Impact of Collaborative Language Learning on English Language Learners' Essay Writing Skills: Evidence from Intermediate Level Students

Aftab Ahmed[1], Mujib Rahman[2], and Saqlain[3]

Abstract

Crucial aspect of the learning process is the acquisition of a language. In this regard, EFL students must master the four fundamental skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing to gain comprehensive proficiency in a foreign language. This research article endeavors to investigate the influence of collaborative language learning on the writing skills of intermediate students at the educational institutions of district Abbottabad KPK by employing quasi-experimental design and applying collaborative language learning theory in EFL classrooms. The study comprises the conduction of pre-tests on both control and experimental groups, particularly peer learning and collaboration, along with the various stages of writing taught to experimental group students. A post-test was conducted to consider the specific aspects of writing, such as coherence, organization, structure, mechanics, vocabulary and development. The findings, after performing the tests suggests that CLL is a highly impactful as technique of teaching the essay writing skills to the students at the intermediate level because writing skills of the students of collaborative language learning group were more organized, coherent, structured and in compliance with the mechanics. The study also recommends further research on the influence of CLL at the elementary and graduation levels.

Keywords: Collaborative Language Learning, Essay Writing, Paired Square Technique.

Introduction

CLL is a significant approach that brings diverse perspectives to the written content by enhancing the students' creativity. It involves multiple factors, such as harnessing the students' experiences and their various ideas and expertise, leading them towards a more nuanced and richer work. In CLL, each participant of the group or pair can provide critical insight and unique insights which help them explore the topic and rectify their weaknesses in the structure and arguments of the written work.

It is important to note that the craze for a more communicative approach to teaching the language has amplified pair work in the second language contexts (Hawkey, 2004). In this way, the language learners can interact in collaborative situations where two or more students share their activities. In order to develop a conducive situation for cooperative activities, the pairs of learners should have the same academic level in the target language.

[1]*PhD Scholar, Qurtuba University of Science and Technology, Peshawar. Email: aftabkhattak78@yahoo.com*
[2]*Professor, Qurtuba University of Science and Technology.*
[3]*Assistant Professor, Riphah International University, Malakand Campus.*

Concerning the nature of collaboration, Roschelle and Teasley (1995), on the other hand, are of the view that collaboration in writing is a synchronous and coordinated activity that stems from a constant struggle to maintain and build a shared perception of the problem. It has been unveiled that learners can learn effectively in a more learner-centered collaborative learning context than in competitive and individualistic learning environments (p. 69-97). It is essential to highlight that the learners engage actively in collaborative learning settings, focusing on formulating linguistic notions through interaction with fellow learners.

Supporting the stance above, Boud and Soloman (2001) have put forth peer learning as a reliable technique for learning from each other in pairs. Writing is generally regarded as an individual activity that helps transmit ideas from the writer to the reader. However, collaboration in writing has gained increasing attention in language assessment and teaching. In recent times, collaborative writing has emerged as a technique to maximize learners' involvement and engagement in learning the language. It has also appeared to be a purposeful and value-laden communicative objective. This collaboration enables the students to avail themselves of opportunities to interact with each other and challenge their language knowledge in a conducive learning environment. However, this type of collaboration among the students makes writing more complex than individual writing tasks. To remove the complexity, this research article utilizes the pair of writing in which the two students interact and collaborate to create written content. A pedagogical basis focuses on using peer learning techniques and collaborative interactions in terms of a communicative approach that helps the learners enhance their competencies in the target language. The process of cooperative learning can be regarded as a group of a few learners who work as a team to accomplish a common task and endeavor to solve their shared problems. As Graham opines, collaborative learning is dissimilar to traditional learning as it gives certain structural opportunities for the learners who perform their specific roles and work together to achieve a common goal. It is focused on providing particular roles within groups so that they can work together to reach common goals. In a traditional classroom, the students usually learn individually, and their academic performance does not positively or negatively impact their fellow students. However, collaborative learning puts the learners together to work on a shared task (Graham, 2005).

It is essential to highlight that essay writing in Pakistan is an important skill. However, it needs to be given attention in schools and colleges. It is taught using a traditional method with a teacher-centered approach with minimal interaction and involvement of the students. This study is focused on determining the influence of collaborative learning on students' performance in connection with essay writing skills at the intermediate level in public sector schools of district Abbottabad Khyber Pakhtoonkhwa, Pakistan. The primary purpose of this research is to investigate how much collaborative learning effectively teaches essay writing skills at an intermediate level in Pakistan.

Literature Review

English is considered an international language for communication in today's globalized world. There is an urge worldwide to learn English in order to meet the global challenges of the current era. In this connection, writing is often overlooked on account of the impact of the usage of audiolingual methods in the English language. In this way, writing has been given less attention. Writing is a skill that involves learning content and expressing ideas (Foster & Trimm, 2008, p. 1004-1017).

Similarly, it is essential to note that mastery of the art of writing makes students more confident and relaxed about learning a foreign language. It also helps them revise the pattern associated with

speaking skills. Writing requires improvement in basic skills such as spelling, handwriting, vocabulary, and grammar, as well as revision and editing of written texts.

In their research, Koros et al. (2013) investigated the perception of the teachers and students regarding the method utilized in teaching writing skills to students at secondary schools with the participation of 31 teachers and 2580 students. Their research findings reveal that the students need more interest in the traditional method of teaching writing skills, and the teachers were unaware of the innovative method of teaching skills in the language. Similarly, Bing (2013) probed into the endeavors through video games based on action-adventure on the students' writing skills. In this research, a group of four students was exposed to four gaming consoles. By utilizing a pre-experimental design, the post-test result revealed that the video games contained certain interactive elements which had influenced the writing skills of students.

Moreover, in their research, the obstacles and challenges novice academic writers face. They gave some recommendations for these authors to become competent collaborative writers. In this research, the students were tasked to write the outlines, initially in the form of drafts and then the final drafts for the term papers of their academic journey. This research reveals that the students have found the time to write collaboratively. They were able to settle disagreements and handled the disputes amicably. In this way, they had adjusted to the personalities of the others to share the competencies of each other in terms of achieving the desired task of language, which was a challenge for them on the individual level (Shafie et al., 2010, 58-69).

On the other hand, Muslim (2014) conducted a research study to help second-year university EFL students focus on improving their writing skills and removing the fundamental shortcomings in their written content. About 150 second-year female Baghdad University English Department students participated in this research. There was a pre-test, and the students were divided into different groups and advised to cooperate to compete with the other groups. The post-test was also conducted at the end, which helped to find out that the collaboration of the students has a beneficial impact on improving their writing skills. In her research study, Khan (2016) strived to determine the effect of utilizing cooperative learning as a technique of essay writing for university students at the graduation level. The research was conducted on 60 students of a public sector university in Punjab, Pakistan, aged 18 to 20, based on experimental and control groups. The study also concluded that cooperative learning can be applied as an effective technique to teach students essay-writing skills at graduation. The overall performance of the experimental group was significantly better than that of the control group in the post-test.

While taking into account the significant aspects of the literature review of this research study, it emerges that there needs to be more studies regarding collaborative language learning in the Pakistani context. This research article mainly focuses on the essay writing skills of intermediate-level students in the district Abbottabad province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. This research article is critical in the Pakistani context, where most students fail competitive exams every year because of their inefficiency in essay writing skills. The researcher wishes to fill the gap mentioned above through this research article by utilizing the quasi-experimental research design. In this context, the paired t-test has also been applied to this research study's experimental and control groups.

Research Methodology

This research article takes into account the two groups—experimental and traditional groups. The experimental group has the instructions for collaborative learning, while the traditional group has received the usual instruction in a conventional classroom. The comparison of these two groups

has helped to formulate the findings of this study. It is essential to highlight that the students in the experimental group received additional instructions to develop collaboration in terms of essay writing. However, the process approach to essay writing was also imparted to these two groups while they were engaged in essay writing separately. There was a kind of similarity between these two groups. Mitchell and Jolley (1988) believe that a researcher must ensure that the control and experimental groups are equal in terms of competencies. These two groups were equal in terms of their abilities at the start of this study.

Similarly, their backgrounds were almost the same, and they were in the same class and department. The teacher assessed each essay based on Paulus's rubric scales (1999) to evaluate the composition of the students. It helps to investigate the organization and the efficacy of developing the topic. The vocabulary, mechanics, structure, grammar, punctuation, and errors were evaluated. Using Paulus's scale to assess the student's writing proficiency was appropriate. Concerning the holistic analysis, it is believed that the rubric offered both analytical and holistic assessment options. Analytical scoring provides a more in-depth description of each category, whereas holistic scoring refers to the overall evaluation of the work by merging multiple categories into one level (1995). The rubric scale had levels for each category, with 1 being the lowest level and ten being the highest. Paulus's rubric has an advantage compared to other rubrics that use scales of 4, 5, or even six levels. The areas in Paulus's rubric were simple for the reviewers to understand because they were connected to regular teacher evaluation standards, making it simple to explain the outcomes to teachers. The students' essays could be graded on a scale of 1 to 10. For each sub-scale, the overall marking was out of 60.

Paulus's rubric (1999) scales were used to grade the pre-test and post-test essays. Ten near-native expert teachers evaluated all participants' results in both the collaborative and traditional learning groups using the essay-scoring criteria from Paulus (1999). They provided total and analytical ratings using a scale with one as the lowest level and ten as the greatest. A better result on the post-tests would suggest that students had improved. The scoring is as follows:-

Tests of both groups are conducted at pre- and post-level in this research study to assess the improvement due to practice and application of CLL. However, there are two ways of testing this claim: 1) If the improvement were simply the result of practice, this would mean that improvement should be found in the experimental CL group and the control TL group. Hence, a comparison was made between the two groups to see if any differences existed between the essays written by one group and those written by the other. 2) The pre-test was conducted in the first week of the study, while the post-test was administered in the twelfth week; the intervening period was long enough to mean that the students might have forgotten what they had written in their pre-test.

This study is experimental as the students filled out the questionnaires and composed essays at the beginning and conclusion of this study. An eight-week research study was conducted from April to July 2020 at the intermediate-level institutions of district Abbottabad. Equal numbers of students from experimental and traditional groups were chosen for this purpose, and they received the initial training jointly. At the later stage, the control group received the usual instruction from conventional classrooms. In contrast, the experimental group was taught how to collaborate to write a comprehensive essay on a given topic. Analyzing the essays written by both conventional and experimental groups has helped to formulate the findings of this study.

Results and Discussion

The result of the easy writing where there is testing the pre-test and post-test analysis has been conducted for organizations, development, coherence, structure, vocabulary, mechanics, total, and

rubric. The results of all pre-test and post-tests of male experimental for the above categories show a difference between the elements of the pre-test male experimental and post-test experimental. The results of all pre-test and post-tests of the female experimental for rubric categories show a difference between the elements of the pre-test male experimental and post-test experimental. The results of all pre-test male experimental and pre-test male control groups for the above categories show no difference between the elements of the pre-test male experimental and pre-test control. The results of all pre-test female experimental and pre-test female control groups for the above categories show no difference between the elements of the pre-test female experimental and pre-test control. The results of all post-test male experimental and post-test male control groups for the above categories show a difference between the elements of the post-test male experimental and post-test control. The results of all post-test female experimental and post-test female control groups for the above categories show a difference between the elements of the post-test female experimental and post-test control. Furthermore, the results of all pre-test male and pre-test female experimental groups for the above categories show a difference between the elements of the post-test male experimental and pre-test experimental female except for the structure.

Table 1: Pre-test male and female for exp group H:4

Categories	Group	Mean		Correlation	Accepted/R ejected paired t-test	Paired t-test	
		Male Pre Test	Female PRE-Test			Paired t-test	P-Value
Organization	Experimental Group	0.8667	0.9208	0.824	Rejected	-2.737	0.008
Development	Experimental Group	.9292	0.9500	0.903	Rejected	-1.692	0.096
Coherence	Experimental Group	0.8125	0.8875	0.651	Rejected	-3.461	0.001
Structure	Experimental Group	0.7958	0.8458	0.526	Accepted	-1.541	0.129
Vocabulary	Experimental Group	0.9375	0.9625	0.880	Rejected	-1.941	0.057
Mechanics	Experimental Group	0.8475	0.8602	0.966	Rejected	-1.763	0.083
Total	Experimental Group	5.1750	5.4292	0.781	Rejected	-3.662	0.001
Rubric	Experimental Group	4.5500	4.7167	0.734	Rejected	-2.316	0.024

We have observed from the above table that the mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of organization is 0.8667, the mean of pre-test of female of organization is 0.9208. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of organization is 0.824. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.008, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of organization. The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of development is 0.9292, the mean of pre-test of female of development is 0.9500. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of development is 0.903. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.086, which is less than the 10% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of development. The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of coherence is 0.8125, the mean of pre-test of female of coherence is 0.8875. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of coherence is 0.651. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.001, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null

hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of coherence. The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of structure is 0.7958, the mean of pre-test of female of structure is 0.8458. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of structure is 0.526. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.129, which is greater than the 5% significance level, which means that we do not reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of structure. The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of vocabulary is 0.9375, the mean of pre-test of female of vocabulary is 0.9625. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of vocabulary is 0.880. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.057, which is less than the 10% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of vocabulary. The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of mechanics is 0.8475, the mean of pre-test of female of mechanics is 0.8602. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of mechanics is 0.966. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.083, which is less than the 10% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of Mechanics.

The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of total is 5.1750 , the mean of pre-test of female of total is 5.4292. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of total is 0.781. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.001, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of total. The mean of the pre-test of male of the exp gp of rubric is 4.5500 , the mean of pre-test of female of rubric is 4.7167. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for exp gp of rubric is 0.734. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.024, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the exp gps of rubric.

The results of all pre-test male and pre-test female control group for above categories show that there is difference between the elements of the post-test male experimental and pre-test experimental female except the mechanic and organization.

Table 2: Pre-test Male and Female for Control Group

Categories	Group	Mean		Correlation	Accepted/Rejected paired t-test	Paired t-test	
		Pre Test Male	Pre Test Female			Paired t-test	P-Value
Organization	Control group	0.8708	0.8875	0.952	Accepted	-1.657	0.103
Development	Control group	.9333	0.9542	0.923	Rejected	-1.932	0.058
Coherence	Control group	0.8458	0.9542	0.729	Rejected	-2.912	0.005
Structure	Control group	0.8375	0.8958	0.436	Rejected	-1.989	0.051
Vocabulary	Control group	0.9292	0.9583	0.851	Rejected	-2.175	0.034
Mechanics	Control group	0.8375	0.8542	0.938	Accepted	-1.657	0.103
Total	Control group	5.2625	5.4542	0.862	Rejected	-4.052	0.000
Rubric	Control group	4.7000	4.5167	0.826	Rejected	-3.639	0.001

We have observed from the above table that the mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of organization is 0.8708; the mean of pre-test of female of organization is 0.8875. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of organization is 0.952. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control group. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.103, which is greater than the 5% significance level, which means that we do not reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of organization. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of development is 0.9333; the mean of pre-test of female of development is 0.9542. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of development is 0.923. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.058, which is less than the 10% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of development. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of coherence is 0.8458, the mean of pre-test of female of coherence is 0.9542.

The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of coherence is 0.729. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.005, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of coherence. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of structure is 0.8375, the mean of pre-test of female of structure is 0.8958. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of structure is 0.436. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.051, which is less than the 10% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of structure. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of vocabulary is 0.9292; the mean of pre-test of female of vocabulary is 0.9583. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of vocabulary is 0.851. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.034, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of vocabulary. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of mechanics is 0.8375; the mean of pre-test of female of mechanics is 0.8542. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of mechanics is 0.38. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.103, which is greater than the 5% significance level, which means that we do not reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of mechanics. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of total is 5.2625; the mean of pre-test of female of total is 5.4542. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group of total is 0.862. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of Total. The mean of the pre-test of male of the control group of rubric is 4.700; the mean of pre-test of female of rubric is 4.5167. The correlation between the male and female pre-test for control group

of rubric is 0.826. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.001, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we do not reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the pre-test male and female for the control groups of rubric.
The results of all post-test male experimental and post-test female experimental group for above categories show that there is difference between the elements of the post-test male experimental and post-test experimental female.

Table 3: Post-test Male and Female for exp group

Categories	Group	Mean		Correlation	Accepted/ Rejected Paired t-test	Paired t-test	
		Post Test Male	Post Test Female			Paired t-test	P-Value
Organization	Experimental Group	1.3708	1.5083	0.826	Rejected	-5.250	0.000
Development	Experimental Group	1.4167	1.5375	0.822	Rejected	-5.166	0.000
Coherence	Experimental Group	1.3000	1.3458	0.902	Rejected	-3.027	0.004
Structure	Experimental Group	1.2500	1.3000	0.936	Rejected	-3.494	0.001
Vocabulary	Experimental Group	1.4000	1.4958	0.760	Rejected	-4.457	0.000
Mechanics	Experimental Group	1.2667	1.3458	0.805	Rejected	-3.627	.001
Total	Experimental Group	8.0042	8.5333	0.881	Rejected	-6.788	.000
Rubric	Experimental Group	6.6333	7.2000	0.814	Rejected	-7.071	.000

We have observed from the above table that the mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of organization is 1.3708; the mean of post-test of female of organization is 1.5083. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of organization is 0.826. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gp. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of organization. The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of development is 1.4167; the mean of post-test of female of development is 1.5375. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of development is 0.822. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of development. The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of coherence is 1.3000; the mean of post-test of female of coherence is 1.3458. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of coherence is 0.902. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.004, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of coherence. The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of structure is 1.2500; the mean of post-test of female of structure is 1.3000. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of structure is 0.936. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null

hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of structure.

The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of vocabulary is 1.4000; the mean of post-test of female of vocabulary is 1.4958. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of vocabulary is 0.760. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of vocabulary. The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of mechanics is 1.2667; the mean of post-test of female of mechanics is 1.3458. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of mechanics is 0.805. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.001, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of mechanics. The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of total is 8.0043; the mean of post-test of female of total is 8.5333. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of total is 0.881. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of total. The mean of the post-test of male of the exp gp of rubric is 6.6333; the mean of post-test of female of rubric is 7.2000. The correlation between the male and female post-test for exp gp of rubric is 0.814. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypotheses 2 and 4 that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the exp gps of rubric.

The results of all post-test male control and post-test female control group for above categories show that there is difference between the elements of the post-test male experimental and post-test control female except coherence.

Table 5: Post-test Male and Female for Control Group

Categories	Group	Mean		Correlation	Accepted/Rejected Paired t-test	Paired t-test	
		Post Test Male	Post Test Female			Paired t-test	P-Value
Organization	Control Group	1.0705	1.5083	0.378	Rejected	-10.432	0.000
Development	Control Group	1.0958	1.2292	0.767	Rejected	-6.355	0.000
Coherence	Control Group	1.1125	1.1667	0.741	Accepted	0.752	0.455
Structure	Control Group	1.0292	1.1417	0.275	Rejected	-4.985	0.000
Vocabulary	Control Group	1.4000	1.667	0.403	Rejected	6.219	0.000
Mechanics	Control Group	1.2667	1.1292	0.966	Rejected	3.733	0.000
Total	Control Group	6.3833	7.0333	0.804	Rejected	-7.305	0.000
Rubric	Control Group	5.2333	5.9333	0.661	Rejected	-6.884	0.000

We have observed from the above table that the mean of the post-test of male of the control group of organization is 1.0705, the mean of post-test of female of organization is 1.5083. The correlation

between the male and female post-test for control group of organization is 0.378. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control group. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of organization. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of development is 1.0958, the mean of post-test of female of development is 1.2292. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of development is 0.767. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 10% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of development. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of coherence is 1.1125; the mean of post-test of female of coherence is 1.1667. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of coherence is 0.752. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.455, which is greater than the 5% significance level, which means that we do not reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of coherence. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of structure is 1.0292; the mean of post-test of female of structure is 1.1417. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of structure is 0.275. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of structure. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of vocabulary is 1.4000; the mean of post-test of female of vocabulary is 1.667. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of vocabulary is 0.403. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups.

The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of vocabulary. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of mechanics is 1.2667; the mean of post-test of female of mechanics is 1.1292. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of mechanics is 0.966. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of mechanics. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of total is 6.3833; the mean of post-test of female of total is 7.0333. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of total is 0.804. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5% significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups of total. The mean of the post-test of male of the control group of rubric is 5.2333; the mean of post-test of female of rubric is 5.9333. The correlation between the male and female post-test for control group of rubric is 0.661. The paired sample test is used to test the difference between the post-test male and female for the control groups. The probability value of the test statistic is 0.000, which is less than the 5%

significance level, which means that we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the Post-test male and female for the control groups of rubric.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research article was to ascertain and verify the impact of collaborative language learning on the essay writing skills of the intermediate level students of the district Abbottabad KPK. The findings of the research revealed that the students included in the experimental groups on both genders had improved more than the traditional group. The results of the analysis manifests that collaborative language have considerably facilitated the students to bring improvements in connection with the certain aspects of writing such as structure, mechanics, coherence, vocabulary and developments as well. As the students of both the experimental CL and control TL groups were introduced to the process approach to writing for about three months, the writing of the essays was an easier task for them. The analysis manifests that in collaborative learning group students facilitated their struggling fellows with their supporting ideas and appreciation and feedback with a sense of responsibility as well. It appears that the utilization CLL in imparting the essay writing skills makes it an easy task for the students who help their fellows in their shared efforts for the completion of their tasks as well. The result of the post- test manifests that the performance of the students included in experimental group is considerably better than those students in the traditional group in terms of their essay writing skills. While, the students showed their motivation and enthusiasm in connection with the utilization of collaborative language learning in the real classrooms as well. The study also recommends that collaborative language learning is highly beneficial for the teaching of essay writing skills and it should be implemented on the elementary and graduation level as well. Students need to be trained how to work collaboratively in groups. Without training, collaborative learning will not be beneficial. Students would not be able to share with each other in groups if their teachers did not give them practical training in how to work collaboratively. Teachers should therefore train their students to work in groups and also explain to them the importance and benefits of the collaborative learning strategy.

References

- Bing. J.P.K. (2013). Enhancing Narrative writing skills Through Action-Adventure video Games. *Journal of Education and Practice, 4*(I5). Retrieved from www.iiste.org
- Boud, D., & Solomon, N. (2001). *Work-based learning: a new higher education?* McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- Foster, J. D., & Trimm IV, R. F. (2008). On being eager and uninhibited: Narcissism and approach–avoidance motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(7), 1004-1017.
- Graham, D. (2005). *Cooperative Learning Methods and Middle School Students.* Unpublished Ph.D Thesis Capella University.
- Hawkey, R. (2004). *A modular approach to testing English language skills: The development of the Certificates in English Language Skills (CELS) examinations*. Cambridge: UCLES, Cambridge University Press.
- Khan, A. (2016). *Crossing Boundaries: The Role of English Companion Ning (ECN) in the Professional Learning of Pakistani University English Teachers*. University of Rochester.

- Koross, B. T., Indoshi, F. C., & Okwach, T. (2013). Perception of Teachers and Students Towards Methods Used in Teaching and Learning of English Writing Skills in Secondary Schools. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *1*(1), 32-39.
- Mitchell, M., & Jolley, J. (1988). *Research design explained*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston Inc.
- Muslim, I. M. (2014). Helping EFL students improve their writing. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *4*(2), 105-112.
- Roschelle, J., &Teasley, S. D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving. *Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 69-97.
- Shafie, L. A., Maesin, A., Osman, N., Nayan, S., & Mansor, M. (2010). Understanding Collaborative Academic Writing among Beginner University Writers in Malaysia. *Studies in Literature and Language*, *1*(2), 58-69.