

Exploring the Effect of Collaborative Strategy Training on the Intermediate EFL Learners' Writing Self-efficacy and Their Perceptions Concerning Collaborative Strategy

Mazyar Safarnejad*

Ph.D. Candidate of TEFL, Karaj Branch, Islamic Azad University, Karaj, Iran

Abstract

This research intended to examine the possible impact of collaborative strategies training on the students' self-efficacy in writing and their perceptions about these strategies. The participants were homogenized and later assigned as one experimental group, which was instruction in collaboration for 12 sessions, and the comparison group which was instructed based on the conventional syllabus. The groups answered the writing self-efficacy questionnaire before the treatment and once more after the treatment. The questionnaire was the self-efficacy writing scale which consisted of 16 questions covering three concepts of ideation, conventions, and self-regulation experiences. The statistical analysis of each group performance indicated that the experimental group improved in their writing self-efficacy beliefs in particular the self-regulation category. Furthermore, the learners' attitudes were assessed through a five-question interview. The findings from the interview revealed very positive attitudes about these strategies and they mainly referred to sharing ideas and understanding different views very helpful in this writing experience. Moreover, they expressed that collaboration positively affected their confidence in writing. The findings have suggested that collaboration can lead to improved self-efficacy beliefs.

Key terms: Collaborative Strategies, Conventions, EFL learners, Ideation, Perception, Self-efficacy, Self-regulation, Writing

INTRODUCTION

Writing is undoubtedly a very difficult language skill to learn (Rattanadilok Na Phuket & Othman, 2015). Acquiring writing skill for all language researchers is gaining more significant (Ghoorchaee, Tavakoli, & Nejad Ansari, 2010). This significance is rooted in the fact that writing is a generative skill which makes students confront many obstacles (Erkan & Saban, 2011). Moreover, EFL learners' writing is very limited by experiences inside the classroom. On the other hand, issues involved in writing like the genre, text organization, and coherence turn writing into a very complicated process which makes students consider it hard to acquire (Zoghipour & Nikou, 2016). Writing entails mental processes in the content and arranging ideas as well as the correct grammatical

structures. The ability to write skillfully is gaining more significance, and teaching this skill is receiving more attention (Chelli, 2006).

The traditional approaches to writing emphasized the final product of writing. Conversely, based on the process approach to teaching L2 writing, the process gained more significance (Flower & Hayes, 1981). In process-based approach, there is an emphasis on exploring, discovering and generating ideas by the learners. There is consensus over the stages of process writing on which most scholars agree (Johnson, 2008; Karatay, 2011; Simpson, 2013). The stages include prewriting, drafting, editing, revising, and publishing. It is believed that collaboration as a process-based approaches can lead to writing improvement (Hawkey cited in Rostampour, et al., 2015). Collaborative tasks promote an environment for the learners to exchange meaning and provide feedback both of which lead to better learning opportunities (Gass, 2003; Mackey, 2012). Moreover, collaboration in writing fosters excellence of the text and improves motivation (Storch, 2005).

Most of previous research has been dedicated on collaborative tasks which prompted spoken discourse (Shehadeh, 2011). On the other hand, the prevailing literature has concentrated on the adequacy of collaborative writing (Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Yong, 2010) rather than how collaboration can contribute to psycholinguistic factors like self-efficacy. As such, there is a requirement for more examination to reveal insight into the idea how collaboration affects self-efficacy and what the learners perceive about the collaborative activities. The current research aimed to discover perspectives of the learners concerning collaborative writing and how collaboration affected their self-efficacy in writing.

Collaborative Learning

Collaboration and cooperation are different concepts in learning. The purpose of cooperation is assisting learners to be more active and involved and active throughout the learning experience. Cooperative learning as Keyser (2000) proposed, assigns learners into groups while giving roles to each learner and a task to be achieved. The goal of collaborative learning is achieving the final outcome based on the input provided by all group members. Collaboration in the education field has been rooted in social development theory and proximal development zone (Vygotsky, 1978). The assumption behind this theory is that communication and interaction in the learning process are significant and learning is viewed as a social phenomenon. Through collaboration, learning becomes a process through which individuals form groups and work together.

Another theory which collaborative learning relies upon is social interdependence theory (Johnson & Johnson, 2002). Social interdependence theory is based on the assumption that the learning and achievements of any individual is affected by others who share the same learning environment. According to Usher and Pajares (2008), social models like interdependence theory contribute to a great deal to self-efficacy development, in particular, in cases when students doubt regarding their skills or experiences concerning a specific task. As Bremner (2010) asserted, teachers employ collaborative learning in classes to help students work together. Collaborative writing

refers the learners' forming groups to assist one another the process of writing (Robayo Luna, & Hernandez Ortiz, 2013). As indicated by Storch (2019), collaborative writing is the creation of a single writing piece by at least two writers who work together.

As Widdowson (cited in Montero, 2005) stated, students who work together are constantly providing feedback and decision making. Collaborative learning experience allows the students to monitor their understanding, identify the gaps in their knowledge and employ right strategies to tackle the issues while working together (Hmelo-Silver et al., 2013). Collaborative learning promotes socially coordinated inquiry and triggers higher cognitive processes that are crucial for the learning needs of the twenty-first-century (Griffin et al., 2012; Sawyer, 2014).

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy originated from the theory of social learning which was proposed by Albert Bandura. Bandura (1995) defined the term self-efficacy as capabilities which one believes to possess to arrange and conduct the actions which are needed to handle prospective situations. Self-efficacy, as a social cognitive theory, allows for personal reflection lets individuals to evaluate their own thoughts and knowledge. As Teo (2013) stated, beliefs concerning self-efficacy may have either positive or negative effects on the learners' ideas about their own ability in learning any given skill. A lot has been investigated on Self-efficacy to figure out the conceivable connection between academic success and self-efficacy. Higher self-efficacy related concept have a correlation with learners' success regardless of being general academic or task specific (Chemers et al., 2001; Finney & Schraw, 2003)

There are different methods of writing self-efficacy evaluation. One method evaluates students' confidence in the specific writing skills like assessing the learners' confidence in their ability in areas including grammar, vocabulary, and ideas arrangement successfully (Pajares, 2003). Another method to assess writing self-efficacy is measuring the confidence in skills to fulfil the tasks like accomplishing the composition of a paper or a letter. The third way of assessing self-efficacy is to utilize ratings on a scale and later compare them with real scores which learners received (Pajares, Britner, & Valiante, 2000).

It is well recognized that success in writing process depends on both cognitive capabilities and a positive self-efficacy (Teng, Sun & Xu, 2018). Literature on writing has indicated that little confidence in EFL learners writing ability an adversely affect the writing (Woodrow, 2011; Yavuz-Erkan & Saban, 2011; Zhang, 2018). Several studies reported a noticeable positive link between writing and self-efficacy among foreign or second language learners (Amogne, 2008; Chen & Lin, 2009; Erkan & Saban, 2011, Shah et al., 2011; Woodrow 2011). It might be inferred that self-efficacy has a vital contribution to students' writing. Self-efficacy in writing skill is believed to be self-confidence which is strong. In other words, this sense of efficacy gives individuals better feelings in their writing ability. They may also be more confident and face with the difficulties with more insistence when doing a writing task (Diab, 2019).

A lot has been discussed on the existing correlation between the issues of writing and self-efficacy in the literature (Hsieh & Kang, 2010). However, the interaction between collaboration and self-efficacy concerning writing skill has been rarely addressed.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Collaborative writing has attracted a lot of attention recently and researchers have been keen on knowing whether writing collaboratively could lead to better results compared with individual writing. For instance, some researchers have confirmed that through collaboration students learned from one another and scored higher compared with individual writers (Dobao & Blum, 2013; Watanabe & Swain, 2007). However, lack of explicit instructions regarding how to collaborate may lead to an ineffective knowledge construction (Chan, 2001). As such, several collaboration scripts were proposed which provide a step wise fashion to build collaboration process (Dillenbourg & Tchounikine 2007; Kollar et al. 2014).

Some studies in Iran examined the impact of collaboration instruction in writing and compared the impact of it against individualized writing experience. For example, Zabihi and Rezazadeh (2013) found that papers which were written collaboratively revealed higher accuracy but lower writing fluency. Biria and Jafari (2013) examined collaboration impact on fluency measures and found that that the fluency did not improve through collaboration compared with individual writings. Khatib and Meihami (2015) investigated the impact of collaboration in writing among EFL students through a pretest and posttest design. They understood that collaborative activities had a positive effect not only on their writing in general, but also on writing subcategories such as text content, rhetoric, structure, and even mechanics.

Moreover, the perceptions of the learners concerning the collaborative writing have been addressed in several studies. Shehadeh (2011) tested the impact of writing collaboration on and asked the students' attitudes about it. The outcome indicated a positive effect on students' writing; though the impact differed in different writing subskills and majority of students found CW enjoyable and useful. Khodabakhshzadeh and Samadi (2018) explored the learners' perceptions after task achievement by collaborative writing and reported positive perceptions due to higher levels of motivation and vocabulary and feedback. Abahussain (2020) examined EFL students' attitudes and perceptions about collaborative writing in Saudi Arabia. The result indicated that learners viewed collaboration much more useful than individual writing and other language skills. Anggraini, Rozimela and Anwar (2020) reported positive perceptions of EFL students' regarding the elements included in collaborative writing included figuring out the subject matter, providing insights, and gaining more terminology knowledge. In another qualitative research, Ismail, Lustyantje and Emzir (2020) examined students' and lecturers' perceptions concerning collaborative writing by focusing on four issues of conceptual understanding, cooperation form, writing ability, and classroom mood. The results projected positive attitudes among both students and lecturer in all four areas.

Furthermore, the correlation between writing and self-efficacy has been addressed in a combined manner, and it has been admitted that a positive relation existed between

them (Amogne, 2008; Hetthong & Teo, 2013; Woodrow, 2011). One of research trends has addressed whether the learners' self-efficacy notions contributed to their achievement in groups (Sins, van Joolingen, Savelsbergh, & van Hout-Wolters, 2008; Wang & Lin, 2007). The advocates of self-efficacy construct justify that by making tasks appealing and achievable, learners will be more engaged in the learning process (Chen & Lin, 2009; Erkan & Saban, 2011). For instance, Wang and Lin (2007) concluded that the high self-efficacy groups revealed higher collective efficacy.

Many studies have investigated the self-efficacy among teachers and how it interacted with other language variables (Althaus, 2015; Kissau & Algozzine, 2014; Lemon & Garvis, 2016). However, studies regarding the impact of collaboration on writing self-efficacy have been rare. For instance, Tai (2016) analyzed the effect of writing collaboratively among nursing students' writing ability and self-efficacy beliefs. The result showed that not only the students' writings improved but also collaborating influenced the learners' self-efficacy. Several experiments have even confirmed that self-efficacy might serve as writing ability indicator (Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007). Ghabeli, Tajidini and Fathi Rad (2021) examined the effect of web-based cooperative teaching on EFL students speaking and listening comprehension in addition to self-efficacy beliefs. The results showed improvement in the learners' self-efficacy with the interview analysis demonstrating a positive impact of web-based cooperative learning.

However, most of the studies mentioned are quantitative studies which investigated the writing self-efficacy in isolation and mostly from a teacher perspective that resulted in a gap in the field of writing self-efficacy (Rezazadeh & Zarrinabadi, 2021). As Bruning, Dempsey, Kauffman, McKim, and Zumbunn (2013) stated, there is a need for a shift concerning the quantitative measures to investigate pedagogical techniques that address different strategies and their impacts on student writing self-efficacy. Accordingly, the current research hypothesized that writing in collaboration can serve as an essential tool for the EFL students and promote writing self-efficacy while adopting a mixed design to consider the perceptions of the learners towards the collaboration. To address the concern of the research, the following questions were asked:

RQ1: What is the impact of collaborative strategy training on the intermediate EFL learners' writing self-efficacy?

RQ2: What are the perceptions of the intermediate EFL learners towards the collaborative strategy training?

The hypothesis was formulated as:

H0: Collaborative strategy training does not have any effect on the intermediate EFL learners' writing self-efficacy.

METHOD

Participants

The target population of this study comprised 60 Iranian EFL students who were learning English at intermediate level, so that they could write a paragraph in English. They were

further assigned as control and experimental groups. They were studying during the fall term of the academic year 2020-2021.

Design

This research employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative data analysis; a writing self-efficacy questionnaire and the interview which collected the perceptions of the students towards the collaborative strategy training on writing in the experimental group. The quantitative feature of the design was quasi-experimental, since it measured the self-efficacy in writing by distributing the questionnaire before and after the treatment phase by manipulating the independent variable. The qualitative aspect of the study included receiving feedbacks from the participants on their perceptions on the effectiveness of collaborative strategy training through interviews.

Instrumentations

OPT

Oxford Placement Test has been applied to homogenize the target participants.

The Writing Self-efficacy Questionnaire

Self-efficacy writing scale was employed which consisted of 16 questions covering three concepts of ideation, conventions, and self-regulation experiences. This questionnaire had been used before (Dempsey, Bruning, & Kauffman, 2010). Bruning, Dempsey, and Kauffman (2012) ran a confirmatory factor analysis revealing that the information validated the 3-factor model requirements. Following methods suggested by Bandura (2006) and being employed by other researchers (Pajares, Hartley, & Valiante, 2001; Shell et al., 1989), the students were required to provide answers for each idea as instructed in five points from agree to uncertain.

Three Components of Writing Self-Efficacy

Ideation

1. I have several thoughts for my writing.
2. I am able to put my ideas into writing.
3. I have a lot of words in mind to explain my ideas.
4. I have many original thoughts.
5. I know precisely where to place ideas in my writing.

Conventions

6. I am able to spell accurately.
7. I am able to write complete sentences.
8. I am able to punctuate sentences accurately.
9. I am able to write sentences correctly in terms of grammar.
10. I am able to bring my paragraphs quickly.

Self-regulation

11. I am able to concentrate on my writing for at least one hour.
 12. I am able to stay away from distractions.
 13. I am able to begin writing on the spot.
 14. I am able to handle my disappointment in writing.
 15. I am able to set writing goals prior to writing.
 16. I am able to keep writing despite being hard.
-

Semi-structured interview

The qualitative inspection of the study included receiving feedbacks from the participants on their perceptions on the effectiveness of collaborative strategy training through interviews.

Data Collection Procedure

To homogenize and select the target sample of the study, an OPT was run on 100 EFL students. Sixty students were picked for the study and half of them were to serve as the comparison group consisting of 30 students and a treatment group comprised the same number. Both groups were asked to reply the questions on self-efficacy at the beginning of the study. The experimental group went under the treatment through collaborative strategies, while the control group was instructed based on the typical curriculum. The treatment phase of the study took 12 sessions and each treatments session lasted 20 minutes or so. After the treatment, the two groups were tested one more time on writing self-efficacy. Besides the self-efficacy questionnaire, the experimental group participants were asked to provide their attitudes towards the collaborative strategy training. The questions probed what they think about collaborative strategy.

Data Analysis

To address research question one, a paired samples test was carried out to compare the subjects' mean score in terms of self-efficacy before and after the treatment. To answer research question two, the results of the interview were classified.

RESULTS

Analysis of Research Question 1

In order to analyze data, the main assumption to be met was the data distribution normality. Accordingly, One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was run on both pretests and posttests of the participants regarding the self-efficacy questionnaire. As Table 1 presented, the significance indices for each of the tests revealed that data were normal for all groups' performances.

Table 1. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test

		con.posttest	Ex.posttest	con.pretest	Ex.pretest
N		30	30	30	30
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	29.4333	32.2333	31.6667	32.0000
	Std. Deviation	8.18613	4.77554	8.02296	6.33545
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.160	.105	.186	.109
	Positive	.160	.061	.186	.109
	Negative	-.088	-.105	-.103	-.104
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.876	.573	1.017	.600
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.427	.898	.253	.865

Descriptive statistics were run on the control group performances. Table 2 delineated that the control group mean score concerning the ideation category in the questionnaire did not show a significant improvement (\bar{x} pretest = 9.800, \bar{x} posttest = 10.033). The mean

score of the convention section of the questionnaire revealed the same result with a slight difference (\bar{x} pretest = 8.733, \bar{x} posttest = 9.100). The third category, the self-regulation section, showed the leads amount of improvement difference (\bar{x} pretest =13.133, \bar{x} posttest =13.1000). In general, the control group performances did not reveal a considerable improvement in writing self-efficacy regarding their mean scores.

Table 2. Control Group Descriptive Statistics

	N	Lowest	Highest	Mean	S.D
pre.Ideation	30	6.00	21.00	9.8000	3.45812
pre.convention	30	5.00	17.00	8.7333	3.03921
pre.Regulation	30	6.00	26.00	13.1333	4.85467
post.Ideation	30	6.00	21.00	10.0333	3.47884
post.Convention	30	5.00	17.00	9.1000	2.80824
post.Rgeulation	30	7.00	26.00	13.1000	4.76590

Table 3 provided descriptive data analysis on the experimental group performances regarding the three sections of the self-efficacy questionnaire. The experimental group's mean score of the ideation category did not reveal a significant change after the treatment in collaborative writing (\bar{x} pretest =8.933, \bar{x} posttest =8.700). The convention section of the questionnaire showed a slight improvement after the treatment (\bar{x} pretest =9.966, \bar{x} posttest =10.233). However, the self-regulation in writing revealed the highest improvement (\bar{x} pretest =10.100, \bar{x} posttest =13.500).

Table 3. Experimental Group Descriptive Statistics

	N	Lowest	Highest	Mean	S.D
pre.Ideation	30	5.00	13.00	8.9333	2.03306
pre.Convention	30	5.00	17.00	9.9667	3.11264
pre.Regulation	30	8.00	19.00	10.1000	3.14423
post.Ideation	30	5.00	13.00	8.7000	1.74494
post.Convention	30	5.00	18.00	10.2333	3.18058
post.Regulation	30	7.00	14.00	13.5000	1.90734

Table 4 showed information on the mean scores including all three categories of the questionnaire for the two groups' performances respectively. The control group mean scores on the three sections of the questionnaire equaled \bar{x} =31.6667 and \bar{x} =32.2333 respectively. The treatment group mean score on their pretest equaled \bar{x} =29.4333 and was calculated \bar{x} =32.0000 on the posttest. It is obvious that the treatment group had a higher mean score in contrast to the comparison group.

Table 4. Descriptive Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	con.Pretest	31.6667	30	8.02296	1.46478
	con.Posttest	32.2333	30	8.18613	1.49458
Pair 2	Ex.Pretest	29.4333	30	4.77554	.87189
	Ex.Posttest	32.0000	30	6.33545	1.15669

To examine the null hypothesis of this research, two sets of two Paired Samples Tests were conducted to analyze the differences of performances within both groups. As Table 5 showed, the significance index for the control group equaled $\text{sig}=.024 \geq 0.05$. This result suggested that comparison group performance did not differ statistically in their two performances.

Table 5. Paired Samples Test on Control Group Performances

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	con.pretest - con.Posttest	-.56667	1.30472	.23821	-1.05386	-.07948	-2.379	29	.024

Another Paired Samples Test was conducted to examine the differences of performances for the group that received intervention. The outcome suggested that the treatment group had achieved significantly higher results in their self-efficacy. Table 6 revealed that the significance value equaled ($t = -2.379$, $\text{sig} (.000) < .05$). This significance level rejected the null hypothesis under investigation which proposed that collaborative strategy training does not affect the intermediate EFL learners' writing self-efficacy.

Table 6. Paired Samples Test on Experimental Group Performances

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 2	Ex.pretest - Ex.posttest	2.56667	2.94412	.53752	1.46732	3.66602	4.775	29	.000

Analysis of Research Question 2 (Student's Interview)

After the treatment was conducted, fifteen students from the experimental group consented to talk about their ideas about collaborative strategy instruction in writing. The interview questions were answered and recorded by students in WhatsApp in English and sent to the teacher. They were allocated 15 minutes to contemplate the questions and respond to them. The interview question included (1) if the collaborative strategies helped them to write better, (2) What the most helpful feature of these strategies, (3) if they gained confidence in themselves by the help of these strategies, (4) if that these strategies helped them to write better than before, and (5) what the main challenges in using these strategies were. The interview was carried out after the last treatment session and provided valuable insights concerning the collaborative writing. Most of the participants projected very positive attitudes regarding not only their writing but also their speaking skill during the collaboration process. They mostly expressed that through collaboration they received various ideas on the topics they were supposed to write about. They articulated that they figured out how to modify their writing

grammatically. Several of the participants affirmed that they gained more confidence in their writing. For instance, student 12 asserted:

I really gained more confidence because others' presence gave me more confidence. I am not doing the writings alone and this makes me feel more confident.

Similarly, student 5 mentioned:

When I do this collaboration, my confidence is more than before. I can write more fantastically and beautifully, because we can write about several ideas. I can use and write my classmates' opinions too. So, through collaboration time, my writing is much better than before.

On the other hand, several students referred to the point that the most useful feature of collaboration was the sharing of ideas, identifying grammatical mistakes, and gaining from each other's writing silks. For instance, student 1 stated:

It was very helpful that there were several types of ideas and we came to conclusions with each other in a shorter time.

Moreover, student 13 mentioned:

The most helpful feature strategy for me is how to write my opinion among different ideas and integrate my own opinion with others as well as trying to make similarities between texts to complement one another's opinion. Besides, correction of peers' grammatical mistakes was great.

Conversely, many of the respondents acclaimed that the main challenge of collaboration was coming to conclusion based on very different ideas. Some students referred to the amount of time taken to this collaboration as a downside compared to individual writing. Student 12 mentioned:

The main challenge for me was the time. It really takes a longer time compared with the individual writing.

Student 2 stated:

The most important challenge was the understanding the differences on an issue. On some opinions, we agreed very much and in some questions we completely disagreed.

Altogether, the ideas presented here reflected very positive attitudes regarding collaboration. Only one participant mentioned that she did not feel any special gain in her collaborative writing compared with her individual writing. Most of the students enjoyed the collaborative work. Most of the students referred to the same point that sharing ideas and understanding different views was very helpful in this writing experience. Collaboration affected their writing confidence positively and some even mentioned they felt improvement in their speaking ability through collaboration. Several students highlighted the time restriction they had to finish their writing tasks. Student 3 mentioned, "Summarizing and putting together the texts that had a slight difference in meaning took a lot of time. We need more time to do it together." In general, many students expressed no challenges at all.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As the analysis of data descriptively and inferentially revealed, the experimental that was instructed in collaborative writing intervention performed better the control group in terms of their self-efficacy in writing. This difference was mostly obvious in the self-regulation section of the self-efficacy assessment with the mean score of $\bar{x}=29.4333$ in their pretest and the mean of $\bar{x}=32.000$ in their posttest. The students' impressions indicated that almost all of the students considered collaboration advantageous. They referred to various issues as the most helpful features of collaboration. Some pointed out sharing of ideas, some referred to identifying grammatical mistakes, and some mentioned hearing different ideas. Except one student, all of the participants referred to higher confidence in writing and better writing ability. The main challenges included putting different ideas together, time limitation, and three people found no challenges at all. The responses from the interview suggested that collaboration affected the self-efficacy positively.

The interview results are in line with previous literature that lower confidence in EFL learners writing ability can adversely affect the writing skill (Woodrow, 2011), whereas sharing ideas through collaboration leads to the positive perceptions about writing (Abahussain, 2020; Khodabakhshzadeh & Samadi, 2018; Ismail, Lustyantie & Emzir, 2020; Shehadeh, 2011). Like this research, all of the studies confirmed that the students found collaboration very useful in their writing.

The result of self-efficacy analysis in the control group and the experimental uncovered that the intervention led to higher means compared with the students who received traditional treatment of product approach. The result matched previous research in which collaboration improved writings compared with individual attempts (Zabihi & Rezazadeh, 2013; Biriya & Jafari, 2013; Khatib & Meihami, 2015). Akin to this investigation, they found that collaboration further developed writing. However, they examined writing from different perspectives like accuracy, fluency, content, vocabulary and grammar. This research did not quantify the writings of the students though. The measurement was limited to the students' self-efficacy through a questionnaire and probed their insights regarding the collaboration. Collaboration has impacted the self-regulation category in the treatment group. Grounded evidence on the questionnaire and the interview results, it can be argued that collaboration is a useful technique to improve higher order thinking about ones own writing like self-efficacy and the students are very interested in this technique to write.

There were some restrictions notably as the treatment length and the sample size. More studies are essential to investigate how the collaborative writing can affect the self-efficacy in the long-term framework. This study has implications. Collaboration among the learners might promote writing self-efficacy achievement through fostering cooperation and reflections on the writing by editing and revising them. Collaborative strategies could be offered and taught by teachers to improve not only the writing skill but also to probe into the perceptions of the learners concerning their own skills. Thus, writing self-efficacy can be improved by positive experiences of collaboration.

REFERENCES

- Abahussain, M. O. (2020). Investigating EFL Learners' Perceptions of Collaborative Writing. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10, 32.
- Althausser, K. (2015). Job-embedded professional development: its impact on teacher self-efficacy and student performance. *Teacher Development*, 19 (2), 210-225. doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2015.1011346
- Amogne, D. (2008). *An investigation of the correlation among efficacy sources, students' self-efficacy and performance in reading and writing skills*: Bahir Dar University in Focus. (Unpublished master's thesis), Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
- Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Biria, R., & Jafari, S. (2013). The impact of collaborative writing on the writing fluency of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(1), 164–175.
- Bremner, S. (2010). Collaborative writing: Bridging the gap between the textbook and the workplace. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29, 121–132.
- Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D. F., McKim, C., & Zumbrunn, S. (2013). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(1), 25-38.
- Chelli, S. (2006). *Errors in grammar as an aspect of learners' incompetence: The case of first year students*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Available from Mohamed Kheider University, Biskra.
- Chen, M. C., & Lin, H. (2009). Self-efficacy, foreign language anxiety as predictors of academic performance among professional program students in a general English proficiency writing test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 2009(109), 420-430.
- Chan, C. K. (2001). "Peer Collaboration and Discourse Patterns in Learning from Incompatible Information." *Instructional Science*, 29 (6), 443–479. doi:10.1023/A:1012099909179.
- Chemers, M. M., Li-tze Hu, & Garcia, B. F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first-year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 55-64.
- Dillenbourg, P., & P. Tchounikine (2007). "Flexibility in Macro-Scripts for Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning." *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 23 (1), 1–13. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00191.x.
- Diab, A. A. (2019). Using Some Online-Collaborative Learning Tools (Google Docs & Padlet) to Develop Student Teachers' EFL Creative Writing Skills and Writing Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, 119(3), 21-70.
- Dobao, A. F., Blum, A. (2013). Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *System*, 41, 365-378.
- Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(1), 164-192.

- Finney, S. J., & Schraw, G. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs in college statistics courses. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 28*(2), 161-186.
- Gass, S. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty, & M. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition*, (pp. 224-255). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ghabeli, N., Tajadini, M., Fatehi Rad, N. (2021). Impact of Online Setting Collaboration through Strategy-Based Instruction on EFL Learners' Self-efficacy and Oral Skills. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 9*(34), 191-202.
- Ghoorchaei, B., Tavakoli, M., & Nejad Ansari, D. (2010). The Impact of Portfolio Assessment on Iranian EFL Students' Essay Writing: A Process-oriented Approach. *GEMA online Journal of Language Studies, 10*(3), 35-51.
- Griffin, P., Care, E., & McGaw, B. (2012). "The changing role of education and schools," In *Assessment and Teaching of 21st Century Skills*, eds P. Griffin, B. McGaw, and E. Care (New York, NY: Springer), 1-15.
- Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.). *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hetthong, R., & Teo, A. (2013). Does writing self-efficacy correlate with and predict writing performance? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2*(1), 157-167.
- Hirvela, A., & Sweetland, Y. L. (2005). Two case studies of L2 writers' experiences across learning-directed portfolio contexts. *Assessing Writing, 10*(3), 192-213.
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Chinn, C. A., Chan, C., & O'Donnell, A. M. (2013). "Information processing approaches to collaborative learning," In *The international Handbook of Collaborative Learning*, eds C. E. Hmelo-Silver, C. A. Chinn, C. Chan, and A. M. O'Donnell (New York, NY: Routledge), 31-52. doi: 10.4324/9780203837290
- Hsieh, P. H., & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Implications from self-efficacy and attribution theories for an understanding of undergraduates' motivation in a foreign language course. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 33*, 513-532.
- Ismail, A.I., Lustyantje, N., & Emzir, E. (2020). EFL Students' and Lecturer's Perceptions on Collaborative Writing. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 7*, 83.
- Johnson, A. P. (2008). *Teaching reading and writing: A guidebook for tutoring and remediating students*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (2002). Social interdependence theory and university instruction – theory into practice. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 61* (3), 119-129.
- Karatay, H. (2011). Süreç temelli yazma modelleri: Planlı yazma ve değerlendirme. M. Özbay (Ed.), *Yazma eğitimi içinde* (s. 21-43). Ankara: Pegem Akademi
- Keyser, W. M. (2000). Active learning and cooperative learning: Understanding the differences and using both styles effectively. *Research strategies, 17*, 35-44. James C. Jernigan
- Khatib, M., & Meihami, H. (2015). Languaging and Writing Skill: The Effect of Collaborative Writing on EFL Students' Writing Performance. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(1), 203-211.

- Kissau, S., & Algozzine, B. (2015). The impact of mode of instructional delivery on second language teacher self-efficacy. *ReCALL*, 27(02), 239-256.
- Kollar, I., S. Ufer, E., Reichersdorfer, S., Vogel, E., Fischer, F., & Reiss, K. (2014). "Effects of Collaboration Scripts and Heuristic Worked Examples on the Acquisition of Mathematical Argumentation Skills of Teacher Students with Different Levels of Prior Achievement." *Learning and Instruction*, 32, 22-36.
- Lemon, N., & Garvis, S. (2016). Pre-service teacher self-efficacy in digital technology. *Teachers and Teaching*, 22(3), 387-408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1058594>
- Mackey, A. (2012). *Input, interaction and corrective feedback in L2 learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: relation to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning*, 57(3), 417-442.
- Montero, A. (2005). What a feeling! Motivating EFL students through collaborative writing with poems. *English Teaching Forum*, 43(3), 36-38.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19, 139-158.
- Pajares, F., Britner, S. L., & Valiante, G. (2000). Writing and science achievement goals of middle school students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 406-422.
- Rattanadilok Na Phuket, P., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(32), 99- 106.
- Robayo Luna, A. M., & Hernandez Ortiz, L. S. (2013). Collaborative Writing to Enhance Academic Writing Development Through Project Work. *HOW Journal*, 20(1), 130-148.
- Rostampour, M., Hashempour, Z. & Behjat, F. (2015). "Collaborative or Individualistic Writing: Which One Is a Better Venue to Improve Iranian Pre-University Female Students' Writing Skill? *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 5(3), 46-54.
- Rezazadeh, M., & Zarrinabadi, N. (2021). The Role of Need for Closure and Need for Cognition in Writing-Specific Psychological Factors. *Discourse Processes*, 58(10), 869-885.
- Ruíz, N. C. (2004). Design of literacy activities to promote writing with children: An experience with second graders. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 6(1), 129-144.
- Sawyer, K. (2014). "Introduction: the new science of learning," In *The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences*, 2nd Edn, ed K. R. Sawyer (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press), 1-18. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139519526.002
- Sins, P. H. M., Van Joolingen, W. R., Savelsbergh, E. R., & van Hout-Wolters, B. (2008). Motivation and performance within a collaborative computer-based modeling task: Relations between students' achievement goal orientation, self-efficacy, cognitive processing, and achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33(1), 58-77.

- Shah P. M., Mahmud W. H., Din R., Yusof A., & Pardi K. M. (2011). Self-Efficacy in the writing of Malaysian ESL learners. *World Applied Sciences Journal (Innovation and Pedagogy for Lifelong Learning)*, 15, 08-11.
- Shehadeh, A., (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 286-305.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 153-173.
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. *Language Teaching*, 52(1), 40-59.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 355-375.
- Tai, H.-C. (2016). Effects of collaborative online learning on EFL learners' writing performance and self-efficacy. *English Language Teaching*, 9(5), 119-133. doi:10.5539/elt.v9n5p119
- Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2018). Conceptualizing writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language context: Scale validation through structural equation modeling. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 911-942.
- Usher, E. L. & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 751-796.
- Wang, S. & Lin, S. S.J. (2007). The effects of group composition of self-efficacy and collective efficacy on computer-supported collaborative learning. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23, 2256-2268.
- Watanabe, Y., & Swain, M. (2007). Effects of proficiency differences and patterns of pair interaction on second language learning: Collaborative dialogue between adult ESL learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 121-142.
- Woodrow, L. (2011). College English writing affect: Self-efficacy and anxiety. *System*, 39(4), 510-522.
- Yong, M. F. (2010). Collaborative writing features. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 41(1), 18-30.
- Yavuz-Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. I. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in the Turkish tertiary-level EFL context. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13(1), 163-191.
- Zhang, Y. (2018). Exploring EFL learners' self-efficacy in academic writing based on process-genre approach. *English Language Teaching*, 11(6), 115-124.
- Zabihi, R., & Rezazadeh, M. (2013). Creativity and narrative writing in L2 classrooms: Comparing individual and paired task performance. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 6(3), 29-46.
- Zoghipour, E., & Nikou, F. R. (2016). The Impact of Explicit Instruction of Lexico-Grammatical Devices on EFL Learners. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, 6(1), 677- 690.