

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RECIPROCAL METHOD TO IMPROVE THE STUDENTS SPEAKING ABILITY

Nurhaaeda Badaruddin¹, Nadya Nurhidayah Nurdin²

¹ STKIP YPUP Makassar, Email: nurhaedabadaruddin23@guru.smp.belajar.id

² STKIP YPUP Makassar, Email: nadyannn@stkip.ypup.ac.id

Abstrak

This research was intended to find out whether or not reciprocal method can improved speaking ability of the first grade students of SMA Tamalatea Makassar. This research used pre-experimental method. The population of this research was the first grade students of SMA Tamalatea Makassar in academic year 2023/2024. The sample was 25 students and used total sampling. In collecting the data the researcher applied speaking test which consists of pre-test and post-test. The result of this research showed that reciprocal method can improved speaking ability for the students. It can be proven by the data of pre-test and post-test mean score, t-test value and t-table. Where pre-test was 3,4 post-test was 4,57, t-test value 15,58 and t-table 2,026. Post-test is higher than pre-test and t-test value is higher than t-table. This research concluded that the use reciprocal method of teaching was effective to improved the students' speaking ability.

Keywords: *Reciprocal Method, Speaking Ability Pre-Experimental Design*

INTRODUCTION

Despite being a fundamental component of language competence, speaking remains one of the most challenging skills for students to master, particularly in EFL contexts such as SMA Tamalatea Makassar. Many learners continue to struggle with speaking due to a combination of psychological and linguistic barriers, including low self-confidence, anxiety about making errors, and limited vocabulary (Tuan & Mai, 2015; Al Nakhalah, 2016). These issues often hinder their ability to communicate effectively in English. In response, educators are encouraged to implement learner-centered instructional strategies that foster active participation and reduce speaking apprehension. One such approach is the *reciprocal teaching method*, which emphasizes interactive, question-driven discussions designed to stimulate student engagement and critical thinking (Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Oczkus, 2018). This study seeks to explore the effectiveness of this method in enhancing students' speaking skills and overcoming the communicative obstacles they face.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A considerable body of research has been dedicated to investigating speaking skills in the context of English language learning, offering valuable insights into the obstacles learners face and the pedagogical strategies that can support their oral proficiency development. Dewi (2015), for example, examined the speaking performance of second-year students at Madrasah Aliyah Model Makassar and identified key impediments such as lack of self-confidence, frequent linguistic errors, limited lexical resources, weak grammatical understanding, and flawed sentence structure—all of which negatively impact students' communicative effectiveness.

In a similar vein, Efendy (2017) analyzed the impact of implementing the discussion method among second-year students at SMUN 1 Sungguminasa. Although students demonstrated generally competent speaking abilities, they continued to struggle with performance anxiety. His research highlighted the dual necessity of fostering both linguistic competence and psychological readiness to speak in English.

Salahuddin (2016) focused on the application of small group discussions among second-semester students in the English Department of the Tarbiyah Faculty at Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin

Makassar. His findings showed that this collaborative technique contributed positively to classroom dynamics, increasing student motivation and engagement in speaking activities.

Building on these prior investigations, the current study proposes that structured speech outlines may serve as a powerful tool to enhance students' speaking accuracy. By promoting clarity, logical organization, and learner confidence, such scaffolding strategies are expected to create more effective and empowering oral communication experiences in EFL classrooms.

METHODS

This study explored the effectiveness of the Reciprocal Method in improving the speaking skills of 25 first-year students at SMA Tamalatea Makassar. Utilizing a pre-experimental design with one group and employing both pre-test and post-test assessments, the research involved four treatment sessions where students engaged in structured reciprocal peer questioning. Speaking evaluations were conducted before and after the intervention. Data analysis, which included t-tests, mean scores, and standard deviations, revealed significant progress in the students' fluency, accuracy, and overall intelligibility. These results suggest that the Reciprocal Method serves as an effective pedagogical strategy for enhancing learners' oral communication abilities.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

FINDING

In collecting the data, the researcher administered tests. The tests were done twice. Pre-test was given before the treatment and post-test was given after the treatment. The results of the tests can be seen as in the following.

1. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Scores

In order to know the students' result in the speaking test, the raw score of the students obtained through pre-test and post-test was firstly tabulated and then analyzed in percentage and mean score analysis. In determining the quality of students' score in the speaking test, their scores were then classified into six levels, as follows

Table 1: The Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Score in pre-test and post-test

No	Classification	Pre-Test		Post-Test	
		Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Excellent	0	0	0	0
2	Very Good	0	0	0	0
3	Good	1	4 %	6	24%
4	Average	8	32 %	17	68 %
5	Poor	15	60%	2	8%
6	Very Poor	1	4%	0	0
Total		25	100 %	25	100

The data in the table 5 above shows the rate percentage and the frequency of the students' pre-test and post-test in speaking English sounds. There are variant scores on the table of the students' pre-test. It can be seen that from 25 students, there were 2 students' (8%) out of 25 students got a

“very good” score, 3 (12%) students got a “Good”, and 17 (68%) students got an “Average”. While the frequency and rate percentage of the student’s post-test can be seen that there were 2(8%) out of 25 students got “Very good”, 11 (44%) students got “Good”, and 12 (48%) students got “Average”.

Based on the result, it can be concluded that the rate percentage in the post-test were higher than the percentage in pre-test.

2. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Pre-Test and Post-test

a. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Pre-Test

- Mean Score of the Pre-Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{1448}{25} = 57,92$$

- Standard Deviation Of the Pre-Test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1448 - \frac{(57,92)^2}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1448 - \frac{3354,73}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1448 - 134,19}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1313,81}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{54,74}$$

$$SD = 7,40$$

Thus, the standard deviation of students pre-test was 7,40

b. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Post-Test

- Mean Score of the Post-Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{1735}{25} = 69,4$$

- Standard Deviation of the Post-Test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1735 - \frac{(69,4)^2}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1735 - \frac{4816,36}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1735 - 192,65}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{1542,35}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{64,26}$$

$$SD = 8,02$$

Thus, the standard deviation of students pre-test was 5,82.

3. The T-Test Value of Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test

In order to know whether the pre-test and post-test are significantly different, the researcher employed t-test. If the result of t-test was higher than the t-test value was lower than the value of t-table, the null hypothesis will be accepted. After calculation the standard deviation, the value of t-test was also calculated. The table below shows

Table 2. result of students' word achievement

No.	Name	Pre-test (Xi)	X ¹¹	Gain (D)	Post-test (Xi)	X ₂₂	Gain (D) ²
1	AAI	69	4761	6	75	5625	36
2	AFA	66	4356	9	75	5625	81
3	ANM	76	5776	14	90	8100	196
4	AAL	57	3249	13	70	4900	169
5	AS	53	2809	12	65	4225	144
6	AMM	48	2304	27	75	5625	729
7	AM	55	3025	15	70	4900	225
8	DOO	59	3481	8	67	4489	64
9	DA	57	3249	8	65	4225	64
10	DP	57	3249	3	60	3600	9
11	ENS	57	3249	19	76	5776	361
12	FMS	58	3364	1	59	3481	1
13	FF	51	2601	4	55	3025	16
14	FJ	58	3364	7	65	4225	49
15	IA	56	3136	10	66	4356	100
16	KK	62	3844	18	80	6400	324
17	ML	62	3844	4	66	4356	16
18	MH	58	3364	9	67	4489	81
19	NAS	58	3364	7	65	4225	49
20	NM	67	4489	13	80	6400	169
21	NS	50	2500	10	55	3600	100
22	NI	60	3600	20	80	6400	400

23	NM	46	2116	14	60	3600	196
24	NAR	55	3025	25	80	6400	625
25	NF	53	2809	12	65	4225	144
		Σ 1448	Σ 84928	Σ 288	Σ 1611	Σ 122272	Σ 4348

$$D = \frac{\Sigma D}{n} = \frac{288}{25} = 11,52$$

T.Test Value

$$\begin{aligned}
 t &= \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\Sigma D^2 - \frac{(\Sigma D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}} \\
 &= \frac{11,52}{\sqrt{\frac{4348 - \frac{(288)^2}{25}}{25(25-1)}}} \\
 &= \frac{11,52}{\sqrt{\frac{4348 - \frac{82944}{25}}{25(24)}}} \\
 &= \frac{11,52}{\sqrt{\frac{4348 - 3317,76}{25(24)}}} \\
 &= \frac{11,52}{\sqrt{\frac{1030,24}{600}}} \\
 &= \frac{11,52}{\sqrt{1,72}} \\
 &= \frac{11,52}{1,31} \\
 &= 8,79
 \end{aligned}$$

$$df = 25 - 1 = 24$$

$$p = 0.05$$

$$t\text{-table} = 1.980$$

Table 3 T-test of the Students' Pre-Test

Variable	Value T-test	Value T-table
X2-X1	8,79	1.711

Where X1: pre-test score
X2: post-test score

Table 3 shows that the value of the t-table (1.711) is greater than the value of the t-test (10.084). Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference.

1) Fluency

a. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Speaking Fluency

The rate percentage and frequency of the students' speaking fluency were presented in the following table.

Table 4. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Speaking Fluency in pre-test

No	Classification	Pre-Test	
		F	%
1	Excellent	0	0
2	Very Good	0	0 %
3	Good	3	12 %
4	Average	22	8 %
5	Poor	0	0 %
6	Very Poor	0	0 %
Total		25	100 %

Table 4 shows that the students' speaking fluency before the treatment was given, there were 0 students (0%) got "Excellent", 0 student (0%) got "Very good", 3 students (12%) got "Good", 22 students (88%) got "Average", and 0 student (0%) got "Poor", and 0 student (0%) got "Very poor".

Table 5. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Speaking Fluency in post-test

No	Classification	Post-Test	
		F	%
1	Excellent	0	0 %
2	Very Good	2	8 %
3	Good	5	20 %
4	Average	11	72 %
5	Poor	0	0 %
6	Very Poor	0	0 %
Total		25	100 %

Table 5 shows that the students' speaking fluency in the post-test the after was given, there were 0 student (0%) got "Excellent", 2 students (8%) got "Very good", 5 students (20%) got "Good", and 11 student (72%) got "Average", and 0 students (0%) got "Poor", and 0 student (0%) got "Very poor".

b. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Pre-Test

1. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Fluency Pre-test

- Mean Score of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Pre-Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{438}{25} = 17.52$$

- Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Pre-Test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X_1^2 - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N}}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{438 - \frac{(17,52)^2}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{438 - \frac{306,95}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{438 - 12,27}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{425,73}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{17,75}$$

$$SD = 4,21$$

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Fluency Post-test

- Mean Score of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Post-Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{486}{25} = 19,44$$

- Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Post-Test
And post-test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{486 - \frac{(19,44)^2}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{486 - \frac{377,91}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{486 - 15,11}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{470,89}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{19,62}$$

$$SD = 4,42$$

Table 6. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Post-Test

Type of test	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Post-test	19.44	4.42

Table 6 shows that the mean score of the students' speaking fluency in the post-test was 19.44 and the standard deviation was 4.11.

c. The T-Test Value of Students' Speaking Fluency in Pre-Test and Post-Test

In order to know whether or not the mean score is difference between two variable at the level of significance 0.05 with degrees of freedom (df) = n - 1, t-test for independent sample was employed.

Table 7. students' word Achievement Fluency

No.	Name	Pre-test FL (Xi)	Gain (D)	Post-test FL (Xi)	Gain (D) ²
1	AAI	18	2	20	4
2	AFA	15	0	15	0
3	ANM	25	5	30	25
4	AAL	20	2	22	4
5	AS	15	0	15	0
6	AMM	23	-2	21	4
7	AM	28	2	30	4
8	DOO	20	2	22	4
9	DA	20	-4	16	16
10	DP	18	-3	15	9
11	ENS	20	1	21	1
12	FMS	20	0	20	0
13	FF	18	-3	15	9
14	FJ	13	2	15	2
15	IA	20	-1	19	1
16	KK	12	8	20	64
17	ML	13	7	20	49
18	MH	13	2	15	4
19	NAS	20	3	23	9
20	NM	15	4	19	16
21	NS	13	2	15	4
22	NI	16	3	19	9
23	NM	15	5	20	25
24	NAR	13	7	20	49
25	NF	15	4	19	19
		Σ 438	Σ 48	Σ 486	Σ 330

$$D = \frac{\sum D}{n} = \frac{48}{25} = 1.92$$

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{n}}{n(n-1)}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1.92}{\frac{\sqrt{330 - \frac{(48)^2}{25}}}{25(25-1)}} \\
&= \frac{1.92}{\frac{\sqrt{330 - \frac{2304}{25}}}{25(24)}} \\
&= \frac{1.92}{\frac{\sqrt{330 - 92.16}}{25(24)}} \\
&= \frac{1.92}{\frac{\sqrt{330 - 92.16}}{600}} \\
&= \frac{1.92}{\sqrt{\frac{237.84}{600}}} \\
&= \frac{1.92}{\sqrt{0.39}} \\
&= \frac{1.92}{0.39} \\
&= 4.92
\end{aligned}$$

df = 24

p = 0.05

t-table = 1.711

The following table shows the result of the calculation.

Table 8. Table TA-test of the Students' Speaking Fluency in Pre-Test

Type of test	T-test	T-table
X2-X1	4.92	1.711

Where X1: pre-test score

X2: post-test score

Table 8 shows that the value of the t-table (1.711) is greater than the value of the t-test (4.923). Based on this finding, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference between the mean score of the student's pre-test from both classes. Based on these findings, it can be inferred that the difference between the students' speaking fluency of both classes was significant, which means that skit technique can significantly enhance the students' speaking fluency.

2) Comprehensibility

a. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility

The rate percentage and frequency of the students' speaking comprehensibility were presented in the following table

Table 9. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in pre-test

No	Classification	Pre-Test	
		F	%
1	Excellent	3	12 %
2	Very Good	7	028%
3	Good	15	60 %
4	Average	0	0 %
6	Poor	0	0 %
7	Very Poor	0	0 %
Total		25	100 %

Table 9 shows that the students' speaking comprehensibility before the treatment was given, there were 3 students (12%) got "Excellent", 7 students (28%) got "Very good", 15 students (60%) got "Good", 0 student (0%) got "Average", 0 student (0%) got "Poor", 0 student (0%) got "Very poor".

Table 10 The Rate Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in post-test

No	Classification	Post-Test	
		F	%
1	Excellent	11	44 %
2	Very Good	14	56 %
3	Good	0	0 %
4	Average	0	0 %
5	Poor	0	0 %
6	Very Poor	0	0 %
Total		25	100 %

Table 10 shows that the students' speaking comprehensibility in the post test after the treatment was treatment, there were 11 students (44%) got "Excellent", 14 students (56%) got "Very good", 0 student (0%) got "Good", 0 student (0%) got "Average", student (0%) got "Poor", and student (0%) got "Very poor".

b. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Pre-Test and post-test

After calculating the data of both classes, the mean score and standard deviation of both classes were presented the following table

a. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility

- Mean Score of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Pre-Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{569}{25} = 22.76$$

- Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Pre-Test

Table 19. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Pre-Test.

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x_1^2 - \frac{(\sum x_1)^2}{N}}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{569 - \frac{(22,7)^2}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{569 - \frac{518,01}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{569 - 20,72}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{548,28}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{22,84}$$

$$SD = 4,78$$

b. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Post-Test

- Mean Score of of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Post-Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n} = \frac{653}{25} = 26.12$$

- Standard Deviation of of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Post-Test

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x_1^2 - \frac{(\sum x_2)^2}{N}}{N-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{653 - \frac{(26,12)^2}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{653 - \frac{682,25}{25}}{25-1}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{653 - 27,29}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{625,71}{24}}$$

$$SD = \sqrt{26,07}$$

$$SD = 5,10$$

The mean score of the students' speaking comprehensibility in the pre-test was 26.12 and the standard deviation was 5,10. In order to know whether or not the mean scores of both classes are significantly different at the level of significance 0.05 with the degrees of freedom (df) = (n - 1), t-test analysis for independent sample was employed.

c. The T-Test Value of Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Pre-Test and Post-Test

In order to know whether or not the mean score is different from the two variables at the level of significance 0.05 with degrees of freedom (df) = n - 1, t-test for independent sample was employed.

Table 11 of students' word Achievement Comprehensibility

No.	Name	Pre-test CM (Xi)	Gain (D)	Post-test CM (Xi)	Gain (D) ²
1	AAI	25	5	30	25
2	AFA	20	8	28	64
3	ANM	30	0	30	0
4	AAL	25	0	25	0
5	AS	20	4	24	16
6	AMM	24	6	30	36
7	AM	30	0	30	0
8	DOO	25	0	25	0
9	DA	22	6	28	36
10	DP	20	4	24	16
11	ENS	25	1	26	1
12	FMS	20	4	24	16
13	FF	18	7	25	49
14	FJ	20	5	25	25
15	IA	25	4	29	16
16	KK	20	3	23	9
17	ML	20	3	23	9
18	MH	20	4	24	16
19	NAS	30	0	30	0
20	NM	20	3	23	9
21	NS	20	5	25	25
22	NI	20	0	20	0
23	NM	20	10	30	100
24	NAR	20	5	25	25
25	NF	30	-3	27	9
		Σ 569	Σ 88	Σ 653	Σ 546

$$D = \frac{\sum D}{n} = \frac{98}{25} = 3.92$$

$$t = \frac{D}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{n}}{n(n-1)}}}$$

$$= \frac{3.92}{\sqrt{\frac{586 - \frac{(98)^2}{25}}{25(25-1)}}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{3.92}{\frac{\sqrt{5.86 - \frac{96.04}{25}}}{25(24)}} \\
&= \frac{3.92}{\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1.591 - 384}{16}}}{25(24)}} \\
&= \frac{3.92}{\frac{\sqrt{\frac{1.591 - 384}{16}}}{600}} \\
&= \frac{3.92}{\sqrt{\frac{2.0184}{600}}} \\
&= \frac{3.92}{\sqrt{0.33}} \\
&= \frac{3.92}{0.33} \\
&= 11.87
\end{aligned}$$

df = 24

p = 0.05

t-table = 1.711

The following table shows the result of the calculation.

Table 12. Table T-test of the Students' Speaking Comprehensibility in Pre-Test and Post-test

Type of test	T-test	T-table
X2-X1	11.87	1.711

Where X1: pre-test score

X2: post-test score

Table 12 shows that the value of the t-table (1.980) is greater than the value of the t-test (1.39). Based on this finding, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference between the mean score of the students' speaking comprehensibility from both classes.

Based on these findings, it can be inferred that the difference between the students' speaking comprehensibility of both classes was significant, which means that skit technique can significantly enhance the students' speaking comprehensibility.

DISCUSSION

The analysis of students' speaking performance revealed a marked improvement following the implementation of the Reciprocal Method. Prior to the intervention, the majority of students exhibited only moderate proficiency in speaking, as evidenced by their pre-test results. Common difficulties included limited fluency, lack of clarity, and low self-confidence when engaging in spoken English. However, after being exposed to structured peer interaction through reciprocal questioning techniques, students demonstrated substantial gains in their speaking performance. Post-test outcomes indicated that a significant number of students advanced to good and excellent categories, showing enhanced fluency, improved linguistic accuracy, and greater intelligibility in their spoken output.

These qualitative observations were corroborated by the statistical data. Results from the paired sample t-test revealed a statistically significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores, confirming the effectiveness of the instructional strategy. The mean score increased from 3.23 prior to the treatment to 4.33 after the treatment, signifying a notable improvement in overall speaking ability. This upward trend underscores the pedagogical value of reciprocal peer interaction, which fosters learner engagement, supports the development of critical thinking, and encourages collaborative meaning-making in speaking tasks (Gillies, 2016).

Consequently, the findings of this study provide empirical support for the application of the Reciprocal Method as a viable and impactful approach to teaching speaking in EFL settings. In particular, this strategy proved effective for enhancing the communicative competence of first-year students at SMA Tamalatea Makassar, suggesting its broader potential for improving oral language outcomes in similar instructional contexts.

CONCLUSION

Following the completion of this study and a thorough analysis of the data, it can be concluded that the speaking abilities of first-year students at SMA Tamalatea Makassar experienced a significant improvement through the implementation of the Reciprocal Method. This instructional approach, which centers on peer collaboration and scaffolded questioning, was shown to be effective in cultivating a more interactive and supportive classroom atmosphere. Structured peer-led discussions encouraged students to participate actively, articulate their ideas clearly, and engage in meaningful communicative exchanges—factors that contributed to improved fluency, accuracy, and confidence in spoken English.

The observed enhancement in students' speaking performance was substantiated by the statistical comparison of pre-test and post-test results, which demonstrated a considerable increase in mean scores. This suggests that the Reciprocal Method not only facilitated clearer sentence construction and message delivery but also contributed to reducing speaking-related anxiety by offering a cooperative and less threatening environment for practice. These findings align with earlier research asserting that peer-based learning strategies can significantly support learners' oral language development in EFL contexts (McDonough & Shaw, 2013).

In summary, the results of this study reinforce the value of the Reciprocal Method as a pedagogically sound strategy for enhancing speaking proficiency. It is therefore recommended for EFL educators aiming to implement learner-centered and interaction-focused methodologies that foster both communicative competence and student autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Al Nakhalah, A. M. M. (2016). Problems and difficulties of speaking that encounter English language students at Al Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 5(12), 96–101.
- Dewi, 2015. *Collaborative Learning in Improving Speaking accuracy of the second grade at Man Makassar*. Thesis S1 UIN Makassar.
- Efendy. 2017. *The effective Using Discussion Method in Learning Speaking English accuracy to the Second Year Students at SMU N 1 Sungguminasa*. Thesis FKIP UNM.
- Gillies, R. M. (2016). *Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice*. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3>
- McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2013). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide* (3rd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Oczkus, L. D. (2018). *Reciprocal teaching at work: Powerful strategies and lessons for improving reading comprehension* (3rd ed.). International Literacy Association.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117–175.

Salahuddin. 2016. *The Using Small Group Method to Enhance the students Speaking Accuracy of the Second Semester of English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty*. Thesis Universitas INA Makassar.

Tuan, N. H., & Mai, T. N. (2015). Factors affecting students' speaking performance at Le Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 8–23.