Research Article

Improving Cognitive Domain of Graduate Students on Corpus Linguistics Course through the Implementation of Blended Learning

[1*] Mirsa Umiyati, [1] Dewa Putu Widjana, [2]Kundharu Saddhono

[1] Universitas Warmadewa Bali, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Indonesia
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mirsa Umiyati, Universitas Warmadewa Bali, Indonesia.
Email: mirsa.umiyati@warmadewa.ac.id

Article History: Received: 10 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 4 June 2021

Abstract

Face to face learning method caused the students to be uninterested in class, discouraged, bored, stop trying in accomplishing tasks given (Felder and Silverman, 1988) however blended learning that is prove to be more effective in improving student satisfaction and knowledge (Marchalot et al (2018), Khodeir (2018), Alsalhi et al (2019), Li et a (2019), Yigzaw et al (2019),Yao (2019), Cocquyt et al (2019), Law et al (2019), (Asarta & Schmidt, 2020). This cross-sectional study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of blended learning in improving graduate students cognitive domain until level 5 (synthesis) on corpus linguistic. The population of this study were first grader university students who enrolled in 2018/2019 (group 1) and third grader university students who enrolled in 2019/2020 (group 2) in corpus linguistics course. The data were analysed using the statistical program that available in SPSS. The similarity of the groups was analysed using crosstabulation and Mann Whitney U test. The different mean (average) scores of the two groups were analysed using an unpairing student t-test/ Mann Whitney U test depend on the equality of variant. The results of the testing revealed that the average score achieved by the students using face to face learning methods was 84.4737 while average scores achieved by the students with blended learning was 90.0000. Both scores were highly significant different with $p < 0.01$. In conclusion, blended learning is more effective compared to face to face learning.

Keywords: Corpus Linguistics, Face to Face Learning, Blended Learning, First Grader University Students, Third Grader University Students

Introduction

Corpus linguistics comes from a corpus and linguistics. A corpus is a collection of naturally occurring language text, chosen to characterize a state of variety of a language and linguistics is the study of language (Sinclair, 1991:171). Hence, corpus linguistics is the study of language/linguistics phenomena through the analysis of data obtained from a corpus. Nesselhauf, (2005) stated that corpus linguistics is a method of carrying out linguistic analyses. Moreover, corpus linguistics is the study of language-based in examples of real life language use (McEnery and Wilson, 2001). Corpus linguistics is one of the courses taught in the second semester of Master of Linguistics. Previously, face to face learning was applied in learning corpus linguistics at Master of Linguistics, Postgraduate program. Face to face learning refers to a teaching method involving instructors and students interacting in a face-to-face manner in the classroom. These face to face learning instructors initiate discussions in the classroom, and focus exclusively on learning content from textbooks and notes. Students receive the information passively and reiterate the information memorized in the exams (McCarthy and Anderson, 2000).

Face to face learning made the teacher as the center and ultimately conventional teaching methods make students uninterested in class, discouraged, bored, stop trying in accomplishing tasks given, and do poorly in tests (Felder and Silverman, 1988) likewise in teaching-learning corpus linguistics at Master of Linguistics, Postgraduate program. However, this method felt very old, was not effective and caused the students to get bored easily. As a consequence, the students' level of achievement in corpus linguistics was decreased. Thus, in this case, to solve this problem, it needs to find a new strategy to improve the students' level of achievement.

One of the strategies that can improve the students' achievement is blended learning. Blended learning is a learning method in which face to face learning are combined with online learning. Garrison & Vaughan (2008) asserted that

blended learning is perceived to be a means to combine the best of face-to-face and online learning. This strategy was implemented to improve the corpus linguistics students' achievement at Master of Linguistics, Postgraduate program since this strategy is effective proven by the several latest related studies. Blended learning is provided through a variety of ways: online learning programs incorporating activities and information that are very similar to other forms of distance learning; online learning portals that take people through a variety of online and offline provisions (Saddhono, Sudarsana, & Iskandar, 2019). Websites that focus on specific product and service offerings highlighting features and benefits in the same way as a corporate brochure; specific sites that allow you to download articles and tools, either free or on a free trial basis prior to purchase (Thorne, 2003). In an experimental, found that higher learning outcomes for students using game-based learning compared to students who did not use it (Felder, R., & Silverman, L., 1988). Systematic review studies and meta-analysis conducted on students revealed that smartphone based mobile learning has a positive impact on learning knowledge, skills, and attitudes. According to the perception of graduate students, blended learning is a learning technology that is easily accessible through website, attractive displays with combination of colours, and interesting with the presence of learning image and videos.

Several previous studies have indicated that blended learning is effective in improving student achievement, such as the studies conducted by Marchalot et al (2018), Khodeir (2018), (Bakeer, 2018), Alsalhi et al (2019), Li et al (2019), Yigzaw et al (2019), Yao (2019), Cocquyt et al (2019), Law et al (2019), (Asarta & Schmidt, 2020). The study conducted by Marchalot et al (2018) showed that mean score of pre-interventional and post-interventional from 2007 to 2014 was 308. For the pre-interventional period, the mean score in the blended learning group (n = 53) was 176 (CI 95% 163 to 188) whereas the mean score in the control group (n = 106) was 167 (CI 95 % 160 to 174) (no difference). For the post-interventional period, the mean score in blended learning group (n = 54) was 232 on 300 (CI95% 227–237) whereas the mean score in the control group (n = 95) is 215 (CI95% 209–220) ($P < 0.001$). In the two groups, comparison between pre and post-interventional stages showed the increase of mean score, stronger for blended learning group (32% and 28% in blended learning and control group, $P < 0.05$). The average time of homework in the blended learning group was 27 h (CI 95% 18.2–35.8) and 10 h in the control group (CI 95% 2–18) ($P < 0.05$). This work suggests the positive effect of blended learning (associating internet-based learning and flipped classroom) on the anaesthesia and critical care residents' knowledge by increasing their homework's time. The findings of the study carried out by (Khodeir, 2018) took the form of a matrix of blended teaching methods that were examined in case studies, this matrix is of value to instructors involved in teaching Project Management courses. In addition, The results of the study done by (Bakeer, 2018) indicated that learners find that the blended learning approach can help them take responsibility for their own learning by making them autonomous and confident. They were motivated to learn English and believed the blended learning method helped them develop their learning and communication skills.

Furthermore, the study of Alsalhi et al (2019) compares the results of various ways of teaching science topics, and students' attitudes towards their use. The findings revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the experimental and the control groups, in favor of the experimental group, and the experimental group's attitudes were also more positive towards the using of blended learning. Their attitudes were in favour of students with academic performance in a science subject of the Performance level (Pass). The study recommends further research into the use of blended learning in higher education institutions.

Other studies of blended learning showed that blended learning can effectively improve the students' knowledge such as a study conducted by Li et al (2019). The finding of this study showed that a total of 8 studies met the inclusion criteria of meta-analysis, including 574 nursing students. Compared with traditional teaching, blended learning could effectively improve nursing students' knowledge (SMD= 0.70, 95% CI [0.52, 0.87], $P < 0.00001$) and satisfaction (SMD= 0.72, 95% CI [0.08, 0.59], P= 0.01), and tended to improve the skills although without significant difference (SMD= 0.58, 95% CI [−0.17, 1.32], P= 0.13). Blended learning can effectively improve the knowledge and satisfaction of nursing students. Therefore, blended learning can be used as a teaching method in nursing education. The results of Yigzaw's et al (2019) study revealed that knowledge scores were similar for the blended and conventional teaching-learning groups before training (58.5% vs 61.5%, $p = 0.358$) and three months post-training (74.7% vs 75.5% = 0.720), with no significant difference in gains made. Post-training skills scores were significantly higher for conventional teaching-learning than blended learning (85.8% vs 75.3%, $p < 0.001$). After controlling for other factors in the multiple linear regression analysis, providers with a university degree had significantly higher skills scores than those with a diploma ($p < 0.001$). Training costs were lower for blended learning than conventional teaching-learning (1032 USD vs 1648 USD per trainee). Blended learning approach using SMS and phone calls was as effective as conventional one to increase providers' knowledge with substantially lower costs. Further study is warranted to examine the effect of blended learning on providers' skills. In Bock et al (2018) and McCutcheon, O'Halloran, and Lohan's research (2018) clarified that application of a blended learning approach could satisfy the requirements of the new generation of

students, and transform traditional lectures into modern, sustainable, and technology-enhanced learning experiences. In addition, blended learning provides added pedagogical value when compared to online learning in terms of teaching undergraduate nurses clinical supervision skills.

Building on the background and latest related studies above, thus the present study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of blended learning in improving graduate students cognitive domain until level 5 (synthesis) on corpus linguistics. The research question of this study is does blended learning improves graduate students cognitive domain until level 5 (synthesis) on a corpus linguistics course?

Method

This research design was cross-sectional in which the data were collected once in certain period of time. The population study was all student of Linguistics Department that were enrolled in year of 2018/2019 and year 2019/2020 with the total number of 19 and 16 person respectively. No sampling was done, all population were considered as the objects of study. The variables studied were included biodata (sex, age, occupation), method of learning (face to face and blended learning), and score of end-semester student examination. The variables were operationalized as follows: (1) sex consists of male and female, (2) age is stated in year, (3) occupations is stated as government employees and nongovernment employees, (4) face to face learning includes the following sessions: lecturing, discussion, student's assignment, (5) blended learning comprises of face to face in combination with e-learning where e-learning here uses various sessions, namely: chatting, forum, feedbacks, online assignments, preparation's test, video tutorial mostly derived from university's vendor, namely Wily Online Library, (6) final semester exam scores are expressed in numbers. Instruments for data collection were: (1) standardized questionnaire for collecting biodata of respondents and (2) the document of final semester exam questions for collecting the score of end semester exam. The methods of data collections were direct interviewed based on standardized questionnaire and document of final semester exam.

In this study face to face learning was introduced to the students of 2018/2019 (group I) while blended learning was introduced to students of 2019/2020 (group II). Student's exam was taken place at the end of semester using essay as well as multiple choices questions and the results was properly noted in education management system. The collected data processed in computer using program of SPSS (statistical packages for social sciences), initiated with inputting data into the database of SPPS, followed by the process of data cleaning. The clean data base is then analysed to focus on knowing the effectiveness of blended learning by comparing the average value of final semester exams results from students of group I who were introduced face to face learning with average value of final semester exam of student of group II who were introduced blended learning.

Comparing average values can be analysed using statistical of parametric or nonparametric, depend on the similarity of data's distribution of the two groups and normality distribution of the score of final semester's exam. If it is similar and normal in their distribution, parametric statistical analysis of unpairing student t-test can be applied, while if it was not, nonparametric statistical analysis of Mann-Whitney U test is proper to use. In this case, the type of similarity tests used were Cross-tabulation for sex distribution and Student t-test for similarity of age distribution, however normality test used was Kosmogorov-Semirnov.

Result and Discussion

The profile of the students

Out of 35 students studied, 19 (54.3%) of them were student enrolled on 2018 and 16 were students enrolled on year 2019. Based on sex distribution, 18(51.4%) were males and 17(48.6%) females. Their age characteristics were as follows: The average age was 29.06 years, while mode was 25 and median was 23, with standard deviation of 8.775 and variance of 76.997. The range was 30 with minimal value of 23 and maximal value of 53 years. Based on their job, it was found that most of them 29(82.9%) were having job while rest of them 6(17.1%) were not having job. (see table 1, 2, 3,4)

Table 1 Student's Distribution Based on Year of Student's Enrollement

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2018	19	54.3	54.3	54.3
	2019	16	45.7	45.7	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 Student's distribution based on sex

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	18	51.4	51.4	51.4
	Female	17	48.6	48.6	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 Statistics for Age Distribution

		Sex	Age	Job	Grade
N	Valid	35	35	35	35
	Missing	0	0	0	0
Mean		1.49	29.06	1.17	1.46
Median		1.00	25.00	1.00	1.00
Mode		1	23	1	1
Std. Deviation		.507	8.775	.382	.505
Variance		.257	76.997	.146	.255
Range		1	30	1	1
Minimum		1	23	1	1
Maximum		2	53	2	2

Table 4 Student's Distribution based on Their Profession

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Having a job	29	82.9	82.9	82.9
	Having no job	6	17.1	17.1	100.0
	Total	35	100.0	100.0	

Group Similarity of Students

Before comparison analysis can be carried out, similarity of the two groups of students were analysed. Similarity concerning sex distribution was analysed using analysis of cross-tabulation, while similarity of age distribution was analysed using student t-test or Mann Whitney U test. Results of cross-tabulation analysis can be seen in table 5 and table 6.

Table 5 Distribution of sex based on student's group (Cross Tabulation Analysis)

			Student's group		Total
			2018	2019	
Sex:	Male	Count	10	8	18
		% within sex	55.6%	44.4%	100.0%
		% within group	52.6%	50.0%	51.4%
		% of Total	28.6%	22.9%	51.4%
	Female	Count	9	8	17
		% within sex	52.9%	47.1%	100.0%
		% within group	47.4%	50.0%	48.6%
		% of Total	25.7%	22.9%	48.6%
Total		Count	19	16	35
		% within sex	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%
		% within group	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	54.3%	45.7%	100.0%

Table 5 revealed that out of 19 students group of 2018, 10 of them were male with their percentage of 52.6% and 9 females with their percentage of 47.4%. Meanwhile, out of 16 students group of 2019, 8 were males and 8 were females with their respective percentage of 50.0% and 50.0%. Empirically the percentage of male students group 2018 and 2019 were different (compared between 52.5% versus 50.0%). It was also found in the percentage of female students group of 2019 (47.4% versus 50.0%).

Table 6 Results of Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.024[a]	1	.877		
Continuity Correction[b]	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.024	1	.877		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.573
:Linear-by-Linear Association	.023	1	.878		
N of Valid Cases	35				
a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.77.					
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table					

Since (a) no cell of the two by two tables with zero count and (b) zero cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5 (the minimum expected count is 7.77) then 2 by 2 cross tabulation analysis can be applied as usual. From table 6 (Chi-Square tests), it was noted that the value of X2 was 0.24, significant of 2 sides was 0.877, mean that the value of p was bigger than 0.05. This fact rejected the alternative hypothesis which states that the percentages were different, meaning that students' sex distributions in the two groups were similar statistically.

Table 7 Results of Standard Deviation

	Class of Students	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	2018	19	84.4737	1.77540	.40730
	2019	16	90.0000	4.16333	1.04083

Table 8 Results of Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Score	Equal variances assumed	29.286	.000	-5.257	33	.000	-5.52632	1.05121	-7.66502	-3.38761
	Equal variances not assumed			-4.944	19.564	.000	-5.52632	1.11769	-7.86112	-3.19152

The alternative test was non parametric of Mann Whitney U test to compare mean. The result showed that Mann Whitney U value was 71.000, Z value of -2.710, with Significance of two tailed of 0.07), $p > 0.05$, it was concluded that null hypothesis was accepted and alternative hypothesis was rejected meant that ages were distributed equally in both groups. Thus, the groups (students' enrolled year 2018/2019 and year 2019/2020) were similar mainly on sex and age distribution (see table 7 and 8).

The Effectivity of Blended Learning Compare to face to face Learning

Comparing mean analysis was carried out in order to calculate the effectivity of blended learning method if compared to offline learning method. The student t-test can be used if the variance score of assessment were equal, vice versa Mann Whitney U test if the variance was not equal. The results of Unpairing Student t test was as follows: (a) The average score of end semester assessment of students 2018/2019 was 84.4737 while student of year 2019/2020 was 90.0000; (b) The Lavene's test for equal variance shows the value of F was 29.296, Sig was 0.0000, $p < 0,01$ which indicated the variance of end semester examination's score of the two groups of students were not equal. This meant that comparing the score of mean of end semester's score of student's examination was suitable using Non Parametric of Mann Whitney U test. The results was as follows: (a) Mann Whitney U value was 26.500, Z value was 4.206, Sig was 0.000, $p < 0,01$; (b) It was concluded that the average score of assessment of students year 2019/2020 was highly significance higher compared to average score of students of year 2018/2019, indicated that blended learning method more effective compared to offline learning method (see table 8, 9, and 10).

Table 9 Average Score of Students Assessment

Ranks				
	Class of Students	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Age	2018	19	22.26	423.00
	2019	16	12.94	207.00
	Total	35		

Table 10 Results of Mann-Whitney U Test

	Age
Mann-Whitney U	71.000
Wilcoxon W	207.000
Z	-2.710
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.007
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.007[b]
a. Grouping Variable: angkatan	
b. Not corrected for ties.	

Discussion

The obtained results of the testing regarding the effectiveness of blended learning in improving graduate students cognitive domain until level 5 (synthesis) on corpus linguistic revealed that the average score achieved by the students using face to face learning methods was 84.4737 while average scores achieved by the students with blended learning was 90.0000. Both scores were highly significant different with $p < 0.01$. This means that blended learning is more effective compared to face to face learning. The results of this study is consistent with several latest related studies that shown blended learning's strategy was effective in improving students' achievement compared with face to face learning such as the study finding of (Marchalot et al, 2018), (Khodeir, 2018), (Bakeer, 2018), (Alsalhi et al, 2019), (Li et al, 2019), (Yigzaw's et al, 2019), (Yao, 2019), (Cocquyt et al, 2019), (Law et al, 2019), (Asarta & Schmidt, 2020).

Comparing with the results obtained by (Marchalot et al, 2018) that Blended learning (associating internet-based learning and flipped teaching) seems to improve residents' results of the first year anaesthesia and critical care teaching. The increase of the working time assessed by the students themselves might be an explanation. Anaesthesia and critical care residents would appear to be satisfied with their blended learning course, thus encouraging to continue this type of teaching and training in coming years. This means that blended learning improves the residents' results of the first year anaesthesia and critical care teaching. Furthermore, the results of this present study is supported by the obtained results of (Khodeir, 2018) which revealed that the findings of this paper took the form of a matrix of blended teaching methods that were examined in case studies, this matrix is of value to instructors involved in teaching PM courses. This result indicated that blended leaning is effective implemented in teaching course. The result of this present study is also in agreement with the previous study that approved the positive impact of blended learning on the achievement of students and their positive attitudes towards its use. This is based on findings of the study show that students' attitudes towards the integration of blended learning had a positive effect in enhancing students' language skills as well as autonomous learning and learner motivation (Bakeer, 2018; Saddhono, 2020; Saddhono et al., 2020). In addition, (Alsalhi et al, 2019) supported that the application of blended learning had a positive impact on students' achievement. It is based on the conducted results of the study. There was a statistically significant difference between the experimental and the

control groups, in favor of the experimental group, who were taught using blended learning. Moreover, the students in that group had positive attitudes toward the use of blended learning. In addition, the results indicated that the attitudes of the students towards the use of blended learning varied depending on the student academic performance in a science subject, in favor of the performance level (pass). No statistical significance was found in this respect with regard to the variable of students' gender.

This present study is also agreed by several previous studies that approved that blended learning could effectively improve the knowledge level and satisfaction. This study is conducted on nursing students' knowledge, skills and satisfaction. Therefore, blended education can be used as a teaching method of nursing education in the future. However, due to the limited number of included literatures, more high-quality studies are needed to confirm the findings (Saddhono et al, 2019). In addition, Chinese adult learners believe a blended learning environment promotes sustainable development in at least three aspects within some degree, (Yao, 2019). This study investigated Chinese adult learners' viewpoints of a blended learning environment in promoting sustainable development.

Other things that supported the effectiveness of blended learning is the facilitation supports in blended courses (Cocquyt et al, 2019). In their study examines whether and how various types of learning support in blended courses are related to adults' social inclusion and social capital. Based on the results of the current study, it seems that both learner-instructor interaction (i.e. process guidance and transfer support) and learner-learner interaction (peer support) contribute positively to adults' social participation, social connectedness and social capital. These types of support reflect a constructivist approach to learning and education. Therefore, it is recommended to facilitate support in blended courses from a constructivist perspective in order to foster social benefits for adult learners. However, this result corresponds with the results of the present study in effectiveness of blended learning.

Another study that supported the results of this presents study is a study conducted by Rahmawati, et al (2019). The results of their study supported that the student enrolment is found to have positive effects on cognitive and social presence, and indirect positive impacts on student learning outcomes. The results reveal that learning motivation enhances student enrolment and social presence. Teaching presence plays a vital role in facilitating student cognitive thinking and social interactions among peers. The findings in this study provide important implications for educators to use student enrolment as a critical measure for adjusting online and offline course design. Student interactions and group discussion require clear instructor guidance to keep the student on track and make social activities effective in achieving learning targets. This study examined the role of student enrolment in the BL teaching environment. Furthermore, the results of this present study is also supported by the results obtained by (Asarta & Schmidt, 2020). This study explored whether any significant gains accrue to students due to previous experience. The results of this study is consistent with the results of the present study which is online and blended experience provided a positive marginal effect on outcomes for high-achieving transfer students. Meaning that blended learning was effective in improving students achievement compared with face to face learning.

Conclusion

The testing in this study was used to evaluate the effectiveness of blended learning in improving graduate students cognitive domain until level 5 (synthesis) on corpus linguistics. However, this study was limited on the achievement of average score both face to face learning and blended learning. Therefore, from the discussion and analysis above, it can be concluded that about 84.4737 was the average score of face to face learning that achieved by students. Meanwhile, about 90.0000 was the average score of blended learning that achieved by students. Both scores were highly significant different with $p < 0,01$. It means that blended learning is more effective compared with face to face learning. That is why blended learning is strongly suggested to be implemented in graduate students of the linguistic program.

References

1. Alsalhi, N. R., Eltahir, M. E., & Al-Qatawneh, S. S. (2019). The effect of blended learning on the achievement of ninth grade students in science and their attitudes towards its use. *Heliyon, 5(9), e02424. doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02424*
2. Asarta, C. J., & Schmidt, J. R. (2020). The effects of online and blended experience on outcomes in a blended learning environment. *The Internet and Higher Education, 44(September 2019), 100708. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2019.100708*
3. Bakeer, A. M. A. (2018). Students' Attitudes towards Implementing Blended Learning in Teaching English in Higher Education Institutions: A Case of Al-Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and*

Social Science, 8(6), 131–139. doi:10.30845/ijhss.v8n6a15

4. Bock, A., Modabber, A., Kniha, K., Lemos, M., Rafai, N., & Hölzle, F. (2018). Blended learning modules for lectures on oral and maxillofacial surgery. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, 56(10), 956–961. doi:10.1016/j.bjoms.2018.10.281*
5. Cocquyt, C., Zhu, C., Diep, A. N., De Greef, M., & Vanwing, T. (2019). Examining the role of learning support in blended learning for adults' social inclusion and social capital. *Computers and Education, 142(March 2018), 103610. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103610*
6. Felder, R., & Silverman, L. (1988). Learning and Teaching Styles in Engineering Education. *Engineering Education, 78(7), 674–681.*
7. Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended Learning in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
8. Hole, Y., Hole, S. P.-, & Bhaskar, M. P. (2019). The damages of liberal marketing myopia. *Restaurant Business*, 118(10), 542-556.
9. Khodeir, L. M. (2018). Blended learning methods as an approach to teaching project management to architecture students. *Alexandria Engineering Journal, 57(4), 3899–3905. doi:10.1016/j.aej.2018.10.004*
10. Law, K. M. Y., Geng, S., & Li, T. (2019). Student enrollment, motivation and learning performance in a blended learning environment: The mediating effects of social, teaching, and cognitive presence. *Computers and Education, 136(March), 1–12. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2019.02.021*
11. Li, C., He, J., Yuan, C., Chen, B., & Sun, Z. (2019). The effects of blended learning on knowledge, skills, and satisfaction in nursing students: A meta-analysis. *Nurse Education Today, 82(August), 51–57. doi:10.1016/j.nedt.2019.08.004*
12. Marchalot, A., Dureuil, B., Veber, B., Fellahi, J. L., Hanouz, J. L., Dupont, H., … Compère, V. (2018). Effectiveness of a blended learning course and flipped classroom in first year anaesthesia training. *Anaesthesia Critical Care and Pain Medicine, 37(5), 411–415. doi:10.1016/j.accpm.2017.10.008*
13. McCarthy, J. P., & Anderson, L. (2000). Active Learning Techniques Versus Traditional Teaching Styles: Two Experiments from History and Political Science. *Innovative Higher Education, 24(4), 279–294. doi:10.1023/B*
14. McCutcheon, K., O'Halloran, P., & Lohan, M. (2018). Online learning versus blended learning of clinical supervisee skills with pre-registration nursing students: A randomised controlled trial. International *Journal of Nursing Studies, 82(January 2017), 30–39. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2018.02.005*
15. McEnery, T., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Corpus linguistics: An Introduction Tony McEnery and Andrew Wilson Second Edition.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
16. Nesselhauf, N. (2005). *Corpus Linguistics: A Practical Introduction.* Universität Heidelberg, 2005(October 2005), 32.
17. Rahmawati, L. E., Suwandi, S., Saddhono, K., & Setiawan, B. (2019). Construction of Test Instrument to Assess Foreign Student's Competence of Indonesian Language through Objective Test. *International Journal of Instruction*, *12*(4), 35-48.
18. Saddhono, K., Satria, E., Erwinsyah, A., & Abdullah, D. (2019, December). Designing SwiSH Max Learning Software Based of Multimedia. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1364, No. 1, p. 012032). IOP Publishing.
19. Saddhono, K., Sudarsana, I. K., & Iskandar, A. (2019, November). Implementation of Indonesian Language The learning Based on Information and Communication Technology in Improving Senior High School Students' Achievement in Surakarta. In Journal of Physics: Conference Series (Vol. 1254, No. 1, p. 012059). IOP Publishing.
20. Saddhono, K., Lestari, P., & Sari, Y. (2020). Aspects of Literacy in Vision and Mission of University Libraries in Indonesia. Library Philosophy and Practice, 1-13.
21. Saddhono, K. (2020). Indonesian Online Media's Construction of 'Maritime': A Critical Discourse Analysis. Pomorstvo, 34(1), 16-23
22. Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
23. Thorne, K. (2003). Blended Learning: How to Intergrate Online Learning and Traditional Learning. *Kogan Page. London: Kogan Page.* Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?id=xkBMgdG9up8C&pgis=1%0Ahttp://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12971163
24. Weigand, E. (2017). *The Routledge handbook of language and dialogue. The Routledge Handbook of Language and Dialogue.* New York: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315750583
25. Yogesh Hole et al 2019 J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 1362 012121
26. Yao, C. (2019). An investigation of adult learners' viewpoints to a blended learning environment in promoting sustainable development in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 220, 134–143. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.01.290*

27. Yigzaw, M., Tebekaw, Y., Kim, Y. M., Kols, A., Ayalew, F., & Eyassu, G. (2019). Comparing the effectiveness of a blended learning approach with a conventional learning approach for basic emergency obstetric and newborn care training in Ethiopia. *Midwifery, 78, 42–49. doi:10.1016/j.midw.2019.07.014*