اثر برنامج تعليمي قائم على الكتابة التشاركية في تحصيل متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية
كلغة أجنبية في مادة الترجمة

الباحث: كاظم محمد موسى

أ.م.د. منى محمد عباس الخطيب

أ.م.د. نادية حميد حسون

جامعة بابل / كلية التربية الاساسية

# The Impact of an Instructional Program Based on Collaborative Writing on College EFL Learners' Achievement in Translation Subject

**Kadhim Muhammad Musa AlShammari**
**Assist. Prof. Dr. Muna Mohammed Abbas AlKhateeb**
**Assist. Prof. Dr. Nadia Hameed Hassoon**
**Babylon University / College of Basic Education**
**bsc.kadhim.mohammed@uobabylon.edu.iq**

**Abstract:**

The present study aims at investigating "The Impact of an Instructional Program Based on Collaborative Writing on College EFL Learners' Achievement in Translation Subject". To achieve this aim, the researchers proposed an instructional program based on CW to be followed to teach the Translation Subject. The current study is limited to University of Babylon – College of Basic Education – Department of English for the academic year 2020-2021. The sample is represented by the Third year students at the department of English/ Morning studies which was 87 participants. Translation syllabus (for the second course) as recommended by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. The sample members were divided into two groups. The first is the experimental with (42) students. The second is the control with (45) students. The Experimental design is adopted as it fits with the aims improvement. The researchers Conduct a final administration of the post-test of translation academic achievement, then, the collected data were analyzed to get results using suitable statistical tools; and finally the results were presented to come up with conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies.

**Keywords:** Instructional Program, Collaborative Writing, Translation

المستخلص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التعرف على "اثر برنامج تعليمي قائم على الكتابة التشاركية في تحصيل متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في مادة الترجمة". لتحقيق هذا الهدف ، اقترح الباحثون برنامجًا تعليميًا يعتمد على الكتابة التشاركية ليتم اتباعه لتدريس مادة الترجمة. الدراسة الحالية اقتصرت على جامعة بابل – كلية التربية الأساسية – قسم اللغة الإنجليزية للعام الدراسي 2020-2021 وتمثلت العينة في طلبة المرحلة الثالثة في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / الدراسة الصباحية وكان عددهم 87 مشاركاً .وتم اعتماد مفردات منهج الترجمة (للكورس الثاني) الذي أوصت به وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي ، وتم تقسيم أفراد العينة إلى مجموعتين. الأولى تجريبية بواقع

(42) طالب وطالبة والثانية كانت المجموعة الضابطة بواقع (45) طالب وطالبة. تم اعتماد التصميم التجريبي لأنه يتناسب مع الأهداف الموضوعة. قام الباحثون بإجراء للاختبار البعدي للتحصيل الأكاديمي للترجمة ، وبعدها تم تحليل البيانات التي تم جمعها للحصول على النتائج باستخدام الأدوات الإحصائية المناسبة. وأخيراً تم عرض النتائج للخروج باستنتاجات وتوصيات واقتراحات لمزيد من الدراسات المستقبلية.

**الكلمات المفتاحية**: برنامج تعليمي, كتابة تشاركية, ترجمة.

## Introduction.

One of the most demanding and challenging intellectual jobs is translating. An action or a result of an activity are both associated with translation. Meaning translation is an action that takes into consideration some of the constraints that exist across languages. Words, situations, grammatical rules, culture, writing codes, and difficult-to-translate words and utterances like idioms should all be considered as limits. When it comes to teaching, using translation in classes is critical. Educates kids on the relationship between languages and their potential. Because foreign words are encountered in many frequent areas and must be decoded, it is an essential and natural activity. Communication success is a two-way process. Learners must be able to communicate in both directions: into and out of the target language. The capacity to utilize a foreign language is emphasized in most instructional materials, but little guidance is provided on how to convey it back into the home tongue. When seeking for the most relevant words to represent what is meant, translation develops attributes that are essential to all language learning: flexibility, correctness, and clarity. Students can submit their own ideas while concentrating on the material and feeling free to express themselves.

Collaboration allows for more in-depth and helpful criticism. When students write on a computer, it is a huge success because everyone can see what is generated and everyone may make changes to it throughout the original and subsequent writing stages. E-mail can be sent by students and professors alike.

Translation is a barrier for Iraqi university English students, especially in the outset of their studies. Translation is viewed as a collection of difficulties of various sorts that demand appropriate and realistic answers. There will be certain issues because English and Arabic are Germanic and Semitic languages from two different linguistic groups.

Collaborative writing is a teaching writing strategy that calls on students to cooperate with each other or in a group to produce good work. This strategy makes it easier for students to write with their peers a certain text. The students are working together, in other words, to write good words. It is usually thought to be writing to two or more people (Sukirman, 2016: 33-4).

In response to possible collaboration technologies, collaborative methods are increasingly being encouraged in second-language schools. According to the literature, there has been a considerable surge in interest in collaborative writing. Collaboration is defined as people working together to achieve a common goal. This implies that the concept of collaborative writing is that two or more students or groups collaborate to compose a formal paper so that descriptive language may be generated collectively. At

each stage of the writing process, each student provides ideas, acquires and organizes material, and prepares, evaluates, and edicts work. Students' ability to write will improve as a result of their collaboration. Students with learning disabilities can collaborate to learn during class time. Collaborative writing is primarily a social activity in which authors search for areas of shared understanding. A shared objective and differential knowledge, interacting as a group, and being separated from the text are some of the social and interactional norms for sharing understanding. This is a good technique to get pupils to think about what they're saying, especially if they're explaining and defending their beliefs to their classmates. Students will share their thoughts, feelings, and results in a collaborative group. They will discuss their ideas for creating descriptive language, contributing components, revising, and producing the paper as part of the learning process (Sipayung, 2016: 91-2).

Vygotsky's 1978 sociocultural perspective was based on the idea of collaborative writing as a tool for establishing linguistic knowledge and written agreements of the L2. In co-operation, students try to work together to develop shared understandings as part of individual understanding. In other words, knowledge is developed if individuals collaborate to achieve a common objective through a particular discourse during collaborative meaning. In collaborative writing, students are encouraged to decide in which language their ideas can be articulated. They therefore need to build a written text where their ideas can be inserted. They actively participate in negotiating meanings in this process and interact with others to obtain information in a writing activity from each other. Teachers are apparently no longer seen as the only actor in learning to transfer knowledge to students in this context of learning. Instead, a school is considered an important context in which students build new knowledge and experience meaningful interaction with and with the teacher. The value of dialogue, in class interaction between students, was supported by research in collaborative writing. Collaborative dialog can enable learners to participate in the resolution of problems and the construction of knowledge. In L2, it helps learners to build their language skills and concentrate on using their own language. For example, students actively engage in dialogue, during collaborative writing, which urges them to pay attention to the gaps in writing. There is therefore a better understanding of the use of their own language not only in the production of texts but also in the use of language in a written text (AlWaleedi, 2018: 45-6).

**Aim and Hypotheses of the study**

The current study aims at investigating The Impact of an Instructional Program Based on Collaborative Writing on College EFL Learners' Achievement in Translation Subject

In light of the presented aims, the researcher postulated the following **hypotheses**:

1. "There is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the average scores of the experimental group students who studied the translation subject by the collaborative writing method and the scores of the control group students who studied the same subject by the traditional way in the post-achievement test".

2. "There is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the average scores of the experimental group students who studied the translation subject by the collaborative writing method and the scores of the control group students who studied the same subject by the traditional way in the pre- and post-achievement tests"

3. "There is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the average scores of the students of the control group who study translation subject by the traditional way in the achievement (pre- and post) tests".

**Procedures:**

1. The experimental research method is used because it fits with the aims of the current research.
2. A review of the study variables is done.
3. A translation academic achievement pre- and post- tests are built.
4. The researcher presents the pre- and post- tests of translation academic achievement to remarkable specialists in ELT.
5. Conducting a final administration of the post-test of translation academic achievement.
6. Analyzing the collected data to get results using suitable statistical tools; and finally presenting the results to come up with conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies.

**Limits of the Study**

The present study is limited to:

1. **Place Limit**
   University of Babylon – College of Basic Education – Department of English.
2. **Time Limit**
   The academic year 2020-2021
3. **Participants Limit**
   Third year students at the department of English/ Morning studies.
4. **Subject/ Material Limit**
   Translation syllabus (for the second course) as recommended by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.

**Definitions of the Terms**

**Instructional program**

It is the organization of educational activities based on pre-determined objectives in a large entity that is the curriculum. It consists of its constituents; its relation is general and special; The curriculum can include many courses which may vary depending on their purpose and value, for instance enhancement programs, treatment programs.... etc (AlKhattat, 2016: 1).

**The operational definition:**

The term 'learning programme,' refers to a reproducible instructional activity designed to achieve the educational objective of a specific group of students, namely some

| آذار 2022 | مجلة كلية التربية الاساسية | العدد 55 |
| | للعلوم التربوية والانسانية | المجلد 14 |

clearly defined changes or changes. These measures of change in the selected group of learners are the primary criteria for determining the success or effectiveness of an educational programme. Those modifications could be emotional, scientific, social or physical.

**Collaborative Writing**

It is used to describe those written work projects involving several writers who collaborate and complete the work. It differs from shared writing, i.e. in shared writing, in which the workplaces are divided between them and focused on these areas (Tutorial points, 2016: 3).

**The operational definition:**

Collaborative writing can be defined as a written pair product, or as a group of students working together to produce a single product. The group members focus on a common objective, negotiate, cooperate and discuss while creating a common text. The process is a social process.

**Academic Achievement**

It is a degree of competency in scholastic work in general or in a specific ability, such as mathematics or reading, or it is any recognized achievement in the domains of scholarship or disciplined study. The results of standardized ability tests and performance evaluations by a teacher or other supervisor are frequently used to predict future academic attainment (VandenBos, 2015: 5).

**The operational definition:**

The researcher defines academic achievement as achievement in standardized tests or examinations shown by a student. It is typically assessed by the use of teacher's ratings, tests ,and examinations.

**Methodology**
In this study, Experimental research method  is used because it fits with the aims of the current research.
Experimental research is a type of QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH in which the experimenters manipulate certain stimuli, TREATMENTs, or environmental conditions and observe how the condition or behavior of the subject is affected or changed (Tavakoli, 2012: 206).

**Population and Sample**
**Population:**
Population is the target group under investigation. It is the entire set under consideration (Noori, 2021: 39). The current research population included the faculties of basic education for the middle Euphrates governorates, and the research population was defined by the English language departments in the faculties of basic education/

morning studies for the academic year (2019/2020). Their total number was (**627**) male and female students distributed as shown in Table (1).

| University | College | Department | Number of students |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Mustansiria** | **Basic Education** | **English** | 92 |
| **Babylon** | | | 176 |
| **Maisan** | | | 193 |
| **Tikrit** | | | 74 |
| **Diyala** | | | 92 |
| **Total number of the students** | | | 627 |

**Table (1) Research Population**

**Sample**

Research sample refers to a part of a population selected (**Mousavi, 1999: 335**). It is any part of a population of individuals on whom information is obtained (**Fraenkel and Norman, 2006: 107**).

The researchers intentionally chose the College of Basic Education / University of Babylon to apply the research experiment, and randomly chose two sections, one of which represents the experimental group with (**44**) male and female students, from which two students were excluded because they obtained the diploma certificate and the control group (**46**) male and female students. One student was executed due to his failure in the stage for the previous academic year. Table (2) shows the sample.

| Section | Group | Total number before exclusion | Excluded students | Total number after exclusion |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | Experimental | 44 | 2 | 42 |
| B | Control | 46 | 1 | 45 |
| Sum | | 90 | 3 | 87 |

**Equivalence of the groups**

**Students' age:**

To ensure that the students of the two research groups are equivalent in this variable, the researcher used the T-test for two independent samples. After analyzing the results, the researcher concluded that the average age of the experimental group was (272.35) and the average age of the control group was (265.16). This indicates that the difference is of no statistical significance at the level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (85), as the calculated T value (1.85) was smaller than the tabulated value of (1.98), which indicates that the two research groups are equivalent in age. Table (3) shows this.

| Group | Size | Mean | SD | T-test | | D. of freedom | Level of significance (0.05) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Calculated | Tabulated | | |
| Experimental | 42 | 272.35 | 24.01 | 1.85 | 1.98 | 85 | Not significant |
| Control | 45 | 265.16 | 14.27 | | | | |

**Parents' academic achievement:**
a. Fathers' academic achievement:
The researcher conducted a statistical equivalence in the academic achievement of the fathers of the students of the two research groups, and to find out the significance of the differences between the average academic achievement of the students' of the two groups fathers, the researcher used the chi-square equation (Chi-Square), and the results were.

| Group | | Level of Academic Achievement of Fathers | | | | | | | d. of freedom | Chi-value | | Significance at 0.05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Size | Illiterate | Read and write | Elementary | Intermediate | Preparatory | Diploma | College | | Calculated | Tabulated | |
| EG | 42 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 11.40 | 12.59 | Not significant |
| CG | 45 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 9 | | | | |

Table (4)

It is noted from Table (6) that there is no statistically significant difference at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (3), as the calculated (Chi-Square) value was (11.40) which is less than the tabulated value (Chi-Square) of (12.59). This indicates that the two groups are statistically equivalent in this variable.

**Academic achievement of mothers:**
The researcher conducted a statistical equivalence in the academic achievement of the mothers, and to find out the significance of the differences between the mean academic achievement of the mothers of the students of the two groups, the researcher used the chi-square equation (Chi-Square), and the results were as in Table (7).

| Group | | Level of Academic Achievement of Fathers | | | | | | | d. of freedom | Chi-value | | Significance at 0.05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Size | Illiterate | Read and write | Elementary | Intermediate | Preparatory | Diploma | College | | Calculated | Tabulated | |
| EG | 42 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2.76 | 12.59 | Not significant |
| CG | 45 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 7 | | | | |

Table (5)

We can see from Table (7) that there is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (3), as the calculated (Chi-Square) value was (2.76) which is less than the tabular value (Chi-Square) of (12.59) and this indicates that the two groups are statistically equivalent in this variable

### Intelligence test

For the purpose of achieving equivalence among the students of the two research groups in the variable of intelligence, and after reviewing the literature and previous studies, the (Carter) test prepared for university students was applied. The test was applied to the research sample and by applying the T-test for the two independent samples to know the significance of the statistical differences, as the calculated T-value (1.02) was smaller than the tabulated value (1, 98) as shown in Table (6)

**Intelligence test equivalence**

| Group | Size | Mean | SD | T-test | | d. of freedom | Significance at 0.05 |
|-------|------|------|-----|------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|
| EG | 42 | 38.88 | 7.32 | Calculated | Tabulated | | |
| CG | 45 | 37.33 | 6.79 | 1.02 | 1.98 | 85 | Not significant |

### Academic Achievement Pre-test

The researcher applied the academic achievement pre- test for the purpose of equalizing the experimental and control groups. After correcting the answers and using the t-test for two independent samples to determine the significance of the statistical differences, the calculated t-test value was (1.89) which is smaller than the tabulated t-value (1.98) with a degree of freedom (85). This indicates that the experimental and control groups are statistically equivalent in reference to the achievement test, and table (7) illustrates this.

**Results of the t-test of the academic achievement pre-test**

| Group | Size | Mean | SD | T-test | | d. of freedom | Significance at 0.05 |
|-------|------|------|-----|------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|
| EG | 42 | 31.88 | 5.01 | Calculated | Tabulated | | |
| CG | 45 | 33.68 | 3.86 | 1.89 | 1.98 | 85 | Not significant |

### Material

The material was unified for the two groups of research represented by the items of the unified translation material for the departments of the faculties of basic education in Iraqi universities established by the Sectoral Committee of the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Table (8 ) that illustrates this.

| N | Syllabus |
|---|----------|
| 1 | Principles of translation. |
| 2 | Literal and non – Literal translation (similarities and differences). |
| 3 | Translation of Words , phrases, Sentences. |
| 4 | Translation of Cultural Differences: |

| 5 | Translation of idioms, proverbs, and jokes. |
|---|---|
| 6 | Translation of Paragraphs. |
| 7 | Difficulties and Problems faced by students in translation. |

**Teaching Supplement**

Teaching aids are an important part of every classroom. Teaching aids can help students improve their reading comprehension abilities, demonstrate or reinforce a skill or idea, differentiate training, and reduce stress or boredom by presenting material in a new and engaging way, to name a few benefits. To enrich or enliven classroom teaching, a teacher could use an item (such as a book, artwork, or map) or a gadget (such as a DVD or computer.(

The teaching tools used in this program included laptops, books and pamphlets, and images that prompted real-life scenarios.

**Experiment equipment**

It outlines the stages involved in developing the proposed program after analyzing prior research and instructional resources.

The current tendency is to create programs that help learners increase their cognitive and skill capacities. The program's success is largely determined by how well it is put together. The presentation will be on a CD.

**Research tools**

One of the requirements of the current research is the preparation of the achievement capabilities test. The preparation was as follows:

**Achievement capabilities test**

It is required to prepare the achievement capabilities test to measure the cognitive aspect according to the levels of (Bloom). Achievement tests are designed to evaluate the proficiency of the students' knowledge, understanding and skill in a specific field of study or program. Its purpose is to measure the examinees acquired knowledge or developed skill which they have learned in a particular subject or group of subjects. Achievement tests are of high importance among teachers, professional associations and employers (Hassan, 2019: 1).

1. Determining the objective of the test:

    The objective of the test was to assess the achievement capabilities of students of basic education faculties in the subject of translation, before and after the application of the experiment.

2. Formulation of behavioral goals:

    (89) behavioral goals have been formulated, distributed according to Bloom's revised taxonomy: (knowledge, understanding, application, analysis, evaluation and creativity).

3. Determining the number and type of test items: the test was formulated to consist of (25) items distributed as follows:

    - (15) items of the subjective type questions and
    - (10) items of the type of multiple-choice questions.

4. The table of specifications (TOS) is a method for ensuring that a test or assessment assesses the material and thinking skills that the exam is designed to evaluate. As a result, when employed correctly, it can give proof of response content and construct (i.e., response process) validity. A TOS can be used for large-scale test production,

teacher classroom evaluations, and the development of psychometric scales. It's a fundamental tool for creating tests and assessments for research and teaching (Fives and Nicole, 2018: 2)

| Subjects | Educational objectives | | | | | | Importance of the subjects | Number of questions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Remembering 22 | Understanding 12 | Applying 12 | Analyzing 12 | Evaluating 10 | Creating 21 | | |
| Principles of translation. | 0.625 | 0.325 | 0.325 | 0.325 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 10 | 2.5 |
| Mark(s) | 1.25 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.6 | 1.2 | | 5 |
| Literal and non – Literal translation (similarities and differences). | 1.25 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 20 | 5 |
| Mark(s) | 2.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.4 | | 10 |
| Translation of Words , phrases, Sentences. | 1.25 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 20 | 5 |
| Mark(s) | 2.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.4 | | 10 |
| Translation of Cultural Differences: Translation of idioms, proverbs, and jokes. | 1.875 | 0.975 | 0.975 | 0.975 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 30 | 7.5 |
| Mark(s) | 3.75 | 1.95 | 1.95 | 1.95 | 1.8 | 3.6 | | 15 |
| Translation of Paragraphs. | 0.625 | 0.325 | 0.325 | 0.325 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 10 | 2.5 |
| Mark(s) | 1.25 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.6 | 1.2 | | 5 |
| Difficulties and Problems faced by students in translation. | 0.625 | 0.325 | 0.325 | 0.325 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 10 | 2.5 |
| Mark(s) | 1.25 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.6 | 1.2 | | 5 |
| Importance of the objectives | 25% | 13% | 13% | 13% | 12% | 24% | 100% | |
| Number of questions | 6.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3 | 6 | | 25 |
| Revised number of questions | 6 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | | 25 |
| Marks | 12.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 6 | 12 | | 50 |
| Revised marks | 12 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 12 | | 50 |

Table (9)

### Test Scoring

After the formulation of the test items, the correction criterion was adopted to give two marks for the correct answer and zero for the wrong answer.

### Validity

It refers to the extent to which a test measures what it purports to measure (**Coombe et al. 2010: xxii**).

According to Brown and Abeywickrama (2010: 30), a valid test assesses exactly what it claims to measure. It does not track variables that aren't important. A valid test depends on empirical evidence to the greatest extent feasible. It entails a performance that is representative of the test's criterion. It provides helpful, relevant information on the test-abilities, taker's and it is backed up by a theoretical rationale or argument.

The evaluation determines the appropriateness of conclusions, applications, and outcomes. This suggests that, based on the assessment results, a high-quality assessment procedure (i.e., obtaining, evaluating, and using the information elicited) is sound, trustworthy, or genuine (Cheng and Janna, 2017: 230).

- Face validity

It's a validity feature that reflects how well a measurement technique looks to measure what it's designed to measure. Face validity refers to the researcher's or participants' belief that the indicator accurately assesses the construct (Tavakoli, 2012: 219).

The test was presented to a number of experts and specialists in curricula and methods of teaching English, educational psychology, measurement and evaluation to find out their opinions about the validity of the test items. Depending on  of observations, the test is built.

**Piloting the test**

The objective of applying the pilot test  is to determine the extent of the clarity of the test and the statistical analysis of the test items in terms of (the level of difficulty of the item, the discrimination power of the items).

The test was conducted on a random sample of (40) male and female students/ Third stage / College of Basic Education / University of Maysan

After applying the test, it became obvious that the test was clear. The time of the test was determined, the average time taken by the members of the pilot sample = (52) minutes.

**Items difficulty**

An item on a test's level of demand or complexity. The level of difficulty requested (and intended) will be determined by the test's purpose and nature. The group's total test scores are used to determine item difficulty. It's a good way to gauge the quality of a product (Cheng and Janna, 2017: 227)

It is clear that the coefficients of difficulty ranged between (0.26-0.79) with an average of (0.56). Therefore, all items are acceptable, as they were within the reasonable limit, as (Bloom) considers that items are valid for application if they are within the reasonable limit if the difficulty coefficient ranges between (0.84-0.20)

**Item discrimination** refers to how successfully a test distinguishes those who know or can do something from those who don't (i.e., high performers from low performers) (Cheng and Janna, 2017: 227)

The  discrimination coefficients ranged between (0.31-0.77) with an average of (0.60). Therefore, all items are acceptable, as it is indicated that the item is good and desirable if the degree of discrimination exceeds (0.20).

**Effectiveness of the incorrect alternatives**

When calculating the effectiveness of the incorrect alternatives for the items of the objective test, the researcher found that it is ranged within (0.11 - 0.26). This means that the incorrect alternatives have attracted more students from the lower group than the students of the upper group, and thus it was decided to keep the incorrect alternatives as they are.

**Table (10)**

| Effectiveness of the incorrect alternatives | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| A | B | C | D |
| 0.19- | | 0.22- | 0.07- |
| 0.26- | 0.15- | | 0.04- |
| | 0.15- | 0.19- | 0.07- |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0.11- | | 0.15- | 0.07- |
| | 0.19- | 0.11- | 0.19- |
| 0.07- | 0.04- | 0.22- | |
| 0.19- | 0.22- | | 0.04- |
| 0.15- | 0.07- | 0.15- | |
| | 0.19- | 0.15- | 0.11- |
| 0.22- | 0.15- | | 0.04- |

## Reliability of the test

Reliability is concerned with the consistency, stability, and dependability of the assessment outcomes. This quality criterion protects our assessments against a variety of faults. For example, dependability is a measure of how often we are to make mistakes while grading pupils' written work (Cheng and Janna, 2017: 228).

There are more than one method for calculating the reliability of the test. The researcher used the re-correction method, which is explained below:

## Reliability of scoring

In order to ensure the reliability of the test correction, the researcher used the Pearson correlation coefficient as a statistical method for calculating the reliability of the achievement test correction. He followed two types of correction agreement methods:

1. Reliability over time:
   Two weeks after the first correction, the researcher re-corrected the answer-sheets without placing a sign or mark indicating the correction.

The correlation coefficient reached (0.93) as shown in Table (11 )

2. Reliability with another rater:
   To extract the reliability of the test correction with another rater, the same answer-sheets were corrected by another rater who has experience in correcting the test. The correlation coefficient reached (0.86).

Table (11)

| Test | Reliability over time | Reliability with another rater |
|---|---|---|
| Achievement test | 0.93 | 0.86 |

## Results Presentation and Discussion

## Presentation of Results

## First: Results related to the first null hypothesis:

1. To verify the results of the first null hypothesis, which states that (there is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the average scores of the experimental group students who studied the translation subject by the collaborative writing method and the scores of the control group students who studied the same subject by the traditional way in the post-achievement test). The researcher applied the post-achievement test to the students of the experimental and control groups, and after correcting and analyzing the answers statistically, the arithmetic mean, variance and standard deviation of the students of the two research groups were extracted.

By using the t-test for two independent samples, it became clear that there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the experimental group at the level (0.05). It appeared that the average scores of the experimental group students were (39.62) and a standard deviation of (3.45), while the average scores of the control group students were (34.49) and a standard deviation of (4.42) and the calculated t-value (5.99) which was greater than the tabulated t-value (1.98), with a degree of freedom (85). Table (12 ) illustrates:

**Table (12 )**

**Results of the t-test for two independent samples of the two research groups in the achievement test**

| Groups | Sample | Mean | SD | D. of Freedom | t-value | | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Calculated | Tabulated | Statistically significant |
| Experimental | 42 | 39.62 | 3.45 | 85 | 5.99 | 1.98 | |
| Control | 45 | 34.49 | 4.42 | | | | |

It is noted from the previous table and chart that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the students of the two research groups in the achievement test in favor of the experimental group.

This result indicates the superiority of the students of the experimental group who studied according to the collaborative writing method over the students of the control group who studied according to the traditional method in the achievement test. Therefore, the first null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

2. **Indication of the effect size (the extent of effectiveness) of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Academic Achievement):**

The researcher used the (eta) square equation to extract the effect size ($\eta^2$) of the independent variable on the dependent variable, and the effect size was ($\eta^2$) (0.3), which is an appropriate value to explain the effect size and by a (large) amount for the teaching variable by the collaborative writing in the achievement test in favor of the experimental group, and as shown in the table (13 ), the researcher relied on Cohen sequencing set by Cohen (Cohen, 1988). Table ( 14) clarifies:

**Table ( 13 )**

**Effect size of Collaborative writing on Academic Achievement**

| Independent Variable | Dependent Variable | Effect Size Value) $\eta^2$( | Effect Size Quantity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collaborative Writing | Academic Achievement | 0.3 | Big |

**Table ( 14  )**
**Effect size values according to Cohen's classification**

| Effect size values | Significance |
|---|---|
| (0,06 -0,01) | Small |
| (0,13 -0,06) | Medium |
| (0,14)  and more | Big |

**Second: Results related to the second null hypothesis:**

1. To verify the results of the second null hypothesis, which states that (there is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the average scores of the experimental group students who studied the translation subject by the collaborative writing method and the scores of the control group students who studied the same subject by the traditional way in the pre- and post-achievement tests). The researcher applied the pre- and post-achievement tests to the students of the experimental group, and after correcting and analyzing the answers statistically, the arithmetic mean, variance and standard deviation of the students of the research group were extracted.

By using the t-test for two correlated samples, it became clear that there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the experimental group at the level (0.05). It appeared that the average scores of the experimental group students in the achievement pre-test (31.88) and a standard deviation (5.01), while the average scores of the experimental group students in the achievement posttest were (39.62) and a standard deviation (3.45). The calculated T value (15.48) was greater than the tabulated t. value which is (2.02) with a degree of freedom (41). This indicates the

superiority of the experimental group after conducting the experiment and introducing the independent variable (collaborative writing) on them. Therefore, the second null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Table (15) shows that:

**Table (15)**

**The mean and the t-value (calculated and tabulated) for the scores of the (experimental) group students in the pre and post achievement test**

| Group | Sample | Test | Mean | SD | D. of Freedom | t-value | | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Calculated | Tabulated | Statistically significant |
| Experimental | 42 | Pre-test | 31.88 | 5.01 | 41 | 15.48 | 2.02 | |
| | | Posttest | 39.62 | 3.45 | | | | |

It is noted from the previous table and chart that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the students of the experimental research group in the (pre- and post-achievement) tests in favor of the post-achievement test. Therefore, the second null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

2. **Indication of the effect size (the extent of effectiveness) of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Achievement)/ Pre- and Post- tests of the experimental group**

The researcher used Cohen's equation to extract the effect size (d) for the independent variable in the dependent variable (achievement). The effect size (d) reached (2.39), a value that explains the effect size of (large) for the teaching variable (collaborative writing) method in developing students' achievement. Table (16)clarifies. The researcher relied on the hierarchy set by Cohen (Cohen, 1988). Table (17) explains:

**Table ( 16 )**

**Effect size of the independent variable (Collaborative writing) on the dependent variable (Academic Achievement)**

| Independent Variable | Independent Variable | Effect size value | Effect size quantity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collaborative Writing | Academic Achievement | 2.39 | Big |

**Table ( 17  )**

**Effect size values according to Cohen's classification**

| Effect size values | Significance |
|---|---|
| (0,4 -0,2) | Small |
| (0,7 -0,4) | Medium |
| (0,8)   and more | Big |

**Third: Results related to the third null hypothesis:**

1- To verify the results of the third null hypothesis, which states that (there is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the average scores of the students of the control group who study translation subject by the traditional way in the achievement (pre- and post) tests), the researcher applied the pre- and post-achievement tests to determine the value of development in the achievement of the students of the control group. After correcting and analyzing the answers statistically, the arithmetic mean, variance and standard deviation of the students of the two research groups were extracted

By using the t-test for two correlated samples, it became clear that there was no statistically significant difference at the level (0.05), so it appeared that the average scores of the control group students in the pre-achievement test were (33.69) with a standard deviation of (6.79), while the average scores of the same group reached (34.49) with a standard deviation of (4.42) in the post-achievement test. The calculated t-value (1.95) was smaller than the tabulated t-value (2.01) with a degree of freedom (44), which means that there is no statistically significant difference in favor of the posttest in the control group. This indicates that this result does not indicate any growth in the creative writing skills of the students of the control group, who studied according to the traditional way. Therefore, the third null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Table (18) illustrates this.

**Table (18)**

**The mean and the t-value (calculated and tabulated) for the scores of the (control) group students in the pre and post achievement test**

| Group | Sample | Test | Mean | SD | D. of Freedom | t-value | | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Calculated | Tabulated | Statistically not significant |
| Control | 45 | Pre-test | 33.69 | 6.79 | 44 | 1.95 | 2.01 | |
| | | Posttest | 34.49 | 4.42 | | | | |

From the previous table and chart, we can note that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the students of the control group in the (pre- and post-achievement) tests. Therefore, the third null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

**2. Indication of the effect size (the extent of effectiveness) of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Achievement)/ Pre- and Post- tests of the control group**

The researcher used Cohen's equation to extract the effect size (d) for the independent variable on the dependent variable (achievement). The effect size (d) was (0.29), a value that explains the size of the effect and by an amount (small) for the teaching variable by the traditional way in reference to the achievement variable. Table (19) clarifies. The researcher relied on the hierarchy established by Cohen (Cohen, 1988). Table (20) shows that:

**Table ( 19 )**

**Effect size of the independent variable on the dependent variable (Academic Achievement)**

| Independent Variable | Independent Variable | Effect size value | Effect size quantity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Traditional way | Academic Achievement | 0.29 | Small |

**Table (20 )**
**Effect size values according to Cohen's classification**

| Effect size values | Significance |
|---|---|
| (0,4 -0,2) | Small |
| (0,7 -0,4) | Medium |
| (0,8) and more | Big |

**Conclusions**

The outcomes of this article support the use of Collaborative Writing Strategies (CWSs) in translation instruction. Furthermore, the study discovered that translation students had a wide range of responses to collaborative writing, with the minority preferring to work alone. The data also demonstrated that the majority of translation students understood and acknowledged the need of discussing and arguing their rendition duties with their partners.

**Suggestions for Further Studies:**

1. The Effect of Collaborative Writing on College EFL Learners' Capability in Essays Writing.
2. The Role of Collaborative Writing Strategies in Enhancing EFL Learners' Researching Abilities.

**References:**

1. AlKhattat, Attiah (2016) Series of Lectures presented to the post-graduate students.

2. Alwaleedi, Mohammed Ali (2018) Collaborative Writing in Arabic as a Second Language (ASL) Classrooms in Saudi Arabia: A Mixed-method Study. The university of Queenland.

3. Brown, H. Douglas and Priyanvada Abeywickrama (**2010**) *Language assessment (Principles and Classroom practice)* 2nd edition. Pearson education, Longman: America.

4. Cheng, Liying and Janna Fox (2017) Assessment in the Language Classroom Teachers Supporting Student Learning. Macmillan education.

5. Coombe, C, Keith Folse and Nancy Hubley (**2010**) *A practical guide to assessing English language learners*. Michigan teacher training.

6. Fives, Helenrose and Nicole Barnes (2018) The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation. SAGE Publications, Inc.

7. Fraenkel, J. R. and Norman E. Wallen (**2006**) *How to design and evaluate research in education* 6th edition. McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.

8. Hassan, Mahmood UI (2019) Achievement tests and optimal design for pretesting of questions. Stockholm University.

9. Mousavi, Seyyed Abbas (**1999**) *A dictionary of language testing* 2nd edition. Rahnama Publications.

10. Noori, Abdullah (2021) Glossary of Key Terms in Educational Research. Kabul University.

11. Sipayung, Kammer Tuahman (2016) THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COLLABORATIVE WRITING METHOD TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING OF DESCRIPTIVE GENRE AT SMP NEGERI 3 PERCUT SEI TUAN ON GRADE VIII AT THE ACCADEMIC YEAR 2015/2016. JURNAL Suluh Pendidikan FKIP-UHN ISSN: 2356-2595 Volume-3, Edisi-1, Maret 20156 Halaman 88-99.

12. Sukirman (2016) Using Collaborative Writing in Teaching Writing. Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teachinng Science, IAIN Palopo. LANGKAWI, Vol. 2 No. 1, Mei 2016 ISSN: 2460-2280

13. Tavakoli, Hossein. (2012). A Dictionary of Research Methodology and Statistics in Applied Linguistics. Tehran: Rahnama Press.

14. Tutorial points (2016) Collaborative Writing.

15. VandenBos, Gary R. (2015) APA Dictionary of Psychology. American Psychological Association.