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Abstract

This study explored a blended learning course by integrating Moodle into a foreign language composition classroom of 28 Saudi female undergraduate students in the English department of Al-Imam University. The study was conducted via Moodle to investigate its effectiveness on students' attitudes towards writing, and to investigate the relative effectiveness of two different writing approaches, product vs. process. Students were divided into two experimental groups (A&B); each group consisted of 14 students. Group A learned the process writing approach through Moodle's collaborative wikis and forums. Group B learned the product approach through individual wikis and quizzes. Quantitative measures were used to analyze the students' writing performance in pre-tests and post-tests, and their attitudes towards writing using attitudinal Likert-type scales. Results confirm that writing performance is more effectively taught to Saudi female students by teaching writing as a product rather than as a process. Results also show that the use of Moodle has a positive effect on students' attitudes towards writing in English.
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ملخص

استكشفت هذه الدراسة دوره تعليمية مدمجة من خلال ضم "مودل" في فصل تعليم الإنشاء باللغة الأجنبية، إذ يتضمن الفصل 28 طالبة سعودية جامعية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة الإمام. وقد أجريت الدراسة عن طريق "مودل" للدراسة تأثيره على موقف الطالبات تجاه الكتابة ولدراسة التأثير النسبي لدى أسلوبين مختلفين في الكتابة: الإنتاج والمراحل. وتم تقسيم الطالبات إلى مجموعتين تجريبيتين، (أ) و (ب)، حيث تضمنت كل مجموعة 14 طالبة. وتعلمت المجموعة (أ) أسلوب المراحل في الكتابة، وذلك من خلال الويكي والمنتديات التابعة لمودل. أما المجموعة (ب)، فقد تم تعليمها أسلوب الإنتاج من خلال الويكي الفردي والامتحانات.

استخدمت هذه الدراسة مقاييس كمية لتحليل أداء الطالبات في اختبارات الكتابة، قبل وبعد التجربة، بالإضافة إلى تحليل مواقفهم تجاه الكتابة من خلال إجراء استبيانات لتقييم أرائهن. وتؤكد النتائج أن تدريس الكتابة للطالبات عن طريق أسلوب الإنتاج يعد أكثر فعالية من أسلوب المراحل.

كما أظهرت النتائج أن استخدام مودل له تأثير إيجابي على موقف الطالبات تجاه الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية.

وقد أجريت الدراسة عن طريق "مودل" لدراسة تأثيره على موقف الطالبات تجاه الكتابة ولدراسة التأثير النسبي لدى أسلوبين مختلفين في الكتابة: الإنتاج والمراحل. وتم تقسيم الطالبات إلى مجموعتين تجريبيتين، (أ) و (ب)، حيث تضمنت كل مجموعة 14 طالبة. وتعلمت المجموعة (أ) أسلوب المراحل في الكتابة، وذلك من خلال الويكي والمنتديات التابعة لمودل. أما المجموعة (ب)، فقد تم تعليمها أسلوب الإنتاج من خلال الويكي الفردي والامتحانات. واستخدمت هذه الدراسة مقاييس كمية لتحليل أداء الطالبات في اختبارات الكتابة، قبل وبعد التجربة، بالإضافة إلى تحليل مواقفهم تجاه الكتابة من خلال إجراء استبيانات لتقييم أرائهن. وتؤكد النتائج أن تدريس الكتابة للطالبات عن طريق أسلوب الإنتاج يعد أكثر فعالية من أسلوب المراحل.

كما أظهرت النتائج أن استخدام مودل له تأثير إيجابي على موقف الطالبات تجاه الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Chapter 1 introduces the present study by explaining the context of the problem, the statement of the problem, the research questions, the significance of the study, the limitations of the study, the study's method and procedure in brief, and finally the definition of terms.

1.1.1. Context of the problem

Technology has become increasingly important in various fields, not the least of which is education. Students arrive in class already familiar with all types of technology and they use them on a daily basis (Erben, 2008; Gromik, 2009). Therefore, educators integrate technology into teaching with e-learning. Web 2.0 technologies such as wikis, forums and blogs can be used as e-learning components (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). They are highly adaptable to the needs of language learners (Alm, 2006; Lo & Chao, 2011; Schuetze, 2011; Yates, 2008). They have the advantage of expanding EFL students’ exposure to the target language and allow more flexibility to both teachers and learners (Stevens, 2012). They can be popular in language instruction in the sense of providing students with the opportunity to continue learning outside the classroom in an authentic environment. The effect of e-learning on students’ writing performance has been investigated in many studies (Li, 2012). The most commonly used approaches to teaching writing are product and process approaches (Hasan & Akhand, 2010). However, it has remained an open question as to which writing approach is more effective than the other, process or product? To investigate the relative effectiveness of these two writing approaches, different components of e-learning were used in this present study. Therefore, this investigation was applied with the use of Moodle, a learning
management system (LMS). Moodle is a web-based platform that delivers various e-learning components such as course content, online activities, quizzes, blogs, forums, individual wikis, and collaborative wikis (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). The use of Moodle was promoted in the learning environment by many studies (Dougiamas, 2010; Fageeh, 2011; Robertson, 2008; Stevens, 2012). However, researchers argue that Moodle alone is not effective in the learning environment unless it is designed based on instructional principles and approaches (Alblehai, 2011; Hunter, 2008; Kazunori, 2011). Moreover, the use of Moodle in KSA (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia) is limited (Al-Kahtani & Al-Haider, 2010). However, EFL Saudi learners are ready for e-learning (Fageeh, 2011). Therefore, Moodle was used in this present study to investigate its effectiveness on Saudi female EFL students' attitudes and to investigate the relative effectiveness of teaching writing as a process vs. product with regard to students' writing performance. This investigation will be applied in the English Department of Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

1.1.2. Statement of the problem

Saudi EFL students' weakness in writing is often reported by teachers and displayed in their attempt to write in English. Therefore, the aim of the present study is to find out the relative effectiveness of teaching writing as a process vs. product using Moodle to Saudi EFL students.

1.1.3. Research questions

1.1.3.1. What is the relative effectiveness of teaching writing as a process vs. product using Moodle to Saudi EFL students?

1.1.3.2. How does the use of Moodle affect students' attitudes towards writing in English?
1.1.4. Significance of the study

This study is significant for teachers, students, and the field of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) for several reasons. The present study may encourage language teachers to use new technologies such as wikis and forums to improve their students’ writing performance through Moodle. It might also make writing more interesting to both the teacher and the student and lessen the burden they both feel towards the writing courses. Since face-to-face instruction is obligatory in the English department, this study might make language instruction more interesting as it investigates blended learning that combines technology-based materials with face-to-face sessions.

1.1.5. Limitations of the study

This study was undertaken in the English Department in the Languages and Translation College of Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. In this department students are taught all subjects in English except for Arabic and Religion. Students typically find writing in English to be difficult and therefore are resistant to learning this skill. Teachers therefore face a big challenge when trying to motivate students to enjoy writing and to write at an appropriate level. At the beginning of each semester, it takes about a month to gather all the students and enroll them in the course. Due to frequent absence of a large number of students, teachers cannot settle on the final number of students in each group. Students’ frequent absence caused insufficient numbers in attendance on the days of the pretest and posttest, thereby delaying the experiment until all the students attended the lecture, which also caused the experimental period to decrease. As for the lecture rooms, they were not equipped with internet and only few included a projector. However, there are computer labs on the first floor but most of them are always occupied, a teacher should book a lab weeks before the lecture.
Al-Imam University does not use Moodle. Thus, the university's administration was not in charge of enrolling the students in the Moodle course, which was time consuming for the teacher.

1.2.1. Method and procedure

1.2.1.1. This quasi-experimental study was applied to two experimental groups. They had a blended learning course which combined face-to-face sessions with e-learning. Both groups had the same face-to-face sessions because a specific course book was required to be taught to them by the university. But each group used a different e-learning component.

1.2.1.2. The e-learning component was designed for each group according to the identified features of the writing approach. The group learning writing as a product used an Individual Wiki combined with an online quiz. On the other hand, the group learning writing as a process used a Collaborative Wiki combined with a Forum.

1.2.1.3. A pretest and a posttest for writing were administered.

1.2.1.4. A writing assessment scale for scoring students' writing was developed and its reliability was established using inter-rater reliability check.

1.2.1.5. An attitudinal scale was designed and its validity and reliability were established.

1.2.1.6. The study was conducted for ten weeks.

1.2.1.7. The data analysis followed a quantitative approach using SPSS.

1.2.2. Definition of terms

The terms used frequently throughout this study are defined as follows:
**Process Writing.** Process writing is a stage-based teaching approach that focuses on teaching writing as a process. The stages of process writing include brainstorming, outlining, first draft writing, editing, and final draft writing. Process writing involves peer editing and peer feedback in addition to the teacher's feedback at every stage (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

**Product Writing.** Product writing is a teaching approach which focuses on teaching the product of writing. It provides students with exercises and drills to practice writing. But it is concerned with the final writing product more than the process employed (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

**Moodle.** Moodle is a web-based learning management system that delivers such e-learning components as course content, online activities, quizzes, forums and different types of wikis (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007).

**E-learning.** E-learning refers to learning through technology such as learning through the internet (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007).

**Web 2.0 Technologies.** Web 2.0 technologies are websites that allow others to write on the website itself, for example: forums, blogs and wikis. They are commonly used as e-learning components (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007).

**Wiki.** A Wiki is a web 2.0 technology that allows its users to write on its pages. A wiki has an edit button that allows its users to change or edit what has been written on the wiki.

The basics of the present study were illustrated in this chapter as it clarified the study's main aim and purpose, summarized the method and procedure, and defined the basic terms.
used in this study. The next chapter, chapter 2, will review the past literature on the topic of this study including the theoretical background and the previous studies.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

The previous chapter introduced the basics of the present study, its purpose, questions, method and procedure. Chapter 2 reviews the literature on this study's issue by explaining its theoretical background and previous studies. The theoretical background includes two sections; the approaches to learning and teaching writing background, and CALL background. As for the previous studies, this chapter reviews the past research on issues concerning the use of LMS or Moodle in EFL instruction internationally and locally, the effectiveness of web 2.0 technologies on EFL learners' writing performance and attitudes, collaborative vs. individual learning, and product vs. process approach to writing.

2.1.1. Theoretical Background

2.1.1.1. Approaches to Learning and Teaching Writing

The approach to learning and teaching writing has witnessed theoretical changes from time to time and three different approaches emerged, the environmentalist, the innatist and the interactionist approach (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

As for the environmentalist approach, up to the end of 1960s, writing was not one of the important skills of learning a language. It was neglected by language teachers and learners due to the environmentalist ideas that were based on structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). The environmentalist approach identified language with speech and writing was only seen as a language skill used for learning grammatical and vocabulary knowledge in order to improve speaking skills (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).
By the late 1960s, Chomsky's innatist theory made a significant change in the approach to learning a language. The focus on language form shifted towards language composition. Chomsky claimed that children are born with an innate ability to learn language (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). Thus, writers’ mental processes in composition began to be significant in the language learning field (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

Consequently, researchers began to investigate how writing was actually produced by questioning the effectiveness of different methods of instruction. Their research was mainly based on the product approach of writing (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

In the 1970s, researchers’ attention to the product writing approach shifted towards the process approach (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). A case-study responded to that shift and analyzed learners’ cognitive processes while writing. The researcher used a technique called the think aloud procedure to discover the stages of writing (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). From this research, different theories of the stages of writing emerged from studies conducted by many researchers. The most significant theory proposed three major stages of writing: 1) the planning stage, which involves generating and organizing ideas and determining the goals for writing; 2) the translating stage, in which writers write their ideas planned in the first stage; and 3) the reviewing stage, in which writers revise the text (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

The focus on writing as a process and not as a product decreased the focus on grammar and spelling and highlighted writer’s creativity and fluency. Writing was viewed as a creative process that was basically learned not taught (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). Therefore, the main role of the teacher was to encourage learners’ creativity, guide them in the process of drafting, revising and editing their writings (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).
By the late 1970s and the beginning of the early 1980s, the sociocultural context of writing gained attention which was based on the interactionist approach to language learning (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). This approach was one of the various approaches that share the common theory that the study of language extends outside the sentence level. Research extended the grammatical analyses of language by including the functional objectives and described language in terms of its functions in social contexts (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). In 1990, this approach was given the term genre. The genre approach to writing viewed the writer as a social being, and the text as a social purpose. The genre approach highlighted the communicative purpose of a text which influences the writer's textual choices (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006). The genre approach provided teachers of writing with useful tools to teach different types of discourse to learners, which was not only based on the context of situation of writing but also the context of culture (Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2006).

The approach of teaching and learning writing went through significant advances over the past decades. It used to be considered as a way to practice grammar and vocabulary to learn the spoken language. But currently, it is seen as a creative and contextualized process of communicating meaning. The genre and process approach to writing are now considered the most popular approaches, and many experiments were conducted to study it. However, the product approach of writing is now neglected. Therefore, this present study focused on the relative effectiveness of both process and product approaches of writing on learners' writing performance.

2.1.1.2. CALL

Beginning in the 1960’s and continuing to the present day, technology has been used in classrooms around the world (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). Tape-recorders and language
laboratories were the first technological materials used in language teaching until the early 1980s when CALL appeared (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). Computers were first used as tutors that required learners to respond to tasks and activities on the computer screen, such as multiple choice items and sentence matching exercises (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). Since the 1990s, CALL has developed and shifted from the use of computers as tutors to their use as tools in response to the technological development offered by the Information and Communications Technology (ICT). Until recently, computers have been employed as tools for the use of the Internet (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). Language Teachers often use both online learning and face-to-face instruction in their courses. This type of learning is known as blended learning (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007). Online learning is often delivered to students via a learning platform known as Course Management System (CMS). It includes course content, activities, quizzes, blogs, wikis and communication tools such as forums and chat rooms. A free open source of CMS known as Moodle is becoming increasingly popular in the learning environment (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007).

This present study used Moodle in a blended learning course of essay writing. The Moodle hosting service used in this study was GNOMIO, which allows its users to design their own Moodle for free. The Moodle designed for this present study was http://alshalanw.mdl2.com. The researcher designed the Moodle learning program and included everything needed for this experiment.

2.1.2. Previous studies

This present study was undertaken in KSA, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Research in KSA by Al-Kahtani & Al-Haider (2010) investigated the state of CALL in EFL instruction at four Saudi institutions. This study explored the factors that promote or discourage the use of CALL in language instruction; it explored EFL Saudi female faculty's perceptions of the
use of CALL at those institutions (Al-Kahtani & Al-Haider, 2010). Through questionnaires, the faculty expressed their attitudes towards the computing facilities, use, and support at their institutions. The findings show that the computing facilities weren’t enough, the computing use was superficial, and the financial, technical, and training support were limited in using CALL at those Saudi institutions (Al-Kahtani & Al-Haider, 2010). However, education in KSA has witnessed huge developments recently due to the generous efforts of King Abdullah bin Abdulaziz Al Saud as he launched educational projects worth SR 81.5 billion ($21.73 billion) on 30th of April 2012 (Alriyadh News Paper, E-copy, 2012). To keep pace with the current scientific and technical developments occurring rapidly in KSA, research in CALL has become significant. Moreover, a study by Fageeh (2011) proved EFL Saudi learners’ readiness for technology and e-learning. It was undertaken in King Khalid University in Saudi Arabia. Fageeh’s (2011) descriptive study included a survey and an interview to analyze students' attitudes towards e-learning. The results showed that students are ready to shift to an e-learning type of education (Fageeh, 2011).

CALL in EFL instruction and research has been growing and developing around the world due to its great influence on EFL learners' performance and attitudes (Erben, 2008; Fang, 2010; Jafarian, Soori, & Kafipour, 2012). Recently, Course Management System (CMS), also known as Learning Management System (LMS), has been popular in the educational field (Dougiamas, 2010; Dudeney & Hockly, 2007; Fageeh, 2011; Kazunori, 2011; Robertson, 2008; Stevens, 2012). This system is not specifically designed for language teaching, but it provides e-learning tools that can be used in ESL/EFL instruction (Dougiamas, 2010). Robertson(2008) examined the use of a CMS by integrating Moodle into a second language composition classroom. He demonstrated certain activities supported by Moodle to apply the process approach of writing (Robertson, 2008). Robertson found implementation of Moodle to be beneficial as it provides a student-centered learning
experience. He also explained Moodle's positive impact on course organization, lesson implementation, coursework distribution, teacher-student communication, and assessment (Robertson, 2008). Robertson (2008) investigated students' attitudes towards Moodle as "no more lost folders, no more dull assignments, and no more waiting for the office hours to talk to the instructor". Stevens (2012) suggested a simple and flexible way of using LMS with the DIY (do-it-yourself) approach. This approach can be achieved with the use of web 2.0 tools such as wikis, chats, and blogs. Stevens (2012) explained that the DIY learner-centered approach offers flexibility for both learners and teachers.

Research promotes the use of CMS. However, researchers agree on one main point; Moodle itself is not effective in the language learning environment unless it is designed based on instructional principles and approaches of second language learning (Dougiamas, 2010; Fageeh, 2011; Kazunori, 2011; Robertson, 2008; Stevens, 2012). To integrate the use of Moodle in composition classrooms, different e-learning components can be used such as wikis, forums and blogs. The most commonly used e-learning component in learning writing is the wiki (Chen, 2008; Dudeney & Hockly, 2007; Franco, 2008; Li, 2012; Liou & Lee, 2011; Miyazoe & Anderson, 2010).

Li (2012) explored the current state of research on the use of wikis in second/foreign language classes. He reviewed the past research on this subject from 2008 to 2011 using Google Scholar and the Eric database and found that wikis have been used frequently in the ESL/EFL instruction around the world in Europe, America, Asia, and Australia (Li, 2012). The researcher examined twenty-one research studies, regarding wikis holistically. The findings show that the socio-cultural theory and the process approach of writing have been widely adopted in the previous research concerning the use of wikis (Li, 2012). The qualitative approach has been used to explore students’ perceptions from their writing
process, interactivity, and collaborative writing (Li, 2012). The previous literature has focused on the process approach of writing and constructing text through wikis. However, one of the researcher's main conclusions is that there is still a lack in the textual analyses of the writing products constructed in wikis (Li, 2012). Therefore, Lee (2012) suggested further studies to be quantitative to assess the effect of wikis on students writing products.

Wikis have been frequently used as collaborative learning tools in second/foreign language instruction. Qualitative and quantitative measures were adopted in previous research studies regarding the collaborative use of wikis (Chen, 2008; Elola & Oskoz, 2010; Franco, 2008; Miyazoe & Anderson, 2010). Chen (2008) asserted that the wiki environment allowed students to cooperate with each other, which was reflected in their positive attitudes towards language learning. Franco (2008) explored the effect of collaborative learning through wikis on students' writing performance. The results suggest that it has a positive effect on students' social and writing skills (Franco, 2008). Miyazoe & Anderson (2010) explored the use of forums, blogs and wikis in an EFL blended and collaborative learning course. The results showed that students favored the use of wikis which had a positive effect on their ability to differentiate English writing styles (Miyazoe & Anderson, 2010). However, Miyazoe & Anderson's (2010) study faced some difficulties concerning collaborative learning as how to assess a group performance during the process of writing (Miyazoe & Anderson, 2010).

Elola & Oskoz (2010) compared EFL learners' performance in individual writing assignments with collaborative writing assignments, only the collaborative assignments were done through wikis. The statistical results did not show any significant differences regarding fluency, accuracy and complexity. However, Elola & Oskoz (2010) explained how learners write differently when working individually or collaboratively. The use of collaborative wikis
allowed learners to use the second language outside the traditional classroom, engage in
different writing conventions, and use the second language in various ways (Elola & Oskoz,
2010). The researchers did not propose that collaborative learning should displace individual
learning but both approaches can complement each other (Elola & Oskoz, 2010).

Liou & Lee (2011) compared collaboratively and individually produced texts through
wikis. EFL learners' writing products and perceptions were analyzed through qualitative and
quantitative measures. Results showed that essays written collaboratively, compared to those
produced individually, were longer and more accurate (Liou & Lee, 2011). Moreover, the
learners expressed a positive attitude towards collaborative learning as they provided and
received feedback from their peers (Liou & Lee, 2011). The researchers concluded that wiki-
based collaborative writing allowed students to learn from each other and improve their
writing more than wiki-based individual writing (Liou & Lee, 2011).

Research has proved the benefits of collaborative learning over individual learning
(Chang, 2010; Suzuki, 2008; Liou & Lee, 2011). Other research has proved that there weren’t
any significant differences between these two approaches (Elola & Oskoz, 2010). Due to this
dichotomy of individual vs. collaborative learning, Leffa (2009) suggested a new approach
for research in CALL, based on the activity theory of Vigotsky and Leontiev, known as the
action approach. The researcher argued that learners should be actively involved in their
individual and collaborative work (Leffa, 2009). The researcher suggested that CALL
research shouldn’t focus on one learning approach, collaborative or individual, and exclude
the other; both approaches should be unified and linked together (Leffa, 2009).

Another dichotomy of language learning approaches is that of process writing
approach vs. product. The product approach is considered traditional and old compared to the
process approach which is more dynamic and interactive (Yan, 2005). Research has focused
on the positive effect of the process approach on learners' writing performance and favored it over the product approach (Li, 2012). However, Hasan & Akhand (2010)’s interventionist study's findings proved the benefit of blending both product and process approaches to improve learners' writing skills. The study examined the effect of each approach on learners' performance. Two ESL classes participated in the study and each class learned using a different approach. Data were collected from the learners writing performance and products; the findings supported the view that the combination of both approaches is needed in language instruction (Hasan & Akhand, 2010).

Hasan & Akhand’s (2010) study is relevant to the present study in examining the relative effectiveness of the product and process approaches to writing on students' performance. However, the present study is different as it applied the experiment through the use of Moodle in a blended learning course of essay writing. The previous research studies handled similar problems to that of the present study in various ways; they were explained in this chapter as it covered most of the theoretical and practical matters regarding this study's problem. The following chapter, chapter 3, will describe the method and procedure of this study in detail.
Chapter 3

Method and Procedure

The previous chapter reviewed the literature pertaining to this study. Chapter 3 reveals all aspects related to the method and procedure of the present study. It starts by specifying and justifying the method. Then, it describes the population and the sample of the study. Finally, it explains the procedure and describes the instruments developed and used in the present study.

3.1.1. Specifying and justifying method of research

As pointed out in chapter 1, the primary aim of this study was to find out the relative effectiveness of teaching writing as a process vs. product using Moodle for students’ writing assignments. This study followed a quasi-experimental design that investigated two experimental groups in a blended learning course. Both groups had the same face-to-face sessions because a specific course book was required to be utilized. As for e-learning, each group experienced different e-learning components. Quizzes and Individual Wikis were the learning experiences of the group learning writing as a product. Whereas the group learning writing as a process used Forums and Collaborative Wikis.

As for the research approach, it is quantitative as it identified students’ writing performance through quantitative measures in their scores in the final posttest compared with their scores in the pretest applied before implementing the experiment. Then the two experimental groups’ scores on the posttest were compared with each other. The pretests were compared as well before implementing the study to ensure that any differences between the groups would be due to the treatment and not due to preexisting differences. The research
also investigated students’ attitudes towards the use of Moodle through quantitative measures in the attitudinal Likert scales provided to them at the end of the treatment (See Figure 3-1).

Figure 3-1: Diagram showing the design of the study

Experimental Group A  \( O_1 \)  \( X \)  \( O_2 \)

Experimental Group B  \( O_1 \)  \( Y \)  \( O_2 \)

\( O_1 \) refers to the students’ scores on the pretest
\( O_2 \) refers to the students’ scores on the posttest
\( X \) refers to the process writing and the Collaborative Wiki combined with the Forum treatment
\( Y \) refers to the product writing and the Individual Wiki combined with the Quiz treatment

3.1.2. Population and sample

The population of this study is female level 4 undergraduate students in the English Department of Imam University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. In this department, students are taught English language, linguistics and literature. As pointed out in chapter 1, Students find writing in English difficult and frustrating, which was their teachers' major challenge as they try to motive them and help them improve their writing skills. This made it significant for the study to be conducted on these level 4 students in the essay writing course. This study took place in the second semester of 2011-2012. The sample of the study included 28 students in two classes. Both classes were the experimental groups; each class included 14 students. The experiment lasted for 10 weeks.
3.1.3. Procedure

In this study, 10 sessions were implemented in 10 weeks. The first session was the pretest, the second session was devoted to training learners to use Moodle, 7 sessions were the blended course (the experiment), and the post-test and the attitude measure were administered in the last session. The following section discusses how the experiment was implemented with the participants.

3.1.3.1. The Pretest (Session 1)

In the first session, the instructor met the students and explained that they would participate in an experiment for an MA project. She introduced the students to the researcher, her assistant in the essay writing course. The researcher was in charge of their homework assignments online. The instructor highlighted the importance of attending all classes and doing the assignments that they would be asked to do. Then the researcher administered the pretest to the students. They were asked to finish the pretest in one hour.

The purpose of the pre-test was to check if all the students in both groups were at the same proficiency level in writing in terms of accuracy, organization, content and fluency. The pre-test was corrected before the treatment with the use of the writing assessment scale, the scale's reliability was established using inter-rater reliability check (See page 33). The scores were entered in SPSS and analyzed using Mean, Standard Deviation, and T-test. The results of the analysis show that the mean average of the subjects’ grades on the pre-test was very similar (See Table 3-1). In addition, there were no statistically significant differences among the two groups’ results in the pre-test; the experimental group A (M=16.36, SD= 3.411) and the experimental group B (M=15.79, SD=3.262); t(26)=0.453, P= 0.654.
Table 3-1: Means and Standard Deviations of experimental group (A) and experimental group (B)'s pre-test scores out of 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Experimental (A)'s pretest</th>
<th>Experimental (B)'s pretest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>3.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3.2. Description and Treatment (Sessions 2-9)

In the second session, the researcher met the students in a computer lab to explain what is Moodle and how to use it. She also showed the students how to enroll in the Moodle's course and submit their assignments online.

The experiment started in the third session. Every session lasted 1 hour and 40 minutes. Both the experimental groups experienced a blended course of face-to-face sessions combined with e-learning. The face-to-face sessions were taught by the groups' instructor. E-learning was managed by the researcher.

3.1.3.2.1. Face-to-face Sessions

The instructor taught both groups an essay writing course from the course book, *Effective Academic Writing 2: The Short Essay, by Alice Savage and Patricia Mayer.*, which was required to be taught face-to-face in the university's English department. The course included three units regarding three different types of essays; opinion essays (unit 4), comparison and contrast essays (unit 5), and cause and effect essays (unit 6).

3.1.3.2.2. E-learning

The researcher designed the Moodle program and included everything the students would need for this experiment. The program’s main page included a summary of the course
and several links to the course description, each unit’s aims and objectives, and the assignments’ instructions. The main page also included a Moodle Guideline Video that showed the students how to do and submit their assignments online.

This Moodle program included 2 courses for two groups, *Essay Writing/ Group A*, and *Essay Writing/ Group B*. Both courses were based on the same course book. Therefore, both courses included the same units; Units 4, 5, and 6. Each unit included an essay assignment that required students to write about a specific topic. Unit 4 was about opinion essays, which required students to write and express their opinions about *texting and how some people spend too much time sending phone messages instead of interacting with others face to face*. Unit 5 addressed comparison and contrast essays. The students' assignment was to write *a comparison between two mobile devices*, the *IPhone* and the *Blackberry*. Finally, Unit 6 required students to write a cause and effect essay; the topic was about *the causes and effects of fast food popularity*.

Both the experimental groups were required to write an essay every two weeks and submit their assignments before the deadline date. Late students weren’t able to submit their work because the assignment submission key was automatically disabled. That is because the researcher edited the wiki’s settings and restricted access to the wiki until a specific closing date.

Each experimental group was provided with different instructions to write the essay assignment. The following section explains each group’s experiment.

**3.1.3.2.2.1.Experimental Group A**

Group A students were required to work collaboratively as groups and do their essay assignments by writing as a process; they followed five stages of writing: brainstorming,
outlining, first draft writing, editing, and final draft writing. The first stage was designed as a forum and the rest of the stages were designed as collaborative wikis.

The first stage forum allowed students to brainstorm their ideas about the essay topic and discuss their opinions together. After deciding on the ideas, students began outlining for the essay by using the second stage wiki. This wiki is a collaborative wiki that allowed the students to work cooperatively as groups and edit the wiki together. The researcher viewed and checked each member's work on the history page. After writing the outline, each group started writing its first draft by using another wiki of the third stage. They wrote their ideas without concern for mistakes, and edited each other's work by adding or excluding some ideas. In the fourth stage another wiki was used for editing. Students copied their first draft and pasted it on this stage's page. Next, they edited their essay by checking for mistakes regarding structure, spelling and punctuation. Then, when they reached the final stage of the final draft, they reviewed and submitted their essays before the submission deadline.

3.1.3.2.2.2. Experimental Group B

Group B students were required to work individually and do their essay assignments by writing as a product. The essay assignment was designed as an individual Wiki in which each student had a separate page to write and edit her own essay and submit it before the submission deadline.

To prepare each student for writing the essay, enabling learning activities were provided. These activities were basically exercises and drills designed as an online quiz. This quiz required students to complete it individually online. The exercises included were similar to the course book exercises to prepare each student for writing the essay. Therefore, the students were familiar with these exercises as they already practiced them in their face-to-face sessions with their instructor.
3.1.3.3. The Posttest (session 10)

After the treatment, the students in both experimental groups were given the one hour posttest. The posttest was an essay writing exam that had the same form and the same level of difficulty as the pretest they took in the first session. The content of both tests were different, but were very similar in the type of content, which fit the test specifications constructed for the content validity in both tests.

3.1.3.4. Scoring Criteria

The pretest and the posttest were scored in the same way by using a writing assessment scale. The assessment scale helped in making the scoring of the test as objective as possible which made the tests reliable.

3.1.4. Instruments

This study included two independent variables, a collaborative wiki and an individual wiki. The dependent variable was the students’ performance in the final posttest. A writing assessment scale was designed to assess and score the students’ performance. The students' posttest scores were compared with their scores in the pretest which was applied before implementing the experiment. To measure the students' attitudes towards the use of Moodle, an attitudinal scale was provided to them at the end of the experiment. Accordingly, a pretest, a posttest, a writing assessment scale, and an attitudinal scale were used in this study and will be explained in the following section.

3.1.4.1. Attitudinal Scale

The purpose of the attitudinal scale is to explore how the use of Moodle affected students' attitudes towards writing in English, and how well the online delivery of the essay
writing course enabled them to learn. This scale consisted of attitudinal questions on a 5-point Likert-scale: 5= almost always, 4= often, 3= sometimes, 2= seldom, 1= almost never. It included 24 items divided into 3 sections; the first section included the experiences of both experimental groups, group A and group B. It consisted of 4 dimensions; Relevance, e-learning, reflective thinking, and tutor support. The second section was related to group-A students’ experiences. It had 2 dimensions; interactivity and peer support. Then, the third section was about group-B students’ experiences that included 1 dimension; the enabling learning activities.

3.1.4.2. Writing Assessment Scale

The purpose of the writing assessment scale was to score students' writing performance in the pretest and posttest, and to help establish the tests’ reliability. The scale was self-designed but its reliability was established using an inter-rater reliability check. Three test papers were co-rated. The correlation between the first rater and the second one was 0.892, which was a highly significant correlation.

The writing assessment scale included 10 criteria for assessing an essay. It is a 3-point scale; 2= excellent, 1= competent, 0= not acceptable. To get an excellent grade in certain criteria such as structure and spelling, the student’s errors should not exceed 3 errors. As for competent, the errors should not be more than 10. If a student’s errors exceeded 10 errors, her grade would be "not acceptable". As for the total score, it was 20 points.

The scale included three sections; content, presentation and question specific criterion. The content section included criteria regarding the thesis statement and whether it is supported with reasons and examples. The presentation section included criteria about the organization of the essay, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation. The question specific criterion was concerned with responding to all aspects of the essay question.
3.1.4.3. Pretest and Posttest

The pretest and posttest were designed to have the same level of difficulty, the same format, and the same content but different topics to make them reliable. The tests administered to both experimental groups were essay questions. They were self-designed and their validity and reliability were established. This format included an essay question and instructions. The total score of the test was out of 20. The students were required to write an essay in response to the essay question that asked them to state, explain, and support their opinions on an issue. The test had clear instructions on what the students had to do. Every specification and criterion measured was mentioned in the questions for students to consider. The students were informed that their essays would be scored on their topic and whether it responds to all aspects of the essay question, the thesis statement and whether their opinion was supported with reasons and examples, the number of paragraphs and sentences, organization, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and punctuation.

3.1.4.4. Instruments Validity & Reliability

3.1.4.4.1. Instruments Validity

The validity of the pretest, posttest, writing assessment scale, and attitudinal scale were established by a jury judgment. The jury included five instructors at the English department of Imam University, each had Masters Degree in English but they differ in their majors. They reviewed the instruments, took a close look regarding whether they were appropriate, and agreed on their validity.
3.1.4.4.2. Instruments Reliability

The attitudinal scale was reliable because it was taken from the Moodle site, http://moodle.org/. However, the researcher made slight changes in some sections to fit this study.

As for the pretest and posttest reliability, it was established by the writing assessment scale. The scale’s reliability was established as well using inter-rater reliability check (See page 33).

In conclusion, this chapter described the method and procedure of the present study in detail. It specified and justified the method. Then, the population and the sample of the study were explained, followed by a detailed account of the procedure and the instruments used to conduct the study. Data collection and analysis will be fully explained in the following chapter.
Chapter 4

Data Analysis

Previously in chapter 3, the method and procedure of the study were described. This chapter is concerned with data analysis in order to answer the study's research questions. The findings of quantitative data analysis are reported.

4.1.1. Question 1

What is the relative effectiveness of teaching writing as a process vs. product using Moodle to Saudi EFL students?

To answer this question, two sub-questions were answered;

4.1.1.1. Sub-question 1

Is there a significant difference in the subjects’ performance in the post writing test compared to the pre-test of both experimental groups (A&B)?

As for experimental group (A), which learned the process writing approach, the results reveal a non significant difference in the English test scores between the pre-test (M=16.00, SD=3.281) and the post-test (M= 16.357, SD= 3.410); t(13)= 0.394, P= 0.70.  
(See Table 4-1).

Table 4-1: Means and Standard Deviations of experimental group (A)’s pretest and posttest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Regarding experimental group (B), which learned the product writing approach, the results reveal a significant difference in the English test scores between the post-test (M=18.0, SD=1.24) and the pre-test (M=15.785, SD=3.26); t(13)=3.215, P=0.007. (See Table 4-2)

Table 4-2: Means and Standard Deviations of experimental group (B)'s pretest and posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1.1.2. Sub-question 2

Which group’s performance (experimental group A; writing as a process, or experimental group B; writing as a product) will have significantly improved the most in the post writing test?

The results show that there is a significant difference between the post-test’s total score of experimental group (A), (M= 16.00, SD= 3.282) and of experimental group (B), (M= 18.00, SD= 1.24); t(26)= 2.133, P= 0.0481. Experimental group (B)'s total score of the post-test is higher than experimental group (A)'s. This indicates that students of experimental group (B) showed significantly more improvement than experimental group (A) in essay writing. (See Table 4-3)
Table 4-3: Means and Standard Deviations of experimental group (A) and experimental group (B)'s post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Experimental (A) post test</th>
<th>Experimental (B) post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>3.282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2. Question 2

How does the use of Moodle affect students' attitudes towards writing in English?

The students' responses to the attitudinal scale questions were coded into quantitative data for data analysis; almost always=5, often=4, sometimes=3, seldom=2, almost never=1. Then, the researcher used a procedure to analyze the Likert-type data that included a median for central tendency and frequencies for variability (Boone & Boone, 2012). (See Table 4-4)

Table 4-4: Distribution of the attitudinal scale's responses and their central tendencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Central tendency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>4.21 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>3.41 – 4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2.61 – 3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before discussing the results, it should be noted that group A's experience with Moodle was different from group B's due to the different writing approaches of each group. Group (A), which learned the process approach of writing, used collaborative wikis and forums. Group (B), on the other hand, learned the product approach of writing and used individual wikis and quizzes. Therefore, each group's attitudinal scale data was analysed separately.

Table 4-5: Means and standard deviations for group (A&B) students’ responses in the attitudinal scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Experimental groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning</td>
<td>3.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective thinking</td>
<td>3.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Support</td>
<td>4.309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results shown in Table 4-5 indicate that the students of both groups (A&B) gave positive responses towards the use of Moodle; all their responses ranged from *often* to *almost always* (Group A total: M= 4.00; Group B total: M= 4.456).

The results of the first dimension regarding the Moodle's relevance to students learning indicate that both groups' responses were *almost always* (Group A: M= 4.21, SD= 0.593; Group B: M= 4.428, SD= 0.609). As for the second dimension concerning the use of e-learning, group (A)'s response was *often*, while group (B)'s response was *almost always* (Group A: M= 3.871, SD= 0.752; Group B: M= 4.476, SD= 0.534). The results of the third dimension about reflective thinking show that group (A)'s response was *often*, while group (B)'s response was *almost always* (Group A: M= 3.976, SD= 0.561; Group B: M= 4.547, SD= 0.383). As for the results of the fourth dimension concerning tutor support, they indicate that group (A)'s response was *almost always*, and group (B)'s was *often* (Group A: M= 4.309, SD= 0.561; Group B: M= 4.102, SD= 0.875).

The first four dimensions discussed before were addressed to both groups (A&B). However, there were other dimensions that were specifically related to one group (A or B). For example, dimensions about interactivity and peer support were addressed to group (A),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Mean (A)</th>
<th>SD (A)</th>
<th>Mean (B)</th>
<th>SD (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>3.976</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The enabling learning activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.642</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td></td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
while the enabling learning activities dimension was meant for group (B). As for group (A)’s interactivity and peer support dimensions, the results show that the students’ responses were often (Interactivity: M= 3.833, SD= 0.736; Peer Support: M= 3.976, SD= 0.778). The results of group (B)’s dimension about the enabling learning activities indicate that the students’ response were almost always (M= 4.642, SD= 0.985).

Table 4-6: Global Means and standard deviations for group (A&B) students' responses in the attitudinal scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Experimental groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>12.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning</td>
<td>11.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective thinking</td>
<td>11.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Support</td>
<td>12.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactivity</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>11.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of quantitative data analysis of the instruments, the pre-test/post-test, indicate that experimental group (B) students showed greater improvement in essay writing than experimental group (A). The attitudinal scale’s results indicate that both experimental groups have positive attitudes towards writing. These results were reported and analyzed in this chapter. The following chapter will present the study's conclusions and recommendations.
Chapter 5

Conclusions and Recommendations

In this chapter, the findings of the study are discussed followed by some suggestions for teaching writing and recommendations for further research.

5.1. Conclusions

The following are the main conclusions of the present study:

5.1.1. In the Saudi context, product writing seems to be significantly more effective than process writing. This can be attributed to the fact that the product approach to writing is the most commonly used approach and therefore students are accustomed to such learning experiences. Students learning writing as a process may not be accustomed to those learning experiences included in their treatment.

5.1.2. Generally speaking, both groups learning writing using a product or a process approach seem to have developed favourable attitudes towards writing.

5.1.3. Students' positive attitudes towards writing might be attributed to the novelty of using Moodle in teaching writing.

5.2. Recommendations and suggestions

5.2.1. Suggestions for Teaching Writing

5.2.1.1. Enrolling the students in the e-learning course was time consuming for the teacher.

Imam University should have a LMS such as Moodle installed on its server and used
extensively particularly in skills courses. Any LMS should be integrated with the Students Information System (SIS) to facilitate the automatic enrolment of students.

5.2.1.2. Although writing as a product seems to be more effective than writing as a process, caution has to be taken in generalizing this finding. As mentioned earlier, students in Imam University may not be accustomed to process writing processes and learning experiences. Therefore, this approach should be tried out to make it familiar to the learners.

5.2.1.3. The English department of Imam University should run Moodle and e-learning training workshops for teachers.

5.2.2. **Recommendations for Further Research**

While conducting this research, the researcher came up with some recommendations for further research:

5.2.2.1. This study investigated the relative effectiveness of teaching writing as a product vs. process using Moodle to Saudi EFL students of Imam University; it would be interesting to conduct this study at other universities.

5.2.2.2. This study was conducted on a small-size sample (28 students). Thus, it would be useful to examine a larger-size sample to be able to generalize the findings.

5.2.2.3. This study's experiment lasted for 10 weeks. Thus, investigating this over a long period of time and measuring the students' progress throughout the experiment may result a stronger version of this study.

5.2.2.4. Only one area of teaching language skills (i.e., writing) was selected to explore the use of Moodle and its e-learning components. However, investigating other skills would be extremely informative.
5.2.2.5. The students in this study had a positive attitude towards the use of Moodle in the language classroom. Therefore, investigating the teachers’ perspective on using Moodle in language instruction would bring out interesting findings.

5.2.2.6. This study explored the effects of 4 e-learning components available in the Moodle (i.e., individual wikis, collaborative wikis, quizzes, and forums). Further research may explore the effects of various other e-learning components existing in Moodle and their effect on different language skills such as reading and writing or on language constructions such as vocabulary, spelling and grammar.

5.2.2.7. Students’ attitudes towards the use of Moodle were investigated through attitudinal scales. It would be interesting if further research explored their attitudes through interviews.
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Appendixes
Appendix A
Pretest
(Self-designed)

Imam Muhammed bin Saud Islamic University
College of Languages & Translation
English Department

Write an essay in response to the question below that asks you to state, explain, and support your opinion on an issue.

An effective essay will contain 3-to-4 paragraphs; each paragraph will contain a minimum of 3 sentences.

Your response will be scored on:
- Your topic and whether it responds to all aspects of the essay question.
- Your thesis statement and whether your opinion is supported with reasons and/or examples.
- Number of paragraphs and sentences.
- Organization.
- Grammar.
- Vocabulary.
- Spelling.
- Punctuation.

Plan, write, and revise your essay.

Essay Question:

If you could have personally witnessed one event in history, what would you want to have seen? Use specific reasons and examples to support your choice.

Teacher Wejdan Alshalan
Appendix B
Posttest
(Self-designed)

Imam Muhammed bin Saud Islamic University
College of Languages & Translation
English Department

Write an essay in response to the question below that asks you to state, explain, and support your opinion on an issue.

An effective essay will contain 3-to-4 paragraphs; each paragraph will contain a minimum of 3 sentences.

Your response will be scored on:
- Your topic and whether it responds to all aspects of the essay question.
- Your thesis statement and whether your opinion is supported with reasons and/or examples.
- Number of paragraphs and sentences.
- Organization.
- Grammar.
- Vocabulary.
- Spelling.
- Punctuation.

Plan, write, and revise your essay.

**Essay Question:**

What invention would the world be better off without? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Teacher Wejdan Alshalan
Appendix C
Writing Assessment Scale
(Self-designed)

Writing Assessment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Not Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The thesis statement is clear and matches the writing task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The thesis statement is supported with reasons and examples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The reasons and examples are accurate, appropriate, and integrated effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organization is purposeful, effective, appropriate, and supports the thesis statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Appropriate vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Appropriate spelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Appropriate grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Appropriate punctuation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Meets the minimum requirements of a sufficient effective essay (3-to-4 paragraphs, not less than 3 sentences in each paragraph).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Specific Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Responds to all aspects of the question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name:</th>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade: ______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excellent: Not more than 3 errors.
* Competent: from 4 to 10 errors.
* Not Acceptable: 10 and more errors.

Teacher Wejdan Alshalan
Appendix D
Attitudinal Scale
(Taken from http://moodle.org/ and self-designed to fit the present study)

Imam Muhammed bin Saud Islamic University
College of Languages & Translation
English Department

Alshalanw’s Moodle of Online Essay Writing Course
for EFL Students of Imam University: A Survey

The purpose of this survey is to help us understand how well the online delivery of the essay writing course enabled you to learn. Each one of the 24 statements below asks about your experience in this course. There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers; we are interested only in your opinion. Please be assured that your responses will be treated with a high degree of confidentiality, and will not affect your assessment. Your carefully considered responses will help us improve the way this course is presented online in the future.
Thank you very much.
All questions are required and must be answered

Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In this online essay writing course...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. My learning focuses on issues that interest me.</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What I learn is important for my writing performance.</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. I learn how to improve my writing performance.</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### E-learning

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E-learning facilitates learning essay writing.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>E-learning makes essay writing fun and interesting.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E-learning encourages me to participate and improve my writing performance.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reflective thinking

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I think critically about how I learn.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I think critically about my own ideas.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I think critically about ideas in the writing assignments.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tutor support

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The tutor stimulates my thinking.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The tutor encourages me to participate.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The tutor provides feedback.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (For Group A Students)

#### Interactivity

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I explain my ideas to other students.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other students explain their ideas to me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Other students respond to my ideas.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Peer support

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other students encourage my participation.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Other students praise my contribution.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Other students empathize with my struggle to learn.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Enabling Learning Activities

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Enabling Learning Activities and Exercises facilitate learning essay writing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Enabling Learning Activities and Exercises make learning essay writing fun and interesting.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The Enabling Learning Activities and Exercises' instructions are clear.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Enabling Learning Activities and Exercises provide feedback.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Enabling Learning Activities and Exercises' feedback help me learn from my mistakes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Enabling Learning Activities and Exercises encourage me to improve my writing performance.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Moodle
(Self-designed)

Moodle's front page

Welcome to Alshalanw's Moodle for EFL Students!

What is Alshalanw's Moodle?
Alshalanw's Moodle is an educational website that lets you:
- Learn essay writing in a fun way.
- Practice writing through online exercises and books.
- Get feedback from your teachers and peers on your writing.

Enter the available courses to learn Essay Writing online!

AVAILABLE COURSES
- Essay Writing | Group A
- Essay Writing | Group B

Moodle's Guideline Video

Hello students!
Welcome to Moodle Guideline!
This guideline shows you how to do and submit your assignments through moodle.

Enter the available courses to learn Essay Writing online!

Moodle Guideline Video
This video is a step by step guideline towards the use of moodle. It shows students how to do and submit their assignments online.
Units’ Assignments

Unit 4 Essay Assignment

- This Essay Assignment requires you to write an opinion essay in response to the question below:
- This assignment is designed as an individual Wiki in which you have your own page to write the essay.

Essay question:
Though texting is a valuable way of communicating, some people spend too much time sending phone messages instead of interacting with others face to face. Explain why you agree/disagree with this observation.

Essay Assignment’s Submission Deadline: 2 April 2012
Remember! This assignment has a submission deadline; submission will be automatically disabled after the deadline. Therefore, you must submit it before the closing date.

Click the Edit link below and start writing your essay on the first page.

Unit 5 Essay Assignment

- This Essay Assignment requires you to write a comparison/contrast essay in response to the question below.
- This assignment is designed as an individual Wiki in which you have your own page to write the essay.

Essay question:
People are always looking for new cell phone devices. There are many options to choose from. The two most common phones people choose to get are iPhone and Blackberry. Both of them are popular, but iPhone and Blackberry are totally different, how are they different? Compare and contrast between the two.

Unit 5 Assignment’s Submission Deadline: 17 April 2012
Remember! This assignment has a submission deadline; submission will be automatically disabled after the deadline. Therefore, you must submit it before the closing date.

Click the Edit link below and start writing your essay on the first page.

Unit 6 Essay Assignment

- This Essay Assignment requires you to write a cause-and-effect essay in response to the question below.
- This assignment is designed as an individual Wiki in which you have your own page to write the essay.

Essay question:
McDonald’s, Burger King and many fast-food restaurants are popular around the world. Explain what caused this popularity? What are its effects?

Unit 6 Assignment’s Submission Deadline: 01 May 2012
Remember! This assignment has a submission deadline; submission will be automatically disabled after the deadline. Therefore, you must submit it before the closing date.

Click the Edit link below and start writing your essay on the first page.
### Group A's Essay Writing Course

**Unit Outline:**

- **Unit Assignment:**
  - Each unit includes an assignment for writing an essay about a certain topic.
  - To accomplish this assignment, students must apply five stage-based learning activities.

  **Stage-based learning activities:**
  - These learning activities are collaborative; they allow students to work together as groups.
  - These learning activities are also stage-based; they allow students to follow the stages of writing.

  **Stage 1: Brainstorming:**
  - This activity is designed as a brainstorming to allow the students to brainstorm their ideas about the topic.

  **Stage 2: Outlining:**
  - This activity is designed as a collaborative wiki to allow the students to use their brainstorm.

  **Stage 3: First Draft Writing:**
  - This activity is designed as a collaborative wiki to allow the students to use their outline.

  **Stage 4: Editing:**
  - This activity is designed as a collaborative wiki to allow the students to edit their first draft.

  **Stage 5: Final Draft Writing:**
  - This activity is designed as a collaborative wiki to allow the students to write their final draft.

### Group B's Essay Writing Course

**Unit Outline:**

- **Unit Assignments:**
  - Each unit includes Enable Learning activities that are basically exercises and activities to prepare students.
  - These activities are designed as an online quiz that requires students to answer the exercises online.

  **Essay Assignments:**
  - Each unit includes an assignment for writing an essay about a certain topic.
  - This assignment is designed as an individual Wiki in which each student can work.

- The units assignments have a submission deadline; submission will be automatically disabled after the deadline.
- The units assignments should be original; plagiarism is prohibited. Click here to read more.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Attempts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brainstorming Stage (Forum)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brainstorming**

*by Jamia alhassan - Sunday, 22 April 2012, 8:11 PM*

The popularity of fast food restaurants increased for many reasons.

1. It’s convenient.
2. It’s cheap.
3. It doesn’t take much time to prepare

*Note: each of these points will be in a paragraph of its own*

---

**Re: Brainstorming**

*by halo abnezha - Tuesday, 24 April 2012, 8:47 PM*

- good points
- I will add to your point that
- it’s delicious
- it’s available everywhere and in every time

---

**Re: Brainstorming**

*by shahad abuzari - Monday, 30 April 2012, 6:59 PM*

- they have an easy logo that everyone can remember it
- their marketing methods, TV commended, different offer

---

**Re: Brainstorming**

*by hara abdram - Saturday, 5 May 2012, 6:20 AM*

- The most good benefit of fast food is saving time.
- Another benefit of fast food it is very inexpensive.
- Many kinds of meals and social flavors from all over the world.

---

**Identifying Facts and Opinions**

Choose Fact if the statement is a fact, or opinion if it is an opinion.

**Question 1**

- Fact

**Question 2**

- Fact
Outlining stage (Collaborative Wiki)

History of the group’s members’ attempts

Essay Assignment (Individual Wiki)

Most of people now have cell phones, and the most popular devices are Blackberry and iPhone. Since their have a messenger program, but there some differences between them. First there is a difference in the shape they are not same, then each of one has a different programs for example Blackberry its messenger program called blackberry messenger while the iPhone messenger program called whasap. Also about the stores for buying and downloading programs they are not same, we have iTunes for iPhone and app world for the blackberry, and about the services there are a few differences, each of them connect to the internet and social websites. But some people prefer the iPhone because its camera is better than the blackberry camera, also there are more choices in iPhone and big capacity to download more programs and applications, but Blackberry better in diversity that there is more than one kind of devices such as Jolid, curve and button while the iPhone still there one kind and it’s develop day by day. Here some differences between these devices which are the best cell phones in these days.

---

**FIRST PAGE NAME**

Created Saturday, 30 April 2013, 01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>07:42 PM</td>
<td>8 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10:25 PM</td>
<td>7 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10:19 PM</td>
<td>7 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:17 PM</td>
<td>7 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:16 PM</td>
<td>7 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>07:55 PM</td>
<td>6 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>03:49 AM</td>
<td>1 May 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The editing and final draft stages use the same collaborative wiki.

**First Draft Writing Stage**

(Collaborative Wiki)

The fast food restaurants are so popular in these day's, It's fact that we eat from them weekly or every two days at least. There are many reasons for why people like fast food, even it's usually unhealthy but still the first choice for us when we want to eat.

People like everything come fast, some of them don't have a time to cook especially those who work for long times they like to eat quickly when the fast food restaurants are really fast, various, delicious and cheap, and they are available in every city.

We can mention that fast food cause nutritional deficiencies, obesity, increased cholesterol level, because they contain fats and very high calories since we know some restaurants fired in the same oil more than once, which is unhealthy and may cause some disease.

Fast food restaurants are very popular and available everywhere for all with a reasonable price, but its nutritional value are really bad so that's why we should underestimate to eat from them and if we have to, one day in two weeks at most, will become better for us.

**PLAGIARISM WARNING**

1. No student shall represent the work of another person as his/her own in any assignment.
2. Any student found to have committed plagiarism shall receive no mark for the assignment; he/she cannot be graded on another person's work.
3. Plagiarism can be checked by the Plagiarism Checker Software.

---

**Comment:**

by Wejdan Alkalal - Sunday, 8 April 2012, 02:58 AM

You did a great job writing your essay in the right page and submitting it on time. However, I cannot grade you on another person's work! I'd like to judge your own writing. I have mentioned before that I have a plagiarism checker; when I checked your essay this following link appeared;

Thank you Students!
by Weydan Alzahalan - Wednesday, 9 May 2012, 08:41 AM

To all Moodle members,

It’s been a pleasure working with you all. Thank you for giving me this joyful opportunity to read your unique essays and brilliant ideas. My main purpose here is to provide you with the best learning experience and satisfy your need to learn. I hope I have accomplished that. I also hope I’d have the honor to teach you again in the upcoming semesters.

May Allah bless you all and guide you towards success and achievements.

Top 6 Essays of Unit 6 Assignment
by Weydan Alzahalan - Wednesday, 9 May 2012, 07:21 AM

Top 6 Essays of unit 6 Assignment
The names are listed alphabetically

1. Fast Food Restaurants by Abeer Al-Fayez
2. Fast Food Restaurants by Esra Alrumayan
3. Popularity of Fast Food by Hanan Alghusun
4. Popularity of Fast Food by Safyah Al-Qahtani
5. Why Fast Food Are Popular by Sarah AlJasser
6. Popularity of Fast Food Restaurants by Lamya Aldessari, Hana Alzahrani, Shahed Alhazzani, and Lulu Alhusayyan

Fast Food Restaurants
by Abeer Al-Fayez

Fast-food restaurants became popular among people nowadays taking a huge place worldwide. People constantly eat from fast-food restaurants to please their hungry children, it is their first choice for its convenience in time and money, also the use of chemicals in making the food has a great role of people's addiction and spending their excess money on it. Fast food restaurants altered eating habits into an unhealthy one.

Popularity of fast food is based on several elements, first to mention is the people's economy that has been improved in the past 10 years, we no longer think about what we eat fast food restaurant. Therefore, people escaped from fast food restaurants.

Fast-food Restaurants
by Esra Alrumayan

Fast-food restaurants are our number one choice at every meal. It’s enough to pass through the streets of any major city to see the living proof of that, so don’t they have become part of our every day life and our culture. We have good reasons for going to fast-food restaurant, they are not hard to find and they provide a convenient food for us.

Living in a fast pace life requires us to choose food that is food easily and cooked quickly and doesn’t require formalities and protocols in eating. Fast-food restaurant is the answer for that. We don’t take much time finding them, they are almost everywhere. Everyone can easily drive to the nearest branch and eat there, our get a take-away order which is even better.

Fast-food restaurant provide a value meals or single items which comes at cheap price. That attracts families for going to them. If we don’t have a fast-food restaurant, we will not have a restaurant that can give teens, adults and children with there parents a convenient food at one place, which made fast-food restaurant even more popular.

It’s clear that fast-food restaurant spend a lot to please their customers by selling delicious meals on an affordable price for all the family, that’s why they are so popular.

Popularity of Fast Food
by Hanan Alghusun

Fast-food restaurants are all over the world. We see the branches of the popular restaurants everywhere we go, in the malls, streets and inside the neighborhoods. It isn’t healthy for the human body but people still buy it. Most people enjoy fast food more than any other kind.