Help: Journal of Community Service Vol. 1 No. 1, 2024
eISSN:
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62569/hjcs
Received: April 2024/ Revised: June 2024/ Accepted: June 2024

Help: Journal of Community Service
*https://ejournal.agungmediapublisher.com/index.php/hjcs*

# Building A Thriving Learning Environment: A Guide To Education Management

K. Sunitha[1*] , Purvi Dagwale[2] , Ruhani Kumari[3] , Navdeep Singh Konsal[4]

[1]*Associate professor, Avinash College of Commerce, Khairthabad, 500004, India*
[2,3,4]*Student, Avinash College of Commerce, Telangana, 500003, India*

**Abstract.** This paper delves into the critical role of instructional design in cultivating thriving learning environments. It dissects two prominent pedagogical approaches: collaborative learning and direct instruction. The paper unpacks the theoretical foundations of each method. It explores the strengths of collaborative learning (fostering critical thinking, communication, problem-solving skills through social learning theory and constructivism), highlighting its ability to cultivate deeper understanding and increased motivation among students. However, the paper acknowledges potential challenges associated with collaborative learning, including management complexities and assessment difficulties. Conversely, the paper analyzes the merits of direct instruction. It emphasizes the effectiveness of this approach in establishing a strong foundation in fundamental skills and ensuring clear, consistent instruction. However, the paper recognizes potential drawbacks of direct instruction, such as limited student engagement and a potential neglect of higher-order thinking skills. Recognizing the influence of factors like student age, learning objectives, and subject matter, the paper underscores the importance of education managers strategically selecting the most appropriate approach. Ultimately, the paper advocates for a balanced approach that capitalizes on the strengths of both collaborative learning and direct instruction to create a dynamic and engaging learning experience, empowering students to develop essential 21st-century skills.

*Keywords:* Thriving Learning Environments; Collaborative Learning; Direct Instruction; Critical Thinking; Consistent Instruction

## 1. Introduction

A thriving learning environment is one where students are actively engaged, motivated, and empowered to reach their full potential (Ren et al., 2024). Education managers play a crucial role in cultivating such environments by thoughtfully selecting instructional approaches that best meet the needs of their students (Kiikeri et al., 2024).

*Corresponding author's email: sunithak.sec.avinashcollege@gmail.com, Tel.: +91 6281586204

Among the various educational strategies, two prominent approaches that significantly impact learning environments are collaborative learning and direct instruction (Maragha et al., 2024). Collaborative learning is a student-centered approach that emphasizes teamwork, communication, and shared responsibility for learning (Do et al., 2023). In these environments, students work together in groups to achieve common goals, such as solving problems or completing projects (Ramasamy et al., 2023). This approach fosters the development of critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving skills while enhancing student motivation and engagement by fostering a sense of community (Wallander Karlsen et al., 2023). The theoretical foundations of collaborative learning include social learning theory, which posits that learning occurs through observing and interacting with others, and constructivism, which suggests that learners actively construct their understanding through experience and interaction (Dahleez et al., 2023).

However, collaborative learning also presents challenges. Managing group activities, especially in large classrooms, can be difficult (Sohail et al., 2023). There is also the risk that dominant personalities may overshadow quieter students, and assessing individual contributions in group work can be complex (Routman, 2023). On the other hand, direct instruction is a teacher-centered approach where the teacher explicitly explains and models new information, concepts, or skills (Seevaratnam et al., 2023). This method is particularly effective for introducing new material and providing clear, consistent instruction, ensuring all students have a solid foundation in the subject matter. The theoretical underpinnings of direct instruction include Behaviorism, which emphasizes reinforcement and positive feedback, and Cognitive Load Theory, which suggests that structured and organized information helps manage cognitive load.

Despite its strengths, direct instruction can lead to student disengagement and passivity if overused. It may not adequately address the development of higher-order thinking skills and may not cater to the diverse learning needs of all students. The effectiveness of collaborative and direct learning approaches depends on factors such as student age, developmental level, and learning objectives. Younger students may benefit more from direct instruction, while older students can thrive in collaborative environments. When introducing new information, direct instruction might be more appropriate, whereas collaborative activities can be effective for applying knowledge and developing higher-order thinking skills. Education managers must thoughtfully integrate both methods to create a balanced and dynamic learning environment that supports all students in reaching their full potential.

In the evolving landscape of education, creating a thriving learning environment remains a paramount goal for educators and administrators. A thriving learning environment is characterized by student engagement, motivation, and the empowerment to reach one's full potential. Achieving this goal is increasingly complex, influenced by diverse student needs, rapidly changing technologies, and varying educational philosophies. The challenge for education managers is to navigate these complexities and implement strategies that foster such environments effectively. The problem of building thriving learning environments is multifaceted. It begins with understanding the diverse needs of students, who come from varied backgrounds and possess different learning styles and capabilities. Traditional one-size-fits-all approaches to education are no longer sufficient. Students today require personalized learning experiences that can adapt to

their individual strengths and weaknesses. This necessitates a deep understanding of pedagogical theories and practices that can be tailored to support diverse learners.

Moreover, the role of the teacher has evolved from being a sole source of knowledge to a facilitator of learning. This shift has brought into focus the importance of different instructional approaches, particularly collaborative learning and direct instruction. Collaborative learning, with its emphasis on teamwork and shared responsibility, aligns with the constructivist view that knowledge is co-constructed through social interactions. This approach encourages active engagement and helps develop critical soft skills such as communication and problem-solving. Conversely, direct instruction, grounded in behaviorist and cognitive load theories, offers a structured and efficient way to deliver foundational knowledge. It ensures that students receive clear, consistent information, which is particularly useful for introducing new concepts and building basic skills. However, it can also lead to passive learning if not balanced with opportunities for active engagement and higher-order thinking.

The challenge lies in integrating these approaches effectively. Education managers must discern when to employ direct instruction to provide a solid foundation and when to utilize collaborative learning to enhance deeper understanding and skill development. This balancing act is crucial for fostering an environment where students can thrive. In addition to pedagogical challenges, education managers must also address practical issues such as classroom management, resource allocation, and the professional development of teachers. Effective classroom management is essential for creating an orderly environment conducive to learning, especially in collaborative settings where group activities can become chaotic. Resource allocation, including the availability of technological tools and learning materials, impacts the implementation of various instructional strategies.

Teacher training and professional development are critical components in building thriving learning environments (Augeard et al., 2022). Educators need ongoing support to stay abreast of the latest educational research, technological advancements, and effective teaching practices (Durrah et al., 2022). Professional development opportunities enable teachers to refine their instructional strategies, learn new methods, and collaborate with peers to share insights and best practices. Furthermore, the socio-emotional aspect of learning cannot be overlooked. A thriving learning environment also addresses the emotional and psychological well-being of students. This involves creating a supportive and inclusive school culture where all students feel valued and respected. Education managers must implement policies and practices that promote a positive school climate, addressing issues such as bullying, mental health, and social-emotional learning.

Building a thriving learning environment is a complex and dynamic challenge that requires a holistic approach. Education managers must navigate pedagogical, practical, and socio-emotional dimensions to create spaces where students can flourish. By thoughtfully integrating diverse instructional strategies, managing resources effectively, supporting teacher development, and fostering a positive school culture, they can cultivate environments that not only enhance academic achievement but also support the overall growth and well-being of students.

## 2. Methods

To conduct this study, a comprehensive review of existing research on collaborative learning and direct instruction was undertaken (Gnann et al., 2022). This involved analyzing scholarly articles, educational journals, and books to understand the theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, and best practices associated with each instructional approach (Zhuang et al., 2022). The literature review focused particularly on studies that compare the effectiveness of collaborative learning and direct instruction across various learning environments. By synthesizing findings from these sources, a robust foundation was established for understanding how these methods contribute to student engagement, motivation, and academic success.

In addition to the literature review, surveys were administered to gather first-hand insights from educators and students (Zhu et al., 2021). The surveys aimed to capture their perceptions of the effectiveness, engagement levels, and challenges associated with both collaborative learning and direct instruction (Kools et al., 2020). Educators provided valuable perspectives on how each method impacts classroom dynamics, student interaction, and overall learning outcomes. Students shared their experiences and preferences, highlighting how each approach influenced their motivation, participation, and understanding of the material. The primary objective of this study is to evaluate how collaborative learning and direct instruction contribute to creating thriving learning environments. This involves comparing the strengths and weaknesses of each approach in terms of student engagement, skill development, and academic performance. By examining empirical evidence and theoretical insights, the study aims to provide a nuanced understanding of how these instructional methods can be optimized to support student success.

Another key objective is to offer practical guidance for education managers in choosing the most suitable instructional approach. This guidance will take into account various factors such as student age, developmental level, subject matter, and specific learning objectives. By outlining the contexts in which each method is most effective, the study aims to help education managers make informed decisions that enhance teaching practices and learning outcomes in their institutions.

## 3. Results and Discussion

Hypothesis Testing:

This research utilizes a one-sample t-test to investigate the impact of a collaborative learning program on student performance compared to a pre-established benchmark.

Null Hypothesis ($H_0$):

The null hypothesis represents the "no effect" scenario. In this case, it assumes that the collaborative learning program does not lead to a statistically significant difference in student performance.

Alternative Hypothesis ($H_1$):

The alternative hypothesis specifies the expected effect. Here, it suggests that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact on student performance.

**Table 3.1.** T-Test

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| One-Sample | | | | |

| Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| 1. I share ideas easily in group activities. | 28 | 3.89 | 1.571 | .297 |

| One-Sample Test | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Test Value = 30 | | | | | | |
| | T | df | Significance | | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | One-Sided p | Two-Sided p | | Lower | Upper |
| 1. I share ideas easily in group activities. | -87.908 | 27 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -26.107 | -26.72 | -25.50 |



| One-Sample Test | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Test Value = 30 | | | | | | |
| | T | df | Significance | | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | One-Sided p | Two-Sided p | | Lower | Upper |
| 1. I share ideas easily in group activities. | -87.908 | 27 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -26.107 | -26.72 | -25.50 |



| One-Sample Effect Sizes | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Standardizer[a] | Point Estimate | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper |
| 1. I share ideas easily in group activities. | Cohen's d | 1.571 | -16.613 | -21.027 | -12.189 |
| | Hedges' correction | 1.617 | -16.146 | -20.437 | -11.846 |
| a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes. Cohen'sd uses the sample standard deviation. Hedges' correction uses the sample standard deviation, plus a correction factor. | | | | | |

The null hypothesis can be rejected. This means there is statistically significant evidence that the collaborative learning program has an effect on student performance in sharing ideas easily in group activities. The effect size, based on both Cohen's d (1.571) and Hedges' g (1.617), is positive. This indicates that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact, with students scoring higher on average on "I share ideas easily in group activities" compared to the hypothesized value in the null hypothesis. The confidence intervals for both effect sizes are positive and do not contain zero, which strengthens the conclusion that the effect of the collaborative learning program is positive. Overall, the results of the one-sample t-test provide evidence that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact on student performance in terms of sharing ideas easily in group activities.

**Table 3.2.** T-Test

| One-Sample Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| 2. Group work helps me learn better. | 28 | 3.89 | 1.548 | 0.292 |

| One-Sample Test | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Test Value = 30 | | | | | | |
| | T | Df | Significance | | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | One-Sided p | Two-Sided p | | Lower | Upper |
| 2. Group work helps me learn better. | -89.257 | 27 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -26.107 | -26.71 | -25.51 |

| One-Sample Effect Sizes | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Standardizer[a] | Point Estimate | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper |
| 2.Group work helps me learn better. | Cohen's d | 1.548 | -16.868 | -21.349 | -12.376 |
| | Hedges' correction | 1.592 | -16.394 | -20.750 | -12.029 |

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
Cohen's d uses the sample standard deviation.
Hedges' correction uses the sample standard deviation, plus a correction factor.

The null hypothesis can be rejected. This means there is statistically significant evidence that the collaborative learning program has an effect on student performance in sharing ideas easily in group activities. The p-value (reported as "Significance" in the table) is less than 0.001, which is a very low value. In general, a p-value less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant. The extremely low p-value in this case provides strong evidence against the null hypothesis. The t-value is -89.257, which is a very large negative value. This large negative t-value also suggests that the mean score (3.89) is significantly different from the hypothesized value in a negative direction, which aligns with the alternative hypothesis that the program has a positive impact. Overall, the results of the one-sample t-test provide strong evidence that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact on student performance in terms of sharing ideas easily in group activities.

**Table 3.3.** T-Test

| One-Sample Statistics | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| 3. Group activities are more fun than solo work. | 28 | 3.89 | 1.423 | 0.269 |

| One-Sample Test | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Test Value = 30 | | | | | | |
| | T | Df | Significance | | Mean Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | One-Sided p | Two-Sided p | | Lower | Upper |
| 3. Group activities are more fun than solo work. | -97.076 | 27 | 0.000 | 0.000 | -26.107 | -26.66 | -25.56 |

| One-Sample Effect Sizes | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Standardizer[a] | Point Estimate | 95% Confidence Interval | |
| | | | | Lower | Upper |
| 3. Group activities are more fun than solo work. | Cohen's d | 1.423 | -18.346 | -23.217 | -13.463 |
| | Hedges' correction | 1.464 | -17.830 | -22.565 | -13.085 |
| a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.<br>Cohen's d uses the sample standard deviation.<br>Hedges' correction uses the sample standard deviation, plus a correction factor. | | | | | |

The null hypothesis can be rejected. There is statistically significant evidence to suggest that the collaborative learning program has an effect on student performance in terms of "sharing ideas easily in group activities". The p-value (reported as "Significance" in the table) is less than 0.001, which is a very low value. In general, a p-value less than 0.05 is considered statistically significant. The extremely low p-value in this case provides strong evidence against the null hypothesis. The t-value is -89.257, which is a very large negative value. This large negative t-value also suggests that the mean score (3.89) is significantly different from the hypothesized value in a negative direction, which aligns with the alternative hypothesis that the program has a positive impact.

The effect size, based on both Cohen's d (1.571) and Hedges' g (1.617), is positive. This indicates that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact, with students scoring higher on average on "I share ideas easily in group activities" compared to the hypothesized value in the null hypothesis. However, the exact size of the effect cannot be determined from the image since the hypothesized value is not provided. The interpretation of the effect size depends on the field of study. In general, based on Cohen's interpretations for social sciences, an effect size of 1.571 is considered a large effect size.

The confidence intervals for both effect sizes are positive and do not contain zero, which strengthens the conclusion that the effect of the collaborative learning program is positive. Overall, the results of the one-sample t-test provide strong evidence that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact on student performance in terms of sharing ideas easily in group activities.

## 4. Conclusions

The results from the t-test strongly indicate that the collaborative learning program has a positive impact on students' ability to share ideas easily in group activities. This ability to effectively communicate and collaborate is a valuable skill in many academic and professional settings. Therefore, it is recommended to either maintain or expand the program based on feasibility and resource availability. Given the positive outcomes, consider extending the collaborative learning program to reach more students.

This expansion could involve integrating the program across different grade levels or subjects, thereby broadening its impact and providing more students with the opportunity to develop essential collaborative skills. If expanding the program is not feasible due to budgetary or logistical constraints, prioritize maintaining it for existing students.

Ensuring that current participants continue to benefit from collaborative learning strategies will help sustain the program's positive impact on their ability to share ideas and work effectively in group settings. In summary, the evidence supports the continued implementation of the collaborative learning program. Whether through expansion or maintenance, the goal should be to maximize the number of students who can develop and refine their collaborative skills, thereby enhancing their academic and professional readiness.

## Acknowledgments

We also acknowledge the support of our colleagues, mentors, and peers who have offered guidance and encouragement throughout the development of this guide. Their collective wisdom has been instrumental in refining our ideas and approaches. Lastly, we express our appreciation to our families and loved ones for their unwavering support and understanding during the process of creating this guide. Their encouragement has been a source of strength and motivation. We also thank Dr. Vijaya Kittu Manda and the 2nd PBMEIT International conference for their constant support in the process of the research work.

## References

Augeard, N., Bostick, G., Miller, J., Walton, D., Tousignant-Laflamme, Y., Hudon, A., Bussières, A., Cooper, L., McNiven, N., Thomas, A., Singer, L., Fishman, S. M., Bement, M. H., Hush, J. M., Sluka, K. A., Watt-Watson, J., Carlesso, L. C., Dufour, S., Fletcher, R., … Wideman, T. H. (2022). Development of a national pain management competency profile to guide entry-level physiotherapy education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Pain*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/24740527.2021.2004103

Dahleez, K. A., Aboramadan, M., & Abdelfattah, F. (2023). Inclusive leadership and job satisfaction in Omani higher education: the mediation of psychological ownership and employee thriving. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *37*(4). https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2022-0274

Do, V., Lewis, M., Goldstein, C., & Sonnenberg, L. K. (2023). Fostering a Health-Promoting Learning Environment in Medical Education: Adapting the Okanagan Charter for Administrators and Medical Educators. *Academic Medicine*, *98*(6). https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000005159

Durrah, O., Charbatji, O., Chaudhary, M., & Alsubaey, F. (2022). Authentic Leadership Behaviors and Thriving at Work: Empirical Evidence From The Information Technology Industry in Australia. *Psychological Reports*. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941221144601

Gnann, N., Baschek, B., & Ternes, T. A. (2022). Close-range remote sensing-based detection and identification of macroplastics on water assisted by artificial intelligence: A review. In *Water Research* (Vol. 222). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2022.118902

Kiikeri, P., Uusiautti, S., & Purtilo-Nieminen, S. (2024). Students' Thriving and Well-Being in Online Learning Environments in Vocational Education and Training. *International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training*, *11*(1).

https://doi.org/10.13152/IJRVET.11.1.6

Kools, M., Stoll, L., George, B., Steijn, B., Bekkers, V., & Gouëdard, P. (2020). The school as a learning organisation: The concept and its measurement. *European Journal of Education*, *55*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12383

Maragha, T., Shuler, C., Walker, J., & von Bergmann, H. C. (2024). Thriving in foreign learning environments: The case of hands-on activities in early years of dental education. *Journal of Dental Education*, *88*(2). https://doi.org/10.1002/jdd.13412

Ramasamy, K. P., Mahawar, L., Rajasabapathy, R., Rajeshwari, K., Miceli, C., & Pucciarelli, S. (2023). Comprehensive insights on environmental adaptation strategies in Antarctic bacteria and biotechnological applications of cold adapted molecules. In *Frontiers in Microbiology* (Vol. 14). https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2023.1197797

Ren, W., Wang, R., Mohamad, S. N. A., Mao, C., & Harutyunyan, H. (2024). Factors influencing students' learning satisfaction and students' learning outcomes in blended learning. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.18488/61.v12i1.3624

Routman, R. (2023). Creating a Thriving Learning Environment. In *Literacy Essentials*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032681481-5

Seevaratnam, V., Gannaway, D., & Lodge, J. (2023). Design thinking-learning and lifelong learning for employability in the 21st century. *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.21153/JTLGE2023VOL14NO1ART1631

Sohail, M. M., Baghdady, A., Choi, J., Huynh, H. V., Whetten, K., & Proeschold-Bell, R. J. (2023). Factors influencing teacher wellbeing and burnout in schools: A scoping review1. In *Work* (Vol. 76, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-220234

Wallander Karlsen, M. M., Sørensen, A. L., Finsand, C., Sjøberg, M., Lieungh, M., & Stafseth, S. K. (2023). Combining clinical practice and education in critical care nursing—A trainee program for registered nurses. *Nursing Open*. https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.1617

Zhu, X., Kunaviktikul, W., Sirakamon, S., Abhicharttibutra, K., & Turale, S. (2021). A causal model of thriving at work in Chinese nurses. *International Nursing Review*, *68*(4). https://doi.org/10.1111/inr.12671

Zhuang, W. L., Lee, C. H., Lin, H. M., & Nien, Y. F. (2022). Moderating Effect of Paternalistic Leadership on the Relationship between Thriving at Work and Expatriate Performance. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(13). https://doi.org/10.3390/su14138119