The Impact of Collaborative Instruction on Enhancing EFL Learners' Writing Proficiency

Zahra TALEBİ[1]

[1] *English Translation and Interpreting Studies, Gelişim University, İstanbul, Türkiye*   0000-0002-0558-7790

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Writing is an important communicative language skill. It is an activity that requires a mental effort to "think out" the sentences and the ways of joining them to be meaningful and communicative. The present study was set up to the effectiveness of collaborative instruction on developing EFL students' writing ability and also to delve into their attitudes towards it. For this purpose, 30 EFL students(18-25) studying at Gelisim University in Turkey were chosen by quasi-experimental research design with a pre-test, treatment, and post-test design using intact EFL classrooms. The obtained data was analyzed using the T-test. The results of the data analysis indicated that there was a positive and significant impact on the development of learners' academic writing skills. Therefore the importance of writing in international communication and the complexity of this skill necessitate the application of appropriate teaching and learning strategies and approaches.

1. Introduction

Writing holds significant importance as a communicative language skill. It is an activity that requires a mental effort to "think out" the sentences and the ways of joining them to be meaningful and communicative. But it is not a skill to be learned in isolation from the other language skills: listening speaking and reading. Writing skill is taught to equip students with the ability to use them in higher education or at work. It is also a good means to express one's needs, feelings, thoughts, and experiences (English General Guidelines and Curricula for the Secondary stage; Moe, 1993, p. 6).

Writing in a second or foreign language is considered a special and unique capability among the four major language skills. Writing tasks in the language learning process as a cognitively demanding activity is highly beneficial for students because it enables them to express their ideas, opinions, and feelings. The L2 linguistic context of authors is entirely different from that of their L1. L1 writers have a greater repertoire of vocabulary knowledge and an intuitive capacity to come up with proper syntax(Hyland, 2003).

The significance of the study lies in its potential to contribute valuable insights to the field of language education, particularly in addressing the persistent issue of inadequate writing proficiency among Turkish EFL students. By exploring the effectiveness of co-teaching as an instructional strategy specifically focused on improving writing ability, this study seeks to fill a gap in the existing literature regarding the application of co-teaching in the context of language learning. Moreover, focus on Turkish EFL students adds a valuable perspective, considering the unique cultural and educational factors that may influence language learning outcomes in this context. Understanding the impact of co-teaching on writing ability among this population can inform instructional practices and curriculum development tailored to the needs of Turkish EFL learners

Despite the significant role of writing in language learning and the challenges and difficulties associated with mastering this skill, EFL students continue to struggle with inadequate proficiency in writing. This deficiency in writing is attributed to various factors including cultural tendencies, educational practices, and individual learner characteristics. While co-teaching has emerged as a potential instructional strategy to address language learning challenges, its effectiveness specifically in improving EFL students' writing ability remains underexplored. Therefore, the problem addressed in this study is twofold: firstly, to investigate whether co-teaching significantly influences Turkish EFL students' writing ability; and secondly, to examine the attitudes of EFL learners toward the effectiveness of collaborative instruction in enhancing their writing skills.

Writing skill is considered by experts and researchers to be one of the most exacting skills in the language learning process (Deane et al., 2008; Richards & Renandya, 2002). The difficulty of writing skills can be attributed not only to the normal need for a good mastery of the target language but also to the necessity of using some special macro strategies such as expressing opinions and constructing and translating sentences (Al-Sobh, 2010). The complex interactions between different aspects of writing e.g., content, lexical items, objectives, mechanics, and organization cause writing skills to be seen as a highly complicated task in academic contexts which can lead to frustration and anxiety for learners (Jahin & Idrees, 2012). Taking the complexity of writing tasks into account, it is widely believed that the majority of language learners suffer from serious deficiencies in achieving a good mastery of this skill(Ong, 2011) (Ong, 2011). Accordingly, researchers and experts need to do their best to find some strategies and techniques to promote this pivotal skill.

The importance of writing in international communication and the complexity of this skill necessitates the application of appropriate teaching and learning strategies or approaches. Therefore, as (Brown, 2001) claims teaching this skill to the learners in a proper way is of utmost importance. The problem learners and teachers usually face is that even in higher levels of education learners suffer from poor writing skills. Thus, learners and teachers need to work harder and more on this complex skill. However, as(Asrobi & Prasetyaningrum, 2017) asserts that we should not think of more practice as the only solution to problems in writing. The problem of poor writing can in be attributed to many factors including teachers' classroom practice Hammadi & Sidek(2015). To get good writing, it needs to be visualized, arranged the thought, composed, studied, and edited, therefore can focus on using language more specifically. Writing is "a complex process composed of many different kinds of activities that eventually result in that product" (Nightingale, 2000, p.135). In the same vein, Nunan (2001) asserts that "producing a coherent, fluent, extended piece of writing is probably the most difficult thing to do in a language learning process. It is something most native speakers never master; thus second language learners' challenges are enormous" (p.271). However, it is one of the vital skills in communication and knowledge organization. In contexts where English is taught as a foreign language, writing is usually overlooked at the elementary stages of learning, (Alagozlu, 2007) associates the writing difficulties experienced by many Turkish students with a cultural tendency to rely on course materials, including course books, reference books, teacher input, and the Internet. She contends that Turkish learners have not developed the ability to judge and question, as the national educational system does little to promote these skills, and Turkish values such as authority, social harmony, and respect for teachers tend to discourage students at all levels from expressing individuality and independent thinking in their writing. Similarly, Sarapli,(2013) explains that discomfort with critical thinking, lack of basic research skills, low levels of English language proficiency, and lack of familiarity with academic writing norms seriously impair the ability of Turkish students at the higher education level to produce quality research texts. Geçikli, (2013) and Candarli & Yuksel, (2012) likewise contend that Turkish Ph.D. students exhibit difficulties adapting to the academic writing genre. In this respect, Geçikli,(2013) raises the concern that Turkish academics may be at a substantial disadvantage when it comes to publishing their research; and they may thus be less likely to reach a desired level of success in their academic careers. Celik et al., (2020) in his research, the Impact of Instructor Feedback on Turkish ELT Graduate Student, demonstrate that the participants found the experience to have a positive impact on the development of their academic writing skills. Some specific suggestions are offered for supporting graduate students in terms of organizing, self-regulation, academic writing standards and evaluation of their own work.

The qualitative scope of the study involves delving into the nuanced experiences, perceptions, and attitudes of Turkish EFL students regarding the effectiveness of co-teaching in improving their writing ability. Through qualitative research methods such as interviews, focus groups, or open-ended surveys, the study aims to

capture the rich, detailed insights of participants regarding their learning experiences within a co-taught writing environment.

Co-teaching is a teaching strategy that requires 2-teachers to collaborate in developing a course syllabus, selecting materials, and assessing students' work. In its general sense, co-teaching refers to an approach in which the process of teaching is carried out by the cooperation of two or more teachers. Various definitions and conceptualizations have been proposed for co-teaching by different researchers. For example, Wenzlaff et al. (2002) defined co-teaching as the presence of two or more individuals who jointly work together collaboratively to achieve an outcome that cannot be possibly attained if the work is done individually. However, it is also described as the shared work of two instructors, one general and the other specialized, to fulfill similar or different teaching responsibilities in the classroom (Gately & Gately, 2001;Gallo-Fox et al., 2005).Cook & Friend,(1995) presented a different view in this respect arguing that co-teaching refers to the mutual presentation of the "substantive instruction" to a group of heterogeneous learners in one classroom. Put in another way, the co-teaching system has been built on a substantial approaches and characteristics which make it distinct from such a conventional interpretation. The nature of co-teaching requires two or more teachers with distinct individual attributes to engage in a teamwork which is the key and crucial factor in construction of an effective partnership by co-teaching. Looking from another points of view, Gallo-Fox et al., (2005) postulated that if the co-teacher would experience a successful sharing of ideas as well as effective teaching, they have to go beyond his/her own individual preferences. In fact, teacher and co-teacher should create a sense of mutual trust, reliance, and honesty to each other through which they can cope with personal anxieties and dilemmas, as well as create an atmosphere which elicit cooperation.

The construction of team for co-teaching depending on the co-teachers' characteristics, teaching objective and student needs can be done in various manners. For example, the co-teaching team can be formed by cooperation of a science teacher with a non-science, or a special needs teacher with a general teacher. According to Roth,(2007), the co-teaching and cooperation of a student teachers with an experienced teacher can provide them with golden opportunities to gain new insights and experiences in teaching science and to foster the learning of high school students.

 The use of co-teaching as an EFL instruction originates from the practice of taking this approach among general education teachers. Roth et al. (2002) state that co-teaching is an efficient way to harness the strengths of two teachers with different expertise. By working together, co-teachers are able to adjust themselves to better meet students' needs. In addition, co-teaching makes it feasible for both teachers to have more opportunities of learning to teach, therefore greatly facilitating their professional development (Roth et al., 2004). In a co-taught class, the varying talents, abilities and strengths of each teacher could interact (Sandholtz, 2000).

In a research on the effectiveness of co-teaching, Wang et al.,(2021) investigated the impact of this teaching approach on the EFL students' language learning achievements and performance which encompasses the mastery of four language skills. To this end, a six-week intervention was carried out on 24 EFL students. The obtained findings suggested that those students who were taught English using co-teaching procedure indicated much better performance in language tests and achieve better outcomes in this regard compared to those EFL students who undergone the traditional teaching procedures with one teacher. These findings revealed that a well-organized co-teaching programs could provide an effective support for students in the classroom settings, which in turn could lead to better or quality learning. In a similar study, Rao & Yu, (2021) explored the influence of using co-teaching approach on the Chinese EFL learners' English proficiency, and determine the learners' attitudes on this mode of teaching. To do so, two teachers, one native and the other non-native English teacher, were selected as co-teachers. Three co-teaching models were employed in this study including: (1) one instructing/one helping, (2) group instruction, and (3) station instruction. The results of this study showed that co-teaching approach exert considerably positive influence on the EFL students' English proficiency. The results of the questionnaire also revealed that a large portion students have positive tendencies toward this teaching approach and attributed the efficiency of co-teaching to three beneficial aspects of it which are pleasant linguistic atmosphere, complementary teaching behaviors, and enjoyable cultural environment.

Aliakbari & Mansouri Nejad, (2010) examined the impact of co-teaching on the EFL students' grammar proficiency. In order to fulfill the purpose of this study, 58 EFL students were selected from junior high school and were assigned to two groups. In the experimental group, grammar was instructed through co-teaching approach, while control group received traditional instruction. It was found that using co-teaching in the classroom did not significantly impacted EFL learners' grammatical achievement.

The effectiveness of co-teaching has also been explored in technology-based instruction.Jang, (2006) using a quasi-experimental method combined the technology-based instruction with co-teaching in seventh-grade science classes. To do so, the four selected science classes were further subdivided into two groups. The results revealed considerable development in the participants' academic achievement when web-based instruction was integrated with coteaching. The above-mentioned studies have explored and analyzed the effect of co-teaching on students' grammar proficiency, reading comprehension, math achievement, English proficiency, discipline, attendance, and etc. However, this study was set up to investigate the effectiveness of co-teaching on developing EFL students' writing ability and also to delve into their attitudes towards co-teaching. Therefore, in the current study researchers formulated these questions:

- Does co-teaching significantly affect Turkish EFL students' writing ability?
- What is the attitude of EFL learners towards the effectiveness of co-teaching to improve their writing ability?

2. Methodology

2.1.Research Model

The present study employed a quasi-experimental research design with a pre-test, treatment, and post-test design using intact EFL classrooms. Learners in one intact class formed an experimental group and received treatment, while the second group served as a control group. The study was an attempt to examine the effect of a co-teaching (team-based) approach on EFL learner's achievement. The teachers divided their classes into two groups. The first group was taught by a sole teacher (the control group), and the second one was enrolled in a co-teaching method (the experimental group). At the end of the course, their grades were examined by a t-test, and their results were compared to see the differences between the two groups. To investigate learners 'perceptions, a semi-structured interview was conducted, comprising three general questions. These questions aimed to elicit students' insights and opinions regarding the implementation of collaborative writing in the learning process.

2.2. Study Groups

The participants of this study were two groups of 30 students (ages,18-29) from a university in Turkey with an Academic Writing textbook Hogue et al., (2014), *Longman Academic Writing Series*. Pearson as the syllabus of the researcher to fulfill the purpose of design in research. The textbook contained several chapters about different types of essays and detailed explanations on various subjects, from how to write different types of essays to how to do research, paraphrasing, and summarizing. The subjects were asked to write three essay compositions on three different topics. The topics of compositions were about the kinds of problems that they have had with nonverbal communication in English. Both researchers pointed out that in their writing assignments, students wrote about one topic, controlling ideas about the topic, main points of support and supporting details, and a conclusion.

2.3. Data Collection Tools and Procedure

Writing pretest and posttest Pretest and posttests were reviewed by two writing experts who were professors of TEFL to ensure their validity. The tests consisted of three topics and each participant was supposed to write a well-formed composition. The allotted time for each task was 25 minutes. It should be noted here that the writing task was assessed by Cambridge IELTS task 2 writing band description. There are four criteria to assess an essay writing task including task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy. Each criterion was awarded a band score from 0 to 9. The criteria were weighted equally.

In addition to the quantitative phase, a semi-structured interview was conducted to delve into the students' overall attitudes toward the implementation of co-teaching. It was designed by the researcher in the form of a semi-structured open-ended interview with 15 items. According to Dörnyei, (2014), a semi-structured

interview encompasses some prescribed items and questions that the interviewer should be about to go through with the task and allow the respondent to talk about particular subjects. Some sessions were conducted in focus group sessions to find out teachers' opinions about the details of the study. It should be mentioned that to ensure the validity of the research instruments, they were reviewed by three language experts, and their comments were utilized in the final draft. Moreover, utilizing Cronbach Alpha, the overall reliability of research instruments was evaluated and reported to stand at .81.

The research was implemented to examine the co-teaching effect on students' writing. To this end, two groups of EFL learners were selected from two language classes based on convenience random sampling. Although the participants' proficiency level had already been determined, OPT was used to further ensure the overall proficiency level of students. Before the study, the pretest was run to assess the participants' overall writing ability. The experimental group went through an eight-week instructional period and the class was held for one hour and 20 minutes. As stated earlier, the co-teaching model for the current study was team teaching. Based on this technique, two language instructors with the same language experience and academic degree collaborated to instruct and run a writing class. They gave instruction mutually and simultaneously and ran the class based on pre-designed planning and organization. During the study, the two classes were assigned to one control group in which traditional writing instruction was delivered by a single teacher and one experimental group in which two instructors were involved in teaching activities at the same time. one teacher instructed while the other noted students' errors and comments and provided feedback and assistance. At other times, one specific instructor explained class activities and divided students into groups of two or three and monitored their activities and performance while the other instructor evaluated and assessed their writing performances based on pre-determined criteria. In both groups, the teacher used a textbook and some text passages as the teaching materials to develop students' comprehension abilities. As it was put forward previously, class A (the control group) underwent traditional writing instruction by only one teacher. The instructor in the control group did his best to teach the same materials, however, he was short of time to handle all class activities at once. He postponed feedback provision to later and assigned students some tasks to do outside the class as he ran short of time and couldn't manage all classroom procedures and tasks. In terms of evaluation and assessment, the teacher in the control group was unable to provide online feedback so the essays had to be delivered for later correction and there could be no on-the-spot correction and feedback. students in the control group also had fewer opportunities to work in pairs groups and had little time to interact with the writing instructor about their problematic areas and issues with pedagogic tasks. Instructors neither can give feedback to all students nor correct them while teaching new materials, subjects, etc. In sharp contrast, the adoption of the co-teaching technique provided ample opportunities for learners to communicate with the instructor as well as with one another and their peers about their writing problems. Moreover, students could be better engaged in classroom activities and well-monitored and evaluated by the two instructors. Finally, a writing posttest was administered to see how different the two groups were concerning their written performances.

2.4. Data Analysis

In this study, SPSS software was utilized to analyze the quantitative data. All the data were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis, where descriptive statistical procedures and further calculations were carried out. The pretest and posttest scores from both the control and experimental groups were compared to assess the impact of co-teaching on students' writing ability. T-test was used to analyze the differences in writing performance between the two groups.

Qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews and focus group sessions were analyzed using thematic analysis. This involved coding the data to identify recurring themes and patterns related to students' and teachers' attitudes toward co-teaching and its effectiveness in improving writing skills. Moreover, utilizing Cronbach Alpha, the overall reliability of research instruments was evaluated and reported to stand at .81.

2.6. Ethical

The researcher took every step possible to guarantee that all participants had complete privacy before and after the data collection. At the beginning of the first session and before the pretest, the researcher explained all of the research objectives of the 8 sessions of instruction during the treatment to all of the participants and ensured that everyone's identity would remain confidential. the researcher ensured that any observed

evaluation either in pre- and post-test or during the whole process of research only would be used for the research.

3. Findings

Comparing the pre-test scores

Table 1. The Descriptive Statistics Indices of Writing Pretest for Control And Experimental Groups

	Grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Writing Pre-test	Experimental	29	54.34	2.446
	Control	30	60.14	3.973

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics indices of the writing pretest scores for the control and experimental groups in the research study. The table includes the number of participants (59), the mean scores, and the standard deviations for each group. The analysis compares the writing pretest scores between the control group (mean = 60.14, SD = 3.973) and the experimental group (mean = 54.34, SD = 2.446) using an independent sample t-test to examine any observed differences in writing proficiency between the two groups.

Table 2. Independent Samples T-Test Comparing Groups' Performance on the Writing Pre-Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				t-test for Equality of Means					%95 Confidence	
		F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean	Std. Error	Lower	Upper
Writing Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	.41	.657	-.477	57	.364	-3.962	.374	-.893	.532
	Equal variances not assumed			-.476	39.043	.359	-4.529	.363	-.941	.518

According to table 2, the observed t was .477 and the observed significance level was .36 which was far above the critical value 0.05. Therefore, it can be argued that the observed t was not significant and it can be inferred that there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores obtained from these two classes in pre-test.

After being informed of the Experimental and Control Groups ' homogeneity with regard to their writing skill in the target language (English), the researcher began applying intervention, i.e. using team teaching technique to instruct the experimental group for **12** sessions. The post-test was then carried out for both groups. Comparison was made to address the study's research question and examine the effectiveness of learner writing strategies promoting their pre- and post-test scores. Once again, an inter-rater relationship was determined using the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation before evaluating the scores.

Table 3. Correlation Coefficient for the Writing Post-Test

		Rater One	Rater Two
Rater One	Pearson Correlation	1	.81
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	59	59
Rater Two	Pearson Correlation	.79	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	

The researcher used the same technique as used for the pre -test inter-rater reliability to check for the inter-rater reliability in the post-test. As it is shown in table 3, the correlation between the scores scored by the raters was performed to the Pearson Product-Moment. A statistically significant coefficient correlation of .79 was obtained indicating a high degree of go-to-togetherness between the given scores by the two raters.

Comparing the pre-test and post- test scores

The researcher compared participants pre and post test score to find the answer to the proposed research question, whether the used strategy was effective in improving learners' writing performance. The results are shown in the following tables.

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics of the Results of the Pre and Posttest of Experimental Group*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pair	29	58.23	2.327
	29	71.12	3.446

Based on the data shown in Table 4, in pre- and post-test the mean scores were 58.23 and 71.12 for the experimental group. Clearly, there was a considerable difference between the mean results of the post-test and the related pre-test scores. To check that the reported discrepancy is statistically significant, a paired sample t-test was conducted to compare the mean scores in the pre- and post-writing test to show the efficacy of co-teaching.

Table 5. *Paired Samples t-test for the Experimental Groups' Performance on the Pre and Post-tests*

	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	p
				Lower	Upper			
Experimental Pre-test /Post-test	-15.97	2.313	.347	-5.657	-4.272	46.15	28	.014

Based on the results, it was determined that the difference between the group's mean scores was statistically significant as the degree of significance (p = .01) was less than .05. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, it was concluded that the participants were able to improve their writing performance when taught using a co-teaching strategy.

Table 6. *Descriptive Statistics of the Results of the Pre And Post-Test of Control Group*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pair	30	59.15	4.561
	30	69.35	3.198

Table 6 displays the descriptive statistics of the pre and post-test results for the control group in the research study. The table includes the number of participants (30), the mean scores, and the standard deviations for both the pre-test(59.15) and post-test(69.35) assessments. This analysis provides insights into the change in writing proficiency within the control group over the course of the study.

Table 7. *Paired Samples T-Test for the Control Groups' Performance on the Pre And Post-Tests*

	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	p
				Lower	Upper			
Control Pre-test / Post-test	-8.87	3.314	.643	-5.547	-4.457	-11.943	28	.34

In order to testify the significance of the observed difference and hence to check the writing performance of the control group, the researcher adopted a paired samples t-test analysis to compare the mean scores. Based on the results, the difference between the mean scores was statistically significant since the significance level equaled 0.034 which was less than 0.05. Hence, it was concluded that the participants in control group also were able to improve their writing performance when being taught by a single teacher. However, due to the significance of the performance difference within both groups, the researcher compared the post-tests of both groups taking writing homogeneity of all participants.

 Comparing the Post-Test Scores

As within group comparison confirmed; co-teaching approach helped the participants improve their writing. Due to the fact that the teaching approach in both groups were successful in improving participants' performances, the researcher decided to compare their post-test performances since before treatment they were homogenous in terms of writing ability. The post-tests' descriptive and analytic statistics are presented in the Tables 8 and 9, respectively.

Table 8. *Descriptive Statistics of the Results of The Post-Test of Experimental and Control Groups*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental Post-test	29	74.034	3.123
Control Post-test	30	69.672	3.102

The study measured the post-test mean scores at the end of the course when both classes had completed the treatment period to demonstrate that the applicable techniques influenced the writing of the subjects equally. The descriptive indices of these scores are shown in Table 8. As shown in this table, there was a slight difference in two groups' mean scores of post-tests.

Table 9. Independent Sample T-Test Comparing Groups' Performance pn The Writing Post-Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					%95 Confidence	
		F	Sig.	t	df	p	Mean	Std. Error	Lower	Upper
Writing Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	.25	.534	-.337	67	.033	2.671	.561	-.768	.623
	Equal variances not assumed			-.352	35.827	.·033	2.671	.557	-.753	.621

In order to testify the significance of the observed difference the researcher adopted an independent t-test analysis to compare the mean scores. The results are shown in table 9.The findings showed a considerable differential on outperformance between the experimental and control groups [t (69) = -. 337, p = .033], which means that co-teaching has been much more successful in improving the overall writing ability of the treatment group.

4. Discussion

Based on the results it was found out that there was no significant difference of mean between the pretest scores of both groups. In other words, there was evidence indicating that the ability of students' writing ability of the experimental group was similar to the control group before the treatment was given. Furthermore, upon administering the post-tests to measure the students' writing ability after the treatment, results indicated that the experimental group tests scores improved significantly. In contrast, no statistical improvement was displayed on the control group scores. Moreover, the mean of post-test scores of the experimental group, 74.034 surpassed the control group 69.672. Based on the statistical comparison of the two means, the results indicated a significant difference (p<0/05). It is concluded that the learners in the experimental writing class whose course was taught by co-teachers, performed remarkably better than learners who experienced the reading class course in the control class with single teacher. One important aspect of the result was that the whole individuals in the experimental group benefited from the alternative teaching strategy. It can thus be concluded that the learners' engagement and the use of multiple teachers and various opportunities can enhance classroom performance and encourage greater student participation to a great extent. This findings are in line with (Aminloo, 2013; Anggraini et al., 2020).

The result research of Anggraini et al. (2020) rvealed that collaborative writing strategy has helped students in generating their writing ideas and activating the students' background knowledge of the topics assigned to them to develop in their writings. The result of this study also highlights the students' positive perception on collaborative writing strategy. Aminloo (2013) showed that both the treatment group and the control group improved significantly from the beginning to the end of the instruction, However, the two groups showed a significant difference in their posttest.

According to the survey findings and interview responses, the majority of participants displayed a favorable perception of collaborative writing in various aspects of the classroom experience. In terms of motivation, students reported an enhanced sense of confidence in their English writing abilities through collaborative writing. This finding aligns with previous research by Anggraini et al.,(2020), which also observed improved self-confidence among subjects engaged in collaborative writing, and Yong's (2006) proposition that collaboration nurtures self-assurance. The respondents largely agreed that collaborative writing provided them with valuable opportunities to discuss the most effective ways to express their ideas using the target language, covering aspects like grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and spelling, among others. This aligns with similar instances of language or language-related episodes identified in Swain (2007), which have been utilized as a variable in various studies on collaborative writing. These episodes have been shown to correlate with the quality of written text produced, as demonstrated in studies such as Watanabe and Swain (2007). Moreover, the interview responses indicated that collaborative writing positively influenced the respondents' grammar skills.

Overall, the participants' positive perceptions of collaborative writing suggest that it not only enhances

motivation and self-confidence in writing but also facilitates valuable discussions and improvements in language usage, contributing to an overall positive impact on their writing abilities.

5. Conclusion

The findings of this research highlighted the positive and meaningful impact of the co-teaching method on the writing skills of Turkish English learners. Additionally, the results demonstrated a significant difference between the effects of co-teaching and traditional teaching on students' writing abilities. The data analysis revealed that co-teachers were more successful in enhancing the overall writing proficiency of the treatment group. Consequently, it can be inferred that alternative language teaching, such as co-teaching, can be more beneficial for learners participating in co-taught classes. It is important to note that while this study emphasizes the positive effects of the alternative teaching strategy, its outcomes may vary in different contexts. Implementing the co-teaching model effectively requires collaborative efforts between co-teachers to design appropriate instructional programs and materials that facilitate the learning process without overwhelming the students.

Moreover, the research suggests that further studies should explore additional variables that may influence the effectiveness of co-teaching methods, such as cultural factors, gender differences, and the learners' proficiency levels. In doing so, a more comprehensive understanding of the benefits and limitations of co-teaching can be gained, leading to informed decisions and improvements in language education practices.

6. References

Al-Sobh, M. A. M. (2010). *Designing a web-based writing instructional EFL program and measuring its effects on enhancing the process and performance of the jordanian secondary students* [Unpublished Dissertation]. Yarmouk University

Alagozlu, N. (2007). Critical thinking and voice in EFL writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*, 118–136.

Aliakbari, M., & Mansouri Nejad, A. (2010). Implementing a co-teaching model for improving EFL learners' grammatical proficiency. *Proceedings of the International Conference ICT for Language Learning 3rd Edition, Florence, Italy*.

Al-Hammadi, F., & Sidek, H. M. (2015). An Analytical framework for analysing secondary EFL writing curriculum: Approaches for writing and preparation for higher education. *International Education Studies*, *8*(1), 59-70.

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.

Anggraini, R., Rozimela, Y., & Anwar, D. (2020). The effects of collaborative writing on EFL learners' writing skills and their perception of the strategy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *11*(2), 335–341.

Asrobi, M., & Prasetyaningrum, A. (2017). Trait based assessment on teaching writing skill for EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 10*(11), 199–203.

Boland, D., E., Alkhalifa, K., B., & Al-Mutairi, M., A. (2019). Co-teaching in EFL classroom: The promising model. *English Language Teaching*, *12*(12), 95.-117.

Brown, D. K. (2001). The social sources of educational credentialism: Status cultures, labor markets, and organizations. *Sociology of Education*, 19–34.

Candarli, D., & Yuksel, H. G. (2012). Students' perceptions of video-conferencing in the classrooms in higher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *47*, 357–361.

cSarapli, O. (2013). Academic essay writing in Turkish higher education system: Critical thinking or ready-made structure. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*, *4*(2), 143–150.

Celik, S., Makay, O., Yoruk, M. D., Bayzit Kocer, I., Ozdemir, M., Kilic, K. D., Tomruk, C., Bilge, O., Uyanikgil, Y., & Dionigi, G. (2020). A surgical and anatomo-histological study on Transoral Endoscopic Thyroidectomy Vestibular Approach (TOETVA). *Surgical Endoscopy*, *34*, 1088–1102.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *28*.

Deane, P., Odendahl, N., Quinlan, T., Fowles, M., Welsh, C., & Bivens-Tatum, J. (2008). Cognitive models of writing: Writing proficiency as a complex integrated skill. *ETS Research Report Series*, *2008*(2), i--36.

Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Researching complex dynamic systems: Retrodictive qualitative modelling'in the language classroom. *Language Teaching*, *47*(1), 80–91.

Gallo-Fox, J., Scantlebury, K., Wassell, B., Juck, M., & Gleason, S. (2005). Co-teaching: A professional development model of co-respect, co-responsibility, and co-generative dialogues for interns and cooperating teachers. *Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Montreal, Canada*.

Gately, S. E., & Gately Jr, F. J. (2001). Understanding coteaching components. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *33*(4), 40–47.

Geçikli, F. (2013). Relationship of reputation and risk: Strategies for sustainable corporational reputation. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, *3*[4], 87-96.

Hogue, A., Bixby, J., Hogue, A., Butler, L., Oshima, A., Curtis, J., Ravitch, L., & Meyers, A. (2014). *Longman academic writing series*. Pearson.

Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(1), 17–29.

Jahin, J. H., & Idrees, M. W. (2012). EFL major student teachers' writing proficiency and attitudes towards learning English. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Educational \& Psychologic Sciences*, *4*(1), 10–72.

Jang, S.-J. (2006). Research on the effects of team teaching upon two secondary school teachers. *Educational Research*, *48*(2), 177–194.

Nightingale, P. (2000). Improving student writing. In S. Makoni (Ed.), Improving Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: A Handbook for Southern Africa, pp. 131-166). Witwatersrand University Press.

Nunan, D. (2001). *Research methods in language learning.* Cambridge University Press.

Ong, J. (2011). Investigating the use of cohesive devices by Chinese EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *11*(3), 42–65.

Rao, Z., & Yu, H. (2021). Enhancing students' English proficiency by co-teaching between native and non-native teachers in an EFL context. *Language Teaching Research*, *25*(5), 778–797.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.

Roth, W.-M. (2007). Coteaching and cogenerative dialoguing. In *In Search of Meaning and Coherence* (pp. 235–270). Brill.

Wang, M., Gan, Q., & Boland, J. (2021). L2 syntactic alignment in the reading-writing integrated continuation task: Evidence from Chinese EFL learners' description of motion events. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *44*(3), 292–313.