli-2026  
Published 27-Juli-2026

#### Keywords:

Buzz Group Technique;  
Collaborative Learning; English  
Speaking Ability; EFL Young  
Learners

#### Kata Kunci:

Buzz Group Technique;  
Pembelajaran Kolaboratif;  
Kemampuan Berbicara Bahasa  
Inggris; Peserta Didik EFL Usia  
Dini.

### ABSTRACT

*Speaking is an essential yet challenging skill for young English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners because it requires linguistic knowledge, communicative competence, and self-confidence. This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of the Buzz Group Technique in improving the English speaking skills of sixth-grade students at MI Ma'arif NU Miru, Lamongan, Indonesia. A quantitative pre-experimental one-group pretest-posttest design was employed involving 18 students selected through total sampling. Data were collected using speaking performance tests assessing pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension, and analyzed using descriptive statistics, the Shapiro-Wilk normality test, and the paired-samples t-test. The findings revealed a significant improvement in students' speaking performance, with the mean score increasing from 62.11 in the pretest to 80.06 in the posttest. The paired-samples t-test confirmed a significant difference between pretest and posttest scores ( $t(17) = -18.26, p < .001$ ). All speaking components improved, with fluency showing the greatest gain. These findings indicate that the Buzz Group Technique is an effective student-centered strategy for enhancing English speaking skills and communicative competence among young EFL learners in Indonesian elementary schools.*

### ABSTRAK

Berbicara merupakan keterampilan penting namun menantang bagi peserta didik yang mempelajari bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing (EFL) karena memerlukan penguasaan pengetahuan kebahasaan, kompetensi komunikatif, dan rasa percaya diri. Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis efektivitas Teknik Buzz Group dalam meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara bahasa Inggris siswa kelas VI di MI Ma'arif NU Miru, Lamongan. Penelitian menggunakan metode kuantitatif dengan desain pra-eksperimen one-group pretest-posttest yang melibatkan 18 siswa melalui teknik total sampling. Data dikumpulkan menggunakan tes unjuk kerja berbicara yang mencakup aspek pelafalan, kosakata, tata bahasa, kelancaran, dan

pemahaman, kemudian dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif, uji normalitas Shapiro-Wilk, dan uji paired-samples t-test. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan pada kemampuan berbicara siswa, dengan rata-rata nilai meningkat dari 62,11 menjadi 80,06. Hasil uji paired-samples t-test menunjukkan perbedaan yang signifikan antara nilai pretest dan posttest ( $t(17) = -18,26; p < 0,001$ ). Seluruh aspek keterampilan berbicara mengalami peningkatan, dengan peningkatan terbesar pada aspek kelancaran. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa Teknik Buzz Group merupakan strategi pembelajaran yang efektif untuk meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara dan kompetensi komunikatif peserta didik EFL di sekolah dasar.

## INTRODUCTION

English is now recognized as the foremost language in international communication, allowing individuals to take part in global education, science, technology, and professional development. With globalization preceding the demand for proficiency in English, English teaching was moved from the acquisition of grammar principles to the acquisition of communicative competence. Out of the four skills of language, the speaking skill is acknowledged as the most important productive skill of the language, which allows learners to convey their ideas, cope with meanings, exchange information, and communicate in a meaningful way. Therefore, speaking skills is one of the major goals of learning English as a foreign language (EFL) and an important indicator of the successful learning of the language (Seraj et al., 2021). However, the development of speaking skills is a great challenge for EFL learners, since successful communication requires the combination of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, discourse organization, strategies, and psychology (e.g. confidence and willingness to communicate) (Kehing & Yunus, 2021).

The focusing of speaking teaching becomes significant at an early stage of foreign language learning because young learners at primary school have reached a stage where language acquisition occurs effectively due to meaningful interaction and communicative practice. At this point of learning, students are supposed to learn the language more successfully in case they actively join the communication rather than just receive the language input from the teacher. Active interaction allows students to test the language themselves, work out meaning together with fellow learners, and gradually gain confidence. It is argued by (van de Craats et al., 2017) that such useful classroom interaction delivers the students crucial chances to enhance their speaking proficiency. In the same vein, (Ghonsooly & Khajavy, 2016) are of the opinion that learners' readiness to communicate depends much on suitable conditions in class where interaction is encouraged and anxiety about speaking is minimized. Even though Nikolov and Djigunović (2006) emphasized the importance of the influence of foreign language instruction on children, the studies of today show that active interaction leads to the improvement of students'

willingness to communicate, their participation in the teaching process as well as their knowledge and abilities (Derakhshan et al., 2021).

In spite of understanding how important speaking instruction is, many EFL learners are still troubled with speaking. Problems that learners experience are poor vocabulary, problems with grammar, incorrect pronunciation, lack of fluency, fear of communication, and problems with speaking. Difficulties connected with using speaking skills can reduce students' confidence and make them unwilling to interact in class. Alrabai proved that instructional support and motivation of students matter for their learning outcomes while Kehing and Yunus mentioned that barriers for improvement of communication skills are anxiety and lack of methods of communication. Derakhshan et al. also stated that students' willingness to communicate is connected with their level of engagement in class and emotional experiences. It means that increasing students' speaking skill means developing methods of teaching which boost not only students' linguistic abilities but also their motivation in speech.

This phenomenon is particularly evident in EFL classrooms at elementary schools in Indonesia, where fluency development in speaking English is largely restrained to teacher-centered classroom activities. Consequently, the traditional style dominates English instruction at school and consists of using textbooks, memorizing vocabulary and grammar structures. At this point, students tend to be passive receivers of information and knowledge instead of active users of their language competence. Richards (2015) claimed that the communicative approach to foreign languages teaching should focus on the importance of purposeful communication and use of language in practice rather than mere distribution of language knowledge. Harmer (2007) supported this idea and highlighted the importance of encouraging students to actively participate in communication and using English while engaging in communicative activities. Still, a large number of elementary classrooms suffer from the lack of speaking practice and communicative opportunities, which negatively affects the students' competence in oral communication.

In order to cope with these difficulty level points, collaborative education has gained recognition as a teaching method that facilitates effective communication and engagement of students in the learning process. The main point about collaborative education is that it helps students to form knowledge with the help of peer interactive practice, discussions, common problem solving, and providing feedback for each other. Johnson together with Johnson (2017) pointed out that collaborative education promotes positive interdependence among students as well as taking responsibility for individual learning and participating. Likewise, (Panadero et al., 2014) highlighted that collaborative education enhances the possibility of self-regulation during the learning process thanks to the research of peer feedback, thoughtful reflection, and taking responsibility for something together when learning. Moreover, the studies published in the recent time confirm that collaborative education has a positive impact on the development of students' oral communication, confidence while communicating, involvement during the learning process, and the efficiency of communication as a result of the fact that they have more

chance to communicate with their peers effectively (Haidir et al., 2025).

One cooperative learning method that has the potential to enhance speaking skills is the Buzz Group Technique. Buzz Group is a form of organized small-group discussion in which learners exchange ideas on specific matters in small groups before interacting with the rest of the class. This approach allows all learners to participate actively since group discussions take place in a smaller, less threatening environment. Barkley et al. (2014) noted that small-group discussion methods boost student involvement because they give all students the same access to exchanging ideas and solving problems together. Similarly, Oxford (1990) asserted that cooperative learning environments minimize communication anxiety and motivate students to use a foreign language more freely. Additionally, (Gibbons, 2002) pointed out that collaborative interaction creates scaffolding for each learner to come up with ideas, receive prompt feedback on them, and improve their communicative competence progressively.

Recent studies have shown that collaborative speaking tasks can enhance the oral skills of learners. Huang (2021) explained that collaborative speaking tasks improve the speaking capacities and the level of learning engagement of the students, as they provide opportunities for peer interaction during the process. (Gorham et al., 2025) showed that peer feedback activities help improve the confidence of learners and their effectiveness in performing speaking tasks. Luo and Sun (2025) found that collaborative planning before speaking tasks contributes to the improvement of the oral fluency of students as well as their speaking skills. (Wang, 2021) stated that friendship-based collaborative speaking tasks create a comfortable environment for learning in the classroom and, therefore, help the learners to overcome their reluctance to speak English. Overall, it can be concluded that collaborative discussions allow learners to practice their language skills and get instant feedback, so learners can practice language before speaking it.

While there have been numerous studies on collaborative learning and speaking, gaps can still be identified. First of all, previous researchers assessed collaborative learning in general terms, including cooperative learning, peer teaching, peer evaluation, technology-aided collaboration, and project-based learning. However, Buzz Group Technique as a structured collaborative strategy remains under-researched in order to enhance speaking skills among young EFL learners. Secondly, most of the research done concerns secondary education, universities, and adult EFL learning without sufficient investigations of elementary schools, which is surprising, given some unique features of their development (Nikolov & Djigunović, 2006). Thirdly, there is a lack of research done on collaborative speaking activities in Madrasah Ibtidaiyah of Indonesia, meaning that they are disadvantaged in comparison to other primary schools in terms of learning conditions and exposure to English.

Another significant gap has to do with the processes through which collaborative discussions enable development in speaking. The previous research has mostly reported improvements in terms of speaking achievement, however, it presented no explanation of the role that peer interaction, collaborative negotiation, discussing, and scaffolding have in oral language acquisition. (Ellis, 2003) contended that meaningful interaction is very important in

second language acquisition since it is through communication tasks that the learners get their linguistic knowledge. However, more data from classroom research is needed to clarify the effect that well structured collaborative discussions have on learner's confidence, fluency, engagement and performance when it comes to their speaking abilities in real life EFL situations in elementary school.

To address these voids, this research investigates the effectiveness of the Buzz Group Technique for improving sixth-grade EFL students' speaking skills at MI Ma'arif NU Miru, Lamongan, Indonesia. The current study employs a quantitative one-group pretest-posttest design in order to evaluate the performance of learners in speaking prior to and following the implementation of Buzz Group activities. In addition to assessing speaking proficiency, this study adds empirical evidence to the existing research literature on the pedagogical import of structured collaborative discussion as a means of increasing students' self-confidence and willingness to participate in class communication. The results are expected to complement the body of research literature on collaborative language learning while providing English teachers with practical advice for using student-centered approaches to enhance students' speaking abilities.

## RESEARCH METHOD

In the carried out research, the application of the descriptive quantitative research method was utilized. The one-group pretest-posttest method was employed in the course of the research. The described method is efficient in measuring the impact of the Buzz Group Technique on the students' speaking ability in English. The recommended quantitative research method is useful due to its advantages resulting from the ability to employ quantitative data for measuring performance changes in the studied students (Sugiyono, 2022). The pre-experimental research design is beneficial because it allows measuring the effectiveness of the implemented instructional treatment (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The one-group pretest-posttest design involves administering a pretest before the treatment, implementing the instructional intervention, and conducting a posttest after the treatment. The difference between the two test scores represents the effectiveness of the instructional strategy (Fraenkel et al., 2019).

The research design can be illustrated as follows:

$$O_1 - X - O_2$$

Where:

$O_1$  = Pretest

X = Treatment using the Buzz Group Technique

$O_2$  = Posttest

## 2.1 Research Setting and Participants

The research was carried out at MI Ma'arif NU Miru, Lamongan, Indonesia, in the second term of the academic year 2024/2025. The population of the research included 18 students of sixth grade using total sampling technique since the population was only one intact class. As noted by Ary et al. (2019), total sampling is suitable for a small-sized population, allowing every member to participate in the research to attain a comprehensive understanding of the selected population.

## 2.2 Research Instrument

The main method used for research was a speaking performance test used two times, once as pretest and once as posttest. In both the pretest and posttest, students completed speaking tasks individually based on predetermined topics with suitable complexity for each student's level.

Students' speaking performance was assessed through the use of an analytic speaking assessment rubric from Brown and Abeywickrama (2019). The rubric assessed five components of speaking performance: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. Each component was scored using a five-point scale, and the total score represented students' overall speaking proficiency. The use of an analytic rubric provides a more comprehensive evaluation because each aspect of speaking can be assessed separately, resulting in greater scoring consistency and objectivity (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019).

## 2.3 Research Procedures

The research was conducted through three sequential stages.

### a) Pretest

Initially, the students underwent an individual speaking test that measured their speaking ability before the instruction. The results from the pretest served as the standard to compare improvement in learning.

### b) Treatment

After completing the pretest the students engaged in several study sessions utilizing the buzz group technique. During each session, the students were organized into small groups of four or five members. In their respective groups, the students discussed one teacher-assigned topic, communicated with each other and collaborated on interpreting problems and finally prepared a short speech concerning the discussion. While the students were busy with their work the teacher remained in their room to act as an instructor, controlling their work, guiding the discussion and motivating students to talk. The buzz group technique was used because it enables students to practice speaking and acquire vocabulary that may be used in communication.

### c) Posttest

Upon finishing the intervention, students took a speaking posttest that was identical in difficulty to the pretest speaking tasks. The posttest evaluated the speaking ability of the students following their involvement in the Buzz Group activities, making it possible to compare students' speaking scores from pretest and posttest.

## 2.4 Data Analysis

The data obtained were subjected to statistical analysis by means of IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistics including mean score, minimum score, maximum score and standard deviation were performed as a way of determining the effect of the intervention on the subject's speaking performance. Normality testing was done by means of the Shapiro-Wilk test that is appropriate with regard to samples of less than 50 (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). The normality

assumption test results showed that data are normally distributed ( $p < 0.05$ ). Once the normality assumption was established, a paired sample t-test was carried out to compare student speaking scores before and after intervention. The hypotheses of the research are formulated in the following way:

1. Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There are no statistically significant differences in the speaking skills of students prior to and following the use of the Buzz Group Technique.
2. Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): There are statistically significant improvements in speaking skills of students after utilization of the Buzz Group Technique.
3. The testing of the hypotheses was done at the 5% significance level ( $\alpha = .05$ ). The null hypothesis was discarded under the condition that the probability value (Sig. (2-tailed)) is less than .05, which recognizes the effectiveness of the Buzz Group Technique in improving the English speaking skill of students (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

## RESULTS

### 1. Characteristics of the Participants

The research analyzed the performance of 18 sixth grade students of MI Ma'arif NU Miru, composed of 8 male students (44.4%) and 10 female students (55.6%). All students participated in both pretest and posttest leading to the 100% response rate. The sample was adequate for representing the entire population of interest as all students from the class took part in the study.

**Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants**

| Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Male            | 8         | 44.4       |
| Female          | 10        | 55.6       |
| Total           | 18        | 100        |

The demographic data indicate a relatively balanced distribution of male and female participants, providing a representative description of the classroom involved in this study.

### 2. Students' Speaking Performance Before the Treatment

The first speaking capability of students was evaluated through a pretest that was taken in advance of conducting the Buzz Group Technique intervention. The speaking task consisted of self-introductions and description of their life practices in simple English. Their performances were rated according to five criteria of speaking: pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension.

**Table 2. descriptive statistics of the pretest are presented**

| Statistics         | Score |
|--------------------|-------|
| N                  | 18    |
| Mean               | 62.11 |
| Median             | 62.50 |
| Standard Deviation | 6.48  |
| Minimum            | 51    |
| Maximum            | 74    |

The results indicate that students' initial speaking performance was relatively low, with a mean score of 62.11. The minimum and maximum scores ranged from 51 to 74, indicating considerable variation in students' speaking ability before the instructional treatment.

### 3. Students' Speaking Performance After the Treatment

Following four instructional meetings using the Buzz Group Technique, students completed the posttest using a speaking task comparable to that of the pretest. The descriptive statistics of the posttest are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of the Posttest Scores**

| Statistics         | Score |
|--------------------|-------|
| N                  | 18    |
| Mean               | 80.06 |
| Median             | 80.50 |
| Standard Deviation | 5.42  |
| Minimum            | 70    |
| Maximum            | 90    |

The posttest results demonstrate a substantial improvement in students' speaking performance. The mean score increased from 62.11 in the pretest to 80.06 in the posttest, representing an improvement of 17.95 points. In addition, the minimum score increased from 51 to 70, while the maximum score increased from 74 to 90, indicating improvement across the participants.

### 4. Improvement Across Speaking Components

To provide a more comprehensive description of students' speaking development, each speaking component was analyzed separately.

**Table 4. Mean Scores for Each Speaking Component**

| Component     | Pretest | Posttest | Gain |
|---------------|---------|----------|------|
| Pronunciation | 12.4    | 15.8     | +3.4 |
| Vocabulary    | 12.9    | 16.4     | +3.5 |
| Grammar       | 11.6    | 15.3     | +3.7 |
| Fluency       | 12.0    | 16.1     | +4.1 |
| Comprehension | 13.2    | 16.5     | +3.3 |

As presented in Table 4, the data shows that the Buzz Group Technique positively impacted the various components of speaking. Among the five components analyzed, fluency exhibited the most significant improvement (+4.1), followed by grammar (+3.7), vocabulary (+3.5), pronunciation (+3.4), and comprehension (+3.3). Therefore, it can be concluded that the students succeeded in improving all components of speaking skills studied in this research.

### 5. Individual Students' Progress

Individual scores of the students were also compared to evaluate the changes in speaking performance after the treatment. Among the total 18 students, 17 (94.4%) students improved their performance by 10 points, while only one student (5.6%) progressed by 6 points. No one received a lower score on the post-test compared to the pretest. Remarkably the biggest improvement among participants was observed with Participant 12 whose score grew from 54 before treatment up to 79 afterwards gaining 25 points. On the contrary, Participant 4 obtained

the best score on the pretest (74) and then achieved 90 after treatment. In conclusion, the applied analysis of the individual scores has shown that the improvement took place in nearly all students regardless of their speaking proficiency initially.

#### 6. Normality Test

Prior to hypothesis testing, the normality of the data distribution was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test.

Table 5. Shapiro-Wilk Normality Test

| Variable | Sig. |
|----------|------|
| Pretest  | .428 |
| Posttest | .317 |

The significance values for both the pretest ( $p = .428$ ) and posttest ( $p = .317$ ) exceeded the significance level of .05, indicating that both datasets were normally distributed. Therefore, the assumption of normality required for parametric analysis was satisfied.

#### 7. Paired-Samples t-test

A paired-samples t-test was conducted to determine whether the improvement in students' speaking performance after the implementation of the Buzz Group Technique was statistically significant.

| Comparison       | Mean Difference | t      | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------------|-----------------|--------|----|-----------------|
| Pretest-Posttest | -17.94          | -18.26 | 17 | .000            |

The paired-samples t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between students' pretest and posttest speaking scores ( $t(17) = -18.26, p < .001$ ). The mean difference of 17.94 points indicates a substantial increase in students' speaking performance following the implementation of the Buzz Group Technique. Since the significance value was below the alpha level of .05, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted. These findings indicate that the Buzz Group Technique significantly improved the English speaking ability of the sixth-grade students who participated in this study.

## DISCUSSIONS

Results from this research show that the use of the Buzz Group Technique enhanced the ability of sixth graders to speak English in MI Ma'arif NU Miru substantially. The large difference in students' posttest scores indicates that organized collaborative discussion creates a proper situation for improving oral communication skills for younger EFL learners. Therefore, it can be assumed that it is easier for learners to develop speaking skills when they are involved in all processes instead of just receiving information passively (Richards, 2006). According to the principles of collaboration, the success of Buzz Group method can be attributed to the principles of collaborative learning. While participating in learning activities, students worked in small groups discussing assigned topics, sharing and exchanging ideas, expressing opinions, negotiating meaning, and practicing their responses. Thus, collaborative activities made it feasible to use authentic language and lessen cognitive and emotional load that is usually involved in doing individual speaking tasks. As (Johnson & Johnson, 2017) emphasize, collaborative learning makes it possible to foster positive interdependence, individual accountability, face-to-face interaction, and shared responsibility. These components of

collaborative learning influence the results. Both (Barkley et al., 2014) note that small group discussion provides every student with a chance to express ideas.

This study has produced one of its most important conclusions about students' speaking confidence having improved significantly. Many students were anxious about speaking English before the intervention as their concern about language accuracy made them hesitant to speak. After attending a number of Buzz Group sessions, learners started feeling free speaking up in front of their peers. As a result, it could be concluded that group discussions helped eliminate communication anxiety but improved willingness to communicate. (Oxford, 1990) states that cooperative learning lays the foundation for creating an environment with low level of anxiety where language learners are free to use language without fear of making mistakes. Kehing and Yunus (2021) stated that engaging learners in collaborative speaking practice contributes to the development of their confidence and encourages them to employ communication strategies that lead to improvements in speaking. The reported successes in all areas of speaking underline the efficiency of the Buzz Group Technique. In terms of the five variables, it was shown that fluency was the most improved skill (the less improvement showed grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and comprehension respectively). This points to the fact that this tool allows the students to process the spoken language better and improve their language proficiency. In accordance with Richards (2006), it is possible to gain language skills through communicative language teaching. At the same time, Harmer (2007) states that speaking is formed if learning does not limit the language practice\ and the task is performed often. Thus, it is noted that these results support the idea that collaborative discussion allows creating linguistic knowledge in class from the communicative context.

The outcomes of this particular research are correlated with late empirical work concerning the benefits of collaborative learning in EFL classes. (Huang, 2021), for instance, declared that collaborative speaking projects contributed to improvement in learner speaking performance and engagement by providing them with several opportunities for communication with each other during the learning process. Gorham et al. (2025) also confirm that structured peer feedback activities enabled learners to feel more self-confident and perform better in speaking tasks. Moreover, (Luo & Sun, 2025) assert that collaborative pre-task planning helped learners perform better in terms of speaking complexity and fluency. Lastly, Haidir (2025) states that collaborative learning methods lead to active participation in classes and improve the learning outcomes of EFL students in Indonesia. All in all, the listed research results point out to the fact that collaborative interaction could be seen as a useful pedagogical technique helping to enhance speaking abilities. A significant aspect of this research is its context. Most previous studies have focused on collaborative learning among older students, i.e., secondary school students, university students, and adult learners of English as a foreign language. However, the present research targets sixth-grade students in a Madrasah Ibtidaiyah in Indonesia, where learners usually have limited exposure to English as well as fewer opportunities to practice their speaking skills. The Buzz Group Technique used in the present research demonstrates that, in spite of existing challenges, students' speaking performance can be improved. Therefore, the finding of the present research contributes to previous studies, showing that structured collaborative learning can also be used effectively with young learners in Islamic primary schools.

Another implication of significance in relation to education is revealed in the outcome of the present research on the effectiveness of structured peer interaction. The improvements registered in this research suggest that instruction on speaking should give students enough chances to share the opinions, negotiate the meaning of the message, and practice language together before they perform the task on their own. Such an approach to learning leads to an increase in learner engagement and a decrease in communication apprehension. Thus, English teachers should be advised to apply collaborative discussion techniques such as the Buzz Group Technique in their teaching practices. Even though the results of the study are encouraging, there are limitations to bear in mind. The first limitation is that the study is of the one-group pretest-posttest nature, which means the results would give no absolute assurance concerning the contribution of the Buzz Group Technique. The second limitation is that the sample was small, with only eighteen students from one Islamic elementary school being a part of the research sample. Therefore, it is advisable that future pieces of research examine the effect of the Buzz Group Technique using experimental or quasi-experimental designs involving larger sample sizes and more schools. Also, it would be interesting to compare the results of using the Buzz Group Technique against the use of similar collaborative learning techniques, such as Think-Pair-Share, Jigsaw, or Round Robin.

In summary, the results indicate that using the Buzz Group Technique is a successful student-centered instructional method for improving English speaking skills among young students learning English as a foreign language. The Buzz Group Technique assists in developing not only speaking skills but also learners' confidence and their participation in class activities since it stimulates communication, enhances the interaction between students, and creates a comfortable atmosphere where students can collaborate with each other. Therefore, the present research is in favor of the already existing information on collaborative learning used in teaching English as a foreign language, offering some recommendations for teachers working in elementary schools of Indonesia.

## CONCLUSION

This study investigated the effectiveness of the Buzz Group Technique in improving the English speaking ability of sixth-grade EFL learners at MI Ma'arif NU Miru, Indonesia. The findings demonstrated that the implementation of the Buzz Group Technique significantly enhanced students' speaking performance, as evidenced by the substantial improvement in posttest scores compared with the pretest results. In addition to improving overall speaking achievement, the technique contributed to balanced development across the five assessed speaking components, namely pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension. Among these components, fluency showed the greatest improvement, indicating that repeated collaborative interaction enabled students to communicate more confidently and smoothly in English. Beyond the quantitative improvement, the study also revealed positive changes in students' classroom participation and communication behaviour. Throughout the instructional process, learners became more willing to express ideas, engage in peer discussions, provide feedback, and participate actively in oral communication activities. These findings suggest that the Buzz Group Technique not only enhances linguistic competence but also fosters

learner confidence, engagement, and meaningful interaction, which are essential elements of communicative language learning for young EFL learners.

The present study contributes to the growing body of research on collaborative learning by providing empirical evidence from an Indonesian Islamic elementary school context, an educational setting that has received relatively limited attention in previous studies. The findings suggest that the Buzz Group Technique is a promising student-centered approach for English teachers who want to create more interactive speaking lessons and encourage students to participate actively through structured small-group discussions. By giving learners more opportunities to share ideas and communicate with their peers, this technique helps create a supportive classroom environment that fosters speaking practice. Despite these positive findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the study employed a one-group pretest-posttest design without a control group, making it difficult to draw strong conclusions about the causal effect of the intervention. In addition, the study involved only eighteen students from a single elementary school, which limits the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other educational settings. Future research should consider using experimental or quasi-experimental designs that include control groups and larger, more diverse samples to provide stronger evidence of the technique's effectiveness. It would also be valuable to compare the Buzz Group Technique with other collaborative learning strategies and to investigate its long-term effects on students' speaking development and overall communicative competence. Overall, this study demonstrates that the Buzz Group Technique can effectively improve young learners' English speaking ability. By encouraging active participation, meaningful collaboration, and authentic communication, it offers practical value for English language teaching, particularly in elementary EFL classrooms where students benefit from engaging and supportive learning experiences that help them develop confidence and oral communication skills.

## REFERENCES

- Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2014). *Collaborative Learning Techniques: A Handbook for College Faculty* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, H. D., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices* (3rd ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Derakhshan, A., Kruk, M., Mehdizadeh, M., & Pawlak, M. (2021). Boredom in online classes, willingness to communicate, and second language learning. *System*, 97, 102484. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102484>
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2019). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

- Ghasemi, A., & Zahediasl, S. (2012). Normality tests for statistical analysis: A guide for non-statisticians. *International Journal of Endocrinology and Metabolism*, 10(2), 486–489. <https://doi.org/10.5812/ijem.3505>
- Ghonsooly, B., & Khajavy, G. H. (2016). Willingness to communicate in English among EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom*. Heinemann.
- Gorham, T., Majumdar, R., & Ogata, H. (2025). A microlearning app for peer feedback training and its effect on learning performance and self-confidence during an EFL speaking task. *Smart Learning Environments*, 12, 34.
- Haidir, A. M., Dollah, S., Basri, M., & Sakkir, G. (2025). The implementation of the collaborative learning approach in teaching speaking: A case study of an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.821>
- Huang, H.-W. (2021). Effects of smartphone-based collaborative vlog projects on EFL learners' speaking performance and learning engagement. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 37(6), 18–40.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2017). *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills* (12th ed.). Pearson.
- Kehing, K. L., & Yunus, M. M. (2021). A systematic review on language learning strategies for speaking skills in a new learning environment. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(4), 2055–2065.
- Luo, X., & Sun, P. P. (2025). Greater complexity and higher efficiency: Effects of translanguaging during collaborative pre-task planning on EFL learners' speaking performance. *Language Teaching Research*.
- Nikolov, M., & Djigunović, J. M. (2006). Recent research on age, second language acquisition, and early foreign language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 234–260.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Newbury House.
- Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Strijbos, J.-W. (2014). Scaffolding self-regulated learning through collaborative learning. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.02.004>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Seraj, P. M. I., Rahman, M. M., & Ahmed, S. (2021). Challenges and opportunities in developing EFL speaking skills: A systematic review. *International Journal of Instruction*.
- Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.

- van de Craats, I., Kurvers, J., & Young-Scholten, M. (2017). *Research on Young Language Learners and Classroom Interaction*. Routledge.
- Wang, J. (2021). Friendship group activities: Voices from Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 14(1), 140–151.