

## EXPLORING LEGAL ENGLISH MAJOR STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES TOWARD THE PRACTICALITY OF COLLABORATIVE LEARNING IN GROUP WORK PRESENTATION ACTIVITIES

Vu Van Tuan\*, Nguyen Pham Hai Ly

Hanoi Law University

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<b>Received:</b> 20/3/2024	Collaborative learning has been applied in the educational setting and has shown that it not only offers advantages but also poses some challenges. The study aimed to examine legal English major students' viewpoints of collaborative learning in group work presentations concerning its benefits and challenges. The study involved in 81 participants from the K46 and K47 courses at Hanoi Law University during the first term of the 2023-2024 academic year. The study employed a descriptive, quantitative approach with a five-point Likert scale survey, which was constructed by the researchers. The results revealed that collaborative learning offered many benefits, such as improved teamwork, communicative and interactive skills, shared knowledge and enriched understanding, developed critical thinking and problem-solving, and better adaptability to future workplaces. Regarding the challenges, participants reported some typical problems, namely unequal participation and contribution among team members, responsibility concerns, communication difficulties, different personality traits, and learning habits. The study would benefit school administrators, legal English lecturers, students, and those who are interested in collaborative learning at the tertiary level.
<b>Revised:</b> 05/6/2024	
<b>Published:</b> 05/6/2024	
<b>KEYWORDS</b>	
Practicality	
Collaborative learning	
Group work presentation	
Higher education	
Prospective career	

## KHẢO SÁT QUAN ĐIỂM CỦA SINH VIÊN CHUYÊN TIẾNG ANH VỀ TÍNH THỰC TIỄN CỦA VIỆC HỌC CỘNG TÁC ĐỐI VỚI HOẠT ĐỘNG THUYẾT TRÌNH NHÓM

Vũ Văn Tuấn\*, Nguyễn Phạm Hải Ly

Trường Đại học Luật Hà Nội

THÔNG TIN BÀI BÁO	TÓM TẮT
<b>Ngày nhận bài:</b> 20/3/2024	Học tập hợp tác được áp dụng trong môi trường giáo dục cho thấy rằng học tập hợp tác không chỉ mang lại lợi ích mà còn có một số trở ngại nhất định. Mục đích của nghiên cứu này nhằm tìm hiểu quan điểm của sinh viên chuyên ngành tiếng Anh pháp lý về lợi ích và khó khăn của học tập hợp tác trong thuyết trình nhóm. Nghiên cứu có sự tham gia của 81 sinh viên chuyên ngành tiếng Anh pháp lý khóa K46 và K47 tại trường Đại học Luật Hà Nội trong học kỳ 1 của năm học 2023-2024. Nghiên cứu áp dụng phương pháp tiếp cận mô tả, định lượng sử dụng bảng câu hỏi thang đo Likert năm cấp độ. Kết quả cho thấy rằng học tập hợp tác mang lại nhiều lợi ích như cải thiện tinh thần hợp tác, kỹ năng giao tiếp và tương tác, chia sẻ kiến thức và hiểu biết sâu sắc hơn, phát triển kỹ năng tư duy phản biện và giải quyết vấn đề, cải thiện khả năng thích ứng với vị trí công việc trong tương lai. Đối với những khó khăn, sinh viên cho biết một số vấn đề điển hình như sự tham gia và đóng góp không đồng đều giữa các thành viên trong nhóm, sự lo ngại về trách nhiệm, trở ngại trong giao tiếp, đặc điểm tính cách và thói quen học tập khác nhau. Nghiên cứu này sẽ mang lại lợi ích cho các nhà quản lý trường học, giảng viên tiếng Anh pháp lý, sinh viên và những người quan tâm đến việc học tập hợp tác ở cấp độ giáo dục đại học.
<b>Ngày hoàn thiện:</b> 05/6/2024	
<b>Ngày đăng:</b> 05/6/2024	
<b>TỪ KHÓA</b>	
Tính thực tiễn	
Học cộng tác	
Thuyết trình nhóm	
Cấp đại học	
Công việc trong tương lai	

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34238/tnu-jst.9929>

\* Corresponding author. Email: [tuanvv@hlu.edu.vn](mailto:tuanvv@hlu.edu.vn)

## 1. Introduction

Collaborative learning (CL) is a multifaceted concept that involves a dynamic and cumulative process leading to the creation of knowledge. This knowledge becomes institutionalized through structures, rules, routines, norms, discourse, and strategies, which then inform future actions [1]-[3]. It is an evolutionary process that refines accumulative knowledge over time. The concept draws from various theoretical backgrounds, including learning theories, organization theory, sociology, and psychology, and emphasizes the importance of social interactions in shaping values and identity. In educational settings, CL often takes place within learning communities where individuals at all levels collaborate to solve problems and enhance learning opportunities. This process involves the application of new knowledge and skills directly to curricular concerns, often influenced by external mandates. Various methods, such as dialogue and staff retreats, are used to facilitate this learning, aiming to improve curriculum, instruction, and student outcomes [2], [4], [5]. Currently, school administrators play a key role by encouraging teachers to learn and share their knowledge with the faculty. This strengthens relationships among staff and deepens their understanding of the curriculum [6]. Moreover, educators also employ various strategies to facilitate CL, such as peer instruction, collaborative note-taking, and the jigsaw method. These strategies are designed to make students' thinking visible, encourage active involvement, and improve problem-solving outcomes. It is important to create tasks that allow for multiple ways of demonstrating competence and to hold students accountable for their learning [7]. Additionally, forming heterogeneous groups and teaching constructive feedback is essential, so CL strategies prepare students for future work environments where similar collaborative approaches are used. Benefits refer to the development of higher-level thinking, verbal communication, self-management, leadership skills, an increased student retention, self-esteem, and responsibility [8]-[11]. To implement CL effectively, educators should establish group goals, monitor group dynamics, and encourage diversity of thought. CL in education is a powerful process that enhances knowledge creation, application, and retention. It involves collaborative efforts that lead to the development of a wide range of skills and competencies, preparing individuals for both academic and professional success [3], [6].

The practicality of CL in group work (GW) presentations is evident through the numerous benefits it offers, such as enhanced student performance, development of critical skills, improved knowledge retention, and preparation for real-world applications [12]. However, careful planning, facilitation, and assessment are crucial to ensure that GW is effective and that students are able to fully reap the benefits of CL. In addition, CL has been shown to lead to higher-performing students and more engaging lessons, because the active, social, and contextual nature of CL contributes to deeper learning and overall college success [13]. Through GW, students can develop a range of skills that are relevant to both group and individual work, including higher-level thinking, oral communication, self-management, and leadership skills. These skills are not only important academically but are also vital in professional settings. CL is associated with improved knowledge retention and higher course completion rates. When students work together, they are more likely to remember the material and stay engaged until the end of the course, which results from clearly defined roles in GW fostering greater accountability and appealing to students' desire for real-world applications of learning [14], [15]. This sense of ownership over assignments can lead to more invested and motivated students. GW introduces unpredictability in teaching, as groups may approach tasks and solve problems in novel, interesting ways, which can lead to innovative solutions and a more dynamic learning environment. To foster a CL environment, it is important to create structure and scaffolding that supports collaboration, be strategic in the creation of groups, and build ample opportunities for discussion [16]-[18]. This approach prepares students for cooperation outside the classroom as contributing members of society. Despite the practical implementation of using GW presentations in education, especially in legal English subject, a few studies have carried out with GW activities, not with researching

CL in GW presentation. This study was conducted to explore how legal English major students at Hanoi Law University (HLU) expressed their viewpoints on this issue. To highlight their attitudes, the study aimed to address the following research questions:

1. What are the benefits and challenges of collaborative learning in group work presentations recognized by HLU legal English students?
2. How do HLU legal English major students evaluate collaborative learning in group work presentations affecting their prospective careers?

## **2. Materials and methods**

### **2.1. Research design**

The descriptive, quantitative study was conducted with 81 legal English major undergraduates enrolling in K46 and K47 courses at HLU. Although the current population of legal English major students at HLU was 315 students, the researchers were unable to incorporate all the students into the study due to practical constraints of time and resource limitations, so utilizing a straightforward sampling formula of Slovin's formula, the sample was collected from 81 respondents. The questionnaire survey was constructed in Google Forms and sent to the students' email addresses for a three-week duration of returning the questionnaire. To deal with the screened data gathered from the five-point Likert scale questionnaire, the IBM SPSS v.25 application was utilized to address the collected data, which would be formulated for conclusion.

### **2.2. Participants**

The study included 81 legal English major undergraduates who were chosen from K46 and K47 courses with the random sampling technique, Slovin's formula ( $n = N/1 + N \cdot e^2$ ; with  $e = 0.05$ ) to choose the equivalent samples from each course. In particular, in terms of student gender, most respondents were female students, with 63 individuals, accounting for 77.8% of the sample. Conversely, male respondents had a comparatively smaller involvement, with 16 students, equivalent to 19.8%. Regarding the academic level, all the respondents primarily belonged to the sophomore level with 40 students, and junior level, with 41 students, representing 49.4% and 50.6%, respectively. As for their study course, K46 had 37 students, which was same as 45.67%, and K47 included 44 learners, making up 54.32%.

### **2.3. Research instruments**

The researcher-made questionnaire survey was well-designed with a five-point Likert scale. The students were expected to indicate (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree for 32 statements, divided into four groups. In addition, another question proposed some potential solutions or strategies for addressing the identified challenges, allowing participants to choose multiple options based on their personal opinions and experiences. The questionnaire survey was first implemented in a dry run among 20 students to enhance its validity. The researchers retained the statements according to the confidence level ( $\alpha = 0.87 - 0.90$ , fairly high [19]). The final survey consisted of 35 items categorized into four groups: 13 statements on learning experience benefits, 6 statements on future professional benefits, 10 statements on challenges encountered during CL in GW presentations, and 6 statements on the impact of these challenges. The final version of the survey was sent to three experts to review and validate its liability.

### **2.4. Procedures and statistical tools**

The survey form, which was converted into Google form, was sent to the participants through their emails with a plain and concise explanation of the study's objectives, instructions, even a withdrawal choice, and the assurance of the respondents' anonymity. The participants were requested to do the questionnaire survey within ten days of receiving the email invitation. The

researcher's contact number was also provided in case a participant had any questions. Afterward, the data screening process was implemented to ascertain the liability of the survey. Descriptive, quantitative statistics with the assistance of IBM SPSS v.25 computing application was used to scrutinize and interpret the data. Specifically, frequency count and percentage were utilized to address the participants' profiles and their frequencies of expressing their viewpoints on CL. The means and standard deviations of each term can be interpreted as follows: strongly disagree (1.0 - 1.80), disagree (1.81 - 2.60), neutral (2.61 - 3.40), agree (3.41 - 4.20), and strongly agree (4.21 - 5.0).

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1. *The benefits of collaborative learning in group work presentations for enhancing students' learning experience*

As shown in Table 1, the participants all felt satisfied with their experience in CL for GW presentation activities. Typically, they highly recognized that CL for GW presentations improved their teamwork and collaboration skills ( $M = 4.16$ ). They fairly recognized the benefits of applying CL for GW presentation to their learning activities in class. The least rank of all the statements in Table 1 was the provision of proper ways and behaviours to express disagreements ( $M = 3.52$ ), which was somehow similar to the findings of the previous studies [6], [9], [10]. In general, CL in GW presentations could enhance the student's learning experience by providing opportunities for problem-solving ( $M = 3.81$ ), creating a comfortable and relaxed atmosphere to learn ( $M = 3.79$ ), and encouraging critical thinking and problem-solving skills ( $M = 3.81$ ). It involved students working together to solve a problem or complete a task, which led to a deeper understanding of the subject matter ( $M = 3.91$ ). Collaborative learning also helped develop important skills such as autonomy learning ( $M = 3.84$ ), creativity and innovation ( $M = 4.00$ ), and improving confidence and self-esteem ( $M = 3.89$ ). Therefore, CL is a pedagogical approach that involves students working together to solve problems, complete tasks, or create presentations. This method of learning has been supported by various educational theories and research, indicating that it can significantly enhance the learning experience by improving knowledge retention, developing higher-level thinking skills, and fostering a sense of ownership over assignments.

CL for GW presentations can indeed better prepare individuals for their future professional environments. Clearly shown in Table 1, CL fostered a stronger sense of workplace community, making tasks more enjoyable and stimulating, which could result in a morale boost spreading across to others in teamwork and collaboration skills ( $M = 4.06$ ). Besides, CL prepared individuals for real-life social and employment situations, enabling them to develop the skills of adaptability to different working styles and perspectives ( $M = 3.77$ ), which possibly helped them succeed in future professional environments. Similarly, CL showed to develop a higher level of problem-solving and decision-making abilities, boosting their students' confidence ( $M = 3.91$ ), improved social and interpersonal skills ( $M = 4.02$ ), better developed presentation and public speaking skills ( $M = 4.01$ ), and assisted students to improve their time management and organizational skills at present and in the future ( $M = 3.82$ ). In this aspect, CL brings together people of various backgrounds, beliefs, education levels, and ages, helping them form and maintain strong personal and professional relationships. It also fosters trust among team members, which can transfer into future workplace interactions, leading to increased productivity and morale. These findings are consistent with those which are found in the previous studies [3], [5], [11].

Although CL is a valuable educational approach that provides students with active learning environments, it comes with its own set of challenges that can negatively impact the effectiveness of group work presentations due to some causes. As presented in Table 1, scheduling conflicts might result in disagreement among group members involving in GW presentation ( $M = 3.64$ ;  $SD = 0.80$ ). Thus, coordinating schedules was a common roadblock, leading to frustration when members felt others were not compromising. Group dynamic issues might stem from diverse backgrounds and perspectives ( $M = 3.62$ ), which not only enriched learning experiences but also led to communication

challenges ( $M = 3.53$ ), and misunderstandings. In addition, the causes might originated from trust issues ( $M = 3.71$ ) when team members lost their trust, so they caused the prevention of open knowledge sharing ( $M = 3.67$ ) and full participation ( $M = 3.55$ ). These dilemmatic issues probably came from team member's dominance and influence ( $M = 3.85$ ). Sometimes, a few members might dominate the group, which could skew decision-making ( $M = 3.68$ ), and limit contributions from others ( $M = 3.55$ ). Thus, these causes could hinder the learning process and group effectiveness.

While collaborative learning for group work presentations offers many benefits, it also presents a range of challenges that can impact the overall experience with collaborative learning for group work presentations in students. However, the participants have neutral stances on these challenges. As clearly disclosed in Table 1, students might resist group work due to past negative experiences or fear of their grades being affected by unequal contributions, which brought about low motivation and engagement ( $M = 3.15$ ). Obviously, differences in opinions and approaches could give rise to criticism and conflict within the group, which, if not managed properly, possibly increased stress and pressure among team members ( $M = 3.23$ ). In case of lacking proper coordination and clear roles, CL in GW presentations was able to cause disorganized presentations, which reflected poorly on the entire team's effort and reduces the quality of work ( $M = 3.03$ ). This probably gave rise to frustration and a sense of unfairness, potentially affecting the group's morale and straining relationships with group members ( $M = 3.26$ ). Besides, effective communication was crucial for the success of CL in GW presentations. Poor communication hindered learning and understood the topic ( $M = 3.08$ ). Typically, the phenomena of social loafing and overachieving provoked uneven contributions, while groupthink could stifle creativity and constituted suboptimal decisions, which resulted in lowering academic results ( $M = 2.96$ ). Thus, it is important to establish ground rules for CL in GW presentations among team members to develop the skills they need to overcome unwanted consequences.

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics of participants' opinions on collaborative learning

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Explanation
<b>Group A: Collaborative learning for group work presentations enhances your learning experience to</b>				
encourage active engagement and participation.	81	3.80	0.72	agreement
foster autonomy learning.	81	3.84	0.83	agreement
create a comfortable and relaxed atmosphere to learn.	81	3.79	0.70	agreement
promote a deeper understanding of the topic through discussion and sharing ideas.	81	3.91	0.74	agreement
provide opportunities for peer learning and support.	81	4.00	0.62	agreement
enhance critical thinking and problem-solving skills.	81	3.81	0.83	agreement
increase motivation and enjoyment of the learning process.	81	3.68	0.68	agreement
enhance communication skills.	81	4.01	0.81	agreement
increase creativity and innovation.	81	4.00	0.73	agreement
expose to diverse perspectives.	81	4.09	0.82	agreement
develop teamwork and collaboration skills.	81	4.16	0.74	agreement
provide proper ways and behaviours to express disagreements.	81	3.52	0.78	agreement
improve confidence and self-esteem.	81	3.89	0.72	agreement
<b>Group B: Collaborative learning for group work presentations better prepares your future professional environments to</b>				
develop teamwork and collaboration skills required in the workplace.	81	4.06	0.67	agreement
increase adaptability to different working styles and perspectives.	81	3.77	0.73	agreement
enhance problem-solving and decision-making abilities.	81	3.91	0.67	agreement
improve presentation and public speaking skills.	81	4.01	0.87	agreement
enhance communication and interpersonal skills.	81	4.02	0.81	agreement
improve time management and organizational skills.	81	3.82	0.78	agreement
<b>Group C: Challenges while participating in collaborative learning for group work presentations cause</b>				
coordination and scheduling issues.	81	3.64	0.80	agreement

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Explanation
unequal workload distribution.	81	3.83	0.85	agreement
communication difficulties.	81	3.53	0.82	agreement
conflicts during decision-making.	81	3.68	0.76	agreement
unequal participation of group members.	81	3.55	0.63	agreement
time management challenges.	81	3.74	0.74	agreement
group dynamics issues.	81	3.62	0.87	agreement
accountability and responsibility concerns.	81	3.71	0.65	agreement
differences in personality traits and learning styles among group members.	81	3.85	0.70	agreement
lack of feedback or care for individual task performance.	81	3.67	0.880	agreement
<b>Group D: Challenges impact your overall experience with collaborative learning for group work presentations in</b>				
decreasing motivation and engagement.	81	3.15	0.86	neutral
increasing stress and pressure.	81	3.23	0.74	neutral
reducing quality of work.	81	3.03	0.67	neutral
straining relationships with group members.	81	3.26	0.72	neutral
hindering learning and understanding of the topic.	81	3.08	0.84	neutral
lowering academic result.	81	2.96	0.73	neutral
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>		<b>81</b>		

Table 2 compares the difference between the genders and their perceptions towards CL in GW presentations. The analysis focuses on four distinct groups, including the benefits of CL to students' learning experience, the benefits of CL to their preparation for the future professional environment, challenges during the collaborative process, and the resulting impacts on students' overall learning experience. As clearly depicted in Table 2, the *Sig.* values in the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances were all above 0.05, so *Sig.* (2-tailed) values in the row of Equal variances not assumed was taken into consideration. Similarly, the values in these *Sig.* (2-tailed) of Equal variances not assumed was higher than 0.05, which meant that there was no differences between the genders in regard to their perspectives of CL in GW presentations.

**Table 2.** Comparison of gender with perceptions towards collaborative learning in group work presentation

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Group A	Equal variances assumed	0.419	0.629	77	0.531
	Equal variances not assumed		0.731	29.070	0.471
Group B	Equal variances assumed	0.522	0.710	77	0.480
	Equal variances not assumed		0.929	36.965	0.359
Group C	Equal variances assumed	0.019	1.261	77	0.211
	Equal variances not assumed		1.261	23.226	0.220
Group D	Equal variances assumed	0.016	0.254	77	0.800
	Equal variances not assumed		0.244	22.202	0.809

**Table 3.** Comparison of courses with perceptions towards collaborative learning in group work presentation

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Group A	Equal variances assumed	0.196	0.848	71	0.399
	Equal variances not assumed		0.844	63.829	0.402
Group B	Equal variances assumed	1.126	0.226	71	0.822
	Equal variances not assumed		0.225	60.498	0.823
Group C	Equal variances assumed	0.013	0.003	71	0.998
	Equal variances not assumed		0.003	68.504	0.998
Group D	Equal variances assumed	0.105	0.645	71	0.104
	Equal variances not assumed		0.643	69.757	0.105

Table 3 gives a comparison of the participants' courses with perceptions towards CL in GW presentation, based on the four identified above groups. Notably, the Sig. values in the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances were all higher than 0.05, so Sig. (2-tailed) values in the row of Equal variances not assumed are taken into consideration. In the same way, the values in these Sig. (2-tailed) of Equal variances not assumed were higher than 0.05, which meant that there were no differences between the courses K46 and K47 regarding their perspectives of CL in GW presentation.

### 3.2. Potential solutions and strategies for challenges during collaborative learning in group work presentation

Table 4 demonstrates the data on some potential solutions or strategies students employ to address the challenges during CL in GW presentation. It highlighted the importance of establishing clear roles and responsibilities, with 67 participants chosen, equivalent to 82.7%. The next item was promoting equal participation and contribution from all group members, with 50 individuals agreeing on this, the same as 61.7%. In the third rank among solutions, as identified by 49 students (equivalent to 60.5%), was "regular check-ins and progress updates". Participants also confessed that they faced difficulty in dealing with conflicts during the decision-making process, so around half of them chose to facilitate open and respectful discussions as a promising solution to settle down their arguments, equivalent to 56.8%. Furthermore, it was noteworthy that communication difficulties were also acknowledged by participants, as illustrated in Table 4, they also got improved communication and clarity of expectations as a solution to tackle it. In line with expectations, both the items such as utilizing time management techniques setting realistic deadlines, and building a positive and inclusive group culture were chosen less frequently, with 39 respondents (accounting for 48.1%), as they consider the relevant drawbacks (e.g., time management, coordination, and schedule issues) to have a relatively minor impact that can be dealt with. Overall, the data suggest that students are actively seeking strategies and solutions to enhance their CL experience in GW presentations. By recognizing and implementing various strategies and solutions, students strive to enhance their CL experiences, ensuring that each member actively contributes, responsibilities and roles are clearly defined, communication is effective, and progress is regularly monitored.

**Table 4.** Potential solutions and strategies

	Frequency	Percent
Improved communication and clarity of expectations	42	51.9
Establishing clear roles and responsibilities within the group	67	82.7
Regular check-ins and progress updates	49	60.5
Facilitating open and respectful discussions to resolve conflicts	46	56.8
Promoting equal participation and contribution from all group members	50	61.7
Time management techniques and setting realistic deadlines	39	48.1
Building a positive and inclusive group culture	39	48.1

## 4. Conclusion

Considering the student's learning experience, most learners acknowledged the role of CL during GW presentations in enhancing their collaborative skills and teamwork cooperation. By working and studying in a collective environment, the students had the opportunity to interact, communicate, lead, assist, and support one another. In the second rank, they unanimously agreed that CL in GW presentations exposed them to a wealth of ideas, knowledge, perspective, and updated information from their teammates. This exposure greatly enriched their understanding of the world around them and facilitates their acquisition of new knowledge. Additionally, the students pointed out that they became more competent in communication throughout the process of participating in collaborative activities, which was attributed to the increased demand for verbal expression, articulation of ideas, interactive engagement, and constructive feedback on

their peers' task performance. They then expressed appreciation for the assistance, shared burden, and peer learning they experienced during the collaborative process. Following that, they recognized the vital role of collaborative presentation groups in nurturing their creative and innovative ability. By working together in groups to share, refine, and generate ideas, the students produced novel and imaginative solutions, they had the opportunity to harness collective intelligence and numerous perspectives. They also advocated that their understanding of the topic and subject matter was markedly solidified through engaging in group discussions, receiving supportive guidance, and benefiting from peer teaching. Subsequently, learners claimed that they felt more confident and courageous to work in groups to deliver presentations collectively, as the supportive and friendly nature of group work instilled a great sense of trust and sharing. In the next rank, they emphasized how their learning autonomy was improved thanks to the expectation and credibility their peer place in their individual task performance. They highlighted the flourishing growth in their critical thinking and problem-solving skills, as well as their proactive engagement and participation. In addition, the participants acknowledged that during CL in GW presentations, they immersed themselves in a friendly and cozy ambiance which greatly and healthily aided their learning process. Finally, the students agreed that they were equipped with proper and tactful manners to settle disagreements with each other while expressing their appreciation for the positive impact on motivation and enjoyment of their studying journey.

Considering the students' future professional workplaces, a large number of the participants affirmed that the most dominant benefit of collaborative presentation groups was the increased adaptability to different working styles and perspectives. They argued that when they engaged in group activities and obtained the collective strengths of the team, they became more adept at identifying challenges, adapting to different perspectives, and sharpening their adjustable abilities and flexible improvisation to various circumstances. The students asserted that thanks to collaborative practices in group work presentations, they stepped into real-life situations where human interaction and collaboration dominated, which provided them with well-trained teamwork and collaboration skills before embarking on their career journey. In the third rank, the students believed that CL in group work presentations helped them improve their communication and interpersonal skills, as well as their public speaking skills since this practice demanded a lot of oral involvement. This package of skills would empower learners to embrace collaboration as a valuable and transformative learning experience that prepared them for future professional endeavors where teamwork and presentation skills were highly requested. In addition, the learners were fully prepared to handle potential troubles, as they engaged in collaborative environments in which they learned how to solve problems and made tough decisions. Eventually, they also learned how to properly and productively organized and managed a group, because they were expected to balance and harmonized those who had different and unique personalities and time schedules. By recognizing and embracing the power of CL, learners were able to unlock their full potential and thrived in their educational and professional adventures.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] M. J. Baker, "Collaboration in collaborative learning," *Interaction Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 451-473, 2015.
- [2] P. S. Rao, "Collaborative Learning in English Language Learning Environment," *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 330-339, 2019.
- [3] M. Laal and S. M. Ghodsi, "Benefits of Collaborative Learning," *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 31, pp. 486-490, 2012.
- [4] F. Han and R. A. Ellis, "Patterns of student collaborative learning in blended course designs based on their learning orientations: a student approaches to learning perspective," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 18, no. 66, pp. 1-16, 2021.
- [5] S. Lane, "Promoting Collaborative among Students," *American Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 4, no. 8, pp. 602-607, 2016.



- [6] D. Kim and C. J. Lim, "Promoting socially shared metacognitive regulation in collaborative project-based learning: a framework for the design of structured guidance," *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 194-211, 2018.
- [7] M. S. A. Hei, J. Strijbos, E. Sjoer, and W. Admiraal, "Collaborative learning in higher education: lecturers' practices and belief," *Research Papers in Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 1-16, 2014.
- [8] R. Kusumawati, H. Hobri, and A. F. Hadi, "Implementation of Integrated Inquiry Collaborative Learning Based on the Lesson Study for Learning Community to Improve Students' Creative Thinking Skill," *Journal of Physics Conference Series*, vol. 1211, pp. 1-11, 2019.
- [9] D. Mandusic and L. Blaskovic, "The impact of collaborative learning to critically thinking," *Trakia Journal of Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 426-428, 2015.
- [10] I. Warsah, R. Morganna, M. Uyun, and H. Hamengkubuwono, "The Impact of Collaborative Learning on Learners' Critical Thinking Skills," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 443-460, 2021.
- [11] S. Ghavifekr, "Collaborative Learning: A key to enhance students' social interaction skills," *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 9-21, 2020.
- [12] A. Normawati, A. I. F. Susanto, A. R. Febrianto, and F. Farikah, "EFL Students' Attitude toward Learning English by Using Collaborative Learning," *Actiya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 262-272, 2023.
- [13] M. H. Nguyen, "EFL Students' Reflections on Peer Scaffolding in Making a Collaborative Oral Presentation," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 64-73, 2013.
- [14] E. Namaziandost, V. Shtalebi, and M. Narsi, "The impact of Cooperative Learning on Developing Speaking Ability and Motivation toward Learning English," *Journal of Language and Education*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 83-101, 2019.
- [15] Y. Zhang, "Cooperative Language Learning and Foreign Language Learning and Teaching," *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 311-327, 2010.
- [16] T. Q. Nguyen, T. V. Vu, and V. T. La, "Non-English Major Students' Strategies to Reduce Anxiety towards English Group Presentations," *Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 178-186, 2023.
- [17] M. Kawamura, "Perceived Difficulties in Group Presentations: Action Research as an Intervention," *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 119-124, 2019.
- [18] R. Lescinskij, E. Jaleniauskiene, and P. Juceviciene, "Development of Collaboration in the English for Specific Purposes Courses: Opportunities and Challenges," *Journal of Research in Reading*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 273-284, 2019.
- [19] L. J. Cronbach, "Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests," *Psychometrika*, vol. 16, pp. 297-334, 1951.