

THE COLLABORATIVE LEARNING ROLE TOWARD HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENTS' LEARNING EXPERIENCE

Didik Rinan Sumekto

English Education Department,
Widya Dharma University, Klaten, Indonesia

Abstract: *This study focused on exploring the Higher Education students' learning experience on collaborative learning. The population was 165 English Education Department students of Tidar University and Widya Dharma University. The method used simple random sampling which involved 86 respondents. Data was collected by means of questionnaire using 5-scaled Likert rating to obtain their learning experience and quantitatively examined through the descriptive statistics.*

The findings showed that the highest response toward each category in the perception referred to questionnaire on the instruction evaluation and reflection toward assessment need was (1) 41.9% or 36 respondents on sometimes toward the lecturer's instruction method; 44.2% or 38 respondents on seldom toward the learning assessment process; 48.2 or 41 respondents on seldom toward the lecturer's assessment mechanism; and 53.5% or 46 respondents on sometimes toward the lecturer's instruction evaluation and reflection; and (2) questionnaire on the collaborative learning evaluation showed that there were 47.4% or 45 respondents on sometimes toward group's performance goals; 48.4% or 46 respondents on seldom toward interpersonal competence; 48.4% or 46 respondents on frequent toward group maintenance; and 41.1% or 39 respondents on sometimes toward classroom work style emphasizing the collaborative learning evaluation.

Keywords: *Collaboration, collaborative learning, learning experience.*

Introduction

Collaborative learning was widely defined as a technique designed to make learning a lively and successful process. When engaging in collaborative learning practices, lecturer(s) was positioned as a guide to the learners towards the attainment of skills, such as initiating, managing, emphasizing, and achieving the learning process and progress (Brown, 2008), since collaborative learning became the interdependence of the individuals where learners shared ideas and reached a conclusion or produced a product (Robert, 2003). Hence, the constructive purposes of collaborative learning should ensure each member of a group had a role, so that all participants were actively engaged with an equal opportunity as well among participants (Osterholt and Barratt, 2010).

In this context, collaborative learning activities should require the reorganization of the material to be learned and possibly contributes to cognitive conflict that can lead to restructuring. The activities involved mixed-ability groups tend to favour high- and low-ability participants in

the meetings (Gilles and Ashman, 2003). They performed equally well in all groups and when working individually as well (Webb et al, 1998; Gilles and Ashman, 2003). In the collaborative classroom, on the other hand, lecturer was also required to understand its implementation including the class preparation as the principal guiding among the participants (Osterholt and Barratt, 2010). The lecturer's attention was drawn to monitoring the participants, which could disrupt the instruction and learning activities in the small group by requiring an attentive, responsive lecturer and participants during the process (Strickland, Ganske, and Monroe, 2006).

Collaborative learning supported the instructional use of small groups or teams where peer interaction plays a key role in learning. Team learning increased students' involvement, improved problem-solving and communication skills, and enhances their achievement (Yazici, 2005). Interaction with peers could result in the development of cognitive or intellectual skills or to an increase in knowledge and understanding among the members (Falchikov, 2001). A simple and reliable collaboration system could be designed to select the participants for those who might not be able to serve the purpose of providing valid diagnosis of collaborative learning difficulties (Lambert and Lines, 2000). They were responsible for one another's learning processes as well as their own and the success of one learner helped other learners to be successful in promoting critical thinking (Gokhale, 1995) and it was highly expected that collaborative learning could help learners generally to reduce the polarisation within the instruction system, to the particular benefit of those higher education students who were on the edges of the system and poorly relative performance (Muijs et al, 2011) and to reduce higher education students' anxiety and improve skills and knowledge as a consequence of working in a group as the ultimate purpose to understand, achieve solution, and/ or create learning products (Delucchi, 2006).

Canagarajah (2002; Casanave, 2003; Hyland, 2003; Ferris and Hedgcock, 2005) focused on particular attention on procedures for solving problems, discovering ideas, expressing them in writing (e.g.: thematic genres), and revising emergent texts, in which writing products might take place. The lecturer might assist the process where his or her roles mostly facilitated the effective and independent learners during the learning process by designing students-students and students-lecturer participation. Another perspective was conveyed by Nayan et al (2010) that the proponents of collaborative learning believe that 'noise' inside the classes indicated that students were actively learning, as long as a lecturer set the rules and standards to be mentioned in the classes activities at the beginning of the class, the 'noise' might convey positive learning is going on.

The constructive judgement on collaborative learning concept was also shown by Dunn and Griggs (1998), where EFL learners' learning styles were the use of small-group as opposed to large-group instruction. An experiment within team learning was to introduce difficult new information, circle of knowledge to reinforce it, brainstorming to develop problem-solving skills, and case studies for relevant reasons and to provide variety and interest. As shown in Figure 1,

indicated that collaborative learning could be effectively applied during the meetings. The participants agreed that collaborative learning activities promoted learners' academic progress; improved learners' interaction skills; encouraged learners' intrinsic motivation; created a collaborative learning environment; be appropriate for the use with small groups; and would be competitive toward participants' learning styles toughness.

Nevertheless, non-native students of English education sometimes have difficulty in transferring ideas from their native language (e.g.: Indonesian and/or other mother tongues) into the target language (e.g.: English) when they collaborated into genre-based instruction context. But, a lecturer might ask participants to produce a text or composition on the basis of purpose, organization and audience (Paltridge, 2001; Widodo, 2006). Both lecturer and students could develop texts together and share the responsibility for a certain performance till the students had the sufficient knowledge and skills (Widodo, 2006). This condition was strengthened that the students' preferred learning by sharing all supporting aspects with peers and lecturer. They were willing to participate and to seek guidance, structure and control in learning the course material. Collaborative role play, discussions, and projects had been successful instructional tools in enhancing critical thinking, communication and implementation skills for team building (Yazici, 2005).

Hence, the instruction strategies might model and explicitly teach the types of strategies used or might predict routines where writing processes such as planning and revising were expected and strengthened (Negari, 2011), where the lecturer's best methods were flexibility and support in responding to the specific instructional contexts, first or second language and experience, writing purposes, and target writing communities, and providing extensive encouragement in the form of meaningful contexts, peer involvement, prior texts, useful feedback and guidance in the writing process (Hyland, 2003). These theoretical approaches were on a group of learners who are possibly able to accomplish tasks. They use team members' morphological knowledge and produced more accurate text working together among group members toward the same goal have played a significant role in the overall performance of the learners. Additionally, participants gain the improved accuracy observed among collaborative writing groups which may have been due to the increased motivation to focus on grammatical accuracy, as well as to engage each learner in collaborative groups to participate to the course activities and in the multi-revision process (Ansari, 2012).

However, even in the genre-based approach instruction context, non-native English learners sometimes have difficulties in transferring ideas from their native language (e.g.: Indonesian and/or other mother tongues) into the target language (e.g.: English). By using genre-based approach, a writing lecturer might be required to ask participants to produce a text or composition on the basis of purpose, organization and audience (Paltridge, 2001; Widodo, 2006). Both lecturer and students could develop texts together and share the responsibility for a certain

performance till the students had the sufficient knowledge and skills (Widodo, 2006). Because writing process involves creating a text that a learner assumes the readers will recognise and expect and genre-based writing breaks down a top to down procedure, starting with texts, which first considers how a text is structured and organised at the level of the whole text in relation to its purpose, audience and message before structuring, organizing, and coding the paragraphs and sentences (Hyland, 2008). To support the structure and organization, herein, seven genre-based writing themes commonly considered as part of the undergraduate student curriculum to meet a standard qualification on writing as shown in table 1.

Table 1
Commonly Genre-based Writing Instructed (Ahn, 2012)

Genre	Social Purpose	Social Purpose
<i>Recount</i>	to reconstruct past experiences by retelling events in original sequence	Personal letters, police reports, insurance claims, incident reports
<i>Procedure</i>	to show how something is done	Instruction manuals, science, reports, cookbooks
<i>Narrative</i>	to entertain and instruct via reflection on experience	Novels, short stories
<i>Report</i>	to present factual information, usually by classifying things and then describing their characteristics	Brochures, government and business reports
<i>Description</i>	to give an account of imagined or factual events	Travel brochures, novels, product details
<i>Explanation</i>	to give reasons for a state of affairs or a judgment	News reports, textbooks
<i>Exposition</i>	to give arguments for why a thesis has been proposed	Editorials, essays, commentaries

Research questions

The primary research questions of the study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. How do higher education students perceive genre-based writing implementation engaged in the collaborative learning classroom?
2. What factors may contribute to the collaborative learning context among the students?

Research objectives

Due to the higher education students' genre-based writing meetings, they were engaged in small groups to work together on particular types of tasks which had not successfully been examined in collaborative learning scheme before. Thus, these research objectives would (1) reveal the students' perceptions on collaborative learning process during the genre-based writing meetings as a learning experience, and (2) analyze the learning organization that might facilitate or lead to the collaborative learning context among higher education students.

Methodology

A questionnaire was used to quantify higher education students' learning experience on instruction evaluation and reflection towards assessment need and collaborative learning evaluation referring to the collaborative learning method. This quantitative survey was to investigate the perceptions from the students of English education department, Tidar University of Magelang and Widya Dharma University of Klaten who had conducted several genre-based writing themes, such as recount, narrative, analytical exposition, and hortatory exposition paragraph in the running semester.

Population and sample

Both Tidar University of Magelang and Widya Dharma University of Klaten were chosen as the population for this study. The participants were 108 from Tidar University of Magelang and 57 from Widya Dharma University of Klaten; they were equal to 165. From the population data provided, the number of sample size (N) obtained in this research was 86 or 52% respondents and 95 or 57% respondents out of 165 population and had taken from simple random sampling. McMillan and Schumacher (2001) stated that the sample size determination must impact to the research design, hypothesis, benefits, number of variables focused, data collection method, and findings.

Procedure

First, questionnaire consisted of sixteen closed questions rated on a five-point's Likert scale, starting from 1 to 5 was provided to all respondents who had completely conducted some genre-based writing themes. Throughout the survey the participants were asked to cross one of the numbers that corresponded to the notion of frequency (Dunn et al, 2004). The questionnaires theme covered *instruction*, *students' perception toward learning assessment*, and *students' involvement during assessment*. This questionnaire was adopted from Nitko's *Educational Assessment of Students (2nd ed.)* in 1996, where there were three parts of the instruments describing specifically about the lecturer's instruction methods, particularly involving interaction between students and lecturer during the process; learning assessment conducted in the class; and students' involvement in genre-based writing assessment themes, particularly when collaborative learning was adopted during the learning process. Then, second questionnaire described seventeen closed questions. The questionnaire covered *group's performance goals*, *interpersonal*

competence, group maintenance, and classroom work which was developed from Nitko's *Educational Assessment of Students (2nd ed.)* in 1996; Ferris and Hedgcock's *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice (2nd ed.)* in 2005. This questionnaire explained about higher education students' collaborative learning experience which had mainly supported participants' contribution during the activities included doing tasks or assignments; and expectation on collaborative learning works.

Data Collection

This research data was collected from the genre-based writing meetings with the certain themes, such as recount, narrative, analytical exposition, and hortatory exposition paragraph instructionally adopted from the syllabus, either English Education Department, Tidar University of Magelang or Widya Dharma University of Klaten engaged in the first semester of academic year 2012/2013. Data was collected from 4 different classes from both universities' students randomly.

Data Analysis

Data was collected from the returned quantitative surveys, descriptive, and inferential statistics included item frequency and mean. Firstly, there would be 16 statements and 8 questions attached, secondly it was continued by 19 statements attached for data analysis. All data was quantitatively examined by statistical descriptive testing to reveal the mean, frequencies in numeric and percentage categorization, and comparison analysis from the *instruction, students' perception toward learning assessment, and students' involvement during assessment and group's performance goals, interpersonal competence, group maintenance, and classroom work* through the SPSS program.

Findings

Data analysis underlined the descriptive analysis on the higher education students of English education undergraduate program at Tidar University of Magelang and Widya Dharma University of Klaten which based on the instruction evaluation and reflection toward collaborative need identification questionnaire. Table 2 showed survey the students' learning experience on instruction evaluation and reflection toward collaboration need identification which consisted of instruction, perception toward learning assessment, and students' involvement during assessment instrument within providing the highest score achieved through each instrument. In accordance with the descriptive analysis presented on the table, there was noted that 41.9% or 36 respondents showed their learning experience on *sometimes* category for instruction instrument, 44.2% or 38 respondents answering *seldom* category for perception toward learning assessment instrument. Meanwhile, there were 48.2% or 41 respondents determining their learning experience on *sometimes* category for students' involvement during assessment instrument. The last perception concerned about *always* category, but there was no respondent revealing his or her learning experience on neither instruction, perception toward

learning assessment nor students' involvement during assessment instrument during the genre-based learning meetings.

Table: 2
Higher Education Students' Learning Experience on Instruction
Evaluation and Reflection toward Collaboration Need Identification

Instrument	Category	Participants		Total
		Tidar University	Widya Dharma University	
Instruction	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	10 (22.2%)	12 (29.3%)	22 (25.6%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	16 (35.6%)	20 (48.8%)	36 (41.9%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	18 (40%)	9 (22.0%)	27 (31.4%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Perception toward learning assessment	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.9%)	3 (3.5%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	18 (40%)	20 (48.8%)	38 (44.2%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	19 (42.2%)	16 (39.0%)	35 (40.7%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	7 (15.6%)	3 (7.3%)	10 (11.6%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Student's involvement during assessment	<i>Never</i>	4 (9.1%)	3 (7.3%)	7 (8.2%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	9 (20.5%)	22 (53.7%)	31 (36.5%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	28 (63.6%)	13 (31.7%)	41 (48.2%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	3 (6.8%)	3 (7.3%)	6 (7.1%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total		100%	100%	100%

Another finding on the descriptive analysis depicted in table 3 was summarized survey the students' learning on collaborative learning evaluation which was presented in groups' performance goals, interpersonal competence, group maintenance, and classroom work instrument within the highest score achieved in its each category. According to the analysis presented on the table, there was in percentage illustrated that 47.4% or 45 respondents answering *sometimes* category for groups' performance goals. It was worthwhile to note that there were 48.4% or 56 respondents providing in *seldom* category for interpersonal competence instrument. Meanwhile, group maintenance instrument noted that there were 48.4% or 46 respondents choosing *frequent* category to perceive their learning experience on collaborative learning evaluation. Another notable result was that displaying *sometimes* category noted on classroom work. There were 41.1% or 39 respondents presenting their learning experience. The last but not least, herein *always* category was the only category determined by the respondents as their collaborative learning evaluation within group maintenance instrument. There were 25.3% or 24 respondents revealing their learning experience. Therefore, groups' performance goals, interpersonal competence, and classroom work instrument did not obtain responses among the participants in *always* category during the collaborative genre-based learning evaluation.

Table: 3
Higher Education Students' Learning Experience on Collaborative Learning Evaluation

Instrument	Category	Participants		Total
		Tidar University	Widya Dharma University	
Group's performance goals	<i>Never</i>	2 (4.7%)	9 (17.3%)	11 (11.6%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	11 (25.6%)	14 (26.9%)	25 (26.3%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	28 (65.1%)	17 (32.7%)	45 (47.4%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	2 (4.7%)	12 (23.1%)	14 (14.7%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Interpersonal competence	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.3%)	4 (7.7%)	5 (5.3%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	18 (41.9%)	28 (53.8%)	46 (48.4%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	17 (39.5%)	18 (34.6%)	35 (37.8%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	7 (16.3%)	2 (3.8%)	9 (9.5%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Group maintenance	<i>Never</i>	1 (2.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.1%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	3 (7.0%)	9 (17.3%)	12 (12.6%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	4 (9.3%)	8 (15.4%)	12 (12.6%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	24 (55.8%)	22 (42.3%)	46 (48.4%)
	<i>Always</i>	11 (25.6%)	13 (25.0%)	24 (25.3%)
Classroom work	<i>Never</i>	2 (4.7%)	1 (1.9%)	3 (3.2%)
	<i>Seldom</i>	11 (25.6%)	20 (38.5%)	31 (32.6%)
	<i>Sometimes</i>	21 (48.8%)	18 (34.6%)	39 (41.1%)
	<i>Frequent</i>	9 (20.9%)	25.0%	22 (23.2%)
	<i>Always</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total		100%	100%	100%

Moreover, the discussion attempted to reveal the instruction evaluation and reflection toward collaboration need identification and collaborative learning evaluation aspects during the students' genre-based writing meetings. First, the descriptive analysis was based on the instruction evaluation and reflection toward collaborative need identification questionnaire. As shown in table 4, there were three profiles highlighting the instruction, perception toward learning assessment, and students' involvement during assessment instrument. According to the table, the highest mean gained by the respondents was *instruction* with 3.8496. This instrument was especially influenced by convenience and transparency shown in the learning atmosphere; equal opportunity given to access and involve during the learning activities; relevant quiz or assignment drilled to improve the writing competence; the learning quality was well-constructed; and collaboration works among the participants' learning activity. Another notable result on the second level was that reflecting *perception toward learning assessment* with the gained mean was 3.5855. This instrument was reported by criteria on the basis of assessment relationship with the course objective, assignment, and examination; students evaluation needs facilitated by the writing lecturer; students' readiness on assessment model given; non-academic affairs which supported to the assessment implementation; and students' cognitive and affective performance that should contribute to the collaborative learning circumstance. The least mean ranked on the third level was 3.5145 complying with *students' involvement during assessment*, where this instrument contributed to the participants' involvement during assessment; lecturers' intensity in engaging collaborative learning; appreciation among students during the collaborative learning involvement; students' participation to do peer assessment or evaluation; and assessment

activity's condition relating with the learning objective which had fulfilled the academic qualification. All gained mean from three instruments shown in table 4 had **significant** category.

Table: 4
Descriptive Analysis on Instruction Evaluation
and Reflection toward Collaboration Need Identification

University		Instruction	Perception toward learning assessment	Students' involvement during assessment
Students of Tidar University	Min.	2.60	2.60	2.60
	Max.	5.00	4.60	4.60
	Mean	3.9489	3.6367	3.6455
	Median	4.0000	3.6000	3.7000
	Std. Dev.	.63080	.49491	.52272
	N	45	45	45
Students of Widya Dharma University	Min.	2.67	2.50	2.33
	Max.	5.00	4.60	5.00
	Mean	3.7407	3.5293	3.3740
	Median	3.6667	3.4000	3.2000
	Std. Dev.	.65995	.54601	.64942
	N	41	41	41
Both students of Tidar and Widya Dharma University	Min.	2.60	2.50	2.33
	Max.	5.00	4.60	5.00
	Mean	3.8496	3.5855	3.5145
	Median	3.8333	3.6000	3.6000
	Std. Dev.	.64952	.51961	.59944
	N	86	86	86
Total				

Second, as illustrated in table 5, there were four profiles highlighting group's performance goals, interpersonal competence, group maintenance, and classroom work instrument. According to the table, the highest mean attained by the respondents was *group maintenance* with 3.7263. This instrument was particularly supported by some influential factors, such as peers' participation in joining collaborative works during their learning process, as well as preparing individual learning activities among the participants, meanwhile engaging collaborative works, peers also attempted to achieve their committed goals, and they responsibly attempted to do and finish their assignments outside the group's learning timetables. Another notable result on the second level was that reflecting *classroom work* with the gained mean was 3.6684. This result was provided in the basis of peers' mutual interaction with other participants while learning collaboratively and participants (peers) learning accommodation through their sense of sensitivity and appreciation to others' ideas as their learning perspectives and behavior. It was concerned to the third level when mean attainment related to *group's performance goals* as well. The mean score was 3.5447, as portrayed from peers' assistance on decision making in relevance with the group's learning necessities and their active collaboration with other participants to help the problem solving. The least mean ranked on the fourth level was 3.4632 indicating *interpersonal competence*. This instrument led to respondents' contribution on giving opportunities to work on assignments with fellow classmates and convenience working with other peers in planning and completing genre-based writing themes. When a peer worked in

small group consisting of five to six participants, she or he would concentrate to learn more, feel comfortable, and produce better work than working individually. Thus, they would have time properly to revise and give comments on other participants' genre-based writing they had collaborated in. Relating to the attained mean from four instruments shown in table 5, they had **significant** category definitely.

Table: 5
Descriptive Analysis on Collaborative Learning Evaluation

University		Group's Performance Goals	Interpersonal Competence	Group Maintenance	Classroom Work
English Education Dept., Tidar University	Min.	2.25	2.33	1.50	2.00
	Max.	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.88
	Mean	3.6047	3.6202	3.7907	3.6977
	Median	3.7500	3.6667	4.0000	3.6250
	Std. Dev.	.53238	.59797	.74986	.62454
	N	43	43	43	43
English Education Dept., Widya Dharma University	Min.	2.00	2.33	2.00	2.50
	Max.	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00
	Mean	3.4952	3.3333	3.6731	3.6442
	Median	3.5000	3.3333	3.5000	3.7500
	Std. Dev.	.76134	.60499	.86254	.63948
	N	52	52	52	52
Both Tidar and Widya Dharma University	Min.	2.00	2.33	1.50	2.00
	Max.	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
	Mean	3.5447	3.4632	3.7263	3.6684
	Median	3.5000	3.3333	4.0000	3.7500
	Std. Dev.	.66642	.61559	.81138	.62997
Total	N	95	95	95	95

Conclusion

This conclusion emphasized two major points portrayed in the collaborative learning roles. First, it relied on the *instruction, perception toward learning assessment, and students' involvement during assessment* aspect. Based on the empirical findings, there were notable facts that higher education students of English education had revealed their collaborative learning experience through the lecturer's instruction methodology which had contributed 41.9% (*seldom* category). This learning condition was considered as the impact of convenience and transparency created the learning atmosphere, equal opportunity given to access and involve during the learning activities, relevant quiz or assignment drilled to improve the writing competence, well-constructed on learning quality; and collaboration works among pre-service teachers' learning activity. Then, students' perception toward learning assessment facilitated by their lecturer while learning collaboratively contributed 44.2% (*seldom* category). The contributing reasons verified on how assessment relationship with the course objective, assignment, and examination were done; students evaluation needs facilitated by the writing lecturer, students' readiness on assessment model provided, non-academic affairs supporting toward the assessment

implementation, and cognitive and affective performance aspect that should contribute to the collaborative learning circumstance in the genre-based writing meetings. After that, students' involvement during assessment contributed 48.2% (*sometimes* category). Obviously this participation involved on lecturers' intensity in engaging collaborative learning, appreciation among the participants during the collaborative learning activities, active involvement toward peer assessment or evaluation during the genre-based writing meetings, and assessment activity's condition relating with the learning objective fulfilling the academic qualification.

Another point of view regarding with this conclusion was how some factors had positively contributed to the collaborative learning implementation among the participants. Herein, it focused on collaborative learning evaluation presenting in *groups' performance goals*, *interpersonal competence*, *group maintenance*, and *classroom work* aspect. It was remarkably considered that groups' performance goals gained 47.4% (*sometimes* category). The influencing aspects referred to peers' participation in joining collaborative works during their learning process, as well as preparing individual learning activities and engaging collaborative works, peers also attempted to achieve their committed goals, and they responsibly attempted to do and finish their assignments out of group's learning timetables accordingly. Then, interpersonal competence contributed 48.4% (*seldom* category). This condition influenced to the internal issues, such as peers' interaction with others while learning as teamwork and accommodation through their sense of sensitivity and appreciation to different ideas as they learned about perspectives and behavior. Next, group maintenance revealed 48.4% (*frequent* category), where peers' assistance on decision making in relevance with the group's learning necessities and their active collaboration with other group members to bridge and find the problem solving were suggested as important points. The last but not least, another notable finding which attained 41.1% (*sometimes* category) on classroom work within the collaborative learning evaluation.

Suggestions and Recommendations

As a learning model that emphasizes teamwork and cohesiveness, collaborative learning is gradually expected to be applied and developed toward the writing course in the undergraduate program of English Education. This learning model would be very helpful for students who have problems of competence or expertise in developing writing quality. By giving opportunities to work collaboratively with peers, feeling convenience to work with others, and solving the problems during the lesson, there would be a priority purpose in this learning model. Although we are very aware of some deficiencies found in the learning model which relate to the reluctance of some students working in a small group, time effectiveness and comprehensive process during the learning process. This learning model also needs a high and maximum role of lecturer(s) in facilitating all learning groups.

Acknowledgement

I express sincere gratitude to Professor Joel G. Bloch, Ph.D, my Sandwich-like/PKPI program advisor in College of Education & Human Ecology, The Ohio State University, who has supported insightful ideas and revisions during this early article writing.

References

- Ahn, H. 2012. Teaching writing skills based on a genre approach to L2 primary school students: An action research. *English Language Teaching*, (5) 2, 2-16.
- Ansari, D. N. 2012. The effect of collaboration on Iranian EFL learners' Writing accuracy. *International Education Studies*, (5) 2, 125-131.
- Brown, F. A. (2008). Collaborative learning in the EAP classroom: Students' perceptions. *English for Specific Purposes*, (7) 1, 1-18. Retrieved 15th October 2012, from http://www.esp-world.info/Articles_17/PDF/Collaborativelearning.pdf.
- Canagarajah, S. 2002. *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Casanave, C. P. 2003. Looking ahead to more sociopolitically oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship (But should it be called "post process"?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (12), 85-102.
- Delucchi, M. 2006. The efficacy of collaborative learning groups in an undergraduate statistics course. *College Teaching*, (54) 2, 244-248.
- Dunn, L., Morgan, C., O'Reilly., & Parry, S. 2004. *The student assessment handbook*. London: RoutledgeFalmer-Taylor & Francis Group.
- Dunn, R., & Griggs, S. A. 1998. *Multiculturalism and learning style: Teaching and counselling adolescents*. Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Falchikov, N. 2001. *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. 2005. *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice (2nd ed.)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Gilles, R. M., & Ashman, A, F. 2003. Co-operative learning: The social and intellectual outcomes of learning in groups. In Ross, J. A., & Rolheiser, C, *Student assessment practices in co-operative learning*. (pp. 119-135). London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Gokhale, A. A. 1995. Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology Education*, (7) 1, 22-30.
- Hyland, K. 2008. Genre and academic writing in the disciplines. *Language Teaching*, (41) 4, 543-562
- . 2003. Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (12), 17-29.
- Lambert, D., & Lines, D. 2000. *Understanding Assessment: Purposes, perceptions, practice*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

- Lee, I. 2012. Genre-based teaching and assessment in secondary English classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, (11) 4, 120-136.
- McCormick, C. B., & Pressley, M. 1997. *Educational psychology: Learning, instruction and assessment*. New York: Longman.
- McMillan, H. J., & Schumacher, S. 2001. *Research in education: A conceptual introduction (5th ed.)*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Muijs, D., Ainscow, M., Chapman, C., & West, M. 2011. *Collaboration and Networking in Education*. London: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.
- Nayan, S., Shafie, L. A., Mansor, M., Maesin, A., & Osman, N. 2010. The practice of collaborative learning among lecturers in Malaysia. *Management Science and Engineering*, (4) 1, 62-70.
- Negari, G. M. 2011. A study on strategy instruction and EFL learners' writing skill. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, (1) 2, 299-307.
- Nitko, A. J. 1996. *Educational assessment of students (2nd ed.)*. New Jersey: Merrill, an imprint of Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Osterholt, D. A., & Barratt, K. 2010. Ideas for practice: A collaborative look to the classroom. *Journal of Developmental Education*, (34) 2, 26-35.
- Paltridge, B. 2001. *Genre and the language learning classroom*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Roberts, T. S. 2003. Online collaborative learning: Theory and practice. In Treleaven, L., *A new taxonomy for evaluation studies of online collaborative learning* (pp. 160-180). Hershey: Idea Group Inc.
- Sullivan, P., Zhang, Y., & Zheng, F. 2012. College writing in China and America: A modest and humble conversation, with writing samples. *The Journal of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*, (64) 2, 306-331.
- Strickland, D. S., Ganske, K., & Monroe, J. K. 2006. *Supporting struggling readers and writers: Strategies for classroom intervention 3-6*. Portland: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Swami, J. A. 2008. Sensitizing ESL learners to genre. *TESL-Education Journal*, (13) 3, 1-13. Retrieved 18th May 2013, from <http://www.tesl-ej.org/ej47/a9.html>.
- Webb, N., Nemer, K. M., Chizhik, A. W., & Sugrue, B. 1998. Equity issues in collaborative group assessment: Group composition and performance. *American Educational Research Journal*, (35), 607-651.
- Widodo, H. P. 2006. Designing a genre-based lesson plan for an academic writing course. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, (5) 3, 173-199.
- Yazici, H. J. 2005. A study of collaborative learning style and team learning performance. *Education + Training*, (47) 3, 216-229.