

**ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**THE EFFECTS OF ONLINE COLLABORATIVE WRITING**  
**ON LEARNERS' L2 WRITING PERFORMANCE AND**  
**ATTITUDE**

**MA THESIS**

**Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ**

**Istanbul**

**August- 2021**

**ISTANBUL SABAHATTIN ZAIM UNIVERSITY**  
**GRADUATE EDUCATION INSTITUTE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**THE EFFECTS OF ONLINE COLLABORATIVE WRITING ON  
LEARNERS' L2 WRITING PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDE**

**MA THESIS**

**Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ**

**Supervisor**

**Asst. Prof. Özlem ZABİTGİL GÜLSEREN**

**Istanbul**

**August - 2021**

## **THESIS APPROVAL**

This study has been approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for MA Degree in English Language and Literature

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Özlem ZABİTGİL GÜLSEREN

Member of jury: Assoc. Prof. Emrah GÖRGÜLÜ

Member of jury: Asst. Prof. Akbar RAHIMI

Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ,

Director,

Graduate Education Institute

## **DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY**

This is to certify that this MA thesis dissertation titled “**The Effects of Online Collaborative Writing on Learners’ L2 Performance and Attitude**” is my own work and I have acted according to scientific ethics and academic rules while producing it. I have collected and used all information and data according to scientific ethics and guidelines on thesis writing of Sabahattin Zaim University. I have fully referenced, in both the text and bibliography, all direct and indirect quotations and all sources I have used in this work.

**Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ**

Istanbul, August 2021

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Özlem Zabitgil Gülseren, for her sustained support, encouragement, and constructive suggestions.

Also, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Asst. Prof. Dr. Kasım Varlı for his support.

In addition, special thanks go to my dear colleagues, Fikri Geçkinli, Muhammet Mustafa Ünlü, Sinem Bayındır Musaoğlu, İlker Tek and my coordinator, Hasan Ayhan Akbaş, who were always there to help me out both academically and personally.

I would also like to express my deepest appreciation to my beloved mother and brothers, Kaan Işık and Murat Işık, for their endless love and support. I also would like to thank specially to my beloved husband for his love and support.

Finally, I would like to dedicate my thesis to my beloved father, Mustafa Tümer IŞIK, whom I lost a year ago, for being a perfect father.

**Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ**

**August - 2021**

## ÖZET

### UZAKTAN EĞİTİMDE İŞBİRLİKÇİ YAZMANIN ÖĞRENCİLERİN İKİNCİ DİL YAZMA BECERİSİ VE TUTUMUNA ETKİSİ

**Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ**

Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Tez Danışmanı: Asst. Prof. Özlem ZABİTGİL GÜLSEREN

Ağustos - 2021, Sayfa 76+ x

Bu çalışma uzaktan eğitimde işbirlikçi çalışmanın öğrencilerin ikinci dil yazma becerisine etkisini ve öğrencilerin uzaktan eğitimde işbirlikçi yazma ile ilgili tutumlarını ölçmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma A1 ve A2 seviyelerindeki İngilizce hazırlık öğrencileri ile yürütülmüştür. Çalışmanın ilk kısmı A1, ikinci kısmı A2 seviyesindeki öğrencilerden oluşmaktadır. A1 seviyesinden 37, A2 seviyesinden 39 öğrenci çalışmada kontrol ve deney grupları örneklemeleri olarak seçilmiştir. Çalışmaya başlamadan önce tüm seviyelerin deney ve kontrol grubu öğrencilerine ön test uygulanmıştır. İşbirlikçi yazma için, deney grubu katılımcıları dört veya beş üyeden oluşan gruplara ayrılmıştır. 7 haftalık işbirlikçi yazma aktiviteleri sonrasında, her bir kontrol ve deney grubu katılımcılarına son test verilmiştir. Ön test ve son test sonuçları iki deneyimli öğretim görevlisi tarafından değerlendirilmiştir. Elde edilen verilerin sonuçları SPSS. 25 programı ile hesaplanmıştır. Nicel verilerin analizleri için Wilcoxon Rank test ve T-test kullanılmıştır.

Nitel verileri elde etmek için deney grubunda yer alan öğrencilere açık uçlu sorulardan oluşan bir yazılı görüşme formu verilmiştir. Açık uçlu yazılı görüşme sorularına ek olarak, rastgele seçilmiş 5 öğrenci ile sözlü görüşme yapılmıştır. Öğrencilerin uzaktan eğitimde işbirlikçi yazma aktivitesine karşı olan olumlu ve olumsuz tutumlarını anlamak için yaygın olarak verilen cevaplar kodlanmıştır. Elde edilen nicel veriler iş birlik içerisinde çalışan öğrencilerin, bireysel olarak çalışan öğrencilere göre yazma becerisinde daha iyi olduklarını göstermiştir. Elde edilen nitel veriler ise öğrencilerin işbirlikçi yazma aktivitelerine karşı olumlu tutumları olduğunu göstermiştir.

Mevcut çalışma günümüzde bir zorunluluk haline gelen uzaktan eğitime işbirlikçi yazma açısından katkı sağlamayı amaçlamıştır.

**Anahtar kelimeler :** İşbirlikçi yazma, İşbirlikçi öğrenme , Uzaktan Eğitim , Uzaktan Eğitimde Yazma , Grup Çalışması

## **ABSTRACT**

### **THE EFFECTS OF ONLINE COLLABORATIVE WRITING ON LEARNERS' L2 PERFORMANCE AND ATTITUDE**

**Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ**

M. A., Department of English Language Teaching

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Özlem ZABİTGİL GÜLSEREN

August -2021, Page: 76+ x

This study aims to reveal the effects of online collaborative writing tasks to learners' performances and students' attitudes towards online collaborative writing. This study was conducted with A1 and A2 level preparatory school students. First section of the study was done with A1 level students and the second section included A2 level students. 37 students from A1 level and 39 students from A2 level were chosen as samples of control and experimental groups. First pretest was given to both control and experimental groups. The experimental group participants were divided into four groups of four or five members to write collaboratively. After seven weeks of collaborative writing activities, a posttest was applied to both groups. The results of the pretest and the posttest were assessed by two experienced instructors. SPSS.25. program was used to calculate the results. To analyze the quantitative data, Wilcoxon Signed Rank test and t-test was used.

To obtain the qualitative data, the students in experimental groups were given a written interview with open-ended question. In addition to the written interview, oral interviews were done with 5 randomly selected students from both A1 and A2 levels. Their most frequent responses were coded to understand their positive and negative attitudes towards online collaborative writing.

The findings of the quantitative data showed that students who participated in online collaborative writing activities performed better in writing. The findings of the

qualitative data reveal that students have positive attitude towards online collaborative writing.

The current study aims to contribute to distance education that has been an obligation recently due to covid pandemic in terms of collaborative writing.

**Key words:** Collaborative Writing, Collaborative Learning, Online Education, Online Collaborative Writing, Group Work

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS APPROVAL .....	i
DECLARATION OF SCIENTIFIC ETHICS AND ORIGINALITY .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	xiii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study .....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.3. Purpose of the Study .....	3
1.4. Research Questions of the Study.....	4
1.5. Significance of the Study.....	4
1.6. Definitions of the Terms.....	5
CHAPTER 2 -LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
2.1. Collaborative Learning.....	6
2.1.1. Socio Cultural Theory .....	8
2.1.2. Peer feedback .....	9
2.2. Computer-Supported Language Learning .....	10
2.3. Collaborative Writing .....	11
2.3.1. Benefits of collaborative writing .....	14

2.3.2. Challenges of Collaborative Writing.....	15
2.4. Studies related to Collaborative Writing .....	16
<b>CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1. Introduction .....	22
3.2. The Nature of the Research.....	22
3.3. Research Design and Methodology.....	23
3.3.1. The Research Problem.....	23
3.3.2. Research Setting.....	24
3.3.3. Sampling of the Study.....	25
3.3.4. Research Instruments.....	26
3.3.5. The Tasks.....	28
3.3.6. The Evaluation Rubric .....	31
3.3.7. Treatment .....	31
3.4. Data Analysis .....	32
<b>CHAPTER 4- FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1. Findings .....	34
4.2. The Findings of the Data Analysis Relating to the First Research Question .....	37
4.3. The Findings of the Data Analysis Relating to the Second Research Question.....	43
4.4. The Findings of the Data Analysis Relating to the Third Research Question.....	45
4.4.1. The Findings of the written interview related to benefits of Online Collaborative Writing.....	46
4.4.2. The Findings of the written interview related to challenges of Online Collaborative Writing.....	49
4.4.3. Findings of the oral interview related to the students' positive attitudes .....	50

4.4.4. Findings of the oral interview related to the students’ negative attitudes ....	52
4.5. Discussion .....	54
<b>CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>60</b>
5.1. An overview of the study.....	60
5.2. Summary of the findings.....	61
5.3. Implications of the study.....	63
5.4. Limitation of the study and the directions for the future research .....	64
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>APPENDIX-A. Ethics Committee Approval .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>APPENDIX-B. Sample Pretest of A1 Level .....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>APPENDIX-C. Sample Posttest of A1 Level.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>APPENDIX-D. Sample Pretest of A2 Level.....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>APPENDIX-E. Sample Posttest of A2 Level.....</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>CV .....</b>	<b>76</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3. 1 Weekly writing questions of A1 proficiency level .....	29
Table 3. 2. Weekly writing questions of A2 proficiency level .....	30
Table 4. 1. The Results of A1 group Cohen’s Kappa Coefficient	34
Table 4. 2. The Results of A2 group Cohen’s Kappa Coefficient .....	35
Table 4. 3. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test conducted for the pre-test and Post-test results of the content factor for A1 level .....	37
Table 4. 4. T-Test Results for Associated Samples for Pre-Test and Post-Test Results of Grammar Factor for A1 Level .....	38
Table 4. 5. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Vocabulary Factor for A1 Level.....	38
Table 4. 6. T-Test Results for Associated Samples for the Organization Factor’s Pre-test and Post-Test Results for A1 Level.....	39
Table 4. 7. T-Test Results for Related Samples for Pre-test and Post-test Results of Spelling Factor for A1 Level.....	40
Table 4. 8. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test conducted for the pre-test and Post-test results of the content factor for A2 Level.....	40
Table 4. 9. T-Test Results for Associated Samples for Pre-Test and Post-Test Results of Grammar Factor for A2 Level.....	41
Table 4. 10. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Vocabulary Factor for A2 Level .....	41
Table 4. 11. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Organization Factor for A2 Level.....	42
Table 4. 12. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Spelling Factor for A2 Level .....	42

Table 4. 13. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Pre-test results of the A1 Level control and experimental groups.....	43
Table 4. 14. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Post-test results of the A1 Level control and experimental groups.....	44
Table 4. 15. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Pre-test results of the A2 Level control and experimental group .....	44
Table 4. 16. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Post-test results of the A2 Level control and experimental group.....	45
Table 4. 17. Benefits and Challenges of Online Collaborative Writing.....	53

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

CL	: Collaborative Learning
CSCL	: Computer Supported Collaborative learning
CW	: Collaborative Writing
ELT	: English Language Teaching
L2	: Second Language / Foreign Language
EFL	: English as a Foreign Language
ESL	: English as a Second Language
L1	: First Language
SPSS	: Statistical Package for Social Science

## **CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION**

### **1. Introduction**

This chapter presents the background of the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and the definitions of the terms.

#### **1.1. Background of the Study**

Writing, among all the other skills; listening, reading, and speaking, is thought to be an individual task that necessitates accumulated knowledge about a topic, awareness of grammar rules, and prior knowledge of L2. Writers are expected to create their final product by gathering information and choosing the right lexical items following several steps. In many ESL and EFL classes, it is observed that learners are usually reluctant to take part in this process regardless of their level. Especially learners with low levels of L2 are usually more discouraged by this challenge, which results in a lack of self-esteem. Cooperative writing tasks can be a solution to the challenging writing task by turning it into a manageable task.

Olsen and Kagan (1992, cited in Oxford, 1997) define cooperative learning as an organized group activity in which the learning process is maintained through a socially structured exchange of information between group members. Also, each learner is responsible for his or her learning and is a resource for the learning of others in this group contract. Through cooperative writing, cooperation rather than competition is promoted, which contributes to a better comprehension of writing tasks and processes.

According to Johnson et al (1994: 4), writers cooperate to accomplish shared goals. Each group member seeks outcomes beneficial to everyone to produce the final draft by maximizing both their own and others' learning, unlike the traditional way of writing. With the help of the cooperative writing method, it is possible to mitigate the

common belief of writing difficulty and writing anxiety in ESL and EFL classes by increasing the contribution of each learner in the writing process. Storch (2005: 166-168) claims that collaborative writing enables learners to change their negative attitudes toward writing through assisting each other with feedback exchanges. They can feel the need and responsibility to be helpful in the group. Therefore, they have more urgency to contribute to the writing task rather than dwelling upon their feelings. Along with technological advancements, collaboration can also be achieved in an internet environment. For EFL learners or teachers, many sources like blogs, channels, clubs, or even classes can create an opportunity for autonomous learning. Therefore, online language education through some channels like Moodle or Microsoft Teams can become a fertile ground for language learning and writing classes. To increase the advantages of collaboration in writing, simulating a traditional classroom environment via Microsoft Teams can be rewarding for improving writing skills. Microsoft Teams is an application that allows group and class conversation as well as file or screen sharing features where learners can easily work together for a common goal such as a writing task. They can gather their ideas, brainstorm, or give feedback as a group. Therefore, the present study will explore the performance differences between individual and collaborative writing assignments in an online environment. For assessment, participants' writings will be evaluated individually in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling in a numerical rubric which is utilized in the preparatory school of a foundation university where the study is carried out.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Writing in L2 classrooms is usually an activity that needs solidarity. In this study, L2 will refer to both second language and foreign language. However, practicing writing in ELT classrooms as a pair or group activity is a reasonably recent pedagogy. That is why language teachers are not too eager to use collaboration in writing. However, L2 learners usually perceive writing as an obligatory and tedious task. For ELT teachers, writing is also challenging since it is difficult to follow each student's weaknesses and respond to each student adequately on an individual basis. Teachers' feedback with corrections on student writing is usually not very practical in attracting the learners'

attention. For this reason, the instructor gives the same correction many times and students continue to make the same mistakes. They must be made aware of the importance of feedback and of taking the necessary steps. Also, L2 learners usually do not give importance to all the necessary sub-skills in writing. They usually hesitate to use the new structures learned during the lessons. Therefore, writing activities become more challenging for both the learner and the instructor. Collaborative writing, on the other hand, can be a solution to this problem as it provides an advantage for learners to take part in their own writing and correction of it, and thus, take active responsibility as a group member. Schrage (1994, cited in Storch, 2013) asserted that the interaction in planning, generating ideas, exchanging ideas, editing, and revising in writing helps learners have shared opinions and experiences. In this way, writing can be an encouraging activity in EFL classrooms instead of being feared and challenging language skills.

Along with the arrival of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), technology has become an indispensable part of EFL classrooms. This progress in technology also enables learners to take advantage of endless possibilities for writing. The internet provides options for a diversity of topics. Students can generate their ideas for writing after they do some research. Additionally, this technology allows learners to reach each other whenever or wherever they are. Today, the World is facing the Covid-19 pandemic. This situation has also affected education globally. It compels schools and universities to switch to online education. This novelty makes writing tasks in EFL even more challenging than before. However, collaborative writing can be even more enjoyable for students by using Microsoft Teams application through video calls, recordings, channels, and private classroom options. Some students who have trouble sharing their opinions face to face may feel more confident in the online environment.

### **1.3. Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to find out whether or not there are performance differences between the preparatory school students who work collaboratively to complete writing tasks on Microsoft teams and others who work individually on the

same writing tasks. Also, this study aims to understand how effective online collaborative writing is for the learners in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Additionally, the present study aims to understand students' attitudes towards online collaborative writing activities.

#### **1.4. Research Questions of the Study**

- 1) Are there any statistically significant differences between the pre-test and post-test results of A1 and A2 proficiency level experimental group in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling?
- 2) Is there a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test results of A1 and A2 proficiency level experiment and control group learners?
- 3) What are the attitudes of experimental group participants about online collaborative writing after having the first-hand collaborative writing experience?

#### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

Although writing in L1 is similar to writing in L2, L2 writing is mostly considered more difficult and tedious. L2 writers need prior knowledge not only for the topic but also for L2. While some learners have good grammar skills, they may not have adequate organizational skills. Collaborative writing allows learners to overcome their writing issues and language deficiencies by working together within a group. Traditional classrooms are not the only contexts for collaborative writing to occur. Collaboration in writing can be practiced in online classrooms, as well. This is actually one of the consequences of the rapid technological developments of today's classes.

Traditional classroom environment does not always serve all students because learners may exhibit disparate learning styles. Therefore, using collaborative writing in an online learning environment may provide comfort and confidence for learners. There have been many studies about implementing collaborative writing in online applications such as blogs, forums, or Wiki. However, few studies related to collaborative online writing on Microsoft Teams will enable a group of students to create a virtual classroom for themselves and work together by recording everything.

This study aims to find out whether online collaboration in writing effectively enhances students' writing skills compared to individual writing process. Also, the study is expected to contribute to online EFL/ESL education, which has become popular because of an emerging need of online education.

## **1.6. Definitions of the Terms**

### **1.6.1. Collaborative Writing**

Collaborative writing is a process that includes both exchange of ideas and negotiation to reach a mutual understanding and decision to complete a written task (Schrage, 1994).

### **1.6.2. Collaborative Learning**

Collaborative learning is a setting in which students come together to discuss with others, share or exchange opinions to complete the task, and actively participate in learning activity (Srinivas, H.,2011).

### **1.6.3. Peer Feedback**

Peer feedback is defined as a way for learners to provide feedback to their peers or group members to contribute to their own learning process (Leonard et al., 1994).

### **1.6.4. Computer Supported Language Learning**

Computer supported language learning refers to working together by getting some support from computers to communicate and negotiate (Gutwin et al., 1996; Hollan and Stornetta, 1992).

## **CHAPTER 2 -LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter reviews the literature on collaborative writing in an online context and its effects on students' writing performances. First, collaborative learning will be examined through the lenses of socio-cultural theory with an emphasis on peer feedback. Secondly, computer assisted collaborative writing will be examined to see if collaborative writing can also be substantiated in an online environment. The benefits and challenges of collaborative writing will be inquired. Finally, previous research on collaborative writing will be examined to understand what collaborative writing has to offer in the online education context of today.

### **2.1. Collaborative Learning**

Today, collaborative learning plays a crucial role in EFL and ESL classes as language learning necessitates social transactions. Collaboration in language learning can happen in several ways: peer collaboration, pair collaboration, group collaboration, online collaboration, collaboration with native and non- native speakers and so on.

Damon and Phelps (1989, cited in Hmelo-Silver, 2013: 2) claim that peer learning consists of three stages: peer tutoring, cooperative learning, and collaborative learning. Peer tutoring is the equal influence and contribution through the learning process, unlike the learner and tutor relationship. Cooperative learning also has equal effect but not equal contribution because learners can contribute at different degrees. However, in collaborative learning, students can benefit from equal influence and contribution in their learning process.

Cooperation is a technique that aims to make learners get a final product by working together with group members. On the other hand, collaboration is more likely to be an individual philosophy in the classrooms. It allows learners to follow their learning steps with the help of the members of the group by respecting other ideas and

contributions. Kagan (1989, cited in Panitz, 1999) defines cooperative learning as an approach that depends on structures of creation through content-free social integration in the classroom. Collaborative learning enables learners to help their peers improve themselves. It also facilitates social interaction among learners. It eliminates competition among them since when success is achieved, it will not be an individual success. Therefore, it also promotes social outcomes through problem-solving and critical thinking skills among learners.

According to socio psychological approach, collaborative learning shapes interdependence. Students are eager to see each other's achievements and assist their peers to accomplish the task.

Johnson & Johnson (1991: 25) established a technique known as learning together, which claims that collaborative learning has five elements:

- . Positive Interdependence: Learners must know that their success or failure depends on other members of the group.
- . Face to face promotive interaction: Learners improve each other's cognitive and affective skills in a group.
- . Individual Accountability: Everyone within a group is responsible for the group itself.
- . Interpersonal and small-group skills: Learners need to have specific skills such as leadership, problem-solving, negotiation to work as a group.
- . Group processing: Evaluating the group members with the contributions they have made.

Learning together focuses on learners' social skills. Even when the task is challenging, it requires students to concentrate on a single outcome as a group.

According to Socio psychological perspective, there is not a direct relation between peer learning and cognitive skills. It alleges that collaboration in the learning process increases motivation, which empowers the learning outcomes. Myers (1992, cited in Panitz,1999) suggests that while cooperative learning aims to employ quantitative methods like the final product, collaborative learning is more likely to adopt a qualitative approach like analyzing the student's talk regarding some aspects. Cooperative learning concerns with what the product of learning is. However, the

collaborative learning technique is more likely to examine the conversation between students based on a source like a piece of literature.

Rockwood (1995, cited in Panitz, 1999) finds similarities between collaborative and cooperative learning as they both need a group and a specific task. However, cooperative learning deals with traditional knowledge, while collaborative learning follows more of a social constructivist movement. That means that in a collaborative learning environment, the authority first depends on the small group, the whole class and finally, the knowledge of the community. On the other hand, in cooperative learning, the authority belongs to the teacher who directs and manages the group work with the exertion of more than learners. In collaborative learning, once the instructor gives the information required for the task, the authority is given totally to learners to build their own learning autonomously.

### **2.1.1. Socio Cultural Theory**

Writing is a complex process requiring students to plan and gather some ideas. Planning is an integral part of the writing process, which requires some time to produce good writing output. According to many social constructivists like Vygotsky, Dewey and Freire, planning of writing can only be achieved by social interaction not readily available through information provided by the teacher.

Vygotsky (1978, cited in Deveci, 2018) asserts that the development of a person can only be possible with social interaction. Mediated mind is a crucial concept of socio-cultural theory. Vygotsky asserts that people do not only depend on the physical world, but also, they need symbolic tools, activities, and others to fit in the World. These artificial man-made tools are modified and developed by the following generations. According to Socio-cultural theory, language is also a symbolic tool to be passed on to future generations. Language is an artifact that provides a mediated relationship with the world we live in. Human social and mental activities are both shaped by symbolic tools. They lead people to thinking, problem solving, learning, and planning. Vygotsky proposed the metaphor of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which proposes that an individual has two high mental abilities that can emerge in their lifetime. The first one occurs when the process is shared between individuals and others including the

cultural artifacts. The second one occurs when the capability a person's action accomplishes the capability through psychological mediation. Briefly, ZPD is what individuals can manage on their own as well as in connection to others.

Scaffolding is another technique that owes much to Vygotsky's sociocultural theory. According to Harris and Hodges (1996, cited in Shooshtari & Mir, 2014), scaffolding is the resignation of authoritative support of a teacher for more autonomous engagement on the part of the learner. In EFL classes, scaffolding refers to the support provided by an expert such as a teacher, lecturer, or peers until the learner entirely becomes independent.

According to John Dewey's pragmatic (1981, cited in Oxford, 1997) form of social constructivism, there is a triangular relation between the individual, people around him, and the world. He claimed that thoughts are only useful if they are,

- a) Admitted by a common theory.
- b) Actively beneficial to establish clear action.
- c) Created by others in society.
- d) Identified with quotation mark of population.

Similarly, what learners can do when working individually and what they can accomplish when working collaboratively differ. Learners can improve their writing skills with the appropriate assistance provided by other learners while working collaboratively. Thus, from a social constructivist perspective, learners ought to be motivated enough to take part in the activities encouraging them to interact with others. From a pedagogical perspective, writing within a group can also enable students to promote the use of L2 while brainstorming their ideas and discussing the organization of the written product.

### **2.1.2. Peer feedback**

Today, peer feedback is considered both as a teaching strategy and as a form of learning autonomy. Peer feedback provides interaction between students and reduces teacher interruption. There are many benefits of peer feedback. When students interact with their peers, it can primarily assist students with learning disabilities. In many

curriculum standards, peer assistance is used to improve critical thinking skills and understandings. It has many positive results like development of academic achievements, emotional social interactions and support and satisfaction in learning.

There are many theories underlying peer assisted learning. It is mainly affected by social-psychological principles which suggest interdependence. Interdependence is a term that is used when a group comes together to achieve a common goal. The success will be attributed to all members, which is called positive interdependence. In competition, on the other hand, success will be dedicated to a person but not to others, which is called negative interdependence.

According to Noreen Webb (1982: 643), a peer can assist a learner to focus on the given task and give an opportunity to check whether they understand the content or not. Many of Webb's works emerge from a cognitive-elaboration perspective. Learners are instructed to participate in peer work and ask for assistance from peers. Webb came out with the idea that students who take part in peer or group work actively have better academic results than the passive students in the group thanks to their cognitive development.

## **2.2. Computer-Supported Language Learning**

Over the last decade, along with the rapid evolution of technology, information and communication technology (ICT) brings many innovations to language learning and teaching methods. Computer-Supported Language Learning (CSLL) has become an indispensable part of EFL classrooms. Horton (2006, cited in Pardede, 2012) defines CSLL as the use of internet and computer devices to accomplish a learning goal.

The advancement of technology facilitates the obtention of various sources for both EFL teachers and learners. CSLL provides many opportunities to make language learning and teaching process more effective and flexible by means of online dictionaries, videos, blogs, games, or other channels. It allows both teachers and learners to adapt numerous sources based on their needs. Compared to traditional classes, online lessons are equipped with more authentic tools, in addition to its

convenience to learners. Riley (2000, cited in Pardede, 2012) pointed out that it can promote better academic achievement for learners.

Akgün and Akkoyunlu (2013, cited in Martin and Tapp, 2019) asserted that education and the progress in technology are now consolidated, and this allows students to get involved in their own learning process in a Computer-Supported Language Learning (CSLL) environment.

Kreijns et al (2002, cited in Zurita and Nussbaum, 2003) assume that social interaction can be achieved through CSLL. In addition to computers, smartphones have majority of computers facilities and provide ease of collaboration. The support of online networking can increase the flexibility of learning. This flexibility can ensure the control of the collaboration in the given task. According to Bricker et al (1998, cited in Zurita and Nussbaum, 2004), the interaction through software prevents stress during the learning process.

Haythornwaite (1999, cited in Zurita and Nussbaum, 2004) believes that students can benefit from many advantages by working together in an online platform. Firstly, unlike traditional classes, students are not restricted by the number of participants in their collaboration groups. Secondly, they can feel more flexible in consideration of time and place. Finally, CSLL can be auspicious and encouraging for future generations.

### **2.3. Collaborative Writing**

Howard (2001, cited in Storch, 2013) defines Collaborative Writing as a task that requires learners to work as a group from the beginning until the end to produce single piece of writing. One of the key aspects for the success of collaborative writing is the share of the work by each group member. Storch (2005: 154) defines this collaboration as shared labor, so collaborative writing becomes shared authoring. Shared authoring entails the equal responsibility taking, but it also creates ownership for each student contributing. If we can create this sense of ownership, we can be sure that students will be more wired to learn.

Ede and Lunsford (1990, cited in Storch, 2013) offered three different characteristics of collaborative writing,

1. Constant communication in writing
2. Having equal domination for decision making and equal responsibility
3. Achieving the goal with the final draft of the writing

From Ede's and Lunsford's perspective, collaborative writing is both process and product. The process happens when learners come together to generate ideas, negotiate, plan, and understand each other. The product emerges when they achieve the final text together. Stages of writing allow the process of collaboration to emerge. Similarly, Kim (2010, cited in Challob, Bakar and Latif, 2016) states that during the writing process, the stages including pre-writing, drafting, and rewriting are statistically significant because all of them provide several opportunities for learners to jump in and volunteer with ideas. To accomplish these stages, collaborative writing is particularly useful for integrating all the necessary sub skills. Another definition of collaborative writing is to work collaboratively to contribute to some aspects of writing, such as the structure, organization, and content. Therefore, learners can acquire several perspectives, unlike the solo process of individual writing. The following points show how a writing task can be daunting as an individual task implying that it can be made more manageable when we conceptualize it as a collaborative task.

Byrne (1993, cited in Ghuftron and Hawa, 2015) mentions the three problems faced by learners during the traditional way of writing are,

- Writing is an individual process, and learners are not able to get direct feedback which causes psychological problems.
- Writers must be careful with their choices of words and sentence structures to express their message accurately to avoid challenging issues.
- Writing is not learned through a natural process as it is in speaking, which creates cognitive problems.

According to Erkan & Sabah (2011, cited in Challob, Bakar & Latif, 2016) during the writing process, certain linguistic and vocabulary knowledge and appropriate writing

conventions are required apart from the intellectual needs which contribute to the effective expressions. That is why EFL/ESL writing has been considered a complex process. Thus, unskilled writers, especially in their early stages of writing need motivational, social, cognitive, and cultural input before finalizing their products which causes anxiety and poor writing performance. (Dujsik,2008; Jun 2008; Erkan & Sabah, 2011; Raoofi et al, 2014) This is why maybe it is even more important to engage in early collaborative practice at lower language proficiency levels. With this in mind, Kim (2010, cited in Challob, Bakar and Latif, 2016) asserts that the involvement in group work in each step of the process as well as getting direct feedback can increase the writer's eagerness to express their ideas. Learners can contribute to each other's learning in their dual role as both the teachers and learners. This process can initiate learning autonomy among these learners.

Collaborative learning immerses learners in holistic language growth. Ansarimoghaddam &Bee (2013, cited in Challob, Bakar and Latif, 2016) suggest that collaborative writing technique can be a good way to contribute to all aspects of writing including content, structure, organization, and language. Learners are not always good at all of the aspects of writing. While they have good grammatical knowledge, they may be challenged in organizing the paragraphs. Collaborative writing can be a solution to specific shortcomings. Thus, collaborative writing negotiation enables learners to support each other's areas of challenge as well as it allows for the natural integration of all language skills. Writers can gather ideas, engage in making decisions, and gain different point of view collaboratively. This enables them to reduce anxiety in writing. In addition, being part of a group can make the process less stressful for them. As learned from several research results, stress, and anxiety influences language performance negatively. It creates similar consequences for writing performance as well. So, collaboration becomes a positive force that assists all members of the writing group. Collaborative writing allows writers to address each other's weaknesses and knowledge gaps such as grammatical deficiency and vocabulary limitations. It is relevant to acknowledge Gunawardena et al (1997, cited in Kimmerle, Moskaliuk, Brende & Cress, 2017). He identified five stages in the co-construction of knowledge during the writing process,

1. Stage of sharing and comparing of information in which language learners express their ideas, ask questions, reply, and explain a problem through some activities.
2. Stage of discovery and exploration of the inconsistency among concepts or statements, which determines the disagreement among the group members.
3. Stage of negotiation of meaning and co-construction of knowledge which identifies the areas of concurrence.
4. Stage of testing and modification of proposed synthesis, which involves analyzing the gained results opposing to personal experiences.
5. Stage of agreement and application of new meaning which involves final concurrences that the former opinions have altered.

Forte and Bruckman conducted a study (2010, cited in Kimmerle, Moskaliuk, Brende & Cress, 2017) according to the Gunawardena's perspective. Group members from different knowledge backgrounds in a secondary school were chosen to share their opinion. Through the process, students were able to exchange their ideas and perspectives and complete a text collaboratively. The research claimed that collaborative writing method is useful in expanding the knowledge about a specific topic and may represent an appropriate learning environment.

### **2.3.1. Benefits of collaborative writing**

There are many possible benefits of collaborative writing. Kim & Li (2016, cited in Li, 2018) suggested that collaborative writing is beneficial in multiple ways. First, it enables learners to verbalize their consultation on language use and discuss meaning and form meaning with peers. To end up with the final product, learners must evaluate many aspects of writing like the linguistic choices. Also, it allows for the provision of justifications for linguistic expressions that are important for language learning. In addition, unlike the traditional way of writing, cooperative writing improves grammatical accuracy in the written product due to the supervision of several pairs of eyes in the group. (Storch, 1999; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009).

Collaborative writing has many cognitive and social benefits for students. In terms of cognitive benefits, it allows students to take some responsibility for their own learning. They can experience different degrees of autonomy and critical thinking as a result of

collective thinking and discussion. Therefore, when learners work on a writing task in a group, it becomes easier to develop a completed writing product than individual writing. When a learner interacts and negotiates with other members of the group, they can improve themselves grammatically, and it assists them to improve their vocabulary. They can also organize their ideas collaboratively by narrowing down the information they collected. In terms of the social benefits of collaborative writing, they can get instant feedback from others. It encourages them to write more. For their future lives, it provides them familiarity with collaborative writing allowing them to work cooperatively and negotiate for the best results.

Dale (1994, cited in Fung, 2010) claims that through collaborative writing process, learners can see how others think, so they can get other learners' ideas as models. It also enables lecturers to observe their students in collaboration to learn about their writing needs more closely. Another benefit of collaborative writing is that several studies have proven that when students work collaboratively, they are more likely to admit if they do not understand something, and they are more willing to pursue clarification compared to teacher-directed writing classes. Also, students who write as a group take more risks because responsibility falls upon every member of the group. In a group, learning potential is much larger in comparison to working alone.

Adding to the benefits of collaborative writing process, Bruffee (1996, cited in Panitz, 1999) defends the idea that when learners come together to work on writing, they can communicate as a member of a community which enables them to contribute to their academic achievement. They can take over several responsibilities such as a teacher, an audience and a critical reader or thinker. Also, through these different roles, a natural setting for peer feedback is created since all group members can give or receive feedback simultaneously.

### **2.3.2. Challenges of Collaborative Writing**

Collaborative writing poses some challenges, as well. It can be time consuming when most ESL teachers must follow a predetermined curriculum. Also, collaborative learning is not too common due to the centralized teaching structure in Turkey. So, adopting collaborative writing in a language classroom requires extra time and effort

as many learners are not used to it and need some orientation. Evaluation of individual writings in addition to collective writing efforts can also be challenging and time consuming.

Time limitation is another concern for many language classrooms for writing instruction. Many teachers are not able to allow pair and group work due to time limitations imposed on them. There is also a concern that collaborative writing can cause deterioration for those students who enjoy working individually and independently. Also, some weaker students may be discouraged by the stronger students as a result of the fact that stronger students take more responsibility and leave no opportunity for them.

Additionally, even if the members of the group want to help each other, they may have a lack of ability to explain like an instructor. They may cause misunderstanding. They may also be unable to explain the topics with detailed examples. Thus, the teacher cannot guarantee the quality of the group efforts if students lack major knowledge on the key issue. The challenge is related to the skill of the instructor who needs to distribute higher-achievers and lower-achievers strategically in each group. In such a class, the instructor's selection of group members should be preferred to self-selection of learners.

#### **2.4. Studies related to Collaborative Writing**

Storch (2005: 156-168) argued that collaborative writing efforts gave rise to more complex and higher quality writing output in product and process and student's reflection in collaborative writing. 23 adult ESL students with intermediate proficiency levels were given an option to work in pairs or individually. 18 students wanted to work in pairs, and 5 students preferred to work individually. Students in pairs were recorded while working collaboratively and were interviewed afterward. The results showed that the texts of the students who worked in pairs were shorter but richer in accuracy and complexity. Students in pairs spent more time and effort on planning, generating ideas, and structuring the text. Interviews showed that students were mostly satisfied with their experience on collaborative writing in their groups, and they were eager to apply collaboration to their speaking activities.

In a study investigating the stages that learners experience in their collaborative writing process, Kimmerle, Moskaliuk, Brende, and Cress (2017: 199-207) found that collaboration in writing can assist students in gaining autonomy as well as acquiring cognitive skills. The participants were fifty-one students from two different secondary schools. The study was conducted in 90 minutes instruction and collaboration sessions. During the instruction session, learners were divided into LT (Learning Theory) and AT (Arousal theories) groups. Both learner groups were given worksheets with different theses on media violence. In a collaborative session, each member of the LT group was paired with a member of AT group. Through the digital collaboration tool Etherpad, they were asked to organize their opinions and write an article with a shared opinion on whether violent media content should be controlled more severely or not. In 80 minutes process, each group member took their turn of ten minutes to contribute to the writing task. Thus, at ten minutes intervals, each student had 40 minutes that were recorded as four rounds. The length of the text is used as a measurement. Knowledge introduction, restructuring, and shared opinion stages in the texts were examined as quantitative analysis. A qualitative content analysis was applied to show the stages with examples in collaboratively written texts. According to the findings of the study, all the stages observed during collaboration sessions affect students' cognitive processes and help them feel involved in their learning process more.

Challob, Bakar, and Latif (2016: 232-234) argued that group writing activities benefited students' writing performances and eased their writing apprehension. This study investigated collaborative blended learning environment (CBLWE) and its effects on EFL students' writing apprehension and writing performance. 12 secondary level male EFL students as participants of this study in Grade 10 in their second semester were chosen according to their level of writing apprehension, writing ability, computer and internet proficiency, and English knowledge. Multiple sources of data were used, such as interviews and diaries rather than a single data source. Pre-writing, drafting, and post-writing stages were applied in the writing task. Students were divided into 3 groups and assigned three writing tasks for 13 weeks. Guidance was given on how to write a descriptive essay through online discussions via the Viber program with sample activities. After brainstorming via Viber, they wrote the first draft of their essays in their class. They received aid from their teachers and researchers

in writing their second and final drafts. Based on the results of the study, their perception towards CBLWE was positive. The study indicated that there was a positive effect on their writing apprehension and performance.

Deveci (2018: 724-728) carried out a study on student perception of Collaborative writing in a project-based course. 34 students participated in the study on different University campuses. After more than a three-month exposure to the collaborative writing experience, research was done with three main sections: demographics, overall student satisfaction level with a collaborative project, and factors affecting students' satisfaction. As quantitative data, a five-point Likert-type scale with five interdependent sub-domains was used. The sub-domains included active learning, innovation, general skills, English language skills, and team skills. For qualitative data, two discourse completion tasks with incomplete sentences were used. The first task was, 'I like collaborative project writing because and the other one was the negative version of the same incomplete sentence task. The results showed that students were mostly satisfied with the experiment. The students generally stated that they find collaborative writing beneficial in generating ideas and filling each other's knowledge gaps.

Sakamoto (2017: 122-123) undertook a study to investigate students' language patterns in a collaborative writing task. Participants from different nations were chosen as participants. Their personal background information consisting of the time spent abroad was collected before the research. Online writing and interview transcripts were used for data collection. The daily English writing task was given to students through Myspace. Each topic entry was supposed to be minimum 150 words. After the completion of online journal task, they were interviewed, and at the end of the semester, a post-treatment questionnaire was administered to the participants anonymously. Their morpho-syntactic and Lexical development and grammar usage were analyzed. The results showed that there was a noticeable improvement in their L2 knowledge. The incorrect grammar usages were seen once or twice in most of the students' writings. Since they did not want to imitate their friend's writings, they made more efforts to find different words. As a result, according to the interview, the collaborative online journal writing task received positive feedback from the participants.

DeKeyser (2007, cited in McDonough, Vleeschauwer, and Crawford, 2018) peer interaction plays a significant role in ESL and EFL contexts in theoretical and pedagogical perspectives. Theoretical perspective deals with the rationale for enabling students to get some opportunities to collaborate with others. From a cognitive perspective, this makes them understand the benefits of a meaningful practice to improve automaticity in a sociocultural way. On the other hand, from a pedagogical perspective, peer interaction in L2 classrooms has several purposes ranging from traditional to modern approaches. With these perspectives in mind, McDonough, Vleeschauwer, and Crawford (2018: 5-11) carried out a study with 57 native speakers of Thai undergraduate students that investigated whether there was a difference in analytic ratings, accuracy, or complexity of paragraphs of the students' prewriting and collaborative prewriting. One group was given collaborative prewriting tasks, and the other group engaged in individual prewriting tasks. A writing task handout and an analytic rubric were used in a reassessment of written output. Analytic ratings, accuracy, and complexity were the dependent variables for the test analysis. As a result, the collaborative prewriting texts had more words in length and higher content, organization, and language rates compared to the individual prewriting texts. Collaborative prewriting texts also had lower error rates and greater coordination and subordination than individually produced prewriting texts.

Dörnyei (2011, cited in Sajedi, 2014) claims that the assistance of peers to get clarification, receive and give information, exchange resources, and receive constructive feedback altogether provide a positive achievement for the goals in the classrooms. Apart from the psychological benefits, collaboration is also helpful for cognitive development. Sajedi (2014: 1652-1654) conducted a study to investigate whether the number of participants in a collaborative writing task affects the quality of students' summary writing after a prolonged engagement and also whether collaborative summary writing has any effect on students' L2 writing development. As an experimental group, 29 students were assigned to work in pairs, 30 students were assigned to be in a group of 7. 7 summary writing texts were collected, including the one as a pretest from the first unit. The results showed that all the collaborative groups of both pairs and groups significantly affect performances. Both collaborative groups of

pairs and groups performed higher than individually performing students. However, pair works were better than triads or individually doing the assignments.

Shehadeh (2011: 290-296) conducted a study that investigated the effects of collaborative writing and students' perceptions of collaborative writing experience. Students expressed positive views regarding collaborative writing assignments. The study consisted of two parallel intact classes with control and experimental groups. A pretest and posttest design constituted the quantitative data, and student surveys provided the qualitative data for the data collection and analysis. Students' writings were rated in terms of content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics of writing by the writing scale developed by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz. The survey questions were open-ended and aimed to highlight students' perceptions of collaborative writing. In both groups, the instructor and the topics were the same. The results showed a statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of content, organization, and vocabulary, whereas there was a lack of difference in mechanics and grammar which could be linked to the students' proficiency levels. However, the survey results showed that many of the students were in favor of collaborative writing.

Gökçe (2001: 29-38) conducted a similar study to measure the effects of Collaborative Writing on learners' attitudes. Two upper-intermediate and advanced classes with a total of 64 students participated in the study. The study aimed to last for four weeks. There was no control group. Two questionnaires were given to both groups of learners twice to measure their attitudes towards writing and collaborative writing. A Likert scale and open-ended questions were included in both surveys. Secondly, they were grouped with their peers of choice, and they were asked to complete a given story as a collaborative writing activity. The results showed that their attitudes in the pretest changed more positively in the posttest after they wrote collaboratively. The result of the study proved that proficiency levels did not affect the perception of learners towards collaborative writing. Students gained a positive attitude towards collaborative writing and writing tasks which they found frustrating at the beginning of the study.

In his study, Akbaş (2017: 35-70) investigated the effects of collaborative work on student's writing performance and their perception of collaborative writing. Akbaş (2017: 35-70) argues that collaborative writing is useful for learners to improve their writing skills. The study was carried out with two intact classes as an experimental and control group with 20 students each. They had the same instructor and the same curriculum. For the quantitative data, a pretest and a posttest were given to the experimental and control groups. A writing scale was used for the evaluation of the pretest and posttest writing outputs. For qualitative data, a four-question survey was given to the experimental group to measure student's perceptions. The results showed a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of the experimental group. They performed much better in the posttest in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, but not so much in grammar. The open-ended survey results showed that almost all students had a positive attitude towards collaborative writing, although some found it challenging and weird at the beginning of the process.

## **CHAPTER 3- METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1. Introduction**

The purpose of this study is to find out whether online collaborative activities are helpful for the writing competence of A1 and A2 proficiency level students in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Additionally, students' positive and negative attitudes are tried to be understood through the process.

In this chapter, the nature of the research will be presented. Research design and methodology will be explained in detail with the research design, research setting, sampling of the study, research instruments, including the questionnaire, interview, pretest, and posttest. The chapter will continue with the tasks, evaluation rubric, and treatment. Finally, data analysis will be explained.

### **3.2. The Nature of the Research**

Along with the surge in online education in ESL and ELT departments because of the pandemics, the research aims to understand the difference between students' writing performances that took part in the online collaborative writing tasks and those performed in the traditional writing tasks. Also, in the scope of the study, the attitudes of the experimental group students towards online collaborative writing tasks in both A1 and A2 proficiency levels are investigated. Based on the aims of the study, the research, then, is an attempt to describe the present context for writing instruction in English language in the English preparatory program of a foundation university. In this sense, this research is descriptive in nature.

McDonough (1997, cited in Zainal, 2007) defined the purpose of descriptive research as revealing the significant effects in the study within the context. Therefore, it makes the research attempts more effective. One of the reasons for this effectiveness is that the variables can sometimes be so large that it may be challenging to get a fair and

realistic balance. Another important reason is the realization of individual effects, which cannot usually work alone.

No studies can be 100% qualitative and 100% quantitative. The present study is not an exception to this. The study has both quantitative and qualitative aspects. According to Hennink, Hutter, and Bailey (2011: 10), qualitative research is an approach that enables a researcher to understand the perspective of the participants' interpretation of an issue through their experiences. On the other hand, quantitative research usually requires statistical data.

Due to the nature of the present study, it is an experimental study where the researchers intervene, manipulate, or compare the variables to understand their effect on one another. In the present study, experimental groups and control groups are the variables that are used to make a comparison to understand the effects of online collaborative writing on students' writing performances.

### **3.3. Research Design and Methodology**

#### **3.3.1. The Research Problem**

The main purpose of the study was mainly to investigate the benefits of online collaborative writing tasks on students' performances in writing skills. Writing in ESL and ELT classrooms consists of more than one subfactor: content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Since all these sub-skills are integrated with quality writing, among all the other skills, writing becomes a challenging task. Learners need to be creative, and at the same time, they need to focus on the writing task requirements. Especially in distance education, it is also challenging for the instructors to keep track of the students' deficiencies in writing by giving personal feedback since the given feedback is not usually memorable for the learners. In this sense, it becomes important to attract students' attention more in writing tasks and enable them to acquire autonomy in writing. Therefore, online collaborative writing tasks can be an intriguing activity to increase students' performances in all sub-skills in writing.

Ohta (1995, cited in Fung, 2010) claimed that each student in a group has their strength in writing. While one can be very good at generating ideas, the other can have good organization skills. When they work collaboratively, they can combine their strengths and produce good writing. Briefly, collaboration can be defined as the sharing of expertise.

Another purpose of the study is to understand students' attitudes towards online collaborative writing. Unlike speaking, reading, and listening tasks, writing skill needs solidarity and individual creativity from beginning to the end. This situation mainly creates anxiety for learners. Therefore, they usually do not know where to start or how to organize their writing. They also need to focus on every sub-skill in their writing. Thus, not all students can enjoy the writing process. Working collaboratively on a writing task and sharing responsibility can make the learners feel less stressed and enjoy the task more.

Horwitz (1999, cited in Saeb & Zamani, 2013) asserted that beliefs are the positive or negative opinions of a learner about the learning process and these beliefs not only shape the learners' perspective on the learning process but also their perspective towards the external aspects like culture and community or language. Thus, learners' perspective through the learning process plays a significant role for student involvement.

### **3.3.2. Research Setting**

This study aims to understand whether online collaborative writing is effective on students' writing performances and how online collaborative writing activities shape the learners' attitudes towards writing. The aim was to conduct the study from different universities. However, due to the outbreak of Covid-19 pandemics and uncertainty in distance education, an English preparatory school in a foundation university in Istanbul was chosen as the focus of this investigation.

### **3.3.3. Sampling of the Study**

This study employs a case study approach in gathering the necessary data for the questions that the study seeks to answer. According to Crowe, Cresswell, Robertson, Huby, Avery, and Sheikh (2011: 1), a case study is an approach that is applied to develop a deeper perception of a complicated issue. The main goal is to examine an event in detail in its natural context. That is why it is sometimes called ‘naturalistic design.’

Sample selection is an essential element in research. A sample is defined as a specific small group that the data is collected from. On the other hand, the population is mainly defined as the whole group from which to draw conclusion in a research. Thus, the sample is a group that represents the population. In this study, the population is A1 and A2 proficiency level preparatory school students in general, and the samples are considered the experimental group students who participated in the online collaborative writing activities.

Sample selection method, a type of probability sampling, was used to select the student sample. Probability samples are the samples chosen randomly from the population. The samples for the experimental groups were selected according to the classes given to one of the instructors, who assessed the pretest and the posttest of the students, by the coordinator of the preparatory school of the university. Samples for the control groups were chosen according to the volunteer instructors who were willing to help the researcher.

This study focuses on two target populations: A1 and A2 proficiency level students. The study was carried out in two sessions at English Preparatory School in a foundation University in the fall semester of 2020-2021 educational year. The first session was conducted with randomly selected A1 students. The experimental group consisted of 18 students. The control group included 19 students. Their ages ranged from 18 to 22.

The second session was carried out after seven weeks of the first quarter of the Preparatory school with different randomly selected A2 level students. While the experimental group consisted of 20 students, the control group included 19 students. Their ages ranged from 18 to 22.

Both A1 and A2 level groups have had 18 hours of Main Course, 6 hours of listening and speaking and 4 hours of reading and writing lessons. Additionally, writing activities have also been included in Main Course lessons.

### **3.3.4. Research Instruments**

The study employs four data collection instruments: written and oral interviews, pretests, and posttests which are graded through a writing scale. To gain the quantitative data, pretests were given both proficiency levels before the interruption. Posttests were given at the end of the study. After seven weeks of online collaborative writing activities, a written interview was given to both A1 and A2 proficiency level students, who participated in online collaborative writing activities, to understand their attitudes towards online collaborative writing. To strengthen the written interview results, the researcher chose five volunteer students from A1 and A2 experimental groups for the oral interview.

#### **3.3.4.1. The Written Interview**

The written interview to measure the students' attitudes included five open-ended questions that require the students' experiences throughout the study. Many other questionnaire and interview questions used in different studies were compared for the reliability. Also, before the current study, it was given to students who took part in the pilot study to minimize the possible problems. The questions were in L1 and limited to five in order to make students write their sincere opinions in detail. The items in the written interview are as follows:

1. Have you ever participated in a collaborative writing activity before?
2. What is your opinion about writing tasks in ESL/EFL classes?
3. After 7 weeks of online collaborative experience, would you prefer to write individually or as a group next quarter?
4. Based on your experiences, what do you think about the positive and negative sides of online collaborative writing to be?

5. Do you think you improved yourself in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling in writing?

#### **3.3.4.2. The Oral Interview**

The study also employed an oral interview, a data collection instrument in survey research. Interviews are commonly defined as a conversation between an interviewer and an interviewee to get an opinion about a specific topic. The present study used a semi-structured interview in which the interviewer depends on the protocol as guidance. However, unlike structured interviews, semi-structured ones are relatively more independent than the questions. The semi-structured interview was done with five randomly chosen volunteer students to get a deeper understanding of the questionnaire. It included five questions that are relatively the same as the questions of the written interview, but it is more detailed. Also, L1 was used during the oral interviews. The oral interview questions are given below:

1. Before the collaborative writing activities, did you have some challenges in writing in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling?
2. Did you find online collaborative writing activities useful to improve your deficiencies you experienced previously?
3. Do you enjoy taking part in online collaborative writing activities in general? If yes, what are the things you like about collaborative writing?
4. Did you find anything challenging during online collaborative writing activities? What were the things you did not like about collaborative writing?
5. Would you prefer to write with a group or individually in your future ESL classes?

#### **3.3.4.3. Pretest and Posttest**

Pretests and posttests are applied to both control and experimental group members in A1 and A2 proficiency levels separately to gather the quantitative data. Pretest was given to both groups before the intervention, and posttests were given after the study.

Both the pretest and posttest were assessed through a writing rubric used in preparatory school through the assessment of different instructors. The final exam writing questions of the quarter in the university were used as the posttest to guarantee that everyone took the posttest.

The question of Pre-test for A1 level.

Write a paragraph that introduces yourself. (100 words)

The question of the Post-test for A1 level.

Choose one of the questions below and write a paragraph.

1. Where do you live? Who do you live with? Describe your home.
2. Where did you last go on holiday? Who did you go with? Where did you stay? What did you do?
3. How do your family members and friends spend their free time? Explain.

The question of Pre-test for A2 level

Write a paragraph about your weekday and weekend routines. (150 Words)

The question of Post-test for A2 level

Choose one of the questions below and write a paragraph.

1. Write an email to a friend whom you have not seen for a while and tell him/her things you have and have not done since you last saw him/her.
2. Write a post for a blog to promote a place (a beach, a lake, an island etc.) in your country.
3. You are looking for a roommate. Write 'a roommate ad' to find one. What is the house like? What is the neighborhood like? How much is the rent per month? Add your personal information to your ad.

### **3.3.5. The Tasks**

This study aimed to determine whether collaborative writing in an online environment improves students' writing performances in content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Both A1 and A2 proficiency level participants were divided

into control and experimental groups to understand the improvement of the students' writing performances. Since there were two proficiency levels, the study has been conducted in two sessions. The first session has been done with A1 proficiency level students, and the second session has included A2 proficiency level students.

For seven weeks, both control and experimental groups in each proficiency level were given a writing task once a week. The writings were chosen simultaneously to the units covered from the coursebook, interchange Introduction for A1 level and interchange 1 fifth edition for A2 level, during that week. Therefore, the writing tasks became a revision of the units. Experimental groups were asked to complete the task with their group members in the Microsoft Teams platform in 50 minutes. Control groups, on the other hand, were asked to submit the task as an individual assignment.

Each week, after completing the paragraph writing of experimental groups, the paragraphs were shared by the instructor on the screen so that everyone could make corrections in the classroom. Therefore, before the instructor, students gave feedback to each other. The writing topics that were given to A1 and A2 levels were shown in Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 respectively.

*Table 3. 1 Weekly writing questions of A1 proficiency level*

A1 PROFICIENCY LEVEL	
WEEK 1	Introduce the woman in the picture. (50 words). Name, surname, age, nationality, appearance, personality. Then, describe the picture. What is she doing? What is she wearing?
WEEK 2	Write a paragraph about your weekly routines. (100 words)
WEEK 3	Write a paragraph about your dream house . (100 words)
WEEK 4	Write a paragraph about your eating habit . (100 words)
WEEK 5	Choose a holiday or festival and write a paragraph . (100 words)

	a) Describe this festival b) Tell what you are going to do at that festival or holiday
WEEK 6	Write a paragraph about your abilities. (100 words)
WEEK 7	Write a paragraph about your last summer holiday . (100 words)

*Table 3. 2. Weekly writing questions of A2 proficiency level*

A2 PROFICIENCY LEVEL	
WEEK 1	Write a paragraph about your shopping preferences (colour/ design/ style /material/places). (100 words). Use comparative sentences.
WEEK 2	You have an online friend in another country. Write an email to your friend about your family. ( 150 words)
WEEK 3	Write a paragraph about your neighbourhood. Describe what kind of neighbourhood it is. Talk about the places that are or aren't in your area. (150 words)
WEEK 4	Write an email to someone you haven't seen for a long time. Include the things you've done since you last saw that person.(150 words)
WEEK 5	Write a paragraph about a place you have visited before and give some advice to people about what to do in there?
WEEK 6	Have you eaten out recently? Write a review of a restaurant or a cafe. (150 WORDS)
WEEK 7	Write a paragraph about how you have changed since your childhood? Appearance – Life style – Routines – education – personality- clothing preferences. (150 words)

### **3.3.6. The Evaluation Rubric**

The rubric is used to calculate students' writing scores, which constitutes a 25-point section at the end of the module exam that is carried out after completing each module at every level at the preparatory school of the university in 2019-2020. To get reliable statistical results, the 25-point scale was changed into 100- point scale. The instructors who assessed both control and experimental groups' writings were experienced lecturers with seven years of teaching experience at the English Preparatory School.

***Content (24 points)*** Effectively addresses the topic developing relevant explanation, exemplification, and details.

***Grammar (24 points)*** Consistent facilities in the use of language, demonstrating syntactic and structural variety and accuracy.

***Vocabulary (24 points)*** Relevant word choice and phrases, lexical variety and accuracy.

***Organization (20 points)*** Unity, progression, coherence with clarity of thoughts and ideas, intentions as well as appropriate paragraph structures promote comprehension.

***Spelling (8 points)*** Precise spelling and punctuation use.

### **3.3.7. Treatment**

The study has been conducted as an experimental research design. It has been conducted in two sessions. The first session has been done with A1 level students, and the second session has included A2 level students. In the first session, A1 level students from two intact classes have been chosen as participants. 19 students from one class have been chosen as an experimental group and 18 students from the other class have been the control group. In A2 level, 20 students from one class have been chosen as an experimental group, and 19 students from another class have been chosen as the control group. Both classes in each level have had the same curriculum and materials. Before the study, a pretest has been administered to both control and experimental groups to gather the quantitative data. The experimental group has been informed

about Microsoft Teams and collaborative writing procedure. During the intervention, participants in the experimental group have been divided into four subgroups with 5 or 4 members. Each group in experimental group has created a classroom in Microsoft Teams to work collaboratively on a writing task without an instructor observing them. They were allowed to use L1 in the session. During Collaborative writing meetings of learners, all the steps during these sessions have been recorded. For the control group, the writing materials have been the same based on Cambridge intro-level fifth edition, but students have been assigned to finish the writing tasks individually within the given time. After the intervention, a post-test was given to both groups to find if there are any differences between these groups. The same procedure has been done to A2 level students in the following quarter of 7 weeks as a second session. The writing topics were chosen from the coursebook, interchange 1 fifth edition.

A written interview with open-ended questions have been given to the participants in experimental groups after the posttest was completed to better understand their perceptions of online collaborative writing task to gather the qualitative data. Also, an oral interview has been done with 5 randomly chosen students from both A1 and A2 levels of experimental groups to strengthen the findings of the written interview.

### **3.4. Data Analysis**

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative data. Before the implementation of the study, all the students in experimental and control groups were given a pretest. Before the study, the experimental group students were divided into four groups of four or five members and were informed about the process of online collaborative writing activities. All the quarters consisted of 7 weeks and the group members came together on Microsoft Teams platform in one of the class hours in each week. All the groups were given a writing topic that was covered from the course book each week. They were asked to use the structures in the unit in their writing paragraph as a group and complete the task in 50 minutes class hour. After the completion of four paragraph writings, all the members of four groups meet again in their regular class with their instructor. The instructor showed the paragraphs of four group one by one on the screen. Therefore, every student in the classroom could give feedbacks to the other

group's writing. Finally, the instructor gave the necessary feedback to the four paragraph one by one. Thus, everyone in the class had a chance to see the mistakes of each writing. This procedure was done in both A1 and A2 proficiency level experimental groups. On the other hand, control group members, who had the same curriculum and course book, were given to the same writing topics as an individual assignment each week. After the implementation, both the control and experimental group members were given a posttest to measure the improvement of their writing skill.

For the qualitative data, all the experimental group members were given a written interview that investigates their attitudes towards online collaborative writing experiences. For the deeper understanding of the written interview results, five randomly chosen students as volunteers were chosen to be orally interviewed. The oral interview questions were a detailed version of the written interview. Finally, students' responses from the written and oral interviews were elicited through categorization to gather the qualitative data.

## CHAPTER 4- FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, the results of the study will be presented in detail. First, for the quantitative data, inter-rater reliability of the two raters will be shown in a table for A1 and A2 proficiency levels. Then, pretest and posttest results will be examined according to the research questions. Finally, data for the positive and negative attitudes of students will be presented.

### 4.1. Findings

This study employed both quantitative and qualitative research procedures. SPSS 25 program was used to analyze the data of the research. For the quantitative data, Cohen's Kappa Coefficient was used to assure the reliability of the scores given by two raters who were experienced instructors. Landis and Koch (1977, cited in Can, 2014) considered weak fit for values of 0.20 and below, values in the range of 0.21-0.40 points are below the middle fit, the 0.41-0.60-point range is a moderate agreement, the range of 0.61-0.80 points were recommended as a good level of adaptation, and finally the range of 0.81 and 1.00 as a very good level of adjustment. Additionally, the 1 point obtained as a result of the calculation shows full harmony. Cohen's Kappa Coefficient scores, which is the coefficient agreement between raters of A1 and A2 groups are given below in Table 4.1 and 4.2.

*Table 4. 1. The Results of A1 group Cohen's Kappa Coefficient*

A1		K	
Pre-Test	Control Group	Content	0.902
		Grammar	0.850
		Vocabulary	0.754
		Organization	0.919

		Spelling	0.836
		Content	0.786
		Grammar	0.837
	Experimental Group	Vocabulary	0.913
		Organization	0.912
		Spelling	0.914
Post-test		Content	0.876
		Grammar	0.867
	Control Group	Vocabulary	0.814
		Organization	0.804
		Spelling	0.925
		Content	0.833
		Grammar	0.724
	Experimental Group	Vocabulary	0.795
		Organization	0.847
		Spelling	0.894

*Table 4. 2. The Results of A2 group Cohen's Kappa Coefficient*

A2		K	
		Content	1
		Grammar	0.743
Pre-Test	Control Group	Vocabulary	0.878
		Organization	0.752
		Spelling	1

		Content	1
		Grammar	0.784
	Experiment Group	Vocabulary	0.841
		Organization	1
		Spelling	1
		Content	1
		Grammar	0.880
	Control Group	Vocabulary	0.736
		Organization	1
		Spelling	1
Post-Test		Content	1
		Grammar	0.864
	Experiment Group	Vocabulary	0.737
		Organization	0.833
		Spelling	1

In addition, arithmetic means and standard variation were used in statistical analysis. As a result of the normality analysis, normality was not achieved in the control group content sub-factor of the A1 level, and the content sub-factor of the A2 level, and total scores were normal. While the results of normality analysis were being checked, Shapiro Wilk test results were considered since the number of participants was under 30 (Can, 2014: 88) and p-value was examined. Normality cannot be achieved in the spelling sub-factor at the A2 proficiency level. That is why Skewness and Kurtosis values were examined. Those values were found to be -0.12 for Skewness and -0.207 for Kurtosis. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007: 79), it is possible to consider that data is distributed normally if the Skewness and Kurtosis coefficients value between -1,5 and +1.5. In this study, Wilcoxin Sign Rank test, T-Test for associated

samples and T-Test for unrelated samples was used to compare the participants' scores. Effect size values were also calculated to compare the scores. While effect size is interpreted as very large above one, it is evaluated as 0.8 large, 0.5 medium, 0.2 minor effects. (Morgan et al. 2004: 91; cited in Can, 2014: 141).

#### 4.2. The Findings of the Data Analysis Relating to the First Research Question

Are there any statistically significant differences between the pre-test and post-test results of A1 and A2 level experimental group in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling?

In order to understand whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the members of A1 level experimental group in terms of content factor , Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was conducted. The results are presented in Table 4.3.

*Table 4. 3. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test conducted for the pre-test and Post-test results of the content factor for A1 level*

End Measurement- Initial Measurement	N	Avarage Rank	Rank Sum	Z	P
Negative Ranks	1	1	1		
Positive Ranks	15	9	135	-3.539	0
No Difference	2				

According to the results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test that was conducted to understand whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test results of the A1 experimental group students who took part in online collaborative writing activities, a statistically significant difference was observed between the Pre-test and Post-test results [ $z=-3.539$ ,  $p<0,05$ ]. The different scores in favor of the positive ranks (post-test) proves that the program has a statistically significant effect on its effectiveness.

In order to understand whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the members of A1 level experimental group in terms of grammar factor , T-Test was conducted. The results are presented in Table 4.4.

*Table 4. 4. T-Test Results for Associated Samples for Pre-Test and Post-Test Results of Grammar Factor for A1 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	18	17.28	1.41	17	-9.16	0
Post-Test	18	21.67	1.81			

In a group of 18 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, The aim of conducting this test was to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the T-Test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pre-test}=17.28$ ) and the Post-test ( $X_{post-test}= 21.67$ ). [ $t(17)= -9.16, p<0.05$ ] The effect size ( $d= 2.16$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

In order to understand whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the members of A1 level experimental group in terms of vocabulary factor , T-Test was conducted. The results are shown in Table 4.5.

*Table 4. 5. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Vocabulary Factor for A1 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	18	17.22	1.23	17	-8.46	0
Post- Test	18	23.11	2.35			

In a group of 18 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, this test aimed to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the T-Test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pre-test}=17.22$ ) and the Post-test ( $X_{Post-test}=23.11$ ). [ $t(17)=-8.46, p<0.05$ ] The effect size ( $d=1.99$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

In order to understand whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the members of A1 level experimental group in terms of organization factor , T-Test was conducted. The results are shown in Table 4.6.

*Table 4. 6. T-Test Results for Associated Samples for the Organization Factor's Pre-test and Post-Test Results for A1 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	18	14.39	1.56	17	-7.47	0
Post-Test	18	18.22	1.88			

In a group of 18 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, the aim of conducting this test was to compare the pre-test and the post-test from the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the T-Test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pretest}=14.39$ ) and the Post-test ( $X_{posttest}=18.22$ ). [ $t(17)=-7.47, p<0.05$ ]. The effect size ( $d=1.76$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

In order to understand whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the members of A1 level experimental group in terms of spelling factor , T-Test was conducted. The results are shown in Table 4.7.

*Table 4. 7. T-Test Results for Related Samples for Pre-test and Post-test Results of Spelling Factor for A1 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	18	5.78	0.61	17	-3.59	0.002
Post-Test	18	6.61	0.81			

In a group of 18 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, the aim of conducting this test was to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the T-Test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pretest}=5.78$ ) and the Post-test ( $X_{posttest}=6.61$ ). [ $t(17)=-3.59$ ,  $p<0.05$ ]. The effect size ( $d=0.85$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

In order to compare the pretest and posttest results of A2 proficiency level, a T-test and Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test were conducted. The t-test results showed that there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the experimental group in terms of grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the content factor. The results of the Wilcoxon Signed-rank test for the content factor for A2 level experimental group are presented in Table 4.8.

*Table 4. 8. Results of the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test conducted for the pre-test and Post-test results of the content factor for A2 Level*

End Measurement-Initial Measurement	N	Avarage Rank	Rank Sum	Z	P
Negative Ranks	0	0	1		
Positive Ranks	4	2.5	10	-1.857	0.063
No Difference	16				

According to the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks test results, there is no statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the experimental group [ $z=-1.857$ ,  $p>0,05$ ].

Table 4.9 shows the t-test results for associated samples for pre-test and post-test results of grammar factor.

*Table 4. 9. T-Test Results for Associated Samples for Pre-Test and Post-Test Results of Grammar Factor for A2 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	20	16.35	1.843	19	-8.878	0
Post-Test	20	21.4	1.429			

In a group of 20 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, the aim was to compare the pre-test and post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the T-Test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pre-test}=16.35$ ) and Post-test ( $X_{post-test}= 21.4$ ). [ $t_{(19)}= -9.16$ ,  $p<0.05$ )The effect size ( $d= 1.98$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

Table 4.10 shows the t-test results for the associated samples for the pre-test and post-test results of the vocabulary factor for A2 level participants.

*Table 4. 10. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Vocabulary Factor for A2 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	20	14.39	1.56	17	-8.46	0
Post-Test	20	18.22	1.88			

In a group of 20 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, the aim was to compare the pre-test and post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the T-Test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pre-test}=17.22$ ) and Post-test ( $X_{post-test}= 23.11$ ) [ $t_{(19)}=-8.46$ ,  $p<0.05$ ]. The effect size ( $d=1.99$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

Table 4.11 shows the t-test results for the associated samples for the pre-test and post-test results of the organization factor for A2 level participants.

*Table 4. 11. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Organization Factor for A2 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	20	14.65	2.96	19	-6.541	0
Post-Test	20	18.95	1.31			

In a group of 20 students who participated in online collaborative writing activities, the aim here was to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the t-test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pre-test}=14.65$ ) and post-test ( $X_{post-test}= 18.95$ ). [ $t_{(19)}=-6.541$ ,  $p<0.05$ ] The effect size ( $d=1.46$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

Table 4.12 shows the t-test results for the associated samples for the pre-test and post-test results of the spelling factor for A2 level Participants.

*Table 4. 12. T-Test Results for the Associated Samples for the Pre-test and Post-test Results of the Spelling Factor for A2 Level*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Pre-Test	20	5.15	0.67	19	-8.718	0.
Post-Test	20	6.35	0.49			

The aim was to compare the pre-test and the post-test results of the related samples performed after the treatment. As a result of the t-test, a statistically significant difference was observed between the mean of the pre-test ( $X_{pre-test}=75.75$ ) and the Post-test ( $X_{post-test}= 92.55$ ). [ $t_{(19)}=-10.3$ ,  $p<0.05$ ] The effect size ( $d=2.12$ ) calculated as a result of the test indicates that this difference is very high.

### 4.3. The Findings of the Data Analysis Relating to the Second Research Question

Is there a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test results of A1 and A2 proficiency level experiment and control group learners?

This study aimed to examine the effects of collaborative writing activities on L2 writing skills in distance education. To see whether there is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of A1 level experimental group and control group, a T-test was conducted. The T-test results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of the control and experimental groups of A1 level are given in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14.

*Table 4. 13. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Pre-test results of the A1 Level control and experimental groups.*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Control Group	18	75.39	7.09	36	-7.787	0.436
Experimental Group	19	77.37	8.13			

According to the T-Test results for the unrelated samples made regarding whether there is a significant difference between the pre-test results of the control and experimental groups, there is no statistically significant difference between the test

scores of the students in control group ( $X=75.39$ ) and the students in the experimental group ( $X=77.37$ ) [ $t(36)=-7.787$ ,  $p>0.05$ ].

*Table 4. 14. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Post-test results of the A1 Level control and experimental groups.*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Control Group	18	85.95	6.78	36	-4.192	0
Experimental Group	19	93.39	3.36			

According to the T-Test results for the unrelated samples made regarding whether there is a significant difference between the post-test results of the control and experimental groups, there is a significant difference between the test scores of the students in control group ( $X=85.95$ ) and the students in the experimental group ( $X=93.39$ ) [ $t(36)=-4.192$ ,  $p<0.05$ ].

For A2 proficiency level participants, table 4.15 shows the t-test results for unrelated samples that was conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test results of the control and experimental groups.

*Table 4. 15. T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Pre-test results of the A2 Level control and experimental group*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Control Group	19	79.84	4.92	37	2.097	0.043
Experimental Group	20	75.75	7.02			

According to the T-Test results for the unrelated samples made regarding whether there is a significant difference between the pre-test results of the control and

experimental groups; there is a significant difference between the test scores of the students in control group ( $X=79.84$ ) and the students in the experimental group ( $X=75.75$ ) [ $t_{(37)}=2.097$ ,  $p<0.05$ ].

Table 4. 16 below presents the t-test results for unrelated samples that was conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the post-test results of the control and experimental group of A2 level.

*Table 4. 16 . T-Test Results for unrelated samples conducted to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the Post-test results of the A2 Level control and experimental group*

	N	X	S	Sd	t	p
Control Group	19	89.95	3.7	37	-2.066	0.46
Experimental Group	20	92.55	4.14			

According to the t-test results for the unrelated samples that was conducted to see whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test results of the control and experimental groups, it was found that there is a statistically significant difference between the posttest scores of the students in control group ( $X=89.95$ ) and the students in the experimental group ( $X=92.55$ ) [ $t_{(36)}=-4.192$ ,  $p<0.05$ ].

#### **4.4. The Findings of the Data Analysis Relating to the Third Research Question**

The third research question of this study was “What are the students’ attitudes in experimental group about online collaborative writing?”

Based on the students’ responses for the open-ended questions of the written interview and the oral interview with 5 students, most of the students indicated that they had no previous experience of online collaborative writing. Although they mostly enjoyed the online collaborative writing experience, they also shared some challenges in online collaborative writing tasks.

#### **4.4.1. The Findings of the written interview related to benefits of Online Collaborative Writing**

Based on the findings of the open-ended questions in written interview, at both A1 and A2 levels, participants mostly found the online collaborative writing tasks beneficial. Their positive attitudes were divided into three main categories: 1) error correction and awareness of the mistake, 2) improvement in L2 and writing, 3) gaining different perspectives and creativity.

##### *Category 1- Error correction and awareness of the mistake*

In A1 level, 15 out of 18 students and in A2 level, 10 out of 20 students claimed that online collaborative writing was very effective since their mistakes were always corrected by their peers. Therefore, they did not repeat the same mistakes. Some of their views were as follows:

*'I think, this activity was very effective because we can correct each other's grammar, spelling and many other different mistakes.'* (A1 level student)

*'When someone makes a mistake in a group writing, another person corrects it immediately, so we keep the right things in mind not the wrong sentences or words.'* (A1 level student)

*'Two heads are better than one. We learn our mistakes together.'* (A1 level student)

*'I found group writing very useful because when we write individually, the things we believe as correct can be wrong. When we write together, there is always someone who realizes the mistakes so that we can learn it immediately.'* (A1 level student)

*'I was not very good at punctuations before, but thanks to my friends' corrections, I am better now.'* (A2 level student)

*'I found this group activity useful; we find each others' mistakes and help each other in this way. Therefore, we learn faster.'* (A2 level student)

*'At the beginning, I really did not like collaborative writing activity. I still prefer to write individually. However, after seven weeks of collaborative writing activities, I can say that even while correcting our friends' mistakes, in fact, we were revising our own knowledge.'* (A2 level student)

### *Category 2: Improvement in L2 and writing*

In A1 level, 15 out of 18 students, in A2 level 17 out of 20 students claimed that they improved both their L2 knowledge in general and their writing skills through online collaborative writing tasks because they could make a revision of the units covered in the classroom. In A1 level, 8 students stated that they have improved themselves in terms of grammar, 7 students stated that they improved their spelling, 6 students stated that they improved themselves in terms of vocabulary. In A2 level, 8 students stated that they have improved in terms of grammar, 11 students stated that they improved their vocabulary knowledge, 5 students stated that they improved their spelling while 2 students stated that they improved their organization and content. Some of the responses from the participants are shown below:

*'I prefer to write in a group because it increases my English knowledge.'* (A1 level student)

*'I usually wrote with the words I already knew before the group work. When we write together, we tried to use different words.'* (A1 level student)

*'My English was very bad before. However, after the group writings, I improved it a lot.'* (A1 level student)

*'I believe that I can write faster now. I used to write the sentences in Turkish and translate them. Now, I can write my sentences in English directly.'* (A1 level student)

*'I improved myself on how to write a paragraph and learned a lot of words. I understand how to write a good paragraph very well.'* (A2 level student)

*'When I write alone, I always used to check whether my sentences are correct or not on the internet. When I write with my friends, everything becomes clearer in my head.'* (A2 level student)

*'I normally have difficulty in vocabulary usage. One word may have different meanings. When I write with my friends, we can find the correct usage of a word.'* (A2 level student)

### *Category 3- Gaining different perspectives and increasing creativity*

In A1 level, 9 respondents out of 18, in A2 level 9 respondents out of 20 students stated that they enjoyed exchanging ideas with each other. Sharing their opinions with each other encouraged them to come up with creative ideas. Some of the responses from the participants are as follows:

*'I think, it is very useful to work with a group because we all come up with different ideas. While talking about these ideas, we find ourselves in a fun environment.'* (A1 level student)

*'My friends helped me gain different opinions and perspectives. Therefore, they increased my potential to talk in English.'* (A1 level student)

*'I believe that brainstorming, arguing about some ideas and coming up with a common solution improves me more.'* (A1 level student)

*'I think that thanks to online collaborative writing activity, I can share my opinions clearly, I am also better at communicating with my friends. Therefore, I believe that collaborative writing is better than individual writing'* (A2 level student)

*'I used to have difficulty in creating ideas. I was unable to write with the new structures we have learned in the classroom. In that sense, I believe that collaborative writing was effective.'* (A2 level student)

#### **4.4.2. The Findings of the written interview related to challenges of Online Collaborative Writing**

In A1 group, 2 students stated that they did not enjoy writing in a group. They stated that there was not equal participation and there were sometimes limitations and arguments. In A2 level, only one student stated that she did not find the online collaborative activities useful because her native language was not Turkish. On the other hand, some students stated some negative sides of online collaborative writing task along with the benefits. Some of the responses from the participants are as follows:

*'If we had not been in a group of the same people throughout the quarter, it could have been better to avoid the disagreements'* (A1 level student)

*'Some people were very active while the others were very quiet. It would have been better if we had done the same activity in pairs.'* (A1 level student)

*'I would like to write individually because everyone has his own opinion that he wants to write about.'* (A2 level student)

*'While some topics can be written better with a group, some should be written individually. For example, I prefer to write individually if the topic is something personal like family.'* (A2 level student)

*'I like collaborative writing better than individual writing. However, there should be equality between them. They both have benefits.'* (A2 level student)

*'I sometimes feel exhausted while deciding on what to write and how to write with a group. Everyone needs to contribute to the paragraphs, and we need to say ok even if we don't like the sentence.'* (A2 level student)

*'I am mostly the one who corrects others' mistakes. Even if I correct them constantly, I get no reaction from them. That is why, I hesitate to correct them.'* (A2 level student)

*'Since my group members mostly spoke Turkish, I do not understand properly.'* (A2 level student)

#### **4.4.3. Findings of the oral interview related to the students' positive attitudes**

In addition to the written interview with open-ended questions, an oral interview was conducted with 5 students from different levels to understand the students' attitudes towards online collaborative writing. Based on the students' responses to the oral interview questions, it can be said that they mostly have a positive attitude towards online collaborative writing activities in A1 and A2 levels. As the results of the written interview, the findings of the oral interview related to the students' positive attitudes can be categorized into 3 main categories.

1. Error correction and awareness of the mistake
2. improvement in L2 and writing
3. gaining different perspectives and creativity

##### *Category 1 Error correction*

4 out of 5 respondents stated that they really found error correction very useful for their L2 improvement during the online collaborative writing activities. They stated that when their mistakes were corrected by their friends, the knowledge became permanent. The responses mostly stated that error correction in groups enabled them to write faster with minimum mistake. Some of the responses from the participants are as follows:

*'When I said something wrong, my friends could correct it or when I misuse some words, my friends could tell a better one. Therefore, the final work became much better.'* (A2 level student)

*'Thanks to my friends' corrections, I improved myself to a great extent in terms of spelling.'* (A2 level student)

### *Category 2 Improvement in L2 and writing*

4 out of 5 respondents stated that they observed an improvement in writing and the target language. Based on the responses, they mostly improved themselves in terms of content, grammar, and spelling. However, some students stated that they also got better in terms of vocabulary and organization. Another frequent response was that they had difficulty in making a sentence before online collaborative writing tasks. Some of the responses from the participants are as follows:

*'We were not very bad at grammar, but we improved it more. After some time, we even started to speak English during the writing activity.'* (A2 level student)

*'I had no idea about how to start the paragraphs and how to continue to the paragraphs. I was lack of the necessary grammar and vocabulary knowledge. While working in a group, I realized the improvement of myself.'* (A1 level student)

### *Category 3 Gaining different perspectives and creativity*

Many of the interviewees stated that sharing their ideas enabled them to have more opinions about the related topic. These different perspectives help them create more ideas instead of repeating themselves to acquire more words while writing. Some of the responses from the participants are as follows:

*'The topics were always related to the ones we covered in the classroom. Before we started writing, we brainstormed our ideas. There were too many ideas eventually. Therefore, we could force ourselves to expand our vocabulary knowledge.'* (A1 level student)

*'Formerly, I used to think very simple. However, when we worked as a group, we improved ourselves in terms of content because everyone gave different*

*opinions. We were combining these ideas so at the end, we could create better and more creative paragraphs.* ' (A2 level student)

#### **4.4.4. Findings of the oral interview related to the students' negative attitudes**

Based on students' responses to the oral interview questions and the advantages of online collaborative writing, there are also some disadvantages. The most frequent complaint of the students was related to their peers with whom they worked. They stated that when they interacted well with their peers, they enjoyed the task very much. The problems that the respondents faced during the online collaborative tasks are as follows:

- 1) Hesitation of error correction
- 2) Inactive group members
- 3) The feeling of discomfort with the others
- 4) Preference of pair work instead of a group
- 5) The unequal distribution of responsibility

Some of the responses from the participants are as follows:

*'I was the one who always corrected the others. When I needed to correct my friends too many times, I usually felt nervous about offending them'* (A2 level students)

*'There were some friends who were not as enthusiastic as I was. They usually preferred to be quiet even if some of us warned them not to. I really enjoyed the same activity in A1 level with my group members. However, in A2 level, I really didn't enjoy working with my friends.'* (a student that involved in the study in both A1 and A2 level)

*'I never enjoy the social interactions. This is my personality. That is why, I felt a little nervous while working in a group.'* (A2 level student)

*‘During the collaborative writing activity, some of my friends did not attend the work. If it had been a pair work, everyone would have attended.’* (A2 level student)

*‘There was always one person who took the responsibility of writing.’* (A2 level student)

Table 4.17 below shows the benefits and challenges of online collaborative writing according to participants’ responses.

*Table 4. 17. Benefits and Challenges of Online Collaborative Writing*

<b>BENEFITS</b>	<b>CHALLENGES</b>
Error Correction	Discrepancy between group members
Awareness of mistakes	Some students remain passive
Improvement in L2 and Writing (Grammar-Content-Vocabulary-Organization-Spelling)	The feeling of limitation
Gaining different perspectives and increasing creativity	Difficulty in writing about personal topics with a group
Social Environment	Hesitation of correcting others
Increased self-confidence	Language differences
Enjoying the lessons	Feeling discomfort with others
	The unequal distribution of responsibility

#### **4.5. Discussion**

The current study examined whether online collaborative writing has a positive effect on students' writing performances. The study was conducted with two different levels, A1 and A2 in an English preparatory school of a foundation university. The same curriculum was followed for both control and experimental groups in both levels. In both sessions, experimental groups were divided into 4 sub-groups of 5 or 4 members. They were all informed about collaborative writing. Once a week within 7 weeks, the members of experimental group came together in Microsoft Team platform during one of their class hours to write a paragraph relevant to the subject covered in the course book, *Interchange fifth edition, Introduction for A1 levels and Interchange 1 for A2 levels*. They worked on the content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling of the writing task collaboratively to complete the task successfully in 50 minutes. On the other hand, the same writing topics were given to control group members as an individual task to be written as an assignment. Before and after the treatment, all the groups were given a pre-test and post-test.

The first research question intended to examine whether there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of A1 and A2 level experimental group members individually in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. For A1 proficiency level, the results of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test show a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of experimental group in terms of content factor. According to the T-Test results, there is also a statistically significant difference between the pretest and the posttest results of students who performed in collaborative writing tasks in terms of grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Considering the effects of collaborative writing task on content, grammar, vocabulary and organization, the results of the present study resemble Shehade's findings. Shehade (2011) examined the effects of collaborative writing in L2. His findings showed a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of experimental group members in terms of content, organization, and vocabulary. However, no statistically significant difference was observed in grammar and spelling. One of the underlying reasons for the significant

differences in the findings can be related to Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory. Vygotsky (1978, cited in Deveci, 2018) claims that a person can only be developed with social interactions and symbolic tools. Language is an artificial tool that leads people to achieve thinking, problem solving, learning, and planning skills.

The first research question also intended to examine whether there was a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of A2 level experimental group members individually in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. The results of Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of experimental group in terms of content factor. However, according to the T-Test results, a statistically significant difference was found between the pretest and the posttest results of students' who performed in collaborative writing tasks in terms of grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. These findings are consistent with the findings of Sajedi (2014: 1653-1654) who investigated the collaborative summary writing and EFL students' L2 development. His findings showed that the students improved themselves considerably in content, organization, and vocabulary but there was no statistically significant difference in terms of grammar and spelling. There was no difference in grammar and spelling in many studies, which can be related to L2 usage requirements for low-level students during the collaborative writing task. Since the students in experimental groups could use L1 to discuss the writing topic, they were more eager to talk during collaboration. They did not have enough L2 knowledge to give feedback to their peers or generate ideas. Blue and Grundy (1996: 247) assert that problem solving is more likely to ensure in collaborative activities when students are eager to share ideas and engage with others.

The second research question intended to examine whether there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of A1 and A2 level experimental group and control group in general.

When the T-test results are considered for the pretest of A1 level students, there is no statistically significant difference between two groups. While the mean pretest score of control group is 75.39, it is 77.37 for experimental group. However, T-Test results show that there is a statistically significant difference in their posttest results. Although

there is a slight difference between the pretest and posttest results of the control group, the difference between the pretest and posttest result of experimental group is higher. The mean posttest score of the control group is 85.95 while it is 93.39 for the experimental group. The results indicate that online collaborative writing activities are effective on students' general writing performances. Swain and Lapkin (1998, cited in McDonough, Vleeschauwer, and Crawford, 2018) asserts that L2 knowledge can be achieved better by those who can benefit from the linguistic knowledge of others. Since A1 level students lack adequate knowledge of both the L2 itself and how to use the existing knowledge in writing tasks, online collaborative writing tasks enabled them to involve in their own learning process by generating ideas and getting or giving feedback to each other. These findings also support Learner-learner interaction focusing on language related episodes (LREs) approach. Swain and Lapkin (1998, cited in McDonough, Vleeschauwer, and Crawford, 2018) define LREs as any kind of dialogue that triggers learners talk about the language they produce, question, and make correction of themselves or the others. Therefore, the findings proved that students who took part in online collaborative writing tasks learned autonomy in learning language. They encouraged themselves as a group to write better every passing week since they know that in case of being indifferent to the task, everyone in the group will be affected by their action. Also, after complete participation in the online collaborative writing tasks, all the members became more curious about the feedback given by their peers and lecturer. However, the students in the control group who handed over the writing tasks as an assignment kept repeating the same mistakes despite the feedback given to them individually by their lecturer. Therefore, it can be said that while the aim of the students in the experimental group was to complete the task as best as they could, the students in control group considered it as an obligatory assignment and aimed to complete it as fast as they could.

The second research question also aimed to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test results of A2 level experimental group and control group in general. Surprisingly, the control group performed slightly better in the pre-test than the experimental group. While the mean pretest score of the control group was 79.84, the mean score was 75.75 for the experimental group. Although the L2 proficiency level of each group was the same,

the experimental group students might have lesser proficiency in writing skills at the beginning. However, there is a statistically significant difference in the posttest results. While the control group's mean test score was 89.95, the mean test score of the experimental group was 92.55. This finding shows that online collaborative writing is effective in the development of writing skills in A2 level. The results are consistent with the findings of Akbaş (2017: 49) who investigated the effects of collaborative work on students' writing performance. Similarly, Akbaş conducted a study with A2 level students. Her findings showed a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the control and experimental groups. Even though the control group in the present study started with a slightly better average at the pretest, it is clear that the difference between pretest and posttest has been significantly more for the experimental group students. Lyster (2001, cited in Sajedi, 2014) argued that feedback received by peers during a collaborative task promotes self-improvement in L2.

The third research question addressed the attitudes of students towards online collaborative writing tasks in terms of the benefits and challenges of online collaborative writing. The most frequent responses of the participants that were given to the written interview were categorized. Also, to strengthen the finding of the written interview, 5 randomly chosen respondents from the experimental group were orally interviewed. Based on the responses obtained through the written and oral interviews, it can be said that students were mostly in favor of online collaborative writing activities. The positive attitudes of students were divided into 3 categories: 1) error correction- awareness of the mistake, 2) improvement in L2 and writing and 3) gaining different perspectives and creativity.

Most of the students in both A1 and A2 levels stated that they had never been in collaborative writing activities before. After 7 weeks of online collaborative writing activities, in both groups, the participants found error correction as the most beneficial contribution of the current study. They stated that when their mistakes were corrected immediately by their peers, they never did the same mistake again. They also believed that they became more aware of their language deficiencies. As Storch (1998, cited in Sajedi, 2014) claimed, being part of a collaboration that includes peer feedback means

receiving immediate information and filling the information gap, both of which enhances language knowledge.

Another important benefit attained from students' responses is that they realized their improvement in both L2 and writing skills. Most of the students stated that they did not understand how to write a paragraph or a sentence before they worked collaboratively. They did not know how to organize a paragraph. Almost all the participants stated that they improved their grammar knowledge because when they wrote with their peers, they were encouraged to use the grammar that was covered in the classroom. Additionally, spelling is another writing skill they believed that they improved. Many students stated that while writing collaboratively, especially if they were the one who was writing, they became more aware of the spelling and punctuations.

According to the responses of the students that participated in online collaborative writing, brainstorming was found to be another benefit that enables them to gain more perspective and creativity. The responses revealed that students mostly had some problems to create an idea to write a paragraph. However, when they worked collaboratively, they realized that there were many different perspectives alternatives. Since they came across different perspectives' alternatives during the task, they thought they needed to be more creative. The need to be creative also provided them with more vocabulary knowledge.

As well as the benefits of online collaborative writing, some students also stated some challenges that they faced during the collaboration. Since L1 is allowed, only a foreign student who cannot speak Turkish very well felt alienated in A2 level. Collaborative writing was also found by some students to be more challenging than individual writing because they thought they were unable to write their opinions freely. Some responses also showed that students prefer to write some personal topics like family or free time activity individually. For some participants, there was no equal share and responsibility in group writing. While some students were very active, some were passive. The feeling of discomfort with others was an additional negative attitude that was obtained from the interviews.

The responses obtained through the oral interview also indicate that students enjoyed the online collaborative writing activities. However, when they were asked to talk about the things they did not like, they mostly stated that there was an important link between the group members and the benefits of the study. One student who took part in online collaborative writing in both A1 and A2 levels stated that she enjoyed the activity to a great extent in A1 level since she had a great interaction with the members of her group. However, she also stated that she did not enjoy the same activity in A2 level because she could not connect with her peers.

## CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION

### 5.1. An overview of the study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of online collaborative writing on learners' L2 writing performances. While implementing collaborative writing in distance education, the effects of collaborative learning (CL), computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) are also reviewed. Furthermore, the findings of the research questions below are examined in detail.

- 1) Are there any statistically significant differences between the pretest and posttest results of A1 and A2 proficiency level experimental group in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling?
- 2) Is there a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test results of A1 and A2 proficiency level experimental and control group learners?
- 3) What are the attitudes of experimental group participants about online collaborative writing after having the first-hand collaborative writing experience?

To find answers to these questions, students were chosen in two intact classes as a control and experimental group both in A1 and A2 proficiency levels. In A1 level, control group consisted of 18 students while experimental group had 19 students. In A2 level, control group involved 19 students, while there were 20 students in experimental group. Before the intervention, all the students were given a pretest. Once a week within 7 weeks, experimental group students of both levels gathered on Microsoft Teams platform in one of their class hours to complete the given written task collaboratively while the students in control groups wrote the paragraphs individually as weekly assignments. After 7 weeks, all the groups were given a posttest. Both the pretests and the posttests were assessed by two experienced instructors. For the inter-rater reliability, Cohen's Kappa coefficient was calculated.

In addition to the quantitative data, qualitative data was also collected through a written interview. Also, oral interviews were done with volunteers to understand student's attitude towards online collaborative writing. Therefore, their positive and negative attitudes were eliminated.

## **5.2. Summary of the findings**

To measure the inter-rater reliability, pretest and posttest scores of both raters are compared through Cohen's Kappa Coefficient. 9 exact fit, 21 very good fit and 9 good level Kappa coefficients in A1 and A2 level assessment confirm that there is a reliability between two raters.

The first research question investigated the difference between the pretest and the posttest of the A1 and A2 level experimental group in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. The findings reveal that before the intervention, A1 level students were not good at writing skill as well as the target language since there is a statistically significant difference between their pretest and posttest results in terms of all the sub-factors like content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling.

The first research question also aimed to investigate whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest of A2 level experimental group in terms of content, grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Like the findings of A1 level, a statistically significant difference was also observed in A2 level students who participated in online collaborative writing activities in terms of grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling factors but there was no difference in content sub factor.

As for the second research question, which aimed to investigate whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of both experimental and control groups of A1 and A2 levels in general, the findings showed that there is not a statistically significant difference in the pretest results of A1 level experimental and control groups. However, there is a statistically significant difference in the posttest. Thus, the results prove that online collaborative writing tasks are effective in improving writing skills in L2 for A1 level.

The second question also addressed whether there is a statistically significant difference between the pretest and posttest results of both A2 level experimental and group. The findings demonstrate a statistically significant difference between the pretest results of control and experimental group. Although the proficiency level of control and experimental groups is the same, control group's writings are slightly better in the pretest which means that at the beginning they had better writing skills. However, this difference in pretest changed dramatically in the posttest results in favor of the experimental group. Posttest results reveal that students who took part in online collaborative writing activities performed better. These results indicate that collaborative writing activities are useful for the advancement of L2 writing skills for A2 level.

The third question was aimed to understand student's attitudes towards online collaborative writing tasks. Their responses from the oral and written interviews were eliminated through categorization of the most frequent answers. The results show that, other than few students, participants were mostly in favor of writing paragraphs together with their group members. The answers revealed that the most important benefit of online collaborative writing is the provision of knowledge through error correction. When students are corrected by their peers, they asserted that the knowledge becomes more permanent. The second benefit of online collaboration in writing is the improvement of not only writing skills, but also general improvement in the target language. The answers stressed that when students write together, they can understand the grammar topics covered in their classes better. They can have a better understanding of how to start a sentence or a paragraph. Other than gaining grammar and organization skills, they also learn new vocabulary from their friends when they write together. The final benefit is brainstorming and bearing alternative point of view. When students discuss their writing topics, they hear different perspectives on the same topic, which enables them to consider different alternatives and gain creative thinking skills.

On the other hand, according to few responses, some challenges also appeared while writing collaboratively in an online environment. Some students found collaboration more difficult since they could not write all their ideas freely because of the necessity of equal participation in the writing process. Another claim students voiced was that

some personal topics like family could be written better individually. Also, some students hesitated to correct their peers' mistakes too much in order not to hurt their feelings or for not being perceived as dominant. Students also expressed that using L1 at times was also defeating their purpose of L2 writing collaboration.

### **5.3. Implications of the study**

Based on the findings of the current study, it can be concluded that there are some theoretical and pedagogical implications of online collaborative writing.

Firstly, as social constructivist perspective suggested, students have the potential to learn within a group to acquire the L2 skills better. Related to social constructivist perspective, it can be observed that students are mostly able to generate a more meaningful text while participating within a group. They can compare several ideas and as a result, they can widen their perspectives. From a pedagogical perspective, writing within a group can also enable students to promote the use of L2 while brainstorming their ideas and discussing the organization of the written product. They can also revise the acquired language through collaborative writing activities.

Secondly, collaborative writing activities are important for a learner in acquiring learner autonomy. As Kim (2010, cited in Challob, Bakar & Latif, 2016) stated, direct feedback and exchange of information during the collaborative writing task encourages students to become more involved in the task since they are aware of their role as learners in this process.

Another important implication is the upgrading of deficiencies in writing. Ansarimoghaddam & Bee (2013, cited in Challob, Bakar and Latif, 2016) suggested that collaborative writing techniques can be a good way to contribute to different aspects of writing including content, structure, organization, and language. Based on this idea, writing requires more than one sub-factor like content but includes several aspects such as grammar, vocabulary, organization, and spelling. Learners are not always good at all the aspects of writing equally. While they may have good grammatical knowledge, they may be having difficulties in organizing the paragraph. That is why collaborative writing can be a solution for challenges students experience.

Additionally, students' positive attitudes towards online collaborative writing are another significant implication of the study. In an online environment, it is usually difficult for lecturers or teachers to follow their students' writing skills and their attitudes towards writing. The writing assignments are usually full of plagiarism and difficult to be controlled by the instructor. Also, plagiarism can be reduced due to the social responsibility of each learner for the group. Nobody wants to risk the welfare or the grade of the whole group by engaging in plagiarism. Another importance of collaborative writing in online environment is the ease of giving feedback for the lecturers because of the reduced number of the writings. In an average classroom, instead of giving feedback for 20 people individually, a lecturer can give feedback to 5 or 4 group writings, which attracts the student's attention more. While supporting each other to write and to learn the target language, students realize different benefits. For instance, they direct each other and gain some autonomy which consequently reduces writing anxiety a lot of students have. This is because it is no longer a big individual task; it is a task to be shared by other students.

Because of the recent disease obligations for distance education around the World, we have very few literature about post covid online era. There are many studies about collaborative writing in face-to-face education. However, there are not adequate number of studies on online collaborative writing. This study can be a good example of online collaborative writing to be shared in literature. Both teachers and students can learn a great deal in practicing collaborative writing activities in online classes.

#### **5.4. Limitation of the study and the directions for the future research**

This study was limited to the English preparatory school students at Sabahattin Zaim University as the pool of participants. The participants were only chosen from beginner and elementary level students in English preparatory school. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized to a large audience. Nevertheless, the study has a potential to inform some writing practices for online collaborative groups. This study can also be conducted with higher proficiency level students in English preparatory schools as well as university level students.

Another limitation was the number of participants. Since the number of students was not large enough in just one level, the study was divided into A1 and A2 proficiency levels. All in all, this study has great the potential to illustrate the potential of such an innovative experiment in influencing the writing potential of our learners for the better. Not only writing, but also all language skill areas have a lot to benefit from such a practice of students. Also, because of the online environment some students stopped attending the classes and could not take the posttest because of their absenteeism. That is why the predicted number of students reduced in number during the quarter. This was beyond the control of the instructor and researcher in the study.

Additionally, since this study was conducted in an online environment, some students encountered with technology related problems during their collaborative writing activities. The instructor and researcher could not influence technological infrastructure of students at their home. Also, covid epidemic impacted the participation of some students who experienced the covid virus during the course of the study.

To sum up, distance education exacerbated some limitations to the study. Collaborative writing experiment in online format is a novel approach which we can learn intensely from. However, several hurdles such as technological shortcomings, student dynamics in the group, spread of the disease, etc. impacted the performance of this experiment. All in all, many of the limitations were related to distance education. Under these aspects, widespread use of distance education around the World is a novel system, the studies that will be conducted in the future will be more organized and informed when both the instructors and the students will be accustomed to it.

## REFERENCES

- AKBAŞ, T. (2017). *The Effects of Collaborative Work on Students' Writing Performance and Students' Perceptions on Collaborative Writing* (MA thesis). ABANT IZZET BAYSAL UNIVERSITY. Retrieved January, 2017.
- Blue, G., & Grundy, P. (1996). Team evaluation of language teaching and language courses. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 244–253. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.3.244>
- Can, A. (2014). *Spss ile Bilimsel Araştırma sürecinde Nicel Veri Analizi*. Pegem Akademi.
- Challob, A. A. I., Bakar, N. A., & Latif, H. (2016). Collaborative Blended Learning Writing Environment: Effects on EFL Students' Writing Apprehension and Writing Performance. *English Language Teaching*, 9(6), 229. doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n6p229
- Collaborative versus Cooperative Learning- A comparison of the two concepts which will help us understand the underlying nature of interactive learning. (1999). *ERIC*.
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*.
- Deveci, T. (2018). Student Perceptions on Collaborative Writing in a Project-based Course. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(4), 721-732. doi:10.13189/ujer.2018.060415
- Fung, Y. M. (2010). Collaborative Writing Features. *RELC Journal*, 41(1), 18–30. doi: 10.1177/0033688210362610
- Gökçe, İ. (2001). *Effects Of Collaborative Writing On Attitudes Of Learners Towards Writing At Anadolu University Preparatory School* (MA thesis).
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative Research Methods* (2nd ed.).

- Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2013). *The international handbook of collaborative learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. (1994). *The new circles of learning cooperation in the classroom and school*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). *Cooperative learning: Increasing college Faculty Instructional Productivity*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education.
- Keleher, D. M. (2016). Mixed Classes, Mixed Methods: Writing Students' Attitudes about Collaborative and Intercultural Learning. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research*, 18(2), 745-745. doi:10.4148/2470-6353.1001
- Kimmerle, J., Moskaliuk, J., Brendle, D., & Cress, U. (2017). All in good time: Knowledge introduction, restructuring, and development of shared opinions as different stages in collaborative writing. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 12(2), 195-213. doi:10.1007/s11412-017-9258-6
- Li, M. (2018). Computer-mediated collaborative writing in 12 contexts: An analysis of empirical research. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(8), 882–904. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1465981>
- Louth, R., Mcallister, C., & Mcallister, H. A. (1993). The Effects of Collaborative Writing Techniques on Freshman Writing and Attitudes. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 61(3), 215-224. doi:10.1080/00220973.1993.9943862
- M. Ali Ghufon, Masnuatul Hawa (2015). The Effects of Collaborative Writing Technique In Teaching Argumentative Essay Viewed From The Students' Creativity
- Mcdonough, K., Vleeschauwer, J. D., & Crawford, W. J. (2018). Exploring the benefits of collaborative prewriting in a Thai EFL context. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 685–701. doi: 10.1177/1362168818773525
- OXFORD, R. E. B. E. C. C. A. L. (1997). Cooperative learning, Collaborative learning, AND INTERACTION: THREE COMMUNICATIVE strands in the

- language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 443–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05510.x>
- Pardede, P. (2012). Blended Learning for ELT. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 2(3), 165. doi:10.33541/jet.v2i3.54
- Saeb, F., & Zamani, E. (2013). Language learning strategies and beliefs about language learning in high-school students and students attending english institutes: Are they different? *English Language Teaching*, 6(12). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p79>
- Sajedi, S. P. (2014). Collaborative Summary Writing and EFL Students' L2 Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1650–1657. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.589
- Sakamoto, M. (2018). How Effective is Interactive Learning? Investigating Japanese University Students' Language Patterns in a Collaborative Writing Task. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2). doi:10.22492/ijll.3.2.05
- Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(4), 286–305. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2011.05.010
- Shooshtari, Z. G., & Mir, F. (2014). ZPD, Tutor; Peer Scaffolding: Sociocultural theory in Writing strategies application. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1771–1776. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.605>
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 153–173. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002
- Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative Writing in L2 Contexts: Processes, Outcomes, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 275–288. doi:10.1017/s0267190511000079
- Storch, N. (2013). *Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

- Webb, N. M. (1982). Peer interaction and learning in cooperative small groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(5), 642–655. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.74.5.642>
- Zurita, G., & Nussbaum, M. (2004). Computer supported collaborative learning using wirelessly interconnected handheld computers. *Computers & Education*, 42(3), 289-314. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2003.08.005
- Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method . *Jurnal Kemanusiaan*.
- Zhang, M. (2018). Collaborative writing in the EFL classroom: The effects of L1 and L2 use. *System*, 76, 1-12. doi:10.1016/j.system.2018.04.009

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX-A. Ethics Committee Approval

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 10.02.2021-E.2020



T.C.  
İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAİM ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ  
ETİK KURULU BAŞKANLIĞI

Sayı :E-20292139-050.01.04-2020  
Konu : Etik Kurul Kararları

Sayın Ayşe İŞİK YILMAZ  
Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Kurulumuz 28.01.2021 tarihinde toplanarak, "Uzaktan Eğitimde İşbirlikçi Çalışmanın Öğrencilerin İkinci Dil Yazma Becerisine Etkisi ve Öğrencilerin Uzaktan Eğitimde İşbirlikçi Yazma ile İlgili Algıları" başlıklı araştırmanızda kullanmak üzere kurula sunmuş olduğunuz Etik Kurul Başvuru Formunuzu uygun bularak imza altına almıştır. Araştırmanızın Etik Kurul Onay Formu ekte yer almaktadır. Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU  
Kurul Başkanı

Ek:14-Etik Kurul Onay Formu-Ayşe İŞİK YILMAZ (2 sayfa)

Mevcut Elektronik İmzalar

NASUH USLU (Etik Kurulu Başkanlığı - Kurul Başkanı) 10.02.2021 17:44

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Belge Doğrulama Kodu : \*BEBP7RLS\* Pin Kodu : 76571  
Adres: Halkalı Caddesi No: 281 Küçükçekmece/İstanbul  
Telefon: 444 97 98 Faks: +90 (212) 693 82 29  
e-Posta: bilgi@izu.edu.tr Web: www.izu.edu.tr  
Kep Adresi: izu@hs01.kep.tr


Belge Takip Adresi : <https://ebys.izu.edu.tr/en/Vision/Dogrula/0N3>

Bilgi için: Zeynep Funda TEZ  
Unvanı: Yeminli Katip  
Tel No: 2126929606



Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 09.02.2021-E.1714

28.01.2021 tarihli ve 2021/01 sayılı Etik Kurulu kararı ektir.

 <b>Istanbul Zaim Üniversitesi</b>		<b>İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAIM ÜNİVERSİTESİ ETİK KURULU ARAŞTIRMA ETİK KURUL ONAY FORMU</b>	
<b>Tarih:</b>	28.01.2021		
<b>Sayı:</b>	2021/01		
<b>Ekler:</b>	EK 1: Başvuru Dilekçesi EK 2: Etik Davranış Beyan Formu EK 3: Etik Kurul Başvuru Formu EK 4: Envanter (2 sayfa) EK 5: Görüşme Soruları (1 sayfa)		
<b>Yer:</b>	İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Rektörlüğü		
<b>İlgi:</b>	Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü'nün 18.01.2021 tarihli ve 787 sayılı yazısı		
<b>Katılımcılar:</b>	1. Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU 2. Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ 3. Prof. Dr. Mustafa ATEŞ 4. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Emin KÖKTAŞ 5. Prof. Dr. Kadir CANATAN 6. Prof. Dr. Yahya Kemal YOĞURTÇU 7. Av. Bilal ŞAMAT	Kurul Başkanı/ Rektör Yardımcısı Kurul Başkan V./ Müdür V. Üye/Dekan V. Üye/Dekan V. Üye/Öğretim Üyesi Üye/Öğretim Üyesi Üye/Raportör	
Planlanan araştırma önerisi özeti aşağıdaki gibidir.			
<b>Araştırmanın Niteliği:</b>	Yüksek Lisans Tezi		
<b>Araştırmanın Başlığı:</b>	Uzaktan Eğitimde İşbirlikçi Çalışmanın Öğrencilerin İkinci Dil Yazma Becerisine Etkisi ve Öğrencilerin Uzaktan Eğitimde İşbirlikçi Yazma ile İlgili Algıları		
<b>Araştırmacılar ve adres bilgisi:</b>	Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ- İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Tezli Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, a.isik@izu.edu.tr, 0530 027 88 37		
<b>Araştırmanın Süresi (ay):</b>	4 ay		
<b>Araştırmanın Amacı:</b>	Bu araştırma; İngilizce Hazırlık Birimi'nde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin, Uzaktan Eğitimde İşbirlikçi yazma aktivitelerinin İngilizce yazma becerileri üzerindeki etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca, bu araştırma, İş birlik içinde yapılan bu yazma aktiviteleri ile öğrencilerin birbirlerine yazma becerisi konusunda ne kadar yardımcı olduklarını incelemeyi de amaçlamaktadır. Buna ek olarak, uzaktan eğitimde işbirlikçi yazma aktivitelerine karşı olan tutumları da araştırılacaktır. Araştırma iki aşamada yapılacaktır. İlk aşamada, Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Hazırlık okulundan A1 seviyelerinde iki sınıf seçilecektir. Sınıflardan biri deney, diğeri ise kontrol grubu olacaktır. Her iki gruba da araştırma öncesi ön test uygulanacaktır. Deney grubu, Microsoft Teams uygulaması üzerinden 7 hafta boyunca 35 dakikalık işbirlikçi yazma etkinliklerinde yer alacaktır. Yazma konuları, derste işlenmiş olan konulardan seçilecektir. Aynı yazma konuları, kontrol grubundaki öğrencilere ödev olarak verilecektir. 7 haftanın sonunda, Her iki gruba da son test uygulanacaktır. İkinci aşamada, aynı uygulamalar A2 seviyesinde iki sınıfta uygulanacaktır. Güvenilirlik açısından, ön test ve son test sonuçları iki farklı öğretim üyesi tarafından incelenecektir. Elde edilen nicel veriler daha sonra SPSS 15.0 aracılığı ile karşılaştırılacaktır. Nicel veriler, her iki aşamada, kontrol ve deney gruplarının sonuçlarının farkını inceleyecektir. Buna ek olarak, deney gruplarındaki öğrencilerin ön test ve son testleri arasındaki içerik, gramer, kelime, organizasyon ve noktalama gelişimleri tek tek incelenecektir. Ön test ve son test sonuçları 25 puanlık Yazma Değerlendirme çizelgesiyle yapılacaktır. Nitel		

1 / 2

Bu belge, 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununa göre Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile imzalanmıştır. Evrak sorgulaması (VALUI)

28.01.2021 tarihli ve 2021/01 sayılı Etik Kurulu kararı ekidir.

	veriler elde edebilmek için, deney grubunda yer alan öğrencilere ilk hafta ve son hafta verilmek üzere iki farklı açık uçlu sorular içeren anket verilecektir. Araştırma sonuçları, özellikle uzaktan eğitimde İngilizce yazma sürecini verimsiz geçiren ve bunun sonucunda başarıya ulaşamayan öğrencilerin, yazma becerisi konusunda grup arkadaşlarıyla yardımlaşarak, kendilerini geliştirmeleri konusunda önem arz edecektir. Mevcut çalışma, günümüzde bir zorunluluk haline gelen uzaktan eğitimde, İngilizce 'de işbirlikçi yazma becerisine odaklanacak olup değişken sonuçların var olduğu literatüre, güncel bulgularıyla zenginlik katacaktır.
<b>Araştırma Etiği:</b>	Araştırmaya kurum izni ve gerekiyorsa veli/vasi izni alındıktan sonra başlanacaktır. Araştırmada kişisel veri toplanacağından 6698 sayılı Kişisel Verilerin Korunması Kanunu ve ilgili mevzuat uyarınca kişisel verileri korumak amacıyla gerekli tüm tedbirler alınacak, gerekli her türlü yükümlülük özenle yerine getirilecektir. Çalışmanın bilimsel bir araştırma için veri toplamayı amaçladığı, çalışma sonuçlarının sadece bilimsel amaçlarla kullanılacağı, çalışmanın sonuçlarının katılımcıların aleyhine olacak şekilde kullanılmayacağı, çalışmaya katılımın gönüllülük esasına dayandığı, cevapların tamamen gizli tutulacağı, çalışmaya katılanların kimliklerini açık edici davranışlardan kaçınılacağı ve çalışmaya katılanların katılım sırasında herhangi bir nedenle rahatsızlık hissetmeleri durumunda istedikleri zaman katılımlarını sona erdirebilecekleri bilgileri çalışma başlamadan katılımcılar ile paylaşılacaktır.
<b>Araştırmada Kullanılacak Ölçme Araçları (adları) ve Kaynakları:</b>	1- Ön test ve son test (Araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan seviyeye göre paragraf yazma soruları) 2- Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Biriminde kullanılan 25 puanlık Yazma Değerlendirme Çizelgesi. 3- Tutumları ölçmede kullanılacak açık uçlu sorulardan oluşan değerlendirme formları. (Araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanacak)
<b>Araştırmaya Katılacak Örneklem Sayısı, Örneklem Nereden ve Nasıl Seçileceği:</b>	Katılımcı grubunun, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Birimi'nde ilk aşamada A1, ikinci aşamada A2 yeterli seviyelerinde dil eğitimi gören hem kız hem erkek toplamda 80 öğrenciden oluşması hedeflenmektedir. Her iki aşamada da öğrencilerin yarısının Kontrol yarısının Deney grubu olması planlanmaktadır. Gruplardaki öğrenciler rastgele seçilecektir.
<b>Uygulamanın veya Ölçme Araçlarının Doldurma Süresi</b>	Yazma soruları için öğrencilere 35 dakika verilmesi planlanmaktadır. Algıları ölçmede kullanılacak açık uçlu sorulardan oluşan değerlendirme formu yaklaşık 5 dakika sürecektir.
<b>KARAR</b>	<b>ARAŞTIRMA İSTANBUL SABAHATTİN ZAİM ÜNİVERSİTESİNİN ETİK DURUŞUNA AYKIRI DEĞİLDİR.</b>

(İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi Etik Kurulu'nun kararı tavsiye niteliğinde olup, üniversitemizle ilgili etik ilkelerinin belirlenmesi ve değerlendirilmesi amacını taşımaktadır.)

\*Bu belgenin araştırmayla ilgili kısımları başvuru tarafından doldurulmuştur.

**Başkan**

Prof. Dr. Nasuh USLU

Üye

Prof. Dr. Ali GÜNEŞ

Üye

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Emin KÖKTAŞ

Üye

Prof. Dr. Yahya Kemal YOĞURTÇU

Üye

Prof. Dr. Mustafa ATEŞ

Üye

Prof. Dr. Kadir CANATAN

Üye

Av. Bilal ŞAMAT

**Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.**

## APPENDIX-B. Sample Pretest of A1 Level

Write a paragraph that introduces yourself. (100 words)

My name is Deniz because my grandma name is Deniz. I was born in 2001.  
I am from Sakarya but my parent are from Trabzon originally.  
My height 169cm and my weight 53.  
My favorite lesson physics in high school.  
I love it books and my favorite writer Haruki Murakami (FOR NOW).  
I don't like to enter reading slump. I like play basketbool but I am amateur.  
I am a Software Engineering student but I want to be pilot.  
My favorite colors blue, black and white. My favorite season a winter  
because I like feeling cold and I like wearing winter clothes. I like all  
fruits but I think strawberry the best. My favorite food is soup.  
My favorite flower is Jasmine. I like listen to indie pop and instrumental music.

## APPENDIX-C. Sample Posttest of A1 Level

Choose one of the questions below and write a paragraph.

1. Where do you live? Who do you live with? Describe your home.
2. Where did you last go on holiday? Who did you go with? Where did you stay? What did you do?
3. How do your family members and friends spend their free time? Explain.

### MY LAST HOLIDAY

I went to Muğla with my mother, my father, my two sisters, my cousin and my cousin's daughter last summer. We stayed at the Ayla Hotel. The hotel was very large, comfortable and nice. Muğla had a lot of turistic and natural places. For example, Ölüdeniz had a very clean water. So I loved to swim there. Every morning, we went to Ölüdeniz and swam there. Also, Muğla's streets were not crowded. So we walked on this streets in peace. Then, we went to Saklıkent Canyon. There was a river in the canyon. We walked on the river. We drank different iced drinks there. They were very delicious! The canyon had a lot of greenery. So I took photos and shared it on social media. Our holiday was great! We are going to go to Muğla again next summer.

## APPENDIX-D. Sample Pretest of A2 Level

Write a paragraph about your weekday and weekend routines. (150 WORDS)

My weekend and weekday routine

Weekday, I get up at 8. I brush my teeth. I dress. I have breakfast. I tidy my room. I looking the phone. I rest some. I looking the lesson. If there is homework I do. I eat somethings. I surf on the computer. I watch video. I read book. I spend time with my sister. I meeting with friend. We are walking or bcycle. I helping my mother. I helping shopping. Evening dinner I eating. I watch tv. I look the news. I check the homework. I drink tea or eat fruit. I go to bed late. Weekend, I get up late. I have breakfast. I looking the phone and checking the messages. I do homework. I surf on internet. I go for a walk with my friend. We are spend time two or three hour. I watch movie. I help my brother's job and we are doing lessons together. I eating dinner. I watch tv. I drink tea or coffee. I read my book. I sitting some and 1 going to bed after.

## APPENDIX-E. Sample Posttest of A2 Level

Choose one of the questions below and write a paragraph.

1. Write an email to a friend whom you have not seen for a while and tell him/her things you have and have not done since you last saw him/her.
2. Write a post for a blog to promote a place (a beach, a lake, an island etc.) in your country.
3. You are looking for a roommate. Write 'a roommate ad' to find one. What is the house like? What is the neighborhood like? How much is the rent per month? Add your personal information to your ad.

Dear Ecevit,

I haven't seen you for a long time. I hope you are fine. I remember that you live in Germany. I traveled to Germany last week but, I hadn't time to see you. So I decided to send this mail. Tell me about yourself. For example; Did you graduate from university, did you like to Germany, did you learn another language.

In 2015 you went to abroad for education and we haven't seen each other. Just we talked on the phone. After you went to Germany, I graduated from high school. I wanted to be a pilot. But I couldn't so that is destiny. So I am studying medicine. I am working a lot to be a professional doctor. However, do you remember that we have played table tennis on school team? We were very successful. I gave up to play table tennis because, my university department is very hard. Do you play table tennis still? If you come there we play table tennis again.

I froze my university for a while. After that I have made a craziness. I went to England. I am trying to improve my English here. England is very crowded also it's rainy. I live in there for six months. I worked in a restaurant as a waiter. I haven't learnt English exactly but I have learnt traditional foods. Actually I don't like their tastes. In my opinion Turkey is better than England.

I am going to come to Germany next month again. If you are available for meeting, you return my mail. I hope you aren't busy.

See you soon. :)

## **CV**

Ayşe IŞIK YILMAZ

Üsküdar / Istanbul

### **A. EDUCATION**

**M.A.:** Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, English Language Teaching, 2021, Istanbul

**B.A.:** Ankara University, English Language and Literature, 2014, Ankara

### **B. PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

Instructor, Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, English Preparatory School  
(September 2017 – Present)

### **C. PUBLICATIONS & PRESENTATIONS**

Yılmaz, A. (2021, May 30). *The Effects of Online Collaborative Writing on Learners' L2 Writing Performance and Attitude* [Conference Presentation]. Istanbul Sabahattin Zaim University Social Sciences Congress, Istanbul , Turkey.