

اثر برنامج تعليمي قائم على الكتابة التشاركية عبر منصات التعليم الالكتروني في تحسين مهارات الكتابة الابداعية لدى متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

أ.م.د. نادية حميد حسون
جامعة بابل

أ.م.د. منى محمد عباس الخطيب
جامعة بابل / كلية التربية
الاساسية

الباحث: كاظم محمد موسى
جامعة بابل / كلية التربية
الاساسية

البريد الإلكتروني Email : bsc.kadhim.mohammed@uobabylon.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: فاعلية - كتابة تشاركية - تعليم الكتروني - منصات - مهارات الكتابة الابداعية .

كيفية اقتباس البحث

موسى، كاظم محمد، منى محمد عباس الخطيب، نادية حميد حسون ، اثر برنامج تعليمي قائم على الكتابة التشاركية عبر منصات التعليم الالكتروني في تحسين مهارات الكتابة الابداعية لدى متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، مجلة مركز بابل للدراسات الانسانية، تشرين الاول 2022، المجلد: 12، العدد: 4 .

هذا البحث من نوع الوصول المفتوح مرخص بموجب رخصة المشاع الإبداعي لحقوق التأليف والنشر (Creative Commons Attribution) تتيح فقط للآخرين تحميل البحث ومشاركته مع الآخرين بشرط نسب العمل الأصلي للمؤلف، ودون القيام بأي تعديل أو استخدامه لأغراض تجارية.

Registered في مسجلة في
ROAD

Indexed في مفهرسة في
IASJ



The Influence of a Collaborative Writing- Based Instructional Program Delivered Through E-Learning Platforms on Improving Undergraduate EFL Learners' Creative Writing Skills

Kadhim Muhammad
Musa AlShammari

University of Babylon/
College of Basic
Education

Asst.prof. Muna
Mohammed Abbas
AL-Khateeb

University of Babylon/
College of Basic
Education

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nadia
Hameed Hassoon

University of Babylon

Keywords : Effectiveness, Instructional Program, Augmented Reality Technology (ART), Visual Intelligence Skills.

How To Cite This Article

AlShammari, Kadhim Muhammad Musa, Muna Mohammed Abbas AL-Khateeb, Nadia Hameed Hassoon, The Influence of a Collaborative Writing- Based Instructional Program Delivered Through E-Learning Platforms on Improving Undergraduate EFL Learners' Creative Writing Skills, Journal Of Babylon Center For Humanities Studies, October :2022, Volume: 12, Issue 4.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

المستخلص:

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى التحقق من فعالية برنامج تعليمي قائم على الكتابة التشاركية عبر منصات التعلم الإلكتروني في تحسين مهارات الكتابة الإبداعية لمتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. لتحقيق هذا الهدف ، اقترح الباحثون برنامجًا تعليميًا يعتمد على الكتابة التشاركية ليتم اتباعه. تقتصر هذه الدراسة على جامعة بابل - كلية التربية الأساسية - قسم اللغة الإنجليزية للعام الدراسي 2020-2021. وتمثلت العينة بطلبة المرحلة الثالثة في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية / الدراسة الصباحية وعددهم 87 مشاركاً. تم تدريس مفردات منهج الترجمة (الكورس

الثاني) بحسب ما اقرته وزارة التعليم العالي والبحث العلمي. تم تقسيم أفراد العينة إلى مجموعتين. الأولى هي المجموعة التجريبية والتي تكونت من (42) طالباً تم تدريسهم بالاعتماد على الكتابة التشاركية عبر منصات التعلم الإلكتروني (مثل Google Classroom و Telegram). والثانية هي المجموعة الضابطة والتي تكونت من (45) طالبا وطالبة تم تدريسهم بالطريقة الاعتيادية. تم اعتماد التصميم التجريبي لأنه يتناسب مع تحقيق الهدف. قام الباحثون بتطبيق الاختبار البعدي لمهارات الكتابة الإبداعية ، ثم تم تحليل البيانات التي تم جمعها للحصول على النتائج باستخدام أدوات إحصائية مناسبة. تبين أن الكتابة التشاركية تدعم الكتابة الإبداعية لدى الطلبة حيث انها تساعدهم في الاستفادة من القوة المشتركة لجميع أعضائها لإكمال عملهم. أحد أعضاء المجموعة ، على سبيل المثال ، يتفوق في تنظيم الأفكار بينما يتفوق آخر في المفردات. لذلك ، أثناء العمل في وظيفة كتابية ، قد يتعاون الطلبة ويستفيدون من بعضهم البعض.

Abstract

The present study aims at investigating The Effectiveness of an Instructional Program Based on Collaborative Writing Via E-learning Platforms on College EFL Learners' Creative Writing Skills Improvement". To achieve this aim, the researchers proposed an instructional program based on Collaborative Writing to be followed. This 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 terms (for the second course) as recommended by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research are taught. The sample members were divided into two groups. The first group is the experimental which consisted of (42) students who were taught by depending on Collaborative Writing via E-learning platforms (i.e., Google Classroom and Telegram). The second group is the control which consisted of (45) students who were taught by the traditional way. The Experimental design is adopted as it fits with the aim improvement. The researchers Conduct a final administration of the post-test of Creative Writing Skills, then, the collected data were analyzed to get results using suitable statistical tools. It is concluded that collaborative writing has certain advantages for students' creative writing. To begin with, it may assist a group of students in utilizing the combined strength of all of its members to complete their job. One member of the group, for example, excels in organizing thoughts while another excels at vocabulary. So, while



working on a writing job, students may cooperate and profit from each other, the group members.

Introduction

Because writing is the vehicle through which we convey our ideas, thoughts, and feelings, it is the most important of the four language abilities. The goal of writing is to make communication more clear and efficient (Mowla, et al., 2012: 98-9).

Writing is used for a variety of purposes and in a variety of formats (Harmer,1988: 4). In order to complete academic tasks in second language acquisition, students must be able to not only speak, listen, and read, but also write. We can use writing to tell stories about people, recollect information, and express ideas. The writer uses writing to express his thoughts, ideas, and feelings in general. We can communicate our thoughts to anyone by writing them down. Writing is a skill that improves with practice in other skills such as listening, speaking, and reading. This preparation can assist in the productive use of words that have been used receptively (Nation, 2009: 126).

Writing is commonly thought of as a lonely, personal activity. Writing in pairs or small groups is a novel practice, and some teachers have expressed apprehension about using it. Some of this apprehension may arise from the idea of writing as a solitary endeavor, as well as assessment procedures that emphasize individual performance. It might also be due to a lack of understanding of the potential benefits of collaborative writing for language acquisition, as well as how to effectively conduct such writing activities. However, given advancements in Web 2.0 technology, notably the usage of wikis and Google Docs — new collaborative writing platforms - collaborative writing is likely to rise. It is suggested that, in today's technologically advanced society, including computer-mediated activities into language education is no longer a choice but a necessity. According to research on the use of wikis in second language schools, online collaborative writing activities, like face-to-face collaborative writing, require careful planning (Storch, 2013: 22).

The term "creative writing" conjures up images of inventive work. It's been defined as a "journey of self-discovery that leads to successful learning." When creative writing projects are put up, students will work harder than normal to generate a wider range of accurate and suitable vocabulary than they would for a more routine assignment.

Any writing activity, according to the researcher, has the ability to increase a writer's knowledge of the affordances and restrictions of text as

a written product. And, because translation, whatever its form, is a sort of writing, and translators are writers, doing concentrated creative writing activities might potentially improve the translator's capacity to construct acceptable translation solutions from a developmental standpoint. Creative writing, like translating, is not simply an exercise in imagination, but also a discipline in writing for a specific goal.

The concept "collaborative writing" refers to activities in which numerous individuals work together (collaboratively) to generate written works rather than working alone. Some projects are managed by an editor or editorial team, while many others are left to their own devices. Individual writing can result in projects that are deeper and more complicated than collaborative writing. One or more collaborative tasks are common in many learning communities. Writing with others, on the other hand, makes the process more difficult (DiCamilla and M.,1997:610).

It is vital to understand the contextual aspects that impact the dynamics of cooperation and subsequent L2 learning in order to have a thorough knowledge of the prospects that technology-based collaboration may offer for L2 growth (Yin, 2017: 22-7).

1.Language proficiency:

In pair or group writing, interlocutors' language skill is critical. Linguistically varied groups bring to the group endeavor varying degrees of linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic abilities. The degree to which group members interact, accept others' ideas and feedback, manage problems, and, ultimately, learn, is influenced by their level of skill. There is a great need for more research on the role of language proficiency. In same-ability groups, average-ability students contribute more and, as a result, learn more than in mixed-ability groups.

2.Task type:

"A piece of classroom work that engages learners in comprehending, manipulating, creating, or engaging in the target language" is how a task is defined. Previous L2 research has revealed that activities play a crucial role in enabling collaborative communication. Further research into the processes by which task types impact cooperation patterns is needed.

Virtual learning environments are used by the vast majority of educational institutions (VLE). It can be part of a controlled learning environment, which is a larger integration of web services and information systems, and is also known as a learning management system or a course management system. A virtual learning environment (VLE) is a piece of web-based software that lets you offer all or part of a course or module online. It allows you to create an online course area using a





menu-based or point-and-click interface without needing to know how to code (Fry, et al., 2009: 86-7).

Google Classroom

Google Classroom is a learning area that may be dedicated to any level of education and is aimed to assist students overcome obstacles to generating assignments without using paper (Douglas, 2020: 8).

Google Classroom is a Google-created online learning platform that allows professors and students to complete daily courses from anywhere. With Google Classroom, teachers can now monitor courses, create tasks, organize lecture notes and lesson plans, and even score each student online (Crawford, 2021: 4).

Advantages of Google Classroom

There are various features on this platform. Below are a few examples (Phoenix, 2020, 35-6):

- 1.Simple to use: extremely simple to use. "Google's classroom software is only a planned learning interface and options used to launch and monitor activities; emails, alerts of significance to the entire course or individual, and delivers support messages," M. Janzen explained.
- 2.Cloud-based: Google Classroom is a set of crucial cloud-based corporate communication tools used by all professional employees, and Google applications are a set of more complicated and legitimate learning advancements.
- 3.Free: there are no fees associated with utilizing the service. Anyone may create and participate in classes, regardless of whether or not they have a Google Account.
- 4.Mobile-friendly: "Today's educational environment needs access to engaging and clear study resources." Google Classroom is designed to work on mobile devices. It is compatible with any cell phone.
- 5.Saves time: Both students and educators benefit from Google Classes. Presentations, documents, records, and spreadsheets are among the Google apps that are coordinated. Tasks, reviews, formative evaluations, and feedback are all divided and simplified as part of the assessment process.

Korman (2020: 41-7) and Crawford (2021: 24-6) share the same advantages. They are listed below:

- 1.**Accessibility:** Google Classroom may be accessed using Google Chrome from any desktop or mobile device, regardless of software. In a Google Drive Classroom archive, both students' and teachers' data is saved. Users from all around the world are welcome to utilize the Classroom. Students should undoubtedly be discussing broken laptops or starving dogs.

2.Exposure: Students are exposed to an online learning system in the classroom. Applicants to most college and university programs are also permitted to complete at least one online course. Students will benefit from exposure to Google Classroom when they transition to other learning management systems used in higher education.

3.Paperless: Because the Classroom is paperless, teachers and students will not have to move large volumes of paper. Teachers can walk around while submitting classroom activities and assessments. Students may complete projects and evaluations directly from the Classroom, and they can even work from home. Students may have access to missed assignments as a result of absences, and they will frequently have access to particular materials that may be required.

4.Communication: Teachers and students have access to send and receive emails, publish on the internet, offer private comments on assignments, and get career information. The feedback and updates from students are completely within the authority of the teachers. They can also contact with parents through individual emails or Classroom email summaries, which feature important dates and news for the class.

5.Collaboration: The curriculum allows students to interact with one another in a variety of ways. Teachers will encourage students to participate in online conversations and create group projects in the classroom. Students can also collaborate to share Google Docs with professors.

6.Engagement: Because many digital natives are at ease with technology, they are more inclined to take ownership and control of their use. Learning may be made more interesting and productive in the classroom through a variety of methods. It allows teachers to differentiate assignments, include movies and online sites into the classroom, and create group activities.

7.Differentiation: Teachers can tell which students are instructing in the classroom. When establishing a task on the Classwork website, assigning courses to the entire college, particular students, or classes of students involves only a few steps.

8.Feedback: An important aspect of all the training is to give the students positive input. Teachers will provide feedback on tasks to each student through the Classroom's assessment resource. There is also the option to build a statement bank for future use throughout the rating process. Classroom, on the other hand, is an iOS app that allows users to annotate their work.





9.Data Analysis: To keep learning effective, instructors will evaluate data from the assessment and ensure the learners understand learning goals. Analytical data may be readily transmitted to Sheets for storage.

Google Classroom as an Active Learning Tool

Teachers first encountered some diversions while utilizing the Class Comment feature—there was all the normal social media banter. When the students began using Google Classroom, however, the professors saw an unanticipated benefit of the Class Comment feature: students began to answer each other's queries. Not all courses or students in their online Google classrooms do this, but those that do prosper. While professors must occasionally intervene to answer a few queries, students, for the most part, educate one another! A notable new component of the platform is the Student Response System (SRS). This allows teachers to insert questions into the Classroom's Stream page and initiate question-driven dialogues in which students respond to each other's queries. Teachers may, for example, publish a video, photo, or article with a question for their students to respond. Teachers may study and check in on their students' development in this way, which is an important practice. With this new feature, they may do so swiftly, from anywhere, at any time. Teachers might give group tasks to online students to enhance engagement.

Forcing learners to collaborate will provide them with fresh experiences and help to great teamwork. Group learning is the most effective method of learning. This provides students with an opportunity to help and learn from one another. Teachers should form small groups of students to prepare, and then let them and their team to develop a video production. They can ask them to take images, record meetings, and upload and finish project documentation like photos and audio recordings (Douglas, 2020: 60).

Telegram

The usage of communication devices to access the internet, such as mobile phones, tablets, and laptops, has been widely employed as a way of indirectly linking the teaching and learning process. Every university course frequently creates a 'group' via WhatsApp or Telegram. Students and professors are frequently involved on a course-related topic using this medium. As a result, informal learning has happened indirectly (Iksan and Sumaiyah, 2017: 21).

Telegram, like other popular messaging applications, has aided in the fast spread of worldwide communications and the emergence of a variety of new types of online conversation. It advertises itself as a messaging

service that values freedom of expression and privacy, and proclaims a readiness to safeguard freedom of expression by overcoming authoritarian countries' restrictions (Badiei, 2020: 1).

Creative Writing

Creativity occurs when a person creates something that is both original and acceptable, productive, or impactful (Stokes, 2006: 13).

Petty (2009: 322) explains that creative work is important for four main reasons:

1. Students' ability to think creatively and solve difficulties should be developed.
2. Students should be able to use their knowledge in productive and meaningful ways.
3. To boost motivation, do the following: Creativity satisfies a basic human need to create and be recognized for it. Self-esteem and self-actualization are high on Maslow's scale of human needs, and both may be met via creative activity.
4. To provide people a chance to explore their emotions and improve their self-expression skills: Education entails more than memorizing knowledge and developing work-related skills. Students should use their imaginations to investigate their emotions and perspectives. They must personalize their experiences and communicate their meanings to others. There are four main differential perspectives to creativity, namely (Paic, 2007: 130-1):

1. The person perspective, which focuses on the personality traits and ability levels of creative people in order to determine the key characteristics of creative people. As a result, it's similar to the dispositional approach to personality (which focuses on the individual rather than the circumstance or context), however it also addresses the link between creativity and known ability structures.
2. On the other hand, the process approach to creativity seeks to conceptualize the cognitive mechanisms that underpin creative thought, such as associative and divergent thinking. Process approaches to creativity, unlike person approaches, do not attempt to discriminate between creative and non-creative persons, but rather attempt to describe the basic process of creative thought in all individuals. They're more interested in genuine creativity than in creative people, and they're significantly influenced by cognitive psychology. In reality, the combined effort of cognitive and differential psychologists best represents the process approach to creativity.
3. The product approach to creativity investigates the features of creative outputs or products, such as paintings, drawings, and sculptures, as well





as scientific articles (e.g., theories, experiments, discoveries). The product approach is strongly linked to aesthetics, which is a well-known branch of philosophy. As a result, it is primarily concerned with output and accomplishment, and it places a greater emphasis on people's works than on their personalities or the processes that facilitate creative production.

4. Finally, the press approach to creativity examines the link between innovators and their surroundings. As a result, it focuses on the contextual factors that influence creativity, similar to the situational rather than dispositional approach to personality.

Creativity entails inventive thought and behavior. Second, this creative activity is purposeful in general: it is aimed at reaching a goal. Third, these procedures must produce something unique. Fourth, the result must be valuable in respect to the goal.

We may encourage students to use their imaginations by planning open-ended activities that recognize and expand on their early language and literacy experiences; activities that allow them to investigate what is presented, make connections with existing knowledge, and respond in a variety of ways. Students can interpret materials or assignments in unexpected ways, even if the author or instructor did not foresee it. For example, art, dance, or music might be utilized to express respect or enjoyment of poetry. Allowing students to investigate a number of possibilities may assist them in gaining a better understanding. In a creative environment, people engage in purposeful activities. They come upon books that are both timely and challenging. The audience for the tales that students tell, the dramas that they do, the books that they write, and the information that they investigate and deliver is larger than the teacher's, but in certain cases the audience may include the text's originator. Students may be involved in the formulation of the learning objective by creative instructors, who do not just discuss it with them. The creative teacher realizes that essential learning may have occurred beyond the scope of the learning aim and will engage the students in self- and peer-assessment. When it comes to the work that youngsters generate in English, what do we understand by originality? Students may display new concepts if they are encouraged to communicate their thoughts and feelings rather than relying on formulaic replies that are either 'correct' or 'wrong.' They are behaving in a creative manner. As instructors, we must encourage students to critically assess their replies and the work they generate in connection to the goals they establish for themselves. If an action, response, artefact, or solution reflects meaningful effort, it is valuable. It is critical that students, regardless of their age, get the chance to communicate what they and others value. What is produced, as well as

the effort required in respect to the specific kid, are both significant (Horner and Vicki, 2007: 1-2).

Creative Writing and Motivation

Students benefit from creative writing in a variety of ways. It not only entertains students, but it also encourages artistic expression, investigates the purposes and values of writing, clarifies thinking, stimulates creativity, aids in the quest for identity, and, last but not least, allows them to learn to read and write. Its engaging quality, which allows students to express themselves and share their points of view, aids teachers in motivating students. Motivation is essential in both teaching and studying English. Intrinsically motivated students to learn about a subject are more likely to engage in activities that they believe will help them learn, such as paying attention to the instructor, mentally organizing and rehearsing the material to be learned, taking notes for future study, checking their level of understanding, and asking for help if they don't understand the material. These exercises, taken together, help students learn more effectively. Because it allows students to freely express their thoughts, create something new, and enjoy toying with language, creative writing may be considered as a motivating exercise for students. Students with poor self-esteem may benefit from creative writing since it allows them to explore and express themselves, eventually helping them to recognize their strengths and, ideally, increasing drive. Teachers should be cautious about their expectations, as the research of motivating tactics in L2 instruction is still mostly unknown ground. There is little question that creative strategies can be used to improve student motivation, but we know much too little about how this can or should be done (Pelcova, 2015: 16-18).

Creative Writing and Translation

While the notion of translation innovation has been received with suspicion, it is an essential element of the process. Fear of creativity in translation originates in part from the phrase's ambiguity, and in part from the widespread belief that creativity reflects less-than-perfect translations. In actuality, it has been a neglected research topic in translation studies. On an individual level, creativity encompasses problem solving, and on a societal one, it leads to innovation. "Creativity is the capacity to produce work that is both distinctive (i.e. original, unexpected) and appropriate (i.e. useful, adaptable to task Luca V. Aranda constraints," Sternberg and Lubart write (2004: 3).

Because translation retraces the original's creative drive, both the writer and the translator are bound by "the handling and crafting of the raw material of language" (Perteghella and Loffredo, 2007: 10).





Despite the fact that "the massive shift from grammatical and lexical contrasts and linguistic theories of translation in favor of pragmatic, discourse, and sociolinguistic factors appears to have maintained the focus on innovation" (Heltai, 2004: 58).

When creativity is emphasized or examined in translation studies, it is usually in reference to literary texts since "it is the core of the literary text to demand creative engagement" (Beier, 2007: 55).

Almost every writer is a translator in some capacity. Above all, creative writing is a translational process. The textual possibilities are then translated, "brought over" – written down, made into language signals – on the blank paper by the writer's cognitive and subconscious brain processes. The mechanisms at work in the act of writing and creative production are explored as translation processes from a cognitive approach. Both creative writing and translation have the ability and energy to refresh themselves as textual modifications of thoughts, words, and worlds. As a result, writing may be thought of as a cognitive or metaphorical translation of one's own voice into a distinct, creative output.

Feelings, observations, perceptions, thoughts, insights, recollections and tales are all transformed into written language by the authorial writer. As a result, writing is the process of converting psychological reality into a language that may then be conveyed with another person or group of people (Pertegbella, 2013: 195).

Creative Writing Skills

Writing is a difficult and time-consuming activity that needs people to use a variety of cognitive abilities and information sources to set goals, solve difficulties, and use their memory resources wisely.

Skill 1: Flexibility

It is defined as "an individual's ability to adapt specific components" (Snow and Danielle, 2016: 913).

Skill 2: Originality

"It is the tendency to produce ideas different from those of most other people" (Arefi and Nesa, 2016: 1)

Skill 3: Fluency

"It is one characteristic required for generating ideas. It refers to the number of relevant responses a person provides when given a prompt. It is a predictor of creative thought" (Salemi, 2017: 48).

Skill 4: Elaboration

Adding details, filling in the gaps, embellishing, and finishing a creative concept are all examples of elaboration. It develops working colleagues' ideas, brings a concept to fulfillment, or provides contextual detail to

make something genuine, intelligible, or aesthetically beautiful. Others would not recognize the full potential of a creative inspiration if it was not elaborated. Elaborators play an important process role in cooperative groups: they perform the legwork to ensure that projects are completed. It is recommended that students utilize interactive or online whiteboards with student-generated "starters" so that they can take turns filling in the remaining elements. Adding detail to a graphic organizer or variations to a poetic pattern, as well as transforming simple drawings and forms into detailed pieces of art, all help to develop elaboration skills (International Society for Technology in Education, 2011: 13).

Skill 5: Mechanics of Writing

According to Broughton et al. (2003: 116) when we write, unlike when we chat, we are involved in an activity that is both private and public. It is private because writing is by its very nature solitary, yet it is public since most writing is intended for an audience, one that is frequently difficult to identify. Writing differs from speech in that it is less spontaneous and more permanent, and the resources available for communication are less since we cannot connect with the listeners and modify as we go along as we do in conversation. As a result, writing standards are less flexible than conversational conventions, and the language employed tends to be standardized. If an English teacher's objective is to help students generate fluent, accurate, and acceptable written English, a number of factors must be taken into account.. These are:

- Mechanical issues with the English script;
- Issues with English grammar and lexis correctness;
- Issues with adapting the writing style to the demands of a certain context;
- Issues with gaining ease and comfort in communicating what has to be stated.

Alnoori and Fatima (2018: 20) assure the importance of checking punctuation, spelling, grammar sentence structure and linking words before handing in any writing projects.

Aims and Hypotheses of the Study

Investigating the effectiveness of the proposed instructional program on the creative writing skills improvement 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 creative writing skills posttest"

2."There is no statistically significant difference at the level of significance (0.05) between the mean scores of the experimental group students who studied translation subject by the collaborative writing method in the creative writing skills tests (pre and post)"

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

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

Collaborative Writing

"It refers to tasks in which written works are developed jointly rather than separately by a group of people. It is concerned with two or more persons collaborating to create a document with group accountability for the final outcome. It allows students to practice literature reviews, academic reading, and writing while also encouraging reflection, information sharing, and critical thinking" (Sukirman, 2016: 34).

The operational definition:

Collaborative writing is a written product created by a pair or a group of students who collaborate to create a single product. It's a social process in which members of a group work together to achieve a shared objective, negotiate, communicate, and discuss while writing a common text.

E-learning platform

Kats (2010: 26) refers to Collis and Moonen (2001) definition of E-learning platform which is: "comprehensive software package that supports some or all aspects of course preparation, delivery and interaction, and allows these aspects to be accessible via a network." (Collis and Moonen, 2001, p. 78)

Creative Writing

"A set of mental abilities related to the writing process that can be trained and developed, and the learner possesses them while writing. It makes him able to come up with new ideas that are distinct from the ideas of his peers, and to produce as many different, diverse, unpopular, and capable ideas as possible to check" (Salim and Faisal, 2017: 165).

Creative Writing Skills

Creative writing skills, according to Handayani et al. (2020: 2-3), include four features: fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration.

1. Fluency is defined as "the capacity to generate a large number of ideas, ways, proposals, questions, concepts, and alternative responses."
2. Flexibility is defined as "the capacity to develop ideas, responses, and questions from a variety of viewpoints."
3. "An capacity to produce ideas to solve issues and create unique and distinctive thinking" is the definition of originality.
4. Elaboration refers to a person's capacity to "develop concepts while also paying attention to the details."
5. Finally, there must be writing mechanics, which are defined as "the technical aspects of writing that include spelling, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and grammar."

Methodology

In this study, Experimental research method is used because it fits with the aims of the current research.

Experimental research is a sort of quantitative study in which researchers adjust various stimuli, therapies, or environmental variables to see how the subject's condition or behavior is influenced or modified (Tavakoli, 2012: 206).

Population and Sample

Population:

Population is the subject of the investigation. It is the full set that is being considered (Noori, 2021: 39). The present research population comprised the English language departments in the faculties of basic education/morning studies for the academic year (2019/2020), and the research population was specified by the English language departments in the faculties of basic education/morning studies. They had a total of 627 male and female students, which were distributed as stated 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

A research sample size is a subset of a population that has been chosen (Mousavi, 1999: 335). It is any segment of a population of people about whom data is collected (Fraenkel and Norman, 2006: 107). The researchers purposefully chose the College of Basic Education / University of Babylon to conduct the study and chose two sections at random, one representing the experimental group with (44) male and female students, from which two students were excluded because they had received a diploma certificate, and the other representing the control group with (46) male and female students. Due to his failure in the previous academic year's stage, one student was killed. The sample is shown in Table 2.

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:

The researchers conducted the T-test for two independent samples to confirm that the students in the two research groups were equal in this variable. The researcher determined that the average age of the experimental group was (272.35) and the average age of the control group was (272.35) after examining the data (265.16). The estimated T value (1.85) was less than the tabulated value of (1.98), indicating that the difference is of no statistical significance at the level (0.05) and degree of freedom (85), indicating that the two study groups are of similar age. This is seen in Table (3).

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) shows that no statistically significant difference exists between the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (3), because the computed (Chi-Square) value was (11.40), which is smaller than the tabulated value (Chi-Square) of (12.59). This means that in this variable, the two groups are statistically equal.

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 (5).

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)

Table (5) shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups 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), indicating 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)

Table (6) Intelligence test equivalence

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

Creative Writing Skills Test\ Validity

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

A valid test, according to Brown and Abeywickrama (2010: 30), measures exactly what it claims to measure. It doesn't track variables that aren't relevant. A valid test relies on empirical evidence as much as possible. It entails a performance that represents a sampling of the test's criterion. It provides helpful, relevant information about the test-abilities taker's and is backed up by a theoretical rationale or argument.

The evaluation determines the appropriateness of assumptions, uses, and consequences. This suggests that, based on the assessment results, a high-quality assessment procedure (i.e., the gathering, interpreting, and utilizing of 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 given to a group of experts and professionals in English curriculum and methodologies, educational psychology, measurement, and assessment to get their feedback on the test items' validity. The test is constructed based on the observations.

Table (7) Face Validity of the Creative Writing Skills Pre-test

N	n.of judges	Agree	Disagree	D.of Freedom	Percentage	Chi-Square Value		Statistical Significance
	Total					Calculated	Tabulated	
1	20	19	1	1	95%	16.20	3.84	S.Significant
2	20	19	1	1	95%	16.20	3.84	S.Significant
	20	19	1	1	95%	16.20	3.84	S.Significant



	20	20	0	1	100%	20	3.84	S.Significant
	20	19	1	1	95%	16.20	3.84	S.Significant

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 first pilot application of 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 = (88) minutes.

As for the second pilot application, the test was applied to a sample of (40) students/ Third stage/ College of Mixed Education / University of Kufa. After completing the pilot application of the test, the results were analyzed in order to identify the coefficients of items difficulty and discrimination respectively.

Item difficulty

The degree to which a test item is complex or demanding. The desired (and intended) level of difficulty will be determined by the test's purpose and structure. The item difficulty is calculated using the overall test scores of the group. It's a useful statistic for judging an item's quality (Cheng and Janna, 2017: 227).

It is clear that the coefficients of difficulty ranged between (0.27-0.63) with an average of (0.47). 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 (0.20-0.84)

Item discrimination

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

It is shown that the discrimination coefficients ranged between (0.26-0.75) with an average of (0.58). Therefore, all items are acceptable, as it is indicated that the item is good and desirable if the degree of discrimination exceeds (0.20).

Reliability

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 students' written work (Cheng and Janna, 2017: 228).

There are several methods for calculating the test's reliability. The following is an explanation of the re-correction procedure utilized by the researcher:

Scoring Reliability

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 (0.96).

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 (0.94).

Results

Results related to the first null hypothesis:

To test the first null hypothesis, which states that (in the creative writing skills posttest, there is no statistically significant difference between the average scores of the experimental group students who studied the translation subject using the collaborative writing method and the scores of the control group students who studied the same subject using the traditional method). The (posttest) was administered to the students in both research groups by the researcher (experimental and control). The arithmetic mean, variance, and standard deviation of the students in the two research groups were calculated after they were corrected and statistically analyzed.

Using the t-test for two independent samples, it was clear that there was a statistically significant difference in favor of the experimental group at the level (0.05), and it was clear that the experimental group's mean scores were (67.93) with a standard deviation of (11.53), while the control group's average scores were (46.78) with a standard deviation of (11.53). (9.16). With a degree of freedom of 1, the estimated t-value (8.62) was bigger than the tabulated t-value (1.98). (85). This is seen in Table (8)

Table (8)

Results of the t-test for two independent samples of the two research groups in the post test of creative writing skills.

Groups	Sample	Mean	SD	D. of Freedom	t-value		Significance
					Calculated	Tabulated	
Experimental	42	67.93	11.53	85	8.62	1.98	Statistically significant
Control	45	46.78	9.16				

In the (creative writing skills posttest), there is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the students in the two research groups in favor of the experimental group, as shown in the previous table and chart. In the creative writing skills posttest, this result indicates that the experimental group students who studied using the collaborative writing method outperformed the control group students who studied using the traditional method. As a result, the first null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Second: Results related to the fifth null hypothesis:

To confirm the results of the second null hypothesis, which states that (there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the experimental group students who studied translation subject by the collaborative writing method in the creative writing skills tests (pre and post), the researcher used the creative writing skills tests (pre and post) to determine the development of those skills in the students of the experimental group.

After statistically correcting and assessing the answers, the arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the research group's students were calculated (Appendix) (). Using the t-test for two correlated samples, it was clear that there is a statistically significant difference in favor of the experimental group for the post-test at the level (0.05), so the average score of the experimental group students in the pre-test of creative writing skills was (48.93) with a standard deviation of (15.48), while the average score of the experimental group students in the post-test was (67.93) with a standard deviation of (15.48). (11.53). At a degree of freedom, the estimated t-value (12.65) is bigger than the tabulated t-value (2.02). (41) This indicates that the experimental group's students have advanced their creative writing skills in favor of the posttest after conducting the experiment and administering the independent variable (collaborative writing). As a result, the second null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This is seen in Table 9:

Table (9)

Mean and t-value (calculated and tabulated) for the scores of the (experimental) group students in the pre- and post- tests of creative writing skills

Group	Sample	Test	Mean	SD	D. of Freedom	t-value		Significance
						Calculated	Tabulated	
Experi	42	Pre-	48.93	15.48	41	12.65	2.02	Statistically significant



mental	test						
	Posttest	67.93	11.53				

In the (pre- and post-) creative writing skills tests, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the students in the experimental study group in favor of the creative writing posttest, as shown in the preceding table. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the second null hypothesis is rejected

Third: Results related to the third null hypothesis:

The researcher used the creative writing skills pre- and post-tests to judge the value of development in creative writing skills on the students in the control group to verify the results of the third null hypothesis, which states that (there is no statistically significant difference at the significance level (0.05) between the average scores of students who study translation subject in the traditional way in the creative writing skills pre- and post-tests), The arithmetic mean, variance, and standard deviation of the students in the research group were calculated after they were corrected and statistically analyzed.

The t-test for two correlated samples revealed that there was no statistically significant difference in favor of the control group at the level (0.05), so the average scores of the control group students in the creative writing skills pre-test were (45,11) with a standard deviation of (11, 34), while the mean scores of the control group students in the creative writing skills posttest were (46.78) with a standard deviation of (11, 34). (13.20). With a degree of freedom, the estimated t-value (1.44) was lower than the tabulated t-value (2.01). (44).

This means that there is no statistically significant difference between the averages of the two tests on the control group, indicating that this result does not indicate that the students in the control group who studied in the traditional manner have improved their creative writing skills. As a result, the third null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. This is seen in Table 10:

Table (10)
Mean, standard deviation and t-value (calculated and tabulated) for the scores of the (control) group students in the pre- and post- tests of creative writing skills

Group	Sample	Test	Mean	SD	D. of Freedom	t-value		Significance
						Calculated	Tabulated	
Control	45	Pre-test	45.11	11.34	44	1.44	2.01	Statistically not significant



		Posttest	46.78	13.20			
--	--	----------	-------	-------	--	--	--

In the (pre- and post-) creative writing skills, there is no statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the students in the control group, as shown in the previous table and graphic. As a result, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the third null hypothesis is accepted.

Conclusions

Table (11) below shows that (Elaboration skill) was the most developed skill. It is due to the amount of the added value which approved (4.54%), then (Flexibility skill) (3.85%), then (Mechanics of Writing skill) (3.79), then (Originality skill) (3.78%) and finally (Fluency skill) which approves (3.02%).

While the concept of creativity in translation has been viewed with skepticism, it is an unavoidable aspect of the translation process. The fear of creativity in translation stems in part from the term's ambiguity and in part from the common misconception that creativity entails sloppy translations. In fact, in the field of translation studies, it has been a neglected research topic. Creativity is a crucial task that entails problem solving on an individual level and leads to innovation on a societal level. Both the writer and the translator are bound by the handling and crafting of the raw material of language, and translation retraces the original's creative drive.

Translation is a skill that all authors possess. Above all, creative writing is a translation. This energizing process starts with the writer's cognitive and subconscious mental processes, which include the textual possibilities that are finally translated, or "brought through" (written down, transformed into linguistic signs).

Table (11)

Creative writing skills development

Creative writing skills	Pre-test	Posttest	Amount of development
Elaboration	9.79	14.33	4.54%
Flexibility	9.6	13.45	3.85%
Mechanics of writing	10.14	13.93	3.79%
Originality	10.1	13.88	3.78%
Fluency	9.31	12.33	3.02%

Footnotes:

- 1Mowla, et al., (2012: 98-9)
- 2.Harmer (1988: 4).
- 3.Nation, (2009: 126).





- 4.Storch, (2013: 22).
- 5.DiCamilla and M.,1997:610).
- 6.Yin, 2017: 22-7).
- 7.Fry, et al., 2009: 86-7).
- 8.Douglas, 2020: 8).
- 9.Crawford, 2021: 4).
- 10.Phoenix, 2020, 35-6):
- 11.Korman (2020: 41-7)
- 12.rawford (2021: 24-6)
- 13.Douglas, 2020: 60).
- 14.Iksan and Sumaiyah, 2017: 21).
- 15.Badiei, 2020: 1).
- 16.Stokes, 2006: 13).
- 17.Petty (2009: 322)
- 18.Paic, 2007: 130-1):
- 19.NACCCE 1999)
- 20.Horner and Vicki, 2007: 1-2).
- 21.Pelcova, 2015: 16-18).
- 22.Sternberg & Lubart (2004: 3).
- 23.Perteghella and Loffredo, 2007: 10).
- 24.Heltai, 2004: 58).
- 25.Beier, 2007: 55).
- 26.Perteghella, 2013: 195).
- 27.Snow and Danielle, 2016: 913).
- 28.Arefi and Nesa, 2016: 1)
- 29.Salemi, 2017: 48).
- 30.International Society for Technology in Education, 2011: 13).
- 31.Broughton et al. (2003: 116) \
- 32.Alnoori and Fatima (2018: 20)
- 33.Sukirman, 2016: 34).
- 34.Kats (2010: 26)
- 35.Salim and Faisal, 2017: 165
- 36.Handayani et al. (2020: 2-3)
- 37.Tavakoli, 2012: 206).
- 38.Noori, 2021: 39
- 39.Mousavi, 1999: 335).
- 40.Fraenkel and Norman, 2006: 107
- 41.Coombe et al. 2010: xxii
- 42.Brown and Abeywickrama (2010: 30)
- 43.Cheng and Janna, 2017: 230).
- 44.Tavakoli, 2012: 219).
- 45.Cheng and Janna, 2017: 227).
- 46.Cheng and Janna, 2017: 227)
- 47.Cheng and Janna, 2017: 228).

References

- 1.Alnoori, Bushra Saadoon Mohammed and Fatima Rahim Al- Musawi (2018) Reading and Writing Skills Practice Book. Idea Publishing.

2. Arefi, Marzieh and Nesa Jalali (2016) Comparison of Creativity Dimensions (Fluency, Flexibility, Elaboration, Originality) between Bilingual Elementary Students (Azari language-Kurdish language) in Urmia City – Iran. The IAFOR International Conference on Language Learning - Dubai 2016 Official Conference Proceedings.
3. Badii, Farzaneh (2020) The Tale of Telegram Governance: When the Rule of Thumb Fails. @JCollaboratory
4. Beier, Jean Boase (2007) A Critical Introduction to Translation Studies.
5. Broughton, Geoffrey, Christopher Brumfit, Roger Flavell, Peter Hill and Anita Pincas (2003) Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Routledge Education Books.
6. Cheng, Liying and Janna Fox (2017) Assessment in the Language Classroom Teachers Supporting Student Learning. Macmillan education.
7. Coombe, C, Keith Folse and Nancy Hubley (2010) A practical guide to assessing English language learners. Michigan teacher training.
8. Crawford, Anna (2021) GOOGLE CLASSROOM. The comprehensive teacher's and student's guide to designing highquality digital learning experiences for whole-class engagement and learning success (edition 2020-21)
9. DiCamilla, F. J. & M. Anton (1997). Repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners: A Vygotskian perspective. Canadian Modern Language Review, 53(4), 609-633.
10. Douglas, Grace (2020) GOOGLE CLASSROOM. A Beginner's Guide to Online Teaching for Teachers and Students. Get the Best from Distance Learning and Teaching with Google and Learn How to Manage Virtual or Blended Classrooms.
11. Fraenkel, J. R. and Norman E. Wallen (2006) How to design and evaluate research in education 6th edition. McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.
12. Fry, Heather, Steve Ketteridge and Stephanie Marshall (2009) A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Routledge. London and New York.
13. Handayani, S A, Y S Rahayu and R agustini (2020) Students' creative thinking skills in biology learning: fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration. Journal of Physics: Conference Series 1747 (2021) 012040 IOP Publishing doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1747/1/012040.
14. Harmer, Jeremy (1988) How to Teach Writing. England: Longman.
15. Horner, Chris and Vicki Ryf (2007) CREATIVE TEACHING: ENGLISH IN THE EARLY YEARS AND PRIMARY CLASSROOM. Routledge. London and New York.
16. Iksan, Zanaton H. and Sumaiyah Mohd Sofian (2017) MOBILE LEARNING: INNOVATION IN TEACHING AND LEARNING USING TELEGRAM. International Journal of Pedagogy and Teacher Education (IJPTE) (Vol.1 Issue 1 | April 2017).
17. International Society for Technology in Education (2011) Grow Creativity! Focusing on fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration skills gives teachers and students an effective shortcut to developing creativity together.
18. Kats (2010) Learning Management System Technologies and Software Solutions for Online Teaching: Tools and Applications. Information Science Reference.
19. Korman, Chaterine (2020) Google Classroom for Teachers 2020/ A complete guide to learn everything you need to know for your classroom management
20. Mousavi, Seyyed Abbas (1999) A dictionary of language testing 2nd edition. Rahnama Publications.





21. Mowla, Shaikh, M. Prabhakar Rao and B. B. Sarojini (2012) *Methods of Teaching English*. Neelkamal publications PVT. Ltd. New Delhi. Hyderabad.
22. Nation, I. S. P. (2009) *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
23. Noori, Abdullah (2021) *Glossary of Key Terms in Educational Research*. Kabul University.
24. Pelcova, Michaela (2015) *Using Creative Writing as a Tool for Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. MASARYK UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF EDUCATION
25. Pertegbella, Mnuela (2013) *Translation as Creative Writing. A Companion to Creative Writing, First Edition*. Edited by Graeme Harper. © 2013 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Published 2013 by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
26. PERTEGHELLA, Manuela (2007) *Poetry, music and transformation in the Gulf of Naples: a creative voyage of The Tempest*. In PERTEGHELLA, Manuela and LOFFREDO, Eugenia. *Translation and creativity*. London: Continuum.
27. Petty, Geoff (2009) *Teaching Today: A Practical Guide 4th edition*. Nelson Thornes.
28. Phoenix, Matt (2020) *Google Classroom: The 2020 ultimate user guide to master classroom*.
29. Salami, Megan Lawler (2017) *Utilizing Fluency, Flexibility, Originality, and Elaboration to Enhance Creativity and Vocabulary Use for Improving Reading Comprehension in Third through Sixth Grade Students*. UNION UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF EDUCATION.
30. Salim, Muhammed Muhammed and Faisal Bin Faraj AlMutairi (2017) *The effectiveness of a proposed strategy based on project learning in developing creative writing and reducing anxiety for non-native adult speakers*. Sixth international conference of Arabic language.
31. Snow, Erica and Danielle McNamara (2016) *The Narrative Waltz: The Role of Flexibility in Writing Proficiency*. *Journal of Educational Psychology* © 2016 American Psychological Association 2016, Vol. 108, No. 7, 911–924.
32. STERNBERG, Robert J.: and LUBART, Todd I. (2004) *The concept of creativity: prospects and paradigms*. In STERNBERG, Robert J. *Handbook of creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
33. Stokes, Patricia D. (2006) *Creativity From Constraints: the Psychology of Breakthrough*. New York: Springer Publications.
34. Storch, Neomy (2013) *Collaborative Writing in L2 Classrooms*. Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.
35. Sukirman (2016) *Using Collaborative Writing in Teaching Writing*. Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teaching Science, IAIN Palopo. LANGKAWI, Vol. 2 No. 1, Mei 2016 ISSN: 2460-2280
36. Tavakoli, Hossein. (2012). *A Dictionary of Research Methodology and Statistics in Applied Linguistics*. Tehran: Rahnama Press.