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Abstract
This research aims to 1) describe the implementation of collaborative teaching model in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan and 2) describe the strengths and limitations of the collaborative teaching model implemented in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan. The research was categorized into descriptive qualitative using case study design. The subjects of this study were 18 students of class X TKR A of SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan in Academic Year 2018/2019. The main data of this research were gained by conducting classroom observation and questionnaire for the students that were analyzed descriptively qualitatively. The findings of the study indicated that the implementation of collaborative teaching model in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan followed teaching procedures of PPP method. They were Presentation, Practice, and Production. Besides, the researcher found the strengths and limitations of the collaborative teaching model implemented in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan. The strengths were 1) The students had more opportunities in asking the materials; 2) The students got their attention back when the pre-service teacher 2 (LZ) and pre-service teacher 3 (DM) approached them; 3) The pre-service teachers helped each other in managing the students; 4) The students felt happy toward the learning process. Otherwise, this model also brought the limitation such as the students might get confused because there was more than one teacher in the classroom.
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Introduction
Teaching English in Indonesia schools deals with English as a foreign language. There are four macro skills in teaching language; they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The four skills are
integrated with other skills. Those skills can be classified into two sections: receptive and productive skills. In the receptive skills which cover listening and reading, the students do not produce language, but they have to receive and understand the language. In contrast, in the productive skills which consist of writing and speaking, the students should produce language. Besides those four macro skills, English also includes micro-skills such as grammar and phonology. Grammar becomes important because it is part of English skills. When the students want to listen, read, speak, and even write text, they have to understand the text construction and comprehend the structure inside the text.

Being an international and universal language in the world, learning English in the 21st century becomes a must for most students to respond to the challenges which occurred. Learning English is important for the students to have higher competitiveness in occupational purposes in either home or foreign country. The government had been also doing curriculum reinforcement to support the problem solving related to the English challenge. The English curriculum has been changed from context-based to communicative based. This is for activating students in using English. Moreover, the teacher should be innovative and creative in motivating their students to establish and increase their skills. To make these happen, the teachers should choose the suitable method, technique, or teaching model.

In Indonesia, English already becomes the main subject in junior, senior, and vocational high school. It means that the students must learn English because it is compulsory for them. Unfortunately, some students experience difficulty in understanding the English materials due to the lack of vocabulary mastery, grammar understanding, confidence, or others. Those problems can be solved by the students themselves or within their environment. They can carry out a conducive environment; so it can also encourage them to use English optimally. It can be predicted that the students will survive from that challenge if they have gained a suitable environment and motivation.

The researcher brought these two reasons; a suitable environment and motivation, as the main reasons for conducting this study. The researcher observed one of the classes in tenth grades of engineering program in SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan, X TKR A (Teknik Kendaraan Ringan). Some of the students have experienced difficulties in
grammatical aspects even in creating sentences based on the given patterns. They did not know how to compose a text so that they tended to put their words randomly. The worst was that they were not interested in the learning process. In other words, they did not have a high motivation in learning English. They were bored with the teaching method so that most of the students preferred to play games or focused on their smartphones during class activities. Due to the whole students in the engineering program are males, the class was mostly being noisy and even bustling. Therefore, as a part of the students’ environment, the class did not support the learning process. The teacher felt difficult to handle the students. The teacher was encouraged to have a solution on how to manage them effectively.

Besides, the students also faced difficulties in understanding form-focused instruction or grammar. Most of the students did not pay attention to the explanation that was given by the teachers. They preferred to sleep, play games, or focus on their smartphones in the classroom. As a result, they commonly got low grades in English exercises in the classroom. Due to those problems, the researcher was interested to research how the implementation of the collaborative teaching model in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan. The students were introduced with a collaborative teaching model and the researcher found out the responses toward the new model. Collaborative teaching is designed to handle the students effectively. In this research, the researcher tried to identify the implementation of the teaching model and describe the strengths and limitations of the collaborative teaching model introduced to teach adverbs in their learning process. The method used in the collaborative teaching is PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production) as designed in lesson plan.

As collaborative teaching model helps students in improving the learning process and provides a new reference for the teaching model implementation, it would help students in SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan to learn grammar easier and more effective. They can recognize what learning model which is suitable with their preference and their grammar understanding may be increased by using the model. To the teachers, the finding can be the reference to apply the model in the classroom and develop it into effective model in teaching grammar. It encourages the teacher to explore the suitable teaching model to the teaching learning process. To the other researchers, this research provides some information about the process of teaching
grammar using collaborative teaching model to the students in grade X TKRA (Teknik Kendaraan Ringan). Thus, the finding of this research can be used as an additional reference to conduct a similar research in a different field or the other related researches.

**Literature Review**

Morin (2014) states that the definition of collaborative teaching is two or more teachers share responsibility for teaching some or all of students which are intended for a classroom. Collaborative teaching is one of fun and interesting ways for students to learn from two or more teachers who may have different ways of teaching. This means that in doing a collaborative teaching, the classroom is handled by more than one teachers.

Considering how collaborative teaching works, there are some basic models of collaborative teaching (Morin, 2014): team teaching, one teaches, one assists and/or observes, station teaching, parallel teaching, and alternative teaching. In this first model, the teachers should plan lessons and work together to teach students. It will make the students see equality toward the teachers. The students will get the chance to ask questions and get assistance during a lesson. In other words, it requires the co-teachers lead large-group instruction by both lecturing, representing different viewpoints and multiple methods of solving problems (Friend & Bursuck, 2009). One teaches, one assists and/or observes; in this model, one teacher teaches in front of the class, the other teachers stay back on the rear or on either right or left side of the classroom. This means that the teacher who explains the lesson only focuses on slides or board. Meanwhile, the rest teachers assist in managing the classroom and do observation. Station teaching model requires more than one teachers and allows the teachers to play to their teaching strengths. Both teachers divide the instructional content and each teacher takes responsibility for planning and teaching part of it. In station teaching, the classroom is divided into various teaching centers. The teacher and student teacher are at particular stations; the other stations are run independently by the students or by a teacher’s aide. In parallel teaching, the students are divided based on number of teachers involved on the parallel teaching. Each teacher takes one group and teaches the same materials; however, each teacher is allowed to choose teaching technique differently. In alternative teaching, one teacher manages most of the class while the other teacher works with a small
group inside or outside of the classroom. The small group does not have to integrate with the current lesson.

Considering the collaborative model, it can be applied in teaching grammar. Krashen (1987) provides a useful account of how the role of grammar is actually defined. It has been reported that language structures studies can have advantages and values in the general educational aspect such as including the language structures in their language program. Larsen-Freeman (1991, cited in Brown, 2000:362) points out that grammar is one of the three language dimensions (grammar, semantics, and pragmatics) which are interconnected with each other. Grammar (first dimension) provides the structures of language, but those structures become meaningless without semantics (second dimension) and pragmatics (third dimension). In other words, grammar provides the term of how to construct a sentence and discourse rules tell about how to string those sentences together. Teaching grammar can be carried out by following the procedures of certain methods. Richards and Rogers (1986:26, cited in Brown, 2000:129) argue that the term of procedure is used to involve “the actual moment-to-moment techniques, practices, and behaviors which carry out in teaching a language according to a particular method”. Harmer (2001: 80) stated that there are several popular methodologies in planning a grammar lesson in the classroom; one of them was PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production). Teaching grammar in deductive PPP includes three main stages:

**Presentation**

In this stage, it includes leading in, presenting form and meaning, giving other examples, conducting repetition of the title, model sentences and example, and finally asking class to copy down lesson.

a. Leading-in

The teacher begins presenting with a text in which grammatical structure appears and the text maybe one or two sentences. The purpose of lead-in section is to warm up and raise students’ interest in the lesson. Therefore, the students will recognize how the structure is used naturally in real life.

b. Presenting form and meaning

The teacher may begin showing the form and then the meaning or vice versa. This depends on the students. If the students prefer
grammar explanation first at the beginning, the form should be presented first (Dang and Ruiter, 2005: 86).

Doff (1998: 34-35) mentioned some these ways in his book that when presenting meaning, the teacher can show it visually or through situation. In showing meaning visually, the teacher can use objects, the students, the classroom, or picture to demonstrate the new structure. Nevertheless, when it is not possible to show the meaning visually, another way is presenting meaning through situation. The good point using a situation is that the students can become familiar with the structure in everyday conversation.

Another aspect which is also important is showing how the structure is formed together with explaining the meaning of the new structure. Doff (1988: 37) stated two basic ways of doing this. First, providing a clear model, enquiring the students to listen and repeat two or three times and demonstrating the structure quickly. Second, writing the structure on the board, saying it when writing and underlining the fixed parts, or even asking the students to tell the teacher what to write.

**Practice**

In this stage, it is necessary to get them to speak or write the new language accurately and fluently after recognizing the structures. The process will go from controlled practice (mechanical) to less controlled practice (meaningful) and finally to free practice (production).

a. Controlled or mechanical practice

In this section, learners do mechanical drills such as repetition, substitution, word cues, picture cue and so on because those drills completely control the students' response. Due to these kinds of drills just focus on correct forms rather than meaning, they are asked to give the only one correct way of responding. Therefore, mechanical drills are only useful if students practice doing them for a short time.

b. Meaningful practice or less controlled practice

In this section, there is still little control of response because students can give several right answers and these drills are not suitable for doing chorally. In meaningful practice, it requires learners to think and understand what they are doing. Some common drills are information gap exercise, mapped dialogue, interview or find someone who, etc.
In both mechanical and meaningful practice, teacher should check whether the students make any errors or not so that the teacher can clarify any problems of understanding.

**Production or free practice**

In this stage, the students have a chance to use the structures to express their own ideas or talk about their experience. Free practice offers students a chance to talk or write freely and that errors often occur. Nevertheless, teachers should not interrupt students to correct their mistakes because the main purpose is to develop fluency and confidence. Important errors can be corrected during giving feedback after this stage.

**Method**

The research was categorized into descriptive qualitative using case study design. Descriptive case study is used to describe an intervention or phenomenon and the real-life context in which it occurred (Yin, 2003). The researcher used qualitative method to reveal the phenomena of the implementation of collaborative teaching model in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan. The research conducted in the even semester of academic year 2018/2019, specifically in April 2019. The researcher obtained the data by conducting classroom observation and questionnaire for the students. The research was conducted in X TKR A *(Teknik Kendaraan Ringan)* which consisted of 18 students. In collecting the data, the researcher observed and recorded the classroom activities, especially the teaching learning process. In analyzing the data, the researcher did data collection, data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusion.

**Discussion**

The discussion covered the context, implementation, and the strengths and limitations of the collaborative teaching model in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan.

**Context**

The first discussion was on the context which was included the material, level of the students, total of the students, room, and time allocation.
Material
The material taught in this research was adverbs including the
definition, examples, types of adverbs, how to form adverbs, examples,
and some exercises to gain students’ understanding about the material
taught during teaching-learning process.

Level of the Students
The level of the students in this case study research was the tenth
grade of SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan. The class was X TKR A (Teknik Kendaraan Ringan).

Total of the Students
The tenth grade of SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan, X TKR A (Teknik Kendaraan Ringan) actually consists of 21 students. When
conducting the research, three students were absent at that time. Therefore, the total of the students in this case study research consisted
of 18 students which all of them are males.

Room
The room description about X TKR A (Teknik Kendaraan Ringan) was as follows:
a) The board that was used in the classroom still used blackboard and
chalks to write down on the board; its position was in front of the
class. Meanwhile, the school provided portable LCD Projector if the
teachers wanted to use it for teaching learning process.
b) Classroom seating arrangement in the class was set into row seating
where desks were placed in either vertical or horizontal straight line.
Row setting was common seating arrangement in the school. In this
case, the desks and chairs were set into pair pods. The pod or pair
arrangement was designed with rectangular desk, one desk for
students in pairs. This arrangement had advantageous when the
students will work in groups or pairs with their classmates for a
large portion of class time. This also could communicate a learning
community where students were expected to work with one another.
The teacher desk was in front of the class. The numbers of the
students’ tables were 12 and chairs were 22.
c) Other facilities: Other facilities: The color of the wall was light blue.
There was no fan in the classroom; there were pictures of the
president, vice president of Indonesia, and the national symbol of
**Burung Garuda.** The ventilations were provided adequately in the classroom. On the corner, it was patched with a small wall magazine; at the back, it was hanged a whiteboard containing a class organization structure and at the right and left side it was patched with slogans and mottos about motivation in learning.

**Time Allocation**

The students entered the class at 07.15 a.m. then did Solat Duha, praying, and preparing them to join the class. Therefore, time allocation of this teaching learning process was started at 07.30 a.m. until 09.00 a.m. or 1 hour 30 minutes.

**Teaching Procedures**

The second discussion was on the teaching process. In this study, the researcher worked collaboratively with three pre-service teachers to implement the collaborative teaching model. The researcher was the observer and the English teacher gave supervision. While teaching-learning process, the researcher took some notes about everything occurred during the activities. The pre-service teachers implemented collaborative teaching model as the approach and PPP as the method in teaching grammar adverbs. There were teaching procedures followed by the pre-service teachers:

1) Presentation

In the presentation stage, the pre-service teacher who was responsible in presenting the material was the pre-service teacher 1 (OD). It was done after praying and introduction carried out. OD greeted the students with greetings utterances such as “Morning class”; and asking them about their condition. When the students made a noise, the other pre-service teachers helped each other to handle the students. The pre-service teacher in the presentation stage, OD, started presenting the material by giving warming up. She explained about part of speech where the adverb included within it. She showed kinds of part of speech on the LCD-Projector and clarified on the blackboard. She began it by introducing the general part first.

After introducing shortly each kinds of part of speech, she specified and narrowed the material into adverb. She began presenting the specific material with the definition first. She asked the students to be involved in the learning by offering them to read. Then, in presenting form and meaning stage, the pre service teacher began showing the
form by giving grammar explanation first at the beginning. She gave the explanation about kinds of adverbs, examples, and meaning. The students were also given other examples and conducted repetition of the title, model sentences and example. The students copied down lesson while the pre-service teacher explaining.

2) Practice

In this stage, pre-service teacher who was responsible in delivering practice was pre-service teacher 2 (LZ). In practice stage, LZ gave the students hand out of exercises to be done. The pre-service teacher asked them to complete the exercise in a given paper. The task type belonged to filling in the gap tasks which consist of ten items. The last part of the practice stage was about evaluating the task given by the pre-service teacher as a practice. After answering all the questions, the task was discussed together in whole class. Then the-pre service 3 (DM) provided further exercise before applying the production activity. She made sure the students’ work and asked them whether they had already finished answering all of the previous exercises and understood the materials. After confirming, the pre-service teacher 3 distributed them the further exercise and provided instructions about what the students should do.

3) Production

The last stage was production. In the production stage, it was time for the students to use what they have been taught in free practice. The focus of this production stage was concerned on writing because writing is one of the productive skills instead of speaking. The students were asked to produce their own paragraph using adverbs. They were freed to write down paragraph according to their experience, for example they write a card related to congratulating on someone.

In the learning process conducted in this research, the pre-service teacher did not carry out production stage completely. The production was set up as the students’ homework and would be corrected by their teacher. The limitation of the time allocation occurred due to the level of vocational high school students in understanding the material.

**Strengths and Limitations**

The third discussion was on the strengths and limitation of the collaborative teaching implementation. According to the research, there were some strengths and limitations drawn from the implementation of
collaborative teaching model in teaching grammar at SMK Muhammadiyah Piyungan. The strengths were as follows:

1) The students had more opportunities in asking the materials. It happens because when pre-service teacher 1 (OD) did presenting the material to the students, the other pre-service teachers 2 (LZ) and 3 (DM) provide guidance to the other students. The students who wanted to ask while OD presenting, they could directly ask the other pre-service teachers who stands nearby.

2) The students got their attention back when the pre-service teacher 2 (LZ) and pre-service teacher 3 (DM) approached them. Due to the fact that all of the students in the classroom were males, the situation became more crowded. While pre-service 1 presenting and showing the materials, the other pre-service teachers helped to get the students’ attention back by approaching the students who were crowded, talked to each other, played mobile phone, and slept.

3) The pre-service teachers helped each other in managing the students. When doing the teaching procedures, each pre-service teacher helped each other. For example, when the pre-service teacher presented the explanation, the others helped the pre-service teacher 1 in handling the students. The way to handle were various, such as approaching the students, warning the students who made crowded and played mobile phones, and waking up who slept.

4) The students felt happy toward the learning process. As collaborative teaching model was newly introduced to the students in their teaching-learning process, the students’ interests on the model showed good responses. Providing supervision to the student more individually can give benefits to the students.

However, there was limitation in this collaborative model; some of the students might be confused to understand the materials because there were more than one pre-service teachers which explained with different styles. Their focus might be not only in one pre-service teacher but also the other pre-service teachers.

**Students’ View on Collaborative Teaching**

The students’ view on collaborative teaching can be summed up into the table below.
### Tabel 1. Students’ View on Collaborative Teaching

| No | General View | Like          | Dislike         |  |
|----|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---|
| 1  | No reasons   | No reasons    | No reasons      |  |
|    | 3/18x 100 % | 100 %         | 100 %           |  |
|    | =16.67%     | =16.67%       | =16.67%         |  |
| 2  | Satisfying   | Enjoyable     | Lack of         |  |
|    | 9/18x 100 % | 100 %         | communication   |  |
|    | =50%        | =16.67%       | among the       |  |
|    |             |               | teachers        |  |
|    | 3/18x 100 % | 100 %         | 100 %           |  |
|    | =16.67%     | =16.67%       | =22.22%         |  |
| 3  | Good         | Not know      | Nothing dislike |  |
|    | 3/18x 100 % | 100 %         | 100 %           |  |
|    | =16.67%     | =11.11%       | =55.56%         |  |
| 4  | So-so as     | Like          | Confusing       |  |
|    | usual        | 10/18x 100 % | 100 %           |  |
|    | =5.56%      | =55.56%       | =5.56%          |  |
| 5  | Quiet dislike| Quiet         | 1/18x 100 %     |  |
|    | 2/18x100 %  | boring        | =100 %          |  |
|    | =11.11%     |               | =5.56%          |  |

The students’ responses that was drawn from questionnaire showed good category because in the first question which was aimed to get the general view of the students about the collaborative teaching, the higher percentage showed “satisfying” (9/18x 100 % = 50%). In the second question which was aimed to get what the students like toward the collaborative teaching, the higher percentage is on “like” (10/18x 100 % =55.56%). Meanwhile, in the third question which was aimed to get what the students dislike toward the collaborative teaching, the higher percentage is on “Nothing dislike” (10/18x 100 % =55.56%).

### Conclusions

The teaching procedures carried out by the English pre-service teachers in the teaching practice related to teaching grammar adverbs followed PPP teaching method which consisted of presentation, practice, and production. Based on the observation and questionnaire result, the researcher found strengths and limitations. The strengths were: 1) The students had more opportunities in asking the materials; 2) The students got their attention back when the pre-service teacher 2 (LZ) and pre-service teacher 3 (DM) approached them; 3) The pre-service teachers helped each other in managing the students; 4) The
students felt happy toward the learning process. Meanwhile, the limitation was the students might get confused because there was more than one teachers in the classroom.

The research was limited by sample size and geographic location. The study included only implementing collaborative teaching with PPP method in tenth grade level. The location of this study represented students’ perspectives in one of the vocational schools in Yogyakarta. Due to the small size, the findings may not represent the majority vocational schools making it difficult to generalize the findings. This study and prior studies identified the need for research into training teachers to implement the collaborative teaching models and methods effectively to establish a standard protocol for implementation. Qualitative study in vocational schools from a broader geographic area will assist in gathering information to identify effective collaborative teaching implementation models. Further research specifically in the areas of teacher knowledge of collaborative teaching is needed.
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