



Investigating The Students' Peer Interaction Pattern To Comprehend Text Explanation In 3stm Classroom

Puteri Ainiyyah Nugraheni¹, Sumarta², Indah Purnama Dewi³

^{1,2,3} University Of Singaperbangsa Karawang

Received: 23 November 2023
Revised : 02 Desember 2023
Accepted: 09 Desember 2023

Abstract

This research is about investigating the students' peer interaction patterns to comprehend text explanations in the 3STM classroom. Student interaction in group discussions can reveal how well they understand the subject. Students that actively participated in the discussion group displayed a comprehension of the material being discussed. This research employed a descriptive case study. The data was obtained by observation and interviews. The research subjects were 36 students from class XI SMA Negeri in Cikarang Barat, arranged into groups of 5-6 people. This study aims to find what patterns does the students use to deliver their comprehension through group discussion in the 3STM classrooms and what factors cause the patterns to appear. Student interaction is analyzed using the IBIS model by Kunz & Rittel (1970), and there are three elements, namely: issues, positions, and arguments. The 3STM was used in this study to assist students understanding of English texts. The results found that two interaction patterns emerged in this study Detailed Knowledge Exchange and Partial Knowledge Exchange. The emergence of these two patterns was caused by factors such as discussion partners, students' knowledge of the topic being discussed, students' courage in expressing their opinions, and a lack of mastery of English vocabulary and grammar.

Keywords: *Student's interaction pattern, IBIS model, 3STM (Three Stage Teaching Method), Group discussion*

(*) Corresponding Author: ainiyyah261@gmail.com

How to Cite: Nugraheni, P. A., Sumarta, & Dewi, I. P. (2023). Investigating The Students' Peer Interaction Pattern To Comprehend Text Explanation In 3stm Classroom. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10434045>

INTRODUCTION

Research shows that collaboration can facilitate students to understand academic texts, because it allows students to share their knowledge and straighten up any confusion (Hirano, 2015). Furthermore, Follmer & Sperling (2018), stated that reading strategies can promote meaning construction and facilitate reading comprehension. Therefore, to help students understand English texts through collaborative groups, the strategies used must be appropriate. The strategy used must be able to facilitate students in exchanging ideas with group members. Three-stage teaching method (3STM) is the developed of the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) by Klingner & Vaughn, (1999, p. 739), model which combines reading comprehension strategy instruction and cooperative learning (Jin et al., 2020). The goal of the 3STM was to naturally bring up the student's reading strategies in small group discussions (Jin et al., 2020). Therefore, 3STM is expected to make it easier for students to understand English texts because it allows students to be free to use any method to absorb the meaning of the text.

The 3STM consists of individual reading, group discussion, and collaborative reflection. There is a group discussion stage in this strategy, where this stage is a forum for students to exchange ideas and discover new knowledge. Hou & Wu

(2011), mentions that by including educational activities that facilitate knowledge construction, such as discussions, collaborative learning, or project-based learning, students are encouraged to share, discuss, and produce diverse concepts during the process of social interactions. At the discussion stage, the participation of each student in contributing to the discussion group will determine the student's comprehension of the material or assignment given by the teacher. This is in line with the statement conducted by Liu & Tsai (2008), who believe that group interaction patterns were discovered to be a reliable predictor of group performance. However, the majority of research has focused on investigating peer interactions, in undergraduate and postgraduate students conducted in online settings. With little research that focuses on investigating the interaction patterns of high school students in conveying their understanding of English texts in offline settings. As stated by Webb et al. (2013), in their research that students' engagement and contribution in group work have been shown to be significant, which might be increased by teachers facilitating students' communication. Therefore, it is important to find out how students participation to group discussions. In this context, teachers can facilitate students by applying the three-stage teaching method (3STM) in group work. Because this strategy is suitable to be applied in this study because it facilitates students to discuss and also makes it easier for students to understand English texts.

As a result, it is critical to investigate what interaction patterns students use to convey their understanding through group discussions in 3STM to teach senior high school students. Because it has been underlined in the context of education that peer discussion or peer interaction supports learning. For example, peer tutoring or peer review has received a lot of attention from educators to enhance student learning (Falchikov, 2001; Liu & Tsai, 2005; Topping, 1998; Tsai, Liu, Lin, & Yuan, 2001; Tsai, Lin, & Yuan, 2002; Liu & Tsai, 2008). In addition, Boardman et al., (2018), found an increase in student conversation during text discussions in high school English language arts lessons that used the CSR approach compared to those who did not. Therefore, by implementing the 3STM, at the group discussion stage, students will have the opportunity to discuss the text they have read before. Patterns of interaction between students during the discussion process to convey their understanding through group discussions will be the focus of this study.

Several studies have investigated student interaction patterns in group discussions with varying focuses. For instance, research conducted by Hu and Huang (2015), this research investigates the open student model used in online peer assessment in order to increase student interaction with peers. Huang et al. (2019) explored the students' interaction patterns and dynamic learning sentiment by conducting seven types of learning activities on an asynchronous discussion platform using quantitative content and lag sequential analysis (LSA). Research conducted by Baharudin and Harun (2014) tries to find the optimum pattern of interaction that takes place in the PBL-CSCL learning setting in order to maximize students' critical thinking skills and cognitive performance. Jacob and Sam (2010), in their research they investigate peer discourse interactions and facilitation techniques used in online problem-solving activities. Another research conducted by Nguyen, Cannata, & Miller (2016,) they discovered patterns of student participation in interactions with peers and teachers through instructional practice procedures.

Previous studies have clearly demonstrated that peer interaction or discussion promotes learning in educational contexts. However, there is still very limited research studies that focuses more deeply on the interaction patterns used by high school students to convey their understanding in group discussions. To fill this gap, IBIS model was used in this study to get a clear description of the students' peer interaction pattern to comprehend text explanation in 3STM classroom. Therefore, this research aims to investigate what patterns does the students use to deliver their comprehension through group discussion in the 3STM classroom and what factors cause the pattern to appear.

METHODS

Based on the research question, the research used a qualitative approach. Moleong (2011) wrote that the aim of qualitative study is to comprehend a phenomenon concerning what the subject experiences, for instance, the subject's actions, motivation, perception, behavior, and so forth. Moreover, descriptive case study is one of the types of qualitative approach. A descriptive case study, as defined by Yin (2017), is a case study whose goal is to describe a phenomena (the "case") in its actual setting. Therefore, the researcher employed descriptive case study since the purpose of this study is to investigate students' action during the discussion in the classroom setting.

This study was conducted in one of the senior high schools in Cikarang Barat. The reasons for choosing this location were due to school accreditation, and other factors that met the research requirements. In addition, access to collect data is also important for researchers to consider. Participants of this study were students of the class XI C senior high school in Cikarang Barat, which consisted of 36 students. Because this research was conducted by using small group discussions, students were divided into groups of 5-6. The researcher will use purposive sampling to select the participant. According to Dornyei (2007), the plan for purposive sampling should be in line with the goal of the research. Additionally, the purposive sample was based on the researcher's judgment while choosing the units that are to be researched. The purpose of this study was to determine the tendency of interaction patterns used by students in conveying their understanding through small group discussions in 3STM class. Groups that are heterogeneous in nature from the sample are very important so that the sample can represent all students of the class XI C senior high school in Cikarang Barat. To collect data, the researcher made observations from the first meeting to the sixth meeting. The researcher observes how group members participate during the discussion process.

To analyze the data collected. According to Miles & Huberman (1994), there are several stages in data analysis, including reduction, data display, and data verification. First, in reduction data, the researcher makes a summary that would be taken data from observation and interview, the data obtained from the classroom observation sheet and the group interview. Second, after making data reduction, data displayed from utterances between the students' interaction while the discussion process. The data would be on display because the data has clearly to understand for the researcher as supporting data to the result. Last, the researcher examines how observation and interview to answered the research questions. The

researcher has been concluding the answer to the research question provided in displaying data by combining the observation data and interview data.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Results

To answer the research questions of this study, data related to the students' peer interaction pattern to comprehend explanation texts using 3STM in the reading classroom were discovered through observation during the group discussion and interview of six research participants as a sample. Purposive sampling was used to choose a sample in order to meet the primary study objectives. The researcher chose Group 3 as a sample because they were particularly involved during the debate stage at the first meeting.

The pattern of interaction used by students to convey their understanding through group discussions in the 3STM class

Distributive knowledge exchange

This study reveal that students' interaction pattern use to deliver their comprehension about explanation text through 3STM at the first and second meeting is Distributive Knowledge Exchange. This interaction pattern is where knowledge exchange does not meet only one student. But all students exchange knowledge with each other. There are issues and responses issued by students during the group discussion process is in progress (Liu & Tsai, 2008).

In the first meeting, after the teacher gave instructions for discussion, the students started discussing the text. When they discuss passive voice and conjunctions in the text, they said:

S2: "Is this sentence a passive voice?"

S3: "Yes, in my opinion it is a passive voice"

S1: "I think so"

S4: "Is the word *then* here a conjunction?"

S6: "Yes, that's the connecting word from the previous sentence"

S5: "Yes, it's a conjunction"

Since the data above showed that S2 and S4 proposed issues. Then the other group members provided responses and then showed support for the issues. The data from the first observation can be categorized as Distributive Knowledge Exchange. Because there was a lot of interaction and exchange of ideas between students during the discussion group. Therefore, this type of interaction pattern is the optimal one for group work (Liu & Tsai, 2008). As there were many students' thoughts are discussed.

As mentioned above, that in the second meeting the interaction pattern shown is Distributive Knowledge Exchange. Because, in this meeting, all students exchanged ideas, and the exchange of knowledge did not stop at just one student. In line with previous research, that every student contributes to pose problems and respond position (Liu & Tsai, 2008).

In the second meeting, after receiving directions from the teacher to discuss. The students started to discuss the text with the topic of flooding. When they discussed the technical terms and action verbs contained in the text, they said:

S4: "*Rivers, seas, lakes, and ditches* are technical terms, right?"

S1: "I think so. Because the text is about the flood, it is still related"

S2: "Yes, still related"

S6: "Ooh that means *water* too, right? "

S2: "Yeah"

S5: "What is an action verb?"

S3: "An action verb is a verb that shows activity"

S1: "Yes, that's a word that refers to the action of the subject"

S4: "Ooh like the word that appears in the sentence *flood comes* right?"

S1: "Yeah"

Similar to the first meeting, at the second meeting, the data above showed that S4 , S6, and S5 proposed issues. While other students i. e. S1, S2, gave responses and S3 gave positions to the issues that arose. Since there was a lot of interaction and exchange of ideas between students during the discussion group. As a result, this peer interaction type is regarded to be the best for group work (Liu & Tsai, 2008).

Partial knowledge exchange

This study reveal another students' interaction pattern use to deliver their comprehension about explanation text through 3STM. It was Partial Knowledge Exchange. This pattern appeared at the third meeting, until the sixth meeting. The Partial Knowledge Exchange indicated that the exchange of knowledge only occurs between selected students. There are some students who do not contribute to proposing issues, providing response or positions. Therefore, issue and position links only occur between selected students, and the student's abilities are diverse.

At the third meeting, the teacher again gives texts with different topics to be analyzed. When discussing the text, what students said were:

S1: "Paragraph 3,4,5 which explain the *how* and *why*, right?"

S2: "Yes, because paragraph 2 still explains the Global Warming process"

S3: "*Due to* is a conjunction, right?"

S2: "I think so because it indicates the discussion in the paragraph is still related to the previous paragraph"

S1: "That's Right"

In contrast to the second meeting, at this meeting, the students were not as active as in the previous meeting. Only three students proposed issues and provided positions. S1 and S3 proposed issues by asking the generic structure of the text and the language feature. S2 was provided response by giving a little explanation about the issue asked by the S1 and S3. While S4, S5, and S6 did not raise issues or provide responses. The issue and position links only occur between S1, S2, and S3 during the discussion process. In line with the prior research by Liu and Tsai (2008), the problem-solving process and knowledge exchange occurred basically between selected students, while several lower students did not actively participate in the activity.

Similar to the third meeting, at this meeting not all students gave issues, positions, or arguments during the discussion process. The knowledge exchange only occurs between two students, while the other students only listen. Therefore, the pattern of student interaction in the discussion group at the fourth meeting is partial knowledge exchange. Because the exchange of ideas only occurs in some students. At the fourth meeting, the conversations carried out by the students during the discussion were as follows:

S1: "Paragraph 2 is still an opening statement, isn't it?"

S2: "Yes, that still explains about rainbow"

S1: "The word *how* is a linking word, isn't it?"

S3: "I don't think so. Because in my opinion it does not connect the previous sentence with the next sentence"

Since the data above shows that only S1, S2, and S3 participate in the discussion process. S1 proposed issue by asking about the generic structure of the text, then S2 provides a support response regarding the issue. Another issue was proposed by S1 by asking about the language feature of the text, S3 answered by showing objection to the issue.

There wasn't much difference from the previous meeting. At the fifth meeting, issues, positions, and arguments only occurred to some members. Although, there was quite a lot of exchange of ideas occurred. However, only a few members contributed, while the other only listened. Therefore, the pattern of interaction at this meeting is back to being a Partial Knowledge Exchange.

At the fifth meeting, the conversations students had during the discussion were as follows:

S1: "The paragraph 3 mentions the cause right?"

S2: "Is it really a cause?... oh yeah, that's a cause"

S1: "Then in paragraph 5 that's the effect?"

S2: "That's right... but paragraph 6 also has a cause"

S3: "Yes, in paragraph 6 there is a cause too"

Since the data above shows that only three students discussed the assignments given, while the other students only listened to the discussion. Therefore, not much interaction occurred during the discussion process. This is because there are not many issues, positions and arguments given by students. S1 and S2 raise problems by asking about the general structure of the text. Then S2 and S3 responded by showing support for the issue.

Continuing at the sixth meeting, the interaction patterns that emerged during the discussion returned to Partial Knowledge Exchange. Because the exchange of thoughts returned to the same students as the previous meeting. The knowledge exchange only occurred between some students.

At the sixth meeting, the conversations carried out by the students during the discussion were as follows:

S3: "*Air temperature* are the technical terms, aren't they?"

S2 : "Yes, they are. Because it is a technical term that is still related to global warming"

S3: "Ooh I see"

S1: "*The melting of the polar ice caps*, the word *melting* is an action verb, right?"

S2: "Yes"

S1 : "Then *polar ice* is the technical term, right?"

S3: "True"

At this meeting, there were problems and positions given by students regarding the topic of discussion. S3 proposed an issue with asking for the text language feature. Then S2 responded by showing support and giving a little explanation about the problem. S1 also proposed some issues regarding the text language feature. Then S2 and S3 show support for the issues that arise

Factors that cause the emergence of the interaction patterns according to students

The factors of independence and knowledge mastery on distributive knowledge exchange

After the sixth meeting ended, students were interviewed to find out the factors causing the pattern of distributive knowledge exchange that emerged in the first meeting and second meeting.

To validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked the students:

Interviewer : “In your opinion, what is the most important thing in determining student activity in group discussions?”

S4 : “In my opinion, group partner. If you are with new people (you don't know/familiar) it makes it a bit awkward, shy, or uncomfortable to discuss”

The answers from all members of group 3 were almost the same, that is, the thing that most determined the activeness of students in group discussions was the discussion partner. Then S2 and S3 had an addition; apart from discussion partners, mastery of discussion topics could also affect the activeness of group members during the discussion process. While the other members, S1, S5, and S6 were briefly answer “Group members”.

Another question asked by the researcher to find out the factors causing the pattern of distributive knowledge exchange that emerged was:

To validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked the students:

Interviewer : “Do you understand what is an explanatory text was before the teacher explained it?”

S2 : “Yes. Because from the word "explain" it is certain that the purpose is to explain”.

Based on the students' answers, they can understand what an explanation text is because they already know what it means. S4 also said that in general she already understood about the explanation text. Likewise the S2 and S4, the other members among them namely, S1, S3, S5 and S6 in brief said “Yes, I do”. Thus, it can be concluded that students' knowledge and understanding of the material studied and the assignments given influence the pattern of student interaction in group discussion.

The factors of bravery and vocabulary barriers on partial knowledge exchange

To find out the factors that causing the pattern of partial knowledge exchange that emerged at the third meeting until the sixth meeting. The researcher interviewed students, then the following are questions whose answers relate to the emergence of these interaction patterns:

To validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked the students:

Interviewer : “When having a discussion, do you prefer to give your opinion or do you prefer to listen and give your opinion?”

S4 : “I'd rather listen to the opinion of my friends”

S3 : “I'll listen first, then give my opinion. So if I already understand the topic being discussed, I will give my opinion. But if I don't really understand, I'll listen to my friends first”.

S1 : “Give my opinion first”.

Based on the answers above, the answers are quite varied. S4, S5, and S6 chose to hear other members' perspectives about the topic being discussed. In contrast, S1

was confident to give her opinion first. Then there were S2 and S3, who adjusted to the situation of their comprehension of the topic being discussed. Therefore, based on the answer of S2 and S3, there is different findings regarding the factors that cause the emergence of these interaction patterns, namely student preferences in contributing. There is students who dare to immediately give their opinions, there are students who prefer to listen first, and there are also students who follow the situation and also determine their understanding of the assignments and the material.

To validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked the students:

Interviewer : “What do you think about English classes?”

S4 : “Learning English is fun, but a little stressful. Because I don't know enough English vocabulary”

(some students said that learning English was fun, but they also experienced difficulties)

S2 : “I really like learning English. Even now I use it in everyday conversations with my friends at school”

(some students said that they like it, and even used English when talking to friends at school)

Based on the student's answers above, it was found that 4 students said that learning English was fun, but they also experienced difficulties. S3, said that “English is fun, but because I'm not used to it. So it's normal not to like it too much”; then S5 said “I think learning English is stressful. Because I don't understand the language”; moreover, S6 said “Sometimes I like it, sometimes I don't. If I understand I like it, but if I don't understand I don't like it”. On the other hand, the other 2 members said they liked it, they even used English when talking to friends at school. As S2 said that she really like learning English and even speak in English when talking to friends at school. Similar to S2, S1 said, “I like learning English. Because it's an international language. So I thought I should be able to speak English. As a result, insufficient language competence may have an impact on students' participation in the discussion process.

To validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked the students:
Interviewer : “What difficulties do you found when learning English, especially in reading skills?”

S2 : “vocabulary, and also grammar”

The students' answers above clarified what caused the tendency of student interaction patterns during the four meetings. Vocabulary is the answer most often mentioned by students, there are five students who mentioned "vocabulary" they are S3, S4, S5 and S6. Besides that, S1 mentioned “grammar” and S2 mentioned both “vocabulary, and also grammar”.

To validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked the students:
Interviewer : “Does a member with a low level of understanding/mastery of the material have the potential to become passive in group discussions?”

S1 : “Yes. Because if I don't understand the topic, what can I say?”

S3 : “In my opinion, as long as there is an effort to do it. The group will be active even if the understanding of its members is lacking”

Some students stated that members with low knowledge would make them not know what to say during the discussions. Students who think like that include; S5,

she said “Yes, it will be passive”; moreover S6 said “In my opinion, yes. Because they don't know what to say”. Beside that, there are some students argue that members with low understanding of the material can still be helped. S2 said “In my opinion, it can still be taught”; then, S4 also said “I think it depends on the individual. If they don't understand but they dare to ask, the group discussion can still be active”. This finding relate with the prior research that emphasize that the student's range of abilities to solve problems is diverse (Liu & Tsai, 2008).

Discussion

This study discovered two patterns of student interaction in a discussion group after completing an observational study in six meetings. There are Distributive Knowledge Exchange and Partial Knowledge Exchange. Following is the discussion concerning the result of the analysis of pattern the students use to deliver their comprehension through group discussion by using the three-stage teaching method (3STM) in the classroom setting by using the IBIS model. And what factors cause this pattern to appear in this study according to the students.

Based on the findings, it was found that the pattern that appears most often is the Partial Knowledge Exchange pattern. This pattern appeared four times, while the other one, the Distributive Knowledge Exchange pattern only appeared twice out of a total of six meetings. Based on research that has been conducted in six meetings, the first pattern that emerges is the Distributive Knowledge Exchange. This pattern appears in the first meeting and the second meeting. This pattern can be identified because based on the findings described earlier, the discussion process fulfills the characteristics of the Distributive Knowledge Exchange pattern. Which, as conducted in the research written by Liu & Tsai (2008) that this pattern shows that every student contributes to propose an issue and respond to a position. In other words, the exchange of ideas is not limited to a small number of students. Instead, all group members contribute to the discussion. Both at the first meeting and at the second meeting, all members actively participated in the discussion process. They actively discussed and exchanged ideas. According to Liu and Tsai (2008) this type of knowledge exchange is the optimal one for group work. Because the group conducted frequent interactive discussions. However, even though the first meeting and the second meeting showed the same pattern, the researchers also found differences that occurred.

At the first meetings, the observation data showed that S2 and S4 proposed issues. Then other group members provided a response and then showed support for the issue. Therefore, it was found that students gave more responses than proposed issues or arguments in the discussion of this first meeting. In contrast to previous research conducted by Jacob & Sam (2010) where they found that in peer discourse interaction by each group in group problem solving activities, students had more proposed issues than proposing positions. In order to validate the claims of this interaction pattern, the researcher asked students on what they believe is the most important factor in determining the participation of students in group discussions. The answer divided into two, the first is group partner. Because when in a group with close friend it would be more comfortable to discuss. The second is mastery of discussion topic. Because when the topic being discuss is hard to understand it might affect the activeness of group members during the discussion process. In contrast, according to Ebadi & Purvis (2009), participants' understanding of the

topic would develop because more aspects were disclosed during the discussion. Therefore, students must be able to try to be more critical in discussions, and not to give up easily when they don't understand the topic of discussion.

At the second meeting, each students contributed during the discussion. They were actively proposed issues and provided position. It is similar with the first meeting, where the knowledge exchange were occur not only by selected students. However, the differences that exist were the number of issues and position that emerging during the discussion. In this meeting it was found that, more issues and positions were proposed by students during the discussion, the number of issues and posts was almost the same, but there were more positions emerged. It is in accordance with the the meaning of position “a position is an answer to an issue that helps to solve the issue. Each issue may have many positions” which conducted in Ebadi & Purvis (2009). Furthermore, the researcher also interviewed students about do they understood what an explanatory text was before the teacher explained it. Based on the students' answers, they can understand what an explanation text is because they already know what it means. As S2 said, “Yes. Because from the word "explain" it is certain that the purpose is to explain”. Thus, it can be concluded that students' knowledge and understanding of the material studied and the assignments given influence the pattern of student interaction in group discussions.

The second pattern that emerges is the Partial Knowledge Exchange pattern. This pattern appears four times, from the third meeting until the sixth meeting. Just like the previous pattern, based on research results, this pattern was identified based on student contributions during the discussion process. This pattern indicates that each member of the group has diverse background knowledge and abilities. Members with high abilities contribute to the process of discussion and problem solving, while members with low abilities do not participate (Liu & Tsai, 2008). Based on the results of observations at the third meeting there was a fairly drastic change from the previous meeting. Because, the knowledge exchange only occurred between 3 students, while the other students only listened. And this continues until the last meeting. In contrast to the findings of previous studies, this study found that students with higher English skills took turns being the center of knowledge. S1, and S2, take turns being members who provide solutions to issues that arise during discussions. Whereas in previous research Liu & Tsai (2008) stated that in this partial knowledge exchange pattern, students who have middle to upper abilities in the group do not occupy a position as a center of knowledge, but are active in group work.

In addition, to clarify what factors that caused this to happen, based on the interview results it is known that this is influenced by students' preferences to contribute to group discussions. Do they prefer to speak first during discussions, or listen and provide feedback. And the answer is most of students choose to listen to the opinions of other members rather than giving their own opinion. According to Wang et al. (2014), the higher the level of interaction, the greater the cognitive involvement required, creating a larger challenge for students. Then, another cause is the level of understanding/mastery of the material and the assignments given also play a role. Based on the students' answers, the researcher also asked about their opinion about learning English. And based on their answers, it was found that students who continued to actively discuss from the first meeting to the last meeting

said that they liked to even use English when talking to friends at school. Meanwhile, students who did not contribute from the third to last meeting said that they had difficulties and were not used to English. In line with Liu & Tsai (2008), they stated that the group with both high and middle ability had better peer interactions as well as learning results. The difficulties they found were vocabulary and grammar. Which vocabulary is the main capital in learning English.

CONCLUSION

This research aims to find the patterns that oftenly appear during the group discussions. The findings shows, there are two patterns that oftenly appear in this study. The first pattern that emerged was Distributive Knowledge Exchange. This pattern appears in the first meeting and the second meeting. Based on research conducted by Liu & Tsai (2008) this pattern is the most optimal pattern in group discussions. Because there is active collaboration between each member in it. Factors underlying the emergence of this pattern were also found. First, the students believe that the thing that most determines students' activeness in group discussions is discussion partners. The students said that their comfort in expressing opinions and responses influenced their activeness in group discussions. Then the second is students' knowledge and understanding of the material being studied and the assignments given. These two factors are the background to the emergence of this Distributive Knowledge Exchange interaction pattern.

The second pattern that emerged was Partial Knowledge Exchange pattern. This pattern emerged due to a significant change at the third meeting to the sixth meeting. Only some of the students from the group contributed to the group discussion. The exchange of thoughts only occurred with three students, while the other students only listened. The factor behind this pattern is that most students choose to listen to the opinions of other members rather than give their own opinions. Then they experience difficulties and are not used to English. The difficulties they found were vocabulary and grammar.

With the discovery of these two patterns, it was found that the factors that led to the emergence of distributive knowledge exchange patterns were discussion partners and students' knowledge of the material being studied. While the factors that influence the emergence of the pattern of partial knowledge are the character of students who prefer to listen to the opinions of other members only, then the difficulties faced by students such as lack of mastery of vocabulary, grammar, and also mastery of material which makes discussions at the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth meetings become less active.

This research is expected to be useful, especially in the field of education. For teachers, this research is expected to make teachers aware of the importance of facilitating students in the learning process. In addition, teachers are also expected to be more sensitive to things that will affect the maximum learning activities in class. Because the findings of the two patterns of student interaction lead to the conclusion that when dividing students for group work, the teacher must pair students with high abilities with students with lower abilities in order for the collaborative learning process to run properly and learning objectives to be reached. Then for students, the researcher hopes that this research can help students when they get group assignments. Because, based on the factors found, it is known that

students need to increase their courage in communicating with their group mates and also have a high desire to learn. However, this study has deficiencies in data collection. Because the researcher only took data from one school and only took one group as the research focus. Therefore, it is suggested for further research to collect broader data, for example taking data from two schools and comparing the findings that emerge.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author(s) disclosed no potential conflicts of interest in this paper's research, authorship, or publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to express gratitude to Allah SWT, the author's parents, and also Mr. Sumarta and Mrs. Indah Purnamadewi for their contributions as the first and second advisors to conducting this research. The author also want to express gratitude to the teachers who helped her in gathering data.

REFERENCES

- Baharudin, S. M., & Jamalludin, H. (2014). Enhancing students' level of critical thinking through interaction with problem-based learning and computer supported the collaborative learning environment. In *Proceeding of Fifth International Conference on Intelligent Systems, Modelling, and Simulation. Langkawi, Malaysia* (Vol. 808).
- Boardman, A. G., Boele, A. L., & Klingner, J. K. (2018). Strategy instruction shifts teacher and student interactions during text-based discussions. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 53(2), 175e195. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.191>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston: Pearson.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ebadi, Toktam & Purvis, Martin. (2009). A collaborative Web-based issue based information system (IBIS) framework.
- Follmer, D. J., & Sperling, R. A. (2018). Interactions between reader and text: Contributions of cognitive processes, strategy use, and text cohesion to comprehension of expository science text. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 67, 177e187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.08.005>.
- Haryono, S. S. (2020). Modul pembeajaran SMA bahasa inggris kelas XI: tell me how and why.
- Hirano, E. (2015). 'I read, I don't understand': Refugees coping with academic reading. *ELT Journal*, 69(2), 178e187. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu068>.
- Hu, Q., & Huang, Y. (2015, July). The design of open learner model to improve interaction of peer assessment in online learning. In *2015 10th International Conference on Computer Science & Education (ICCSE)* (pp. 310-314). IEEE.
- Huang, C. Q., Han, Z. M., Li, M. X., Jong, M. S. Y., & Tsai, C. C. (2019). Investigating students' interaction patterns and dynamic learning sentiments in online discussions. *Computers & Education*, 140, 103589.

- Heo, H., Lim, K. Y., & Kim, Y. (2010). Exploratory study on the patterns of online interaction and knowledge co-construction in project-based learning. *Computers & Education*, 55(3), 1383-1392.
- Hou, H. T., & Wu, S. Y. (2011). Analyzing the social knowledge construction behavioral patterns of an online synchronous collaborative discussion instructional activity using an instant messaging tool: A case study. *Computers & Education*, 57(2), 1459-1468.
- Jacob, S. M., & Sam, H. K. (2010, October). Analysis of interaction patterns and scaffolding practices in online discussion forums. In *2010 4th International Conference on Distance Learning and Education* (pp. 115-118). IEEE.
- Jin, T., Liu, X., & Lei, J. (2020). Developing an effective three-stage teaching method for collaborative academic reading: evidence from Chinese first-year college students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 45, 100853.
- Kunz, W. and Rittel, H. W. J. (1970). Issues as elements of information systems. Working paper. University of California at Berkeley: 1-9.
- Liu, C. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2008). An analysis of peer interaction patterns as discoursed by on-line small group problem-solving activity. *Computers & Education*, 50(3), 627-639.
- Liu, X., Gu, M. M., & Jin, T. (2021). Strategy use in collaborative academic reading: Understanding how undergraduate students co-construct comprehension of academic texts. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688211025688.
- Mahrukh Bashir. 2017. *Bahasa Inggris*. Edisi Revisi. Indonesia: Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Balitbang, Kemendikbud.
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*, 2nd Ed., p. 10-12. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moleong, L. J. (2011), *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*, Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nguyen, T. D., Cannata, M., & Miller, J. (2018). Understanding student behavioral engagement: Importance of student interaction with peers and teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(2), 163-174.
- Rittel, H. J. and Webber, M. M. (1984). "Planning problems are wicked problems." development in design methodology: 135-144.
- Susanti, A., Retnaningdyah, P., Puspita Ayu, A. N., & Trisusana, A. (2020). Improving EFL Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills through Collaborative Strategic Reading in Indonesia. *Online Submission*, 1(2), 43-52.
- Tegos, S., & Demetriadis, S. (2017). Conversational Agents Improve Peer Learning through Building on Prior Knowledge. *Educational Technology & Society*, 20 (1), 99–111.
- Wang, Z., Chen, L., & Anderson, T. (2014). A framework for interaction and cognitive engagement in connectivist learning contexts. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 15(2), 121–141.
- Webb, N., Franke, M., Ing, M., Wong, J., Fernandez, Cl, Shin, N., & Terrou, A. (2013). Engaging with other's mathematical ideas: Interrelationships among student participation, teachers' instructional practices, and learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 63, 79–93.

Yin Robert, K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*.