



# The Influence Of Collaborative Blended Learning Through Written Small Group Discussion Model On High School Students' English Writing Skills

Ernitasari Mulyadi<sup>1\*</sup>, Yatim Riyanto<sup>2</sup>, Andi Kristanto<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Student of Graduate School of Doctoral Program, Educational Technology Study Program, Surabaya State University, Surabaya, Indonesia, ernitasari.21001@mhs.unesa.ac.id

<sup>2</sup>Doctoral Program, Educational Technology Study Program, Surabaya State University, Surabaya, Indonesia, yatimriyanto@unesa.ac.id

<sup>3</sup>Doctoral Program, Educational Technology Study Program, Surabaya State University, Surabaya, Indonesia, andikristanto@unesa.ac.id

\*Corresponding Author: Ernitasari Mulyadi

\*Student of Graduate School of Doctoral Program, Educational Technology Study Program, Surabaya State University, Surabaya, Indonesia, ernitasari.21001@mhs.unesa.ac.id

**Citation:** Ernitasari Mulyadi, et al (2024), The Influence Of Collaborative Blended Learning Through Written Small Group Discussion Model On High School Students' English Writing Skills, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 5895 - 5904

Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.3051

## ARTICLE INFO

## ABSTRACT

This research explored the effectiveness of the Collaborative Blended Learning model through Written Small Group Discussions (CBL through WiSGuD) on enhancing students' analytical exposition text writing skills. The study utilized a quantitative approach, employing a MANOVA analysis to assess changes in students' abilities to articulate ideas, structure texts, and use language effectively within a collaborative learning setup. Data were gathered from students' writing assignments, which were analyzed based on content, text organization, vocabulary, language use, and writing mechanics. Results indicated significant improvements in all assessed areas, demonstrating that the CBL through WiSGuD model substantially enhances students' writing skills. These findings support the hypothesis that collaborative learning environments contribute positively to students' ability to construct coherent and persuasive texts, particularly in analytical exposition writing, which demands high analytical and organizational skills. The study underscores the importance of incorporating collaborative and blended learning strategies in educational curricula to improve specific academic skills and foster essential 21st-century skills such as teamwork and effective communication. The implications of these findings are critical for educators aiming to enhance students' writing competencies and prepare them for collaborative and communicative demands of the professional world. Future research might consider longitudinal studies to evaluate the long-term impacts of such educational interventions across various learning contexts and disciplines.

**Keywords:** Collaborative Blended Learning; Analytical Exposition Text Writing; Educational Strategies; Student Engagement; Writing Skills Improvement

## I. INTRODUCTION

A learning model that can be effectively and efficiently applied is an essential aspect in the teaching and learning process to date (Syafudin et al., 2018). An effective learning model not only orientates itself towards the use of effective media or teaching and learning aids but also positions itself as a medium that can motivate students to learn both independently and in groups (Sabbagh, 2013). The massive development of information and communication technology has led to changes in the habits in all aspects of human life, including in learning activities (Rahmatullah et al., 2022). In the era of the Industrial Revolution 4.0, innovations occur in every human activity, including in conventional learning processes that transform into the 21<sup>st</sup> century learning with the use of information and communication technology (Oke & Fernandes, 2020). Changes in competencies are also one of the demands in the world of work which therefore require schools to be capable of preparing their students with the soft skills needed for life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, including communicating, critical thinking, creative thinking, and collaborating (Erdoğan, 2019). The concept of 21<sup>st</sup> century learning is also oriented towards students' active participation in the learning process where they construct new

knowledge through meaningful activities, such as sharing experiences and information with classmates (Vlada & Adascalitei, 2014). However, the English learning, especially learning English writing skills in high schools, in the city of Palu has yet to show maximum results to master the 21<sup>st</sup> century skills. There are some issues associated with the nonoptimal implementation of the learning process, especially in developing the skills to write English analytical exposition texts, from the perspective of both the teacher's teaching and the students themselves.

Several preliminary field studies found some problems in the learning strategies for developing writing skills as (1) students are required to complete individual writing assignments, making interaction and communication between students and teachers rarely established. The research results revealed that one of the challenges and difficulties faced by students in writing together in groups was the lack of communication within the groups (Alhassan et al., 2022). The data from the questionnaire showed that approximately 90% of the students stated that they studied and worked individually. This indicates that students are not used to working collaboratively to complete writing assignments, and they have inadequate experience of collaborative work to solve problems. Consequently, students face difficulties in the writing process. The questionnaire data showed that about 73% of the total 35 students stated that they had difficulty completing individual writing assignments. Meanwhile, (2) the teaching strategy still focuses on teacher-centered learning, in which teachers dominate the learning process as they tend to explain the concepts of writing various texts but give students little time to practice writing. The teaching and learning process dominated by teachers makes learning boring for students (Graciani Hidajat et al., 2020). Such a statement implies that if teachers dominate the time allocation in class, then students will become passive listeners, making learning boring and meaningless for students. In addition, (3) the assignments given lack variety and are limited to writing simple sentences and summarizing analytical exposition texts from the textbook. As a result, students become less active and not creative in developing their writing, especially in constructing paragraphs for analytical exposition texts.

Based on the above-mentioned description, the researchers proposed a Collaborative Blended Learning through Written Small Group Discussion (CBL through WiSGuD) model to overcome the problems. This model has been developed to improve students' active participation and writing skills, especially in writing English analytical exposition texts. In the context of this research, the writing skills are learnt using the CBL through WiSGuD model to produce a complete analytical exposition text. The skills in writing analytical exposition texts in English include the ability of students to convey factual issues briefly, clearly, and concisely in standard written English using the formal style, in which the text consists of 3-4 paragraphs with a text structure comprising the thesis statement, argumentation, and reiteration.

The CBL through WiSGuD model or collaborative blended learning through written small group discussions is an innovative and creative model that is oriented towards students' active learning and collaborative work through face-to-face (offline) or online discussions in small groups to understand learning material, make decisions, and conclude the essence of learning collaboratively (Laal et al., 2012). In this case, students construct their knowledge together with their friends to develop a joint product. According to the constructivism theory, learning is the act of producing meaning and knowledge from what a person learns (Muhajirah, 2020) and the act of building or forming knowledge, attitudes, and skills that characterize an individual.

Learning in the form of collaboration is learning to unite and combine perspectives on learning content (Zhang et al., 2023). Collaborative learning is learning to solve problems together and create products from their learning (Kirschner et al., 2018). Studies revealed some aspects associated with collaborative writing, including discussing a topic, sharing knowledge, and giving opinions (Kirschner et al., 2018). Some experts also stated that "collaborative learning is an educational approach to teaching and learning that involves groups of learners working together to solve a problem, complete a task, or create a product" (Laal et al., 2012). Collaborative learning through discussions in small groups can help students to solve problems and create a product together (Krismadinata et al., 2020).

Through such collaborative learning, it was found that students were able to perform the four main stages of collaborative learning, including forming (establishing groups and making initial agreement), storming (synchronizing ideas and setting learning goals), norming (distributing roles and responsibilities), and performing (initiating collaborative learning activities), which in this case was writing analytical exposition texts. In addition, students had been able to master the concept of writing analytical exposition texts, which was identified through their ability to recognize a) the social function, b) the generic structure, and c) the language features of analytical exposition texts. Students' mastery of such writing concept was reflected in their ability to identify and write paragraphs based on the generic structure of the text that includes thesis statement, argumentation, and reiteration. Therefore, the implementation of CBL through WiSGuD model can increase students' active participation in learning to write collaboratively and improve their ability to write analytical exposition texts.

Based on the background, this study aims to examine whether there is an influence of CBL through WiSGuD model on students' active participation and writing skills, especially in writing English analytical exposition texts.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Collaborative blended learning through written small group discussion is a collaborative learning model conducted face-to-face and online by groups of students with different backgrounds, abilities, learning styles, and personalities through written discussions to achieve mutual success (Monteiro & Morrison, 2014). This blended collaborative learning involves the active participation of students together in solving problems (Beckton et al., 2016). Collaborative learning is learning together in small groups to maximise shared learning outcomes. Collaborative learning in a small group where members or students of diverse backgrounds work together to achieve a common academic goal. Each member is active and responsible for the group (Haugland et al., 2022). In the collaborative learning process, students work together, discuss, and share ideas and opinions that aim to understand a topic and solve problems together until finally producing a new product. The purpose of collaborative learning is to create a situation where productive interaction between learners can be generated (Hermansyah & Sadapotto, 2021).

The characteristics of face-to-face and online collaborative learning are (1) participation and interaction. Students actively participate, interact, discuss, share knowledge, and give responses or feedback. The interaction/communication between members in small groups, face-to-face and online, allows the achievement of an academic support system where each group member is responsible for the learning process: sharing ideas, opinions, knowledge, and experiences on the topic of the problem to help solve problems and produce a product together. (2) Shared knowledge between teachers and students. In traditional learning, where the teacher is the centre of the learning process, the teacher is dominant in providing information or knowledge to students. However, in collaborative learning, teachers and students are the source of information. The teacher facilitates and motivates students to participate actively in learning and solve problems together. (3) Independence: independence is the group's ability to work independently, not being fully guided by the teacher, so the teacher's role is that of a mediator in the learning process. The teacher directs and helps students learn how to learn; (4) interdependence, in this case, interdependence for a common goal. Interdependence will be realised if each group member realises that one cannot succeed without involving the success of other members. The success they achieve is the success for all members of their group. Individual goals will not be achieved unless group goals are achieved. (5) Formation of heterogeneous groups. The formation of groups that have diverse backgrounds such as experience, knowledge, learning styles, and personality is necessary to enrich the knowledge of everyone, as well as to improve the quality of achieving joint results in the learning process (Chaeruman & Maudiarti, 2018; Gao et al., 2021).

## III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

The study employed a quasi-experimental design, utilizing a two-group pretest-posttest model to explore the effects of the Collaborative Blended Learning (CBL) through Written Small Group Discussions model on students' writing skills. This design facilitated a controlled comparison between conventional learning methods and the experimental CBL model. Materials used in the study included standardized tests to evaluate students' writing abilities before and after the intervention and instruments designed to gather data on student participation and engagement during the learning process (Gitadewi et al., 2022).

**Table 1.** Research Design

Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test	Class
O1	X1	O2	Control
P1	X2	P2	Experimental

Description:

O1 : Control class pre-test (Conventional Learning)

O2 : Post-test of control class (Conventional Learning)

P1 : Pre-test of experimental class (Use of CBL Through WiSGuD model)

P2 : Post-test of experimental class (Use of CBL Through WiSGuD model)

X1 : control class (Conventional Learning)

X2 : experimental class (Use of CBL Through WiSGuD model)

### Sample Preparation

The sample consisted of 70 students, divided evenly into control and experimental groups, with 35 students each. Selection was made using cluster random sampling, where classes were randomly chosen to designate the control and experimental groups. This method ensured that the sample represented a wide range of abilities and backgrounds, which is critical for the reliability and generalizability of the study outcomes.

### Experimental Setup

The experimental setup involved administering a pre-test to both groups to assess their initial writing skills. Following this, the experimental group was exposed to the CBL through WiSGuD model, which emphasized collaborative learning through written discussions. The control group continued with conventional learning methods. Both groups were then given a post-test to measure any changes in their writing skills, allowing for a comparative analysis of the effectiveness of the CBL model against traditional teaching methods (Mohamad et al., 2015; Rode & Ringel, 2019).

### Analysis of learning model implementation

An analysis of the learning model implementation was conducted to determine whether the instruments used met the standards of validity and reliability. The analysis uses SPSS software. Based on the results of the data analysis carried out, it will be known that the instrument has met the standards of validity and reliability well and the test questions have met the criteria for good questions from the aspects of validity, reliability, proportion of difficulty levels and have excellent differentiating power. Hence, the instrument and test questions are suitable for use.

### Student Learning Activities

Observations of student activity were made of the control and experimental classes before and after using the learning model. This observation determines how active students are in responding to teacher instructions, discussing, interacting with groupmates, constructing paragraphs of analytical exposition text, and presenting the results of joint writing. Through this observation, information will be obtained on the effectiveness of the learning model on students' writing skills learning. Observations of student activity in the learning process were carried out through an observation sheet consisting of several aspects of observation. The observation of student activities during the learning process involved an observation sheet that comprised several elements, as described in Table 2.

**Table 2: Aspects to Observe in Student Activities**

Aspect	Activity
Responding	The students responded to the teacher's instructions
Forming	Students are involved in the grouping activities
Discussing, Identifying constructing) &	Students actively participate in a discussion to identify collaborative group learning and blended learning.
	Students actively participate in a discussion to identify blended learning
	Students actively participate in a discussion to identify the general steps of writing and the structure of writing analytical exposition texts
	Students actively participate in a discussion to identify the general steps of writing and the structure of writing analytical exposition texts
	Students actively participate in a discussion to support each other, give suggestions and corrections, determine, and construct the thesis statement
	Students actively participate in a discussion to support each other, give suggestions and corrections, determine, and compose the argumentation 1 and 2
Presenting	Each group gives a presentation on the results of their collaborative work

(Kim et al., 2021; Webb et al., 2006)

### Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills

The data collection technique at this stage is through tests; the data obtained from this test are the results of measuring the ability of students' analytical exposition text writing skills before and after learning in classes that use the CBL Through WiSGuD model (Pre-test and Post-test) and control classes (conventional learning). The aspects assessed by the students were their understanding and writing skills in terms of the content, text organization (generic structure), vocabulary, language use (language features), and writing mechanics. The data from the pre-test and post-test were then further analyzed with descriptive statistical analysis and a MANOVA test. Before the test questions were used, a normality test was conducted to check whether the research data came from a normally distributed population. The normality test used the Saphiro-Wilk test with the help of SPSS software. (Kim et al., 2021; Rode & Ringel, 2019).

**Table 3.** Aspects Observed in Exposition Text Writing Skills

Aspects Observed	Student Activity in CBL Through WiSGuD Learning
Content	Congruence between content and purpose of the text Unity between ideas and supporting sentences; begins with a writing plan
Text Organization (Generic Structure)	Appropriateness between text structure and text content; Thesis statement, Argument 1, Argument 2 and Reiteration Congruence between ideas from one paragraph to the next.
Vocabulary	Words – Choice: the choice of words used is in accordance with the content of the topic and the content of the text
Language Use (Language Features)	Appropriateness of Grammar - and linguistic components to the text: Spelling, vocabulary - noun, adjective, spelling
Writing Mechanics	Accuracy of capitalization and punctuation

#### IV. RESULT

##### Results of the Analysis of Student Learning Activities

Observations of student learning activities were conducted for experimental and control classes before and after treatment. The aspects observed in the students' collaborative learning activities are presented in Table 4 and Table 5, which include responding, forming, discussing, identifying, constructing, and delivering activities. Furthermore, the pretest and post-test data of the experimental and control classes were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and MANOVA. The pretest and post-test data were tested, and normality and homogeneity were met. Descriptive statistical analysis was used to compare the mean score of the pretest and post-test using a collaborative blended learning model through written small group discussions and control class on student learning activities. Table 4 shows that the average post-test score of the responding aspect or the students responded to the teacher's instructions in the experimental class ( $M=70.17$ ) is higher than the average pretest score ( $M=43.31$ ). Likewise, in the control class, the average post-test score ( $M=43.31$ ) was higher than the average pretest score ( $M=43.31$ ). The second aspect analyzed in student learning activities is forming, or the students were involved in the grouping activities. Table 4 results show that the average post-test in the experimental class ( $M = 70.40$ ) is higher than the average pretest score ( $M = 42.43$ ). likewise in the control class the average post-test ( $M = 51.03$ ) is higher than the average pre-test score ( $M = 42.30$ ). The third aspect analyzed was discussing, identifying & constructing, or the students actively participated in a discussion to identify collaborative group learning. The analysis results in Table 4 also show the same trend that the average post-test score in the experimental class ( $M=90.06$ ) is higher than the average pretest score ( $M=45.17$ ). Likewise, in the control class, the average post-test score ( $M=52.43$ ) was higher than the average pretest score ( $M=43.09$ ). The last aspect analyzed in Student Learning Activities is Presenting, or the groups presented their discussion results; the results of the analysis in Table 4 also show that the average post-test score in the experimental class ( $M = 93.00$ ) is higher than the average pretest score ( $M = 44.66$ ). as well as in the control class the average post-test ( $M = 51.86$ ) is higher than the average pretest ( $M = 42.71$ ).

**Table 4: Observation Results of Student Activities**

Dependent Variables		Groups	N	Means	STD	Category
Aspect	Activity					
Responding	The students responded to the teacher's instructions	Pre-test Control	35	41.80	2.81	Poor
		Post-test Control	35	53.97	1.36	Fair
		Pre-test Experimental	35	43.31	2.25	Poor
		Post-test Experimental	35	70.17	2.63	Good
Forming	The students were involved in the grouping activities	Pre-test Control	35	42.30	2.42	Poor
		Post-test Control	35	51.03	1.98	Fair
		Pre-test Experimental	35	42.43	2.58	Poor
		Post-test Experimental	35	70.40	2.05	Good
Discussing, Identifying & constructing	The students actively participated in a discussion to identify	Pre-test Control	35	43.09	2.88	Poor
		Post-test Control	35	52.43	2.13	Fair
		Pre-test Experimental	35	45.17	1.82	Poor
		Post-test Experimental	35	90.06	1.43	Very good

	collaborative group learning.					
Presenting	The groups presented their discussion results	Pre-test Control	35	42.71	3.92	Poor
		Post-test Control	35	51.86	1.97	Fair
		Pre-test Experimental	35	44.66	2.60	Poor
		Post-test Experimental	35	93.00	1.51	Very good

The analysis of Student Learning Activities in Table 4 also shows that based on the average post-test and average pretest categories, the four aspects analyzed show an increasing category. The pretest category for the control and experimental classes showed the same results, namely poor; the average post-test category for the control and experimental classes showed different results. The average post-test of the control class included poor, but the post-test of the experimental class included good and very good. To find out the difference in the average post-test score between the control class and the experimental class on Student Learning Activities, a MANOVA analysis was carried out in Table 5.

**Table 5: The Results of Manova of Student Activities**

Dependent Variables	Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
The students responded to the teacher's instructions	4592.700	1.00	1048.20	0.00
The students were involved in the grouping activities	6566.914	1.00	1621.63	0.00
The students actively participated in a discussion to identify collaborative group learning	24778.414	1.00	7506.70	0.00
The groups presented their discussion results	21367.557	1.00	6333.10	0.00

The MANOVA results in Table 5 show a significant difference in the average score of the Responding aspect (The students responded to the teacher's instructions) ( $F = 1048.20$ ,  $sig. = 0.00$ ) between the control and experimental classes. Table 5 also shows a significant difference in the average score of the Forming aspect, or the students involved in the grouping activities ( $F = 1621.63$ ,  $sig. = 0.00$ ) between the control and experimental classes. Table 5 also shows a significant difference in the average score of Discussing, Identifying & constructing aspects ( $F = 1621.63$ ,  $sig. = 0.00$ ) between the control class and the experimental class. Likewise, the Presenting aspect or the groups' discussion results showed a significant difference between the control and experimental classes ( $F = 6333.10$ ,  $sig. = 0.00$ ).

Significant differences in all aspects analyzed between the control class and the class that applied the Collaborative Blended Learning through Written Small Group Discussion learning model on the post-test score showed that students were very active in participating in small group discussion activities to identify together the concept of analytical exposition text, writing steps in general; constructing paragraphs starting from thesis statement, argumentation and reiteration to produce a complete analytical exposition text, and presenting it in groups (Morton et al., 2016).

The good category in the percentage of student learning activities is also evidence that students are active in responding to teacher instructions, forming groups, discussing the concept of group learning, collaborative learning and blended learning. This shows that collaborative learning through small group discussion allows the involvement of all members to complete the task together. Small group discussions provide greater opportunities for students to participate in communicating and sharing ideas with their group mates (Bliss & Lawrence, 2009). Small group discussions also allow for intense interaction between groupmates to construct broader knowledge together (Puntambekar et al., 2023)

A comparative analysis with existing literature suggests that the observed improvements in student activities are in line with findings from similar educational interventions focusing on collaborative and blended learning environments. Studies have been conducted by several researchers that emphasize the important role of collaborative environments in improving student engagement and learning outcomes, especially in complex skill areas such as writing. These studies confirmed that active collaboration enhances skill acquisition and improves student interaction and productivity during learning tasks, reflecting the improvements noted in CBL through the WiSGuD model (Pedler et al., 2020; Xu et al., 2020).

The findings from this study underscore the importance of integrating collaborative learning strategies in teaching complex skills such as analytical exposition text writing in English. The marked improvement in students' engagement and ability to construct well-formulated arguments and texts as a result of using CBL through the WiSGuD model demonstrates the efficacy of this pedagogical approach. Scientifically, it supports constructivist theory, which advocates learning as an active and contextualized process of

constructing knowledge through interaction. Practically, the success of this model provides a scalable strategy for educators aiming to improve students' critical thinking and writing skills, which are crucial for their future academic and professional lives. Moreover, using digital tools such as Virtual digital boards to facilitate discussion and feedback emphasizes the role of technology in modernizing and improving educational practices, making learning more accessible and aligned with today's digital reality.

### Results of the Analysis of Exposition Text Writing Skills

Observations of exposition text writing skills were. The aspects assessed by the students were their understanding and writing skills in terms of the content, text organization (generic structure), vocabulary, language use (language features), and writing mechanics. Furthermore, the pre-test and post-test data of the experimental and control classes were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and MANOVA. The pretest data and post-test data have also met normality and homogeneity. Descriptive statistical analysis compared the average pretest and post-test scores of Collaborative Blended Learning through Written Small Group Discussion and control classes on Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills. Table 6 shows that the experimental class's average post-test Content sentence score (M=79.40) is higher than the average pretest score (M=44.37). Likewise, in the control class, the average score of post-tests (M=50.06) of the experimental class was higher than that of the pre-test (M=42.17). The second variable analyzed in Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills is Text Organization (Generic Structure). The results in Table 6 show that the average post-test score in the experimental class (M=76.14) is higher than in the pre-test class (M=45.49). Likewise, in the control class, the average post-test (M=51.03) is higher than the average pre-test (M=42.30). The third variable analyzed was Vocabulary. The results of the analysis in Table 7 also show the same trend. The average post-test score in the experimental class (M=78.09) is higher than that of the pretest class (M=44.89). Likewise, in the control class, the average post-test score (M=52.89) is higher than the average pre-test score (M=41.91). The fourth variable analyzed in Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills is Presenting Language Use or Language Features; the results of the analysis in Table 6 also show that the average post-test score in the experimental class (M = 79.31) is higher than the average score of the pretest class (M = 44.74). as well as in the control class the average post-test score (M = 53.49) is higher than the average pre-test score (M = 41.54). The last variable analyzed on Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills is Writing Mechanics; the results of the analysis in Table 6 also show the same results: the average post-test score in the experimental class (M = 79.37) is higher than the average pretest score (M = 45.69). as well as in the control class the average post-test score (M = 53.17) is higher than the average pre-test score (M = 42.17).

**Table 6: Observation Results of Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills**

Dependent Variables	Groups	N	Means	STD	Category
Content	Pre-test Control	35	42.17	1.76	Poor
	Post-test Control	35	50.06	2.29	Fair
	Pre-test Experimental	35	44.37	1.57	Poor
	Post-test Experimental	35	79.40	2.24	Good
Text Organization (Generic Structure)	Pre-test Control	35	42.86	1.80	Poor
	Post-test Control	35	52.94	3.28	Fair
	Pre-test Experimental	35	45.49	1.31	Poor
	Post-test Experimental	35	76.14	3.06	Good
Vocabulary	Pre-test Control	35	41.91	3.25	Poor
	Post-test Control	35	52.89	3.60	Fair
	Pre-test Experimental	35	44.89	1.83	Poor
	Post-test Experimental	35	78.09	2.84	Good
Language Use (Language Features)	Pre-test Control	35	41.54	1.87	Poor
	Post-test Control	35	53.49	3.39	Fair
	Pre-test Experimental	35	44.74	1.74	Poor
	Post-test Experimental	35	79.31	2.53	Good
Writing Mechanics	Pre-test Control	35	42.17	3.01	Poor
	Post-test Control	35	53.17	1.81	Fair
	Pre-test Experimental	35	45.69	1.73	Poor
	Post-test Experimental	35	79.37	2.52	Good

The analysis results on Analytical Exposition Text Writing Skills in Table 6 also show that the five variables analysed show different categories based on the average post-test and average pretest categories. The pretest category for the control and experimental classes shows the same poor result. In contrast, the average post-test category for the control and experimental classes shows different results. The average post-test scores of the control class were all in the poor category, but the post-test of the experimental

class was good. To find out the difference in the average post-test results of the control class and the experimental class on the Exposition Text Writing Skills, a MANOVA analysis was carried out in Table 7.

**Table 7: The Results of Manova of Exposition Text Writing Skills**

Dependent Variables	Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Content	15067.557	1	2941.820	0.000
Text Organization (Generic Structure)	9419.200	1	936.177	0.000
Vocabulary	11113.200	1	1055.023	0.000
Language Use (Language Features)	11674.514	1	1305.089	0.000
Writing Mechanics	12012.700	1	2496.963	0.000

The Manova results in Table 7 show a significant difference in the average score of the sentence content aspect ( $F = 15067.557$ , sig. = 0.00) between the control and experimental classes. Table 7 also shows that the sentence's Text Organization (Generic Structure) variable has a significant difference between the average score of the experimental class and the control class ( $F = 936.177$ , sig. = 0.00). Table 8 also shows a substantial difference in the average score of the Vocabulary variable ( $F = 1055.023$ , sig. = 0.00) between the control and experimental classes. Likewise, the Language Use (Language Features) variable shows a significant difference between the control and experimental classes ( $F = 6333.10$ , sig. = 0.00). The writing mechanics variable also has a significantly different average score between the experimental and control classes ( $F = 2496.963$ , sig. = 0.00).

Significant differences in all variables analyzed between the control class and the class that applied the Collaborative Blended Learning through Written Small Group Discussion (experimental) learning model on the post-test score show that students are very active in participating in small group discussion activities can bring up new ideas of students in writing English, especially in terms of the content of sentences made by students, text organization (Generic Structure) used, the amount of Vocabulary used, Language Use (Language Features) in the sentences made and Writing Mechanics of the sentences. This aligns with Mahawan and Langprayoo's (2020) research, which found that students' English communication skills learning achievement after using collaborative learning approaches and Blended Learning was higher than before using these approaches (Mahawan & Langprayoon, 2020).

The findings align with existing educational research emphasizing the benefits of collaborative learning in writing skills development. According to Wahab et al. (2023), enhancements in students' writing abilities, particularly in expressing ideas through analytical exposition texts, are notably linked to the structured and interactive learning setups provided by collaborative models. Additionally, Van Leeuwen & Janssen (2019) and Le et al. (2018) support the idea that collaborative learning strategies facilitate easier and more effective writing assignments, as students benefit from peer interactions and shared knowledge within small groups. These interactions improve content creation and text structuring and enhance vocabulary usage and adherence to language norms, as collaborative learning allows for real-time feedback and iterative refinement of text (Le et al., 2018; Van Leeuwen & Janssen, 2019).

The scientific implications of these findings are significant as they contribute to the body of evidence supporting collaborative learning's effectiveness in enhancing complex skill sets like writing. This study extends the understanding of how structured group interactions and peer-to-peer learning can directly impact students' ability to produce coherent and structured written work, reinforcing theories of social constructivism, which advocate for learning as a socially mediated activity. Practically, these results underscore the potential for educational frameworks to integrate collaborative writing assignments more effectively, particularly in curricula aimed at improving language skills. The ability of students to engage in small group discussions and collaboratively construct texts is a crucial skill in both academic and professional settings. Moreover, the positive outcomes observed from such learning strategies suggest that educators should consider more nuanced and interactive approaches to teaching writing, moving beyond traditional lecture-based methodologies to embrace more collaborative, student-centred learning experiences.

Overall, the enhanced writing skills observed in this study highlight the effectiveness of the collaborative learning model and suggest a viable pathway for educators aiming to foster deeper linguistic competence and critical thinking among students through active participation and mutual support in learning environments.

The findings from Table 8 provide valuable insights into the practical applications of collaborative learning models in teaching writing. Scientifically, these results contribute to understanding how social interactions within small groups can enhance cognitive processes involved in writing, particularly in structuring arguments and using language effectively. This supports existing theories in educational psychology that posit learning as a social activity where peer interactions play a crucial role in students' cognitive development.



Practically, the success of the collaborative learning strategy in improving writing skills suggests a model that can be replicated in various educational settings to enhance student's writing abilities, particularly in senior high school education and professional training environments. The ability to write well-structured and coherent texts is a critical skill in academic and professional contexts, making the findings particularly relevant for curriculum developers and educators seeking to enhance these skills in students.

Moreover, the emphasis on group collaboration in learning enhances academic skills and prepares students for the collaborative nature of the modern workplace, where teamwork and communication are highly valued. Thus, integrating these approaches into educational practices can help develop well-rounded individuals equipped with both the hard writing skills and the soft skills of teamwork and communication.

## CONCLUSION

This study rigorously examined the impact of a Collaborative Blended Learning model through Written Small Group Discussions (CBL through WiSGuD) on students' analytical exposition text writing skills. The results, derived from a MANOVA analysis, clearly demonstrated significant improvements in various aspects of writing, including content, text organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. These findings substantiate the hypothesis that collaborative learning environments significantly enhance students' ability to articulate their thoughts, structure arguments, and utilize language effectively.

The practical implications of these findings are profound. Educators and curriculum developers are encouraged to integrate collaborative learning strategies into their instructional models to enhance not only the writing skills of their students but also their collaborative and communicative competencies. Such skills are indispensable in both academic settings and the professional world, highlighting the relevance of this study beyond the classroom. Moreover, this research contributes to the academic literature by affirming the effectiveness of collaborative learning in improving writing skills, a core area of many educational curriculums. It also supports the theoretical framework advocating for educational environments that foster active learning and student interaction as means to engage and educate more effectively. In conclusion, the CBL through the WiSGuD model has proven to enhance students' writing abilities and equip them with the critical skills necessary for successful collaboration and communication in diverse settings. Future research could explore the long-term impacts of such models on student performance across different disciplines and educational levels, potentially guiding significant shifts in educational practices and policies.

## REFERENCES

1. Alhassan, A., Bora, S. F., & Abdalla, Y. A. (2022). Collaboration with EAP teachers in English-medium instruction contexts in higher education: Content lecturer perspectives. *TESOL Journal*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.610>
2. Beckton, D., Brien, D. L., & Sturm, U. (2016). From reluctant online contributor to mentor: Facilitating student peer-to-peer mentoring online. *M/C Journal*, 9(2).
3. Bliss, C. A., & Lawrence, B. (2009). Is the whole greater than the sum of its parts? A comparison of small group and whole class discussion board activity in online courses. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 13(4).
4. Chaeruman, U. A., & Maudiarti, S. (2018). Quadrant of Blended Learning: a Proposed Conceptual Model for Designing Effective Blended Learning. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Inovatif*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.21009/jpi.011.01>
5. Erdoğan, V. (2019). Integrating 4C skills of 21st century into 4 language skills in EFL classes. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(11), 113–124.
6. Gao, S., Zheng, H., Wu, F., & Liu, J. (2021). Evaluation of Individual Contribution in Blended Collaborative Learning. *Journal of Educational Technology Development and Exchange*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.18785/jetde.1402.05>
7. Gitadewi, A. J., Prabowo, Supardi, Z. A. I., & Maryuni, W. (2022). Student's Concept Understanding and Motivation to Learn Through Flipped Classroom Learning Integrated with Nested Model. *Studies in Learning and Teaching*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.46627/silet.v3i1.105>
8. Graciani Hidajat, H., Hanurawan, F., Chusniyah, T., & Rahmawati, H. (2020). Why I'm Bored in Learning? Exploration of Students' Academic Motivation. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(3), 119–136.
9. Haugland, M. J., Rosenberg, I., & Aasekjær, K. (2022). Collaborative learning in small groups in an online course – a case study. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03232-x>
10. Hermansyah, S., & Sadapotto, A. (2021). Interplay of writing skill and inquiry-based learning strategy in EFL classroom. *UAD TEFL International Conference*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.12928/utic.v2.5765.2019>
11. Kim, K., Bretz, F., Cheung, Y. K. K., & Hampson, L. V. (2021). *Handbook of statistical methods for randomized controlled trials*. CRC Press.

12. Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., Kirschner, F., & Zambrano R, J. (2018). From cognitive load theory to collaborative cognitive load theory. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 13, 213–233.
13. Krismadinata, U. V., Jalinus, N., Rizal, F., Sukardi, P. S., Ramadhani, D., Lubis, A. L., Friadi, J., Arifin, A. S. R., & Novaliendry, D. (2020). Blended learning as instructional model in vocational education: literature review. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(11B), 5801–5815.
14. Laal, M., Laal, M., & Kermanshahi, Z. K. (2012). 21st century learning; learning in collaboration. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, 1696–1701.
15. Le, H., Janssen, J., & Wubbels, T. (2018). Collaborative learning practices: teacher and student perceived obstacles to effective student collaboration. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(1), 103–122.
16. Mahawan, K., & Langprayoon, P. (2020). The effect of blended learning with collaborative learning upon English communication skills of English teaching program students. *2020 5th International STEM Education Conference (ISTEM-Ed)*, 55–58.
17. Mohamad, M. M., Sulaiman, N. L., Sern, L. C., & Salleh, K. M. (2015). Measuring the validity and reliability of research instruments. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 204, 164–171.
18. Monteiro, E., & Morrison, K. (2014). Challenges for collaborative blended learning in undergraduate students. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2014.997126>
19. Morton, C. E., Saleh, S. N., Smith, S. F., Hemani, A., Ameen, A., Bennie, T. D., & Toro-Troconis, M. (2016). Blended learning: How can we optimise undergraduate student engagement? *BMC Medical Education*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0716-z>
20. Muhajirah, M. (2020). Basic of learning theory:(behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism, and humanism). *International Journal of Asian Education*, 1(1), 37–42.
21. Oke, A., & Fernandes, F. A. P. (2020). Innovations in teaching and learning: Exploring the perceptions of the education sector on the 4th industrial revolution (4IR). *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(2), 31.
22. Pedler, M., Hudson, S., & Yeigh, T. (2020). The teachers' role in student engagement: A review. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(3). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2020v45n3.4>
23. Puntambekar, S., Gnesdilow, D., & Yavuz, S. (2023). Understanding the effect of differences in prior knowledge on middle school students' collaborative interactions and learning. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-023-09405-0>
24. Rahmatullah, A. S., Mulyasa, E., Syahrani, S., Pongpalilu, F., & Putri, R. E. (2022). Digital era 4.0: The contribution to education and student psychology. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 6(S3), 89–107.
25. Rode, J. B., & Ringel, M. M. (2019). Statistical software output in the classroom: A comparison of R and SPSS. *Teaching of Psychology*, 46(4), 319–327.
26. Sabbagh, M. A. (2013). Application of case discussions to improve anatomy learning in Syria. *Avicenna Journal of Medicine*, 03(04). <https://doi.org/10.4103/2231-0770.120499>
27. Syafrudin, M., Alfian, G., Fitriyani, N. L., & Rhee, J. (2018). Performance analysis of IoT-based sensor, big data processing, and machine learning model for real-time monitoring system in automotive manufacturing. *Sensors (Switzerland)*, 18(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/s18092946>
28. Van Leeuwen, A., & Janssen, J. (2019). A systematic review of teacher guidance during collaborative learning in primary and secondary education. *Educational Research Review*, 27, 71–89.
29. Vlada, M., & Adascalitei, A. (2014). Computers: As Digital Facilities for Scientific Research and As Tools for Enhanced Learning In Higher Education. *10th International Conference ELearning and Software for Education*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.12753/2066-026x-14-138>
30. Webb, N. M., Shavelson, R. J., & Haertel, E. H. (2006). 4 reliability coefficients and generalizability theory. *Handbook of Statistics*, 26, 81–124.
31. Xu, B., Chen, N. S., & Chen, G. (2020). Effects of teacher role on student engagement in WeChat-Based online discussion learning. *Computers and Education*, 157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103956>
32. Zhang, R., Shi, J., & Zhang, J. (2023). Research on the Quality of Collaboration in Project-Based Learning Based on Group Awareness. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(15). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15151901>