



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

An International Open-Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal

Impact Factor: 6.064

E-ISSN: 2249 – 4642

P-ISSN: 2454 - 4671

COLLABORATIVE WRITING AS A MEANS IN DEVELOPING EFL LEARNERS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Qusay Mahdi Mutar, Saad Hasan Hmud

University of Baghdad, Iraq

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.048>

Paper Received:

10 October 2022

Paper Accepted:

28 November 2022

Paper Received After Correction:

08 December 2022

Paper Published:

14 December 2022



How to cite the article: Qusay M.M., Saad H.H.(2022) Collaborative Writing as a Means in Developing EFL Learners' Writing Performance, *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, Oct-Dec 2022 Vol. 12, Issue 4; 908-925 DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.048>

ABSTRACT

Collaborative learning is a way that prepares students practically for real-world applications. Working together as teamwork to execute various writing skills is essential in most professions since it increases the level of experience. Thus, the current study aims to identify the role collaborative writing in developing students' level of performance in writing. It is qualitative in nature since the researcher depended on the extant literature in achieving the objective of the study. The researcher touched upon related theories that addressed Collaborative learning, categories, and problems. It concluded that collaborative writing increases the students' self-confidence, self-esteem, creativity, and motivation through the interaction among students over task completion. It enables the provision of feedback between students, which enhances their vocabulary, offers them ideas, and improves their learning. Writing in groups improves students' writing in the aspect of grammatical accuracy and vocabulary. Finally, the study came out with a number of recommendations.

Keywords: *collaborative learning; collaborative writing; writing performance*

CHAPTER ONE**Introduction**

Teaching English refers to the provision of communication skills. Considering that spoken language is the main method of communication among students, assisting them in writing would help them link between oral and written expressions (Thomas and Thomas, 1989). However, the inadequate natural prompting in the dialogue leads to challenges in writing among students (Moffet, 1983; Scardamalia, Bereiter, and Goelman, 1982; Vygotsky, 1986). Students will be able to learn the strategies of literacy that could empower them only through the exchange and negotiation of meanings (Onore, 1989). Essentially, learning to write, which involves speaking, is a social activity

collaboratively instilled in interactions (Spurling, 1990, p. 281).

Collaborative learning is a method that could increase the learners' accomplishment and favorable learning results. It has long been recognized as a beneficial tool to promote learning in various settings and levels of education (Johnson and Johnson, 2003 & 2005). This learning approach is perceived as having higher productivity compared to individual or competitive learning (Johnson and Johnson, 2005). Slavin (2011) stated that it encourages not only academic success among learners, but also the growth of their social skills due to the students' need for a small amount of help in developing and displaying the appropriate social skills. To optimize the potential of collaborative learning, Johnson and Johnson (2003) recommended five essential conditions to be fulfilled by

learners upon the collaboration: 1) positive interdependence; 2) face-to-face interaction; 3) individual accountability; 4) interpersonal and small-group skills; and 5) group processing. Under these requirements, collaborative learning takes place during the learners' interaction with other group members, their support towards task completion, co-construction of their knowledge and expertise, and contribution to their own learning. Subsequently, learners are able to gain an advantage from their group members' achievement when the task is completed. This process is known as internalization, in which learners develop their interpersonal experiences into intrapersonal competence upon their interaction with the group members (Vygotsky, 1978).

Working collaboratively in writing tasks could bring advantages to the learners in the entire process of writing and developing favorable results from it (Storch, 2011, 2013; Wigglesworth and Storch, 2012a). Essentially, pair work and working in small groups assist the learners in interacting to fulfill the group objectives in learning (Gillies, 2014; Johnson and Johnson, 2013). It could be said that through interaction, learners are able to make negotiation over their contrasting perspectives of their learning, allowing them to learn from one another. Therefore,

supported by Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural framework, CW is considered an effective approach to improving L2 learners' writing outcomes (Storch, 2013).

Collaborative writing is perceived as a productive teaching approach, with its implementation being highly preferred in writing classrooms by numerous researchers on the global level (Dobao, 2012; Storch, 2011). This method could also be described as a written product consisting of a pair or a group of students who collaborate on the production of one common product (Inglehart et al., 2003). Similarly, Storch (2019) described collaborative writing as a process where two or more writers collaborate on the production of a single text. Lowry et al. (2004) stated that collaborative writing is a social process where the group members are focused on a common goal and conduct collaboration and negotiation. Collaborative writing gains the attention of numerous researchers worldwide in their research on whether the collaboratively written products show higher performance than the individually written products. Storch (2002) recorded that the students involved in collaborative writing could appreciate collaborative writing activities, make better ideas, and improve their

vocabulary and accuracy compared to other learners who worked individually.

Dobao and Blum (2013) proved that when students collaborate in essay writing in the discussion session, better results of the post-tests could be achieved. In Kim's (2008) comparison between collaboratively written papers and individually written papers, a difference was found between these writing conditions. However, the use of vocabulary in collaboratively written papers showed better outcomes in the post-tests. According to Storch (2011) as the lecturers of academic writing, collaborative writing activities would provide a wonderful learning environment for students to enhance their academic writing quality in case of careful training designs.

Research purpose

This research has mainly focused on English as foreign language; limited attention has been given to collaborative writing significance in foreign language context as the literature displayed. This study mainly aims to figure out if the collaborative writing contributes to developing EFL learners' writing performance.

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Socio-Constructivist Framework

The socio-constructivist framework demonstrated the function of interaction with other individuals in the development of knowledge. This method is attributed to Piaget's (1948) theory, which essentially places an emphasis on the individual factors in cognitive development. The socio-constructivist view considers individual cognitive development as the result of social interactions. Several research works demonstrated that peer interaction assists in learning through the mediating process known as 'socio-cognitive conflict' (e.g., clashing points of view about two or more matters) (Doise, Mugny, and Perret-Clermont, 1975). Social interactions are indicated as the motivation for solving the clashing perspectives to achieve a consensus on a solution. Thus, the learners in pair and group works could gain advantages from these perspectives through the development of new knowledge.

Bakhtin and Dialogism

Bakhtin (1981) highlighted the socially constructed nature of language, specifically the voice and struggle in dialogic language. Dialogism provides a reasoning for interaction in writing, particularly collaborative writing. Putting

the dialogue of thoughts and words into consideration, socializing the writing context leads to an abundant language environment. Dialogism also leads to another perception that the ownership concept in writing is false and sets the stage for valuing collaborative writing as appropriate and contextualized. Co-authoring guides the voice towards a dialogic perception. Considering that the competition of ideas, words, and styles is prominent, the learning process among students could improve. Collaborative writing is able to contribute to language growth as it substantiates and expands a naturally occurring event.

Vygotsky Sociocultural Theory

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory perceives human development as a socially mediated process where people gain beliefs, cultural values, and problem-solving approaches through collaborative dialogues with the members of society with higher knowledge. Vygotsky's theory is comprised of concepts such as culture-specific tools, private speech, and the Zone of Proximal Development. Vygotsky (1978, 1981, 1986) has made several theoretical contributions that demonstrate the possibilities of collaborative writing, which include the redefinition of the association between learning and development (1978). Piaget essentially

contributed to cognitive theory, while Vygotsky showed a more direct expression of how social interaction assists in learning (DiPardo and Freedman, 1988, p. 134). In a crucial break from past inceptions, he perceived learning as leading the development rather than following it, which leads to crucial educational implications.

The objective of targeting teaching to the expertise beyond what could be achieved by the student was described by Vygotsky as the area of proximal development. This area allows children to make accomplishments through adult guidance or assistance from a more competent peer. Considering the numerous areas of expertise, which student acts as the most competent peer in collaborative writing groups becomes a question. The student who is not able of writing properly by most standards could contribute positive ideas on what to be built or offer effective examples. Following that, students are able to learn from other individuals who conduct proper organization, retain the purpose and audience in mind, or find joy in the selection of words for effect.

Despite the struggle that teachers would face upon teaching in every student's zone of proximal development, collaborative writing groups would help fulfill this

result. Essentially, small groups would decrease the struggles. Besides, co-authoring enables the maximization of learning time among the students in their areas. There is a possibility that a peer shows slightly further progress compared to others in terms of their thoughts on writing or its mechanics or structure. This is followed by the possibility that several students are able to assist one another with weaknesses, creating a more comprehensible sense compared to the teacher regarding the matter that causes frustration in their assignments (Collins, Brown, and Newman, 1989; DiPardo and Freedman, 1987). Besides, no individual is able to warrant whether a co-authoring group or session would successfully aim at every student's learning area, although there is a higher possibility for this situation to occur in a co-authoring group compared to large group instruction. At the minimum, the students would learn their respective strong points and composing approaches.

Collaborative writing

Collaborative writing method is a teaching writing method where students are required to collaborate in a pair or group for the production of good writing. This method assists students in writing specific texts with their peers, indicating that the

students will cooperate towards producing good writing. Collaborative writing provides the chances not only for practicing literature review, writing, and academic reading, but for critical thinking, reflection, and knowledge sharing (Hadjerrouit, 2011: 431). Reid (1993) suggested that collaborative writing efforts could boost risk-taking, motivation, and resilience among learners. In collaborative writing tasks, students are required to employ a range of social skills that could develop a sense of community, cooperation, and accountability (Savova and Donato, 1991). Graham and Perin (2007: 16) stated that collaborative writing includes the development of instructional arrangements, in which adolescents collaborate in the planning, drafting, revising, and editing of their composition. It could be gathered from these statements that collaborative writing leads to the students' ability to go through the entire writing phase: prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing.

Foster (1998) stated that the aforementioned tasks could optimize the interaction among students in the target language. In conclusion, collaborative writing strategy could be described among the teaching writing methods suitable for improving students' writing ability and enhancing their motivation, confidence,

and critical thinking, which lead to their production of a good composition by collaborating with their peers.

Categories of Collaborative Writing Strategy

Collaborative writing denotes an iterative and social process involving a team that focuses on a common intention that performs negotiation, coordination, and communication when a common document is created (Ede, 1992; Lowry, 2004). Berndt (2011) Collaborative writing is in line with diverse approaches, with five approaches being the most widespread namely each-in-sequence writing, one-for-all writing, all-in-parallel writing, multi-mode writing, and all-in-reaction writing. Each approach is different in terms of the coordination of writing in a group and suitable in various collaborative contexts.

One-for-all writing takes place when an individual performs the writing in support of the team. This approach is suitable for simple writing tasks with minor risks. As an example, numerous collaborative teams employ one author for the writing of an analytical memo that describes the group's discussion during a research meeting. Although this approach provides a stylistic consistency and effectiveness, it could lead to limited agreement or amendment, with the exception that these agreements or

amendments are developed in document cycles. Thus, it is ideally employed by groups with mutual comprehension of the writing task. It could also function as an effective method of creating a first rough draft, which is understood by the team to go through multiple iterations through diverse writing approaches. It is clear that writing the first draft is not easy, however, it could be effective when the mutual goal is to obtain a certain matter on the page for a group to collaborate with.

Each-in-sequence writing takes place when an individual begins to write, fulfills their task, and transfers it to the next individual to fulfill it. This approach is practical for groups who work in an asynchronous manner and are not able to frequently face each other. In this case, document-sharing platforms have a primary function in their efficient accomplishment. Numerous teams would employ it in instances such as the early phases when a grant application is drafted, considering that it is a simple coordination of distributed work. The examples show that the sequence is purposeful, while the introduction would be drafted by the lead author, followed by the drafting of the approaches by the research assistant. Subsequently, the results are drafted by the third team member. The piece would be returned to the lead author for the drafting of the

discussion. Notably, this sequence is random in most cases, where writers are able to write the sections within their capability (Berndt, 2011). However, each-in sequence writing comprises several obstacles, which include minimum social interaction, inadequate consistency due to the failure in reconciling the clashing ideas or invalidation of writers' work, haphazard version control, and one person bottlenecks. These challenges could cause poor consistency of the document. However, they could be solved through early meetings for clear articulation of writing and discussion of the regions of possible overlap or disagreement. The consensus on the primary point of the article and how it would flow through all sections is crucial besides the mutual method employed in writing style basics including the first or third-person narration, and active or passive voice construction. The improvement in consistency could be achieved by employing a lead writer who supervises the order and is responsible for integration. However, the authority to effectively meet this role is critical for the writer (Berndt, 2011).

In all-in-parallel writing, the writing task is divided into separate units, while writers work at the same time instead of in order. This approach shows good performance

when the division of the writing task conveniently takes place and the individual sections do not have a mutual dependency. To illustrate, it has the tendency to offer further effectiveness in the process and writer autonomy. Compared to each-in-sequence writing, all-in-parallel writing is able to create a rapid, high volume output. This approach shows the highest effectiveness when the divisions of labor are devised based on every writer's primary skills rather than being inconsistent. To illustrate, the methodologist on a research team would possibly perform the writing of the first draft of the approach section, while a team member that is experienced in the substantive domain of the work performs the writing of the literature review. However, the primary obstacle of all-in-parallel writing is that writers are not aware of one another's work, which could lead to redundancy in the material. To address this obstacle, parallel writing requires meticulous pre-planning, which includes an outline of the relation between the parts, a shared vision of the audience, the document objective, and the procedures for reconciling stylistic differences (Berndt, 2011). Upon the production of documents in real-time for the changes and additions that do not involve clear preplanning and

coordination, the approach of “all-in-reaction” writing is involved. A possible situation would be when the first draft of an article Problem/Gap/Hook is written and submitted to the co-authors concurrently for feedback. In this case, the edits may be made concurrent, in agreement, or in disagreement with the article or one another, leading to the possibility for a careful, spontaneous, or impromptu consideration.

Notably, the benefit of all-in-reaction collaborative writing approach is its capability of supporting the agreement through all writers' flexible and innovative expression. It is also capable of evoking debates and the emergence of unpredictable meanings. However, the drawbacks of this approach include restricted coordination, the possibility of disorganized growth of the piece, and challenges in the control of the version as a result of simultaneous writing. Besides, the addition of beginner or less prominent writers in the group could create an unstable, harmful experience. Therefore, all-in-reaction writing shows the highest performance in small groups without hierarchy, where the entire members perceive the safety in expressing their opinions. Upon the fulfillment of these conditions, this approach may be highly effective for interdisciplinary groups to

develop new meanings outside the borders of conventional disciplinary thinking (Berndt, 2011).

The integration of the approaches used by many teams during a writing project is known as “multi-mode writing”. To illustrate, a graduate student could develop the first draft of their research manuscript (one-for-all), which would receive a sequential review by the team members, either in a preplanned order (each in purposeful sequence) or as allowed by their calendar (each-in-random sequence). Subsequently, the revisions are published by graduate students (one-for-all), with every team member thoroughly reviewing the section of the revision based on their skill (all-in-parallel). The abstract could be presented on Google Docs or the email overload mostly hours before the conference submission deadline, with the simultaneous assistance by team members in whittling the word count and prioritizing the primary messages (all-in-reaction). Notably, guaranteeing that all writers are able to employ the technologies that support the collaborative process is crucial (Berndt, 2011).

Activities of Collaborative Writing

More processes beyond writing are required in collaborative writing. The writing researchers have determined seven

core activities, namely conceptualization, brainstorming, outlining, editing, drafting, reviewing, and revision. In brainstorming, the writing group lists out the possible ideas for the article. They would determine the ideal method of presenting the findings, the elaboration to be made for the findings related to the research question, the storylines that could create a convincing discussion, and the conversations to be incorporated in to the literature through conversation and text [6]. Brainstorming may begin in the middle of data collection and analysis, especially in qualitative research that employs theoretical sampling methods (Berndt, 2011).

Conceptualization comprises the coalescence and priority placed on brainstorming ideas to elaborate on the primary subject of the article. Several ideas would be placed aside as inadequate or not relevant to the primary objective of the research, while other ideas would be obtained in ongoing analyses and reading of empirical and theoretical literature works on the same matter. When a research works produce more than one subject, the conceptualization should also take the order and audiences of multiple manuscripts into account: Which story to be first told? Who is the audience? (Lingard, 2017)

When the conceptualization is complete, outlining would elaborate on how it would take place throughout the sections of the research manuscript genre. In this case, several questions are present: What should be in the introduction and what route would be unimportant? What level of information should be included in the approaches? Which results would be featured and in what arrangement? In what manner would the ideas be developed through the introduction? Outlining is an activity in which preparation is inclined to solo project compared to a collaborative project. However, even when a writer leads the outlining, other group members should be able to view this activity. Making a rough discussion of the outline as a team, followed by a review of the outline developed by the lead author, is a method of maximizing the effectiveness and input at this phase of the writing process (Lingard, 2016).

In drafting, the outlined sections are presented incomplete arguments, paragraphs, and sentences. In the case of the development of a practical schedule for this activity, the outline appears to outline the entire article. However, several matters are to be addressed: Would the organization of the literature review be chronological or made through the viewpoint of the current scholarly

conversation? What is the amount of theoretical framing to be present in the introduction? How detailed should the approaches be, and what is the proper stability of explanation and rationalization? How would the explanation of the findings be, and which information should be present in figures, tables or quoted excerpts? How the development of the storyline in the discussion would be ahead of the summary of the findings and limitations? Besides, the drafting of sections in blocks would be justified when the complication of the writing that is submitted into the rough first draft is acknowledged. The pairing approaches, findings, introduction, and discussion are considered as they denote the study and story (Lingard, 2016).

Review, revision, and editing commonly take place in cycles. To be specific, reviewing requires the draft material to be read by the entire members who would then present feedback through verbal means, email, or text in the “track changes” tool or comment boxes. Reviewing is ideally perceived as a directed activity, where the group members are required to emphasize the specific concerns at certain points in the writing process. Meanwhile, revision requires the deliberation, emphasis, and incorporation of feedback from group

members into the draft. The review and revision processes would occur until the text is rhetorically efficient, substantially complete, and logically consistent.

In editing, micro-level revisions for grammar, style, and flow could occur upon the maturity of the individual sections or the judgment of the whole document as complete. This degree of editing could be a process that is ideally conducted by one writer in the group to ensure that the article does not appear as if it has been written by some people. These collaborative writing projects are effectual and repetitive. There are some cases when the storyline should be re-examined after a substantial phase of review, which could also be changed into revising. On the other hand, editing could occur on several completed segments while other segments remain under review. For this reason, effective collaboration involves the cultivation of a mutual comprehension regarding the activity that is conducted at any provided period (Lingard, 2016).

Problems in Collaborative Writing

Several issues may obstruct the favorable impact of collaborative writing, which are as follows:

1. Students' conduct: Several members do not have the

willingness for accepting different views, considering that they may not have the motivation to be involved in collaborative writing tasks (Chisholm, 1990).

2. Students' unfavorable viewpoint toward collaborative writing is attributed to members who are not productive and gain marks in spite of their insufficient contribution. Several group members do not offer an equal contribution (Davies, 2009).
3. Several members have control over the discussion without offering chances for others to elaborate their ideas. This condition is in line with the research by Shea (1995), who mentioned that stronger members commonly outperform the weaker members and dominate the discussion.
4. Following the low level of proficiency in English among the students, several group members conduct their discussions in Arabic, leading to a lower possibility of enhancing their communication skills.
5. The association between the group members could impact their work. It was highlighted that several students could be struggling in

their participation in the group activity with strangers (Tarmizi and Cheung, 2017).

Literature Review

Over the past few decades researchers who are interested in teaching and learning foreign languages found that it is necessary to focus on collaborative writing as one of the significant manners to master second language. Here we have referred to a bunch of studies that considered collaborative writing in relation to other variables. Pham (2021) attempted to figure out the framework that students adopt to carry out their collaborative writing, as well as to find out if this type of writing contributes to developing students' fluency. A sample of (52) students who study the English language at the University Of Ho Chi Minh In Vietnam was divided into two groups: 35 students as experimental group and 27 students as a control group. They were asked to write an argumentative essay, which was analyzed to show the difference among the collected sample. The book that was used to train students "academic writing skills student's book 3" written by Chin et al (2013). The results showed that collaborative writing has a significant role in enhancing students' fluency in terms of gaining new vocabulary, which were proved in both individually and

collaboratively written work. Additionally, students revealed that they followed specific useful steps to perform their writing, which starts by brainstorming together, making outlines, and negotiating. Then, they divided the topic into subsections for each group member, gathering subsections to form a complete essay, reading the essay as a whole, providing feedback. Finally, hand it to the lecturer. The study sample revealed their positive attitudes toward using collaborative writing as a means in developing students writing performance.

Alkhalaf (2020) has conducted a study to find out student attitudes toward writing collaboratively and the challenges that may face through writing. To this end, a total of (50) Saudi EFL-female learners who were enrolled in an English training course at al- Qassim University were chosen as the study sample. They were studying various majors, divided into three levels: beginners, intermediate, advanced. All three groups had four writing sessions a week. So as to collect required data, a questionnaire of (17) items was developed by the researcher to examine students' attitudes toward collaborative writing and to identify the challenges the students encounter during writing activity, based on previous studies: Abdel & Farrah (2015) and Gokce (2001). The finding revealed

that students have positive attitudes toward writing collaboratively. As for challenges, the study indicated a number of challenges; some students were unwilling to discuss their ideas, the lack of motivation to engage in-group tasks, the lack of contribution, the lack of opportunity for some group members to explain their ideas, and using the mother language in discussing, which affects negatively on developing learner performance.

Zulfikar & Aulia (2020) attempted to investigate the perception of students toward employing collaborative writing in raising students' level of writing. To this end, two criteria were adopted to choose the study sample: enrolling in a three-semester writing course and completing two assignments or projects following collaborative writing. Hence, seven out of sixty-seven students studying the English language at Ar-Raniry State Islamic University in Indonesia were chosen to be the study sample. The researcher utilized the narrative inquiry design since he focuses on exploring and examining students learning experiences and story sharing. Additionally, the researcher used semi-structured interviews, taking notes, observation, and recording to collect the needed data. The research findings

demonstrated that collaborative writing has many advantages through improving learners' clarity, accuracy in writing, curbing apprehension of sharing ideas, raising up self-confidence, and increasing the stock of vocabulary. On the other side, it could have some disadvantages such as time-consuming, the lack of responsibility of some group members, stealing the effort of other group members, and discomforting talking to the group members.

Isnaini (2017) has raised two questions in his study, which are, do students write better individually or as a group. Is there a significant difference between introvert and extrovert students on writing collaboratively in terms of vocabulary, grammar, context, organization? To answer these questions, the researcher selected a sample of (84) undergraduates in the sixth semester who taking an essay writing course at brawijaya university in Indonesia. To identify students' level of proficiency, the TOFEL test was used. The researcher employed "the big five personality traits" questionnaire to identify students' social orientation and personality type, which was modified to suit the purpose of this study. It included (30) items to identify the introvert and the extrovert students. The students were required to write an argumentative essay to

measure their achievement individually and collaboratively. The findings of the study revealed that generally, introverted students showed more capacity in writing achievements. There is no significant difference between an introvert and extrovert students on writing collaboratively in terms of vocabulary, grammar, context, organization. The study also indicated that collaborative writing is better than individual writing.

Aminloo (2013) carried out a study to investigate the effect of group work and collaborative writing on EFL learners' writing performance at the elementary level among Iranian university students. The study included a convenience sample of (64) male and female students studying different majors at the University of Tehran. They formed an experimental group of (31) male and female students and a control group of (33) male and female students. Writing course was assigned as a compulsory course for all majors. The main material was writing prompts selected from the official booklet. The findings have revealed that participants showed significant improvement over the process of instruction, which was assessed by using two paired sample t-tests. Moreover, there is a significant difference between the

control and experimental group upon post-test.

CHAPTER THREE

Collaborative Learning Values

Collaborative Learning has established specific functions and values to be encouraged by teachers to students upon their activity in collaborative environments (Smith and Macgregor, 1992), which are as follows:

- ❖ First, all participants are involved in collaborative work and function as a group with a distinguished direction of the project.
- ❖ Second, students acquire knowledge of the methods of cooperation. In this case, rather than an individual product, work is perceived as a procedure where the participants' ideas have a favorable effect on the project. Thus, the participants make important and appropriate contributions.
- ❖ Third, responsibility is understood through collaborative writing, which allows students to understand that several capabilities are important for one to be developed into a thriving professional. These capabilities include cooperating with people,

distributing ideas, sharing viewpoints, describing objectives, and seeking the approaches to fulfilling the goals. These factors of collaborative learning have demonstrated that learning, which is perceived as an integral process, does not only need the transfer of knowledge from the teacher, but also needs the experience gained through the cooperation among people in academic writing classrooms.

Collaborative Writing Advantages in EFL Environment

Collaborative writing presents numerous benefits in EFL classes, which are as follows:

- ❖ It allows learners to consider the application of language and find a solution to the problems related to language (Elola and Oskuz, 2010).
- ❖ It incorporates four learning language skills through the interchange and task completion (Bueno-Alastuey and Larumbe, 2017).
- ❖ It increases the students' self-confidence, self-esteem, creativity, and motivation through the interaction among students over

task completion (Supiani, 2017; Foster, 1998).

- ❖ It enables students to determine others' perceptions and the methods through which ideas are developed (Supiani, 2017).
- ❖ It is beneficial for both students with high and low proficiency degrees. Specifically, students with low proficiency degrees are able to gain targeted and organizational abilities by interacting with their peers (Weinstein and Bearison, 1985).
- ❖ Writing in groups improves students' writing in the aspect of grammatical accuracy and vocabulary (Dobao, 2012).
- ❖ Collaborative writing increases the appeal and enjoyment of a task, which encourages them to write (Supiani, 2017).
- ❖ Collaborative writing enables the provision of feedback between students, which enhances their vocabulary, offers them ideas, and improves their learning (Tarmizi and Cheung, 2017).

Recommendations

- 1- Encourage teachers to adopt Collaborative-writing activities in class to promote less proficient EFL students.

2- Teachers should elaborate the significant role of this type of writing for students in developing their English language level.

3- Teachers should develop new pedagogical beliefs among students that allow them to recognize the value of collaborative writing.

Financial support and sponsorship: Nil

Conflict of Interest: None

REFERENCES

1. Alkhalaf, N. A. (2020). Saudi female EFL learners and collaborative writing: attitudes and challenges. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(9), 1118-1127.
2. Aminloo, M. S. (2013). The effect of collaborative writing on EFL learners writing ability at elementary level. *Journal of language teaching and research*, 4(4), 801.
3. Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Ed. Michael Holquist (CarylEmerson and Michael Holquist, Trans.) Austin: University of Texas Press.
4. Berndt, A. E. (2011). Developing collaborative research agreements. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, 37(5), 497-498.
5. Bueno-Alastuey, M. C., & Martínez de Lizarrondo Larumbe, P. (2017). Collaborative writing in the EFL Secondary Education classroom: comparing triad, pair and individual work. *HUARTE DE SAN JUAN. Filología y Didáctica de la Lengua N. 17/Filologia eta Hizkuntzaren Didaktika 17 Z. Pamplona: Universidad Pública de Navarra/Nafarroako Unibertsitate Publikoa*, 2017. Págs. 254-275.
6. Chisholm, R. M. (1990). Coping with problems of collaborative writing. *Writing across the curriculum*, 11, 90-108. Retrieved in June 2020 from <https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/journal/vol2/chisholm.pdf>.
7. Collins, A., Brown, J. & Newman, S. (1989). *Cognitive apprenticeship: teaching the craft of*

- reading, writin., and mathematics. In L.B. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
8. Davies, W. M. (2009). Groupwork as a form of assessment: Common problems and recommended solutions. *Higher Education*, 58(4), 563-584. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9216-y>
 9. DiPardo, A. & Freedman, S.W. (1987). Historical Overview: Groups in the Writing classroom. (Tech. Rep. No. 4). Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Writing.
 10. DiPardo, A., & Freedman, S. W. (1988). Peer response groups in the writing classroom: Theoretic foundations and new directions. *Review of educational research*, 58(2), 119-149.
 11. Dobao, A. F., & Blum, A. (2012). Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *System*, 41, 365–378.
 12. doise, W., Mugny, G., Perret-Clermont, A.-N., 1975. Social interaction and the development of cognitive operations. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 5, 367–383.
 13. Ede, L. S., & Lunsford, A. A. (1992). *Singular texts/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing*. SIU Press.
 14. Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14, 51–71. Retrieved in June, 2020 from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/26920581.pdf>
 15. Foster, P. (1998). A Classroom Perspective on the Negotiation of Meaning. *Applied Linguistics* Vol. 1, 1-23
 16. Foster, P., & Wigglesworth, G. (2016). Capturing accuracy in second language performance: The case for a weighted clause ratio. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 98–116.
 17. Gillies, R. M. (2014). Cooperative learning: Developments in research. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 3(2), 125-140. [[Links](#)]
 18. Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
 19. Hadjerrouit, S. (2011). Collaborative writing with wikis: Pedagogical and technological implications for successful implementation in teacher education. In *Ubiquitous and mobile learning in the digital age* (pp. 173-189). Springer, New York, NY.
 20. Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Chinn, C. A., Chan, C., & O'Donnell, A. M. (Eds.). (2013). *the international handbook of collaborative learning*.
 21. Inglehart, E. L., Narko, K. D., Zimmerman, C. S. (2003). From cooperative learning to collaborative writing in the legal writing classroom. *The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute*, 9(1), 185–226
 22. Inhelder, B. (1948). *La représentation de l'espace chez l'enfant*. [Representation of space by the child]. Presses Universitaires de France.
 23. Isnaini, H. (2017). The Effectiveness of Collaborative Work in Developing Students' L2 Writing Achievement across Social Orientation. *Language in India*, 17(5).
 24. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2003). Training for cooperative group work. In M. West, D. Tjosvold, & K. Smith, *International handbook of organizational teamwork and cooperative working* (pp. 167–183). London: Wiley
 25. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (2005). New developments in social interdependence theory. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 131(4), 285–358.
 26. Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. y Holubec, E. J. (2013). *Cooperation in the classroom*. Interaction Book Company.
 27. Kim, Y. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *Modern Language Journal*, 92, 114–130.
 28. Lingard, L. (2017). *Does your discussion realize its potential?. Perspectives on medical education*, 6(5), 344-346.
 29. Lingard, L., & Watling, C. (2016). It's a story, not a study: writing an effective research paper. *Academic Medicine*, 91(12), e12.
 30. Lowry, P., Curtis, A., & Lowry, M. (2004). Building a taxonomy and nomenclature of collaborative writing to improve interdisciplinary research and practice. *Journal of Business Communication*, 41(1), 66–99.
 31. McPherson, S. L., & Thomas, J. R. (1989). Relation of knowledge and performance in boys' tennis: Age and expertise. *Journal of experimental child psychology*, 48(2), 190-211.

32. offet, J., & Wagner, B. (1983). Student-centered language arts and reading. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.;
33. Onore,C.(1989).The student, the teacher, and the text: Negotiating meanings through response and revision. In C.M.Anson (Ed.). Writing and response: Theory, practice, and research (pp.231-260).Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English. Piaget, J., & - -
34. Pham, V. P. H. (2021). The Effects of Collaborative Writing on Students' Writing Fluency: An Efficient Framework for Collaborative Writing. SAGE Open, 11(1), 2158244021998363.
35. Pham, V. P. Ho., & Nguyen, N. H. (2020). Blogging for collaborative learning in the writing classroom. International Journal of Cyber Behavior, Psychology and Learning (IJCBPL), 10(3), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCBPL.2020070101>
36. Piaget, J. (1964). Development and learning. In R. Ripple, & U. Rockcastle (Eds.), Piaget rediscovered. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
37. Reid, J. M. (1993): Teaching ESL Writing. Englewood Cliffs (NJ), Prentice Hall Regents. Reid, J. (1995). Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom. Boston: Heinle & Heinle
38. Savova, L., & Donato, R. (1991). Group activities in the language classroom. English Teaching Forum, 29(2), 12-15, 26.
39. Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1986). Written composition. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook on research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 778-803). New York: Macmillan.
40. Sharples, M., & Pemberton, L. (1992). Representing writing: External representations and the writing process. In *Computers and writing* (pp. 319-336). Springer, Dordrecht.
41. Shea, J. H. (1995) Problems with collaborative learning. Journal of Geological Education, 43(4), 306-308. Retrieved in June 2020 from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.5408/0022-1368-43.4.306>
42. Slavin, R. E. (2011). Student Team Learning: A Practical Guide to Cooperative Learning (3rd ed.). Washington DC: National Education Association.
43. Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. T. (1992). What is collaborative learning.
44. Sperling, M. (1990).I want to talk to each of you: Collaboration and the teacher-student writing conference. Research in the Teaching of English, 24(3), 279-321.).
45. Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2007): «Writing tasks: The effects of collaboration», in M. P. García Mayo (ed.), Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 157-177.Gillies, 2014;Johnson & Johnson, 2014
46. Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. System, 27, 363–374.
47. Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14, 153–173.
48. Storch, N. (2013): Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms, Bristol, Buffalo, Toronto, Multilingual Matters.
49. Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. Language Teaching, 52(1), 40–59.
50. Supiani, S. (2017). Teaching writing skill through collaborative writing technique: from theory to practice. Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies, 4(1), 37–52. doi: 10.30762/jeels.v4i1.330
51. [Tarmizi](#) Talib, T., & Cheung, Y. L. (2017). Collaborative Writing in Classroom Instruction: A Synthesis of Recent Research. English Teacher, 46(2).
52. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
53. Vygotsky, L.S. (1986). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
54. Weinstein, B. D., & Bearison, D. J. (1985). Social Interaction, Social Observation, and Cognitive Development in Young Children. European Journal of Social Psychology, 15(3), 333-343.
55. Wigglesworth, G., and Storch, N. (2009). “Pairs Versus Individual Writing: Effects on Fluency, Complexity and Accuracy”. Language Testing, 26, 445–466
56. Zulfikar, Z., & Aulia, C. T. (2020). Exploring Acehese EFL College Students' Perceptions on Collaborative Writing. Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra, 12(2), 171-180.