Akdeniz Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi
Mediterranean Journal of Educational Research 2018, Cilt 12 Sayı 25, Sayfa 60-75
https://doi.org/10.29329/mjer.2018.153.4
Copyright © 2018. Açık Erişim Makale CC BY-NC-ND

The Prediction of Collaborative EFL Task Achievement by Teaching, Social and Cognitive Presence

İrem Sarı Heshmati[1] *& Kadir Kozan*[2]

Abstract: This study investigated how well teaching, social and cognitive presence would predict collaborative task achievement in an English language learning context. Specifically, it was conducted at the prep school of a private, not-for-profit university in Turkey. A total of 169 students at a pre-intermediate level of proficiency participated in the study. The study employed an ex post facto research design along with an explanatory sequential mixed method. The survey results were analyzed through a standard multiple regression analysis accompanied by qualitative data analysis of semi-structured interviews. The interview results were mainly used for descriptive purposes. The survey results revealed that the participants regarded the learning environment as a community of inquiry; yet, the predictive power of the presences as a group was non-significant. Moreover, the presences could not significantly predict task achievement individually either. In other words, no predictive relationship was found between the presences and the collaborative task achievement despite their relatively adequate levels involved in the target learning context as suggested by survey ratings and interview results.

Keywords: Collaborative EFL Task Achievement**,** Cognitive Presence, Teaching Presence, Social Presence

Geliş Tarihi: 18.07.2018 **– Kabul Tarihi:** 10.08.2018 – **Yayın Tarihi:** 30.09.2018

DOI: 10.29329/mjer.2018.153.4

[1] Instructor, Bahçeşehir University, School of Foreign Languages, İstanbul / Turkey.

[2] Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Istanbul Bilgi University, English Language Teacher Education, İstanbul, Türkiye.

İrtibat Yazarı: kadirkozan53@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

A learning community using constructivist approach (Cross, 1998) and aiming to "foster community, coherence, and connections among courses and more sustained intellectual interaction among students and teachers" (MacGregor & Smith, 2005, p. 3) is regarded as crucial for collaborative learning and communication in higher education (Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007). Such a learning community can also be promoted in English-as-a-foreign language (EFL) classrooms particularly through collaborative activities. These activities are commonly used in classes, and they focus on developing communicative skills and competency to use a second language (Edstorm, 2015). After all, pair and group work can facilitate learning by increasing the quality of learner interaction, the quantity of practice, student motivation and leading to comprehensible input (Long & Porter, 1985).

Rooted in the social-constructivist approach, the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework asserts "higher-order learning is best supported in a community of learners engaged in critical reflection and discourse" (Garrison, Cleveland-Innes & Fung, 2010, p. 32). Although it is originally concerned about collaborative community learning in online higher education, the CoI framework can also guide face-to-face learning environments (e.g., Kozan & Richardson, 2014b). However, most of the CoI framework-related studies involve online or blended learning (e.g., Akyol & Garrison, 2011). Therefore, there is a need for further research on the factors impacting the relationship between teaching, social and cognitive presence, and course outcomes (Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007). Further, learners in blended courses may indicate higher teaching, social and cognitive presence levels than those taking fully online courses (Shea & Bidjerano, 2012). This insight implies that to create an effective community of inquiry, face-to-face components can be crucial as they contribute to "the salience of instructional, social, and cognitive dimensions of blended courses" (Shea & Bidjerano, 2012, p. 322).

The Community of Inquiry Framework

The CoI framework lays out the lines of effective learning during which a learner is engaged in learning affectively, socially and cognitively (Garrison et al., 2000). Such an effective learning experience involves a student's personal world (reflective) and shared world (collaborative) (Ke, 2010). The three key CoI framework components are teaching, social and cognitive presence. Teaching presence is "the design, facilitation, and direction of cognitive and social processes for the purpose of realizing personally meaningful and educationally worthwhile learning outcomes" (Anderson et al., 2001, p. 5). Consequently, teaching presence emphasizes "the design and organization of instruction, and especially the facilitation of productive discourse among students" (Shea & Bidjerano, 2009, p. 545). Ke (2010) claimed that design, facilitation and instruction elements shape adult students' cognitive and social performance in an online course.

Cognitive presence is "the extent to which the participants in any particular configuration of a community of inquiry are able to construct meaning through sustained communication" (Garrison et al., 2000, p. 89). Cognitive presence also "reflects higher-order knowledge acquisition and application and is most associated with the literature and research related to critical thinking" (Garrison et al., 2000, p. 7). Meaningful discussion activities will enhance cognitive presence, thereby leading to critical thinking and higher-level learning (Darabi, Arrastia, Nelson, Cornille & Liang, 2011). Therefore, cognitive presence is essential for such successful learning elements as critical thinking (Kanuka & Garrison, 2004).

Social presence is "the ability of participants to identify with the community (e.g., course of study), communicate purposefully in a trusting environment, and develop inter-personal relationships by way of projecting their individual personalities" (Garrison, 2009, p. 352). Thus, social presence plays a significant role in generating a safe and encouraging environment in a learning community (Garrison, 2011). It is essential for collaboration and critical discourse thus influencing, triggering, maintaining and fostering critical thinking (Akyol et al., 2009). As such, social presence is to provide situations for inquiry and worthwhile interaction to fulfill valuable learning goals in a collaborative way. Besides, social presence is not merely about the quantity of the interaction (Garrison, 2007) and "social presence in a community of inquiry must create personal but purposeful relationships" (Garrison & Arbaugh, 2007, p. 160).

The CoI framework assumes that the presences do not function separately (Garrison et al., 2001) and deep learning occurs through their interaction (Akyol et al., 2009). In other words, the co-existence of teaching, social and cognitive presences triggers meaningful learning (e.g., Garrison et al., 2000). Consequently, Akyol and Garrison (2008) stated that "social presence through group cohesion and teaching presence through direct instruction supports integration and higher levels of cognitive presence (i.e., integration)" (p. 17). Moreover, there are close relationships among teaching, cognitive and social presence (e.g., Kozan & Richardson, 2014a). For instance, Garrison, Anderson and Archer (2010) identified social presence as a mediator between teaching and cognitive presence while teaching presence had casual links to social and cognitive presence. Similarly, Kozan (2016a) revealed that, by the time online learning experiences end, cognitive presence can function as a full mediator between teaching and social presence while social presence can be a partial mediator between the other two presences.

Collaboration and foreign language education

Collaboration is the act of building and sustaining a shared understanding of a problem, and it promotes a rich learning environment (Roschelle & Teasley, 1995). Moreover, collaboration highlights active knowledge construction not a common product (Fjuk & Holmfeld, 1997). Therefore, "collaboration does not just happen because individuals are co-present; individuals must make a

conscious continued effort to coordinate their language and activity with respect to shared knowledge" (Roschelle & Teasley, 1995, p. 94). Learning activities that would encourage learners to work together and build knowledge in a collaborative way would allow learners to exchange ideas and receive peer feedback (Storch, 2005), and they are rather effective in terms of using the language to convey messages, to construct meaning and to come up with an output (Swain, 2000). Interaction, an important aspect of collaboration, is a crucial factor in language acquisition as well (Swain, Brooks & Tocalli-Beller, 2002). Further, second language (L2) learning occurs within collaboration rather than as a result of it (Swain et al., 2002) suggesting that the process of collaborative work facilitates L2 acquisition. According to Swain (1997), learners can both enhance their own and their peers' L2 proficiency through collaborative dialogue.

Accordingly, learning an L2 is a cognitive process including a social setting in which learners interact with each other through collaborative tasks triggering problem solving skills (Swain, 2000). Particularly, intriguing tasks draw the attention of students, necessitate critical thinking and stimulate motivation (Beckmann & Weber, 2016). Moreover, collaborative learning is a fundamental aspect of social presence that stimulates cognitive development since it increases critical thinking (e.g., Garrison, 2003; Garrison et al., 2000). After all, the most collaborative learning approaches (e.g., problem-oriented pedagogy) emphasize social interaction (Fjuk & Holmfeld, 1997). Consequently, it is reasonable to expect the CoI framework to inform effective collaboration between and among learners thereby enhancing collaborative task achievement in EFL contexts. This claim further suggests that teaching, cognitive and social presence can predict collaborative EFL task achievement. As a result, the present study addresses this research question:

How well can teaching, cognitive and social presence predict collaborative EFL task achievement?

This study also focuses on the two complementary research questions below:

Which presence is the best predictor of collaborative EFL task achievement?

What are the participants' perceptions of teaching, social and cognitive presence as they relate to collaborative EFL task achievement?

METHOD

Research Design

This study included qualitative and quantitative data since "this mixing or blending of data" facilitates understanding of it to a greater extent (Creswell, 2013, p. 264). The study also used an explanatory sequential mixed method where the main purpose is to clarify the quantitative results through qualitative data (Creswell, 2013). The qualitative data in this study were used mainly for

descriptive purposes, which means that the study was quantitatively driven or quantitatively dominant (e.g., De Lisle, 2011). Lastly, the study was ex post facto since it was conducted after the collaborative task was completed, and the variables were not manipulated.

Research Setting and Participants

The data were collected at the school of foreign languages of a not-for-profit private university. 169 pre-intermediate students from 15 classes participated in this study. 84 of the participants (49.7 %) were female and 85 (50.3 %) were male. Furthermore, the interview participants were chosen purposefully based on the survey results. That is, the participants were classified into high- and low-rater groups based on the total rating of each participant. A total of 10 students (5 from the high and 5 from the low group) were randomly chosen and interviewed. Participants completed an informed consent form before data collection.

INSTRUMENTS

The CoI survey

Originating from the CoI questionnaire constructed by Arbaugh et al. (2008), Ozturk's (2012) adapted Turkish survey was used in this study. The original questionnaire includes 34 items having a 5-point-scale going from (0) *Strongly disagree* to (4) *Strongly agree*. Previous research provided strong insights into the validity and reliability of the instrument or its adapted versions (e.g., Kozan, 2016b; Bangert, 2009; Caskurlu, 2018; Diaz, Swan, Ice, & Kupczynski, 2010; Garrison et al., 2010; Swan et al., 2008). Based on a pilot study done with 138 students, the Turkish version of the CoI instrument was used since some participants had difficulty understanding some of the original English questions. However, the 5-point-scale designed by Arbaugh et al. (2008) remained as it is. The items on the Turkish version were also adapted to the collaborative task. To illustrate, such expressions as "course", "course participants", and "online discussions" were replaced by "group members" and "group discussions".

The collaborative EFL task

The collaborative work assignment was a written task with three parts: In the first part, students were asked to write what they had learnt in the pre-intermediate level. The second part included an evaluation of learners' performance by themselves. Lastly, learners were required to lay out a future learning plan in the third part. In each section, there were some prompts given as well (e.g., "How do you feel as a learner now?", "How do you see your performance as a student?"). The purpose was to clarify the task and lead the students in a meaningful way so that they would focus on the material and meet the expectations of the assignment accordingly. Further, the participating students had already been familiar with the collaborative tasks before the data collection since proficiency level coordinators develop these tasks and the common grading criteria approved by the management.

Semi-structured interviews

Seven open-ended questions, developed in accordance with the questionnaire items, were addressed to the interviewees to check their collaborative learning task perceptions and the involvement of the three presences in it. The initial questions asked were general (e.g., "What do you think about this group work?"). Depending on the answers, the questions became more directive (e.g., "Do you think this group work encouraged collaboration and sense of belonging in the students?").

Data collection and analysis

Initially, the researchers collected and analyzed the quantitative data. Data collection occurred in a period from September to December 2016. Specifically, course instructors distributed the handouts including the instructions of the collaborative work assignment, *My English Journal-Reflective Journal Task*, to the participating students in the class and provided any necessary clarifications. The partners were chosen either by themselves or their instructors. They worked on the assignments in or out of school time and submitted their product on December 28, 2016. The survey data were gathered by means of Surveymonkey on the same day. The instructors distributed the survey link to the participants, and they completed it online.

In the qualitative part, the participants and the questions directed at them were chosen purposefully as purposive sampling is considered to be effective in choosing cases that are rich at presenting information (Patton, 1990). The interviews took place at school within two weeks after students submitted their tasks. They were conducted in five separate sessions as all the students were not simultaneously available. All the interview content was recorded via a smart phone and was transcribed. All in all, the quantitative and qualitative data were collected separately in less than three weeks. For the quantitative data, assumptions ranging from outliers to normality and missing points were checked before running a standard multiple regression analysis. There were no missing points and the few univariate outliers were not problematic based on the 5% trimmed means. Overall, the data were not normally distributed based on Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics (p's$< .001$), which was expected since a high level of presence is an essential indicator for a real community of inquiry. Moreover, since data transformations did not work, the data were left as they were.

Partly following Lodico, Spaulding and Voegtle (2010), the qualitative data analysis was inductive in that the data were organized in small units and the relevant ones were put together so that more comprehensive statements and conclusions could be obtained. As such, the semi-structured interviews were analyzed based on some of Lodico et al.'s (2010) steps in an adapted way since the present qualitative data set was not large enough to employ the steps fully: (a) preparing and organizing; (b) reviewing and exploring; (c) coding data; (d) building themes; and (f) reporting and interpreting. There was also a second coder who analyzed the interview data individually. Results of

the first and second coder's analyses were compared and integrated until achieving complete consensus between the two.

RESULTS

Descriptive Results

There was a high internal consistency level of the whole survey (Cronbach's Alpha = .98) and each part of it: teaching presence = .96; cognitive presence = .97; and social presence = .93. Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics:

Table 1. Descriptive Statics (*N* = 169)

Presence	Possible Minimum	Minimum	Possible Maximum	Maximum	*M*	*SD*
TP	0	1	52	52	43,05	9,89
SP	0	1	36	36	29,41	6,92
CP	0	0	48	48	37,58	11,39
Total Presence	0	2	136	136	110,04	26,24
Task Achievement	0	30	100	100	83,80	14,75

Using a 1-5 scale, Matthews, Bogle, Boles, Day and Swan (2013) claimed that the survey questions with a mean rating "less than 3.75, or slightly less than "agree" (4)" would be less than desired to indicate a strong community of inquiry (p. 493). Because the scale used in this study ranged from 0 to 4, the threshold rating was 3 for each item. The mean rating for teaching presence was 3.3 (*SD* = .119), 3.3 (*SD* = .090) for social presence and 3.1 (*SD* = .109) for cognitive presence. Further, the participants rated each survey item above 3 except for one item: Item 24 focusing on whether the task activities aroused curiosity in participants or not (*M* = 2.79; *SD* = 1.363).

Correlational Results

There were some large and positive correlations observed using Pearson's *r* and Spearman's rho (r_s) (Table 2).

Table 2. Initial Correlations (*N*=169**)**

		1 (r_s)	2 (r_s)	3 (r_s)	4 (r_s)
1	Task	-			
2	TP	.069 (-.027)	-		
3	SP	.050 (-.088)	.787*(.773*)	-	
4	CP	-.044 (-.093)	.765* (.793*)	.844*(.875*)	-

Note. $^{*}p < .001$(1-tailed).

Social and cognitive presences were so highly (i.e., r_s = .875) correlated that they may have referred to one very similar variable, if not the same, which might have violated multicollinearity (e.g.,

Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). For this reason, social and cognitive presences were combined into socio-cognitive presence. An additional correlational analysis followed this to inspect the correlations again (Table 3). The socio-cognitive presence had a mean rating of 33.50 (*SD* = 8.81). However, socio-cognitive presence is not a new presence type suggested here, it only emanated from a statistical need to ensure that the predictor variables were distinguishable enough.

Table 3. Final Correlations (*N*=169**)**

		1 (r_s)	2 (r_s)	3 (r_s)	4 (r_s)
1	Task	-			
2	TP	.069 (-.027)	-		
3	S-CP	-.009 (-.095)	.803*(.810*)	-	

Note. S-CP = Socio-cognitive presence. *p < .001(1-tailed).

Teaching presence and socio-cognitive presence still had a large and positive correlation. However, they were not related to the task achievement.

Multiple Regression

A standard multiple regression analysis was run to check how well teaching and socio-cognitive presence can predict the collaborative task achievement as a group.

Table 4. Results for the Standard Multiple Regression (*N* = 169)

Variables	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*t*	*p*	sr^2
Constant	80.35	5,00				
TP	.313	.190	.214	1.65	.100	.016
S-CP*	-.300	.212	-.181	-1.40	.164	.011

Note. R = .128, R^2 = .016, ΔR^2 = .004

The regression R (.128) was statistically non-significant, F (2,166) =1.375, p = .256 suggesting that teaching presence and socio-cognitive presence could not predict collaborative task achievement significantly. In the same vein, the standardized regression coefficients of teaching presence and socio-cognitive presence were both statistically non-significant. Accordingly, the presences did not turn out to be statistically significant predictors of collaborative task achievement in an EFL context, either as a group or individually.

Interview Results

The interview data were employed and examined to find out further insights that may enrich the quantitative results. Results revealed that more than 50 % of the participants were satisfied with the task (six out of 10). Two students in particular stated that the collaborative task was useful for their writing skills and helped them see the improvement in their English level. Two other students stated that they managed to know each other better. For instance, one participant stated that *"I didn't use to*

like writing, but with this collaborative task, and we did it with a partner, I enjoyed it more. I became aware that I could do it." On the other hand, one student stated that all students got more or less the same grades and complained that it was not fair to those who worked harder. Moreover, the design of the task was the only part that they really worked together. One student underlined that she did not enjoy the task, and two students reported that the task was a waste of time. For example, a participant stated that *"Everybody answered the questions individually, we just put them together."*

Regarding teaching presence, all the interviewees had a positive impression of their instructors, and also stated that the instructors were helpful. Some students mentioned that (a) their instructors clarified everything about the task (six out of 10); (b) they were supportive and encouraging (three out of 10) from the beginning till the end of the task (one out of 10); and (c) they were shown examples that helped them comprehend the task better (four out of 10). To illustrate, one participant stated that *"She explained the task clearly, and she encouraged us to start soon. She thoroughly supported us, she was quite helpful"*. However, only four students stated that they got enough feedback. As for the instructions, some found the information sufficient (six out of 10) and clear to understand (three out of 10) whereas some others found it difficult to understand and needed extra help either from their instructors or the dictionary (three out of 10). Surprisingly, even the required word count was not clear to some students (two out of 10). Namely, they were confused whether it was meant for all of the parts or each part. As an example, a participant stated that *"We were confused with the wording... we needed to write 80-100 words for each part, for each question or in total? This was confusing... when we asked our teacher, she clarified it."*

Furthermore, insights obtained from the interview responses revealed somehow contradictory viewpoints about the social aspect of the task. To clarify, almost all of the students declared that collaborating with close friends was comfortable and they had no communication problems (nine out of 10). Half of the students reported to have worked in a pleasant environment (five out of 10) and they also experienced the sense of belonging to the group (four out of 10) as well as a shared sense of stress (one out of 10). Besides, the task enabled them to understand the value of other students' presence (three out of 10). For instance, a participant stated that "*At points where I was inadequate, she stepped in, or when we had problems with vocabulary, I would say it. I really enjoy group work, it feels like it gives you strength, maybe I cannot do it alone."* On the other hand, seven students regarded the task as an individual activity rather than a group work, and they mentioned that the design of the task was the only part in which they worked together (six out of 10). Only one student disagreed with this opinion and emphasized that members' performance also affected the others. Unshared responsibilities and the presence of an irresponsible group member were other drawbacks of the task completion process according to some students (two out of 10): *"To be honest, responsibilities are not shared equally."*

Additionally, the cognitive presence level of the collaborative task seemed to be relatively low at least for some participants. The task stimulated the interest of three students only. They mentioned that they were able to observe their development (two out of 10) and their motivation increased thanks to the task (one out of 10). For instance, a participant stated that *"I think it was useful for us, it was different than the others because we wrote about our personal development... at least we had the chance to evaluate ourselves."* A few students reported to have exchanged ideas related to the task (three out of 10). On the other hand, some others merely shared overall ideas, still did not experience any disagreements as they considered the task to be an individual assignment (six out of 10): "*When we were writing it, it was individual, but while writing we also get help from the others like "How did you write?", "Did you keep that part long or short?". We just talked about this; we still got help from each other."*

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSIONS

Similar to earlier research (e.g., Kozan & Richardson, 2014a), the presences were strongly correlated in this study thus enriching previous insights such as "social presence through group cohesion and teaching presence through direct instruction supports integration and higher levels of cognitive presence (i.e., integration)" (e.g., Akyol & Garrison, 2008, p.17). Besides, each of the presences was rated above three, meaning that the ratings were high enough for a community of inquiry or learning community. Likewise, the survey responses and collaborative task achievement results were relatively high, implying a certain level of community of inquiry. However, the multiple regression analysis showed that teaching and socio-cognitive presence, as a group or separately, were unable to predict the collaborative task achievement. The interview results can provide insights into the main reasons for these findings.

To start with teaching presence, there were two indicators in this study: the instructors and the instructions. The students had high opinions about their instructors in terms of helping, encouraging, supporting, explaining the unclear parts of the task and setting the deadline, which is in accordance with responses given to the survey items regarding facilitation (M = 3.25, SD = .039). This strongly aligns with interview results in that the facilitation of the instructors was sufficient and satisfactory. Previous studies highlighted that instruction and facilitation are crucial contributors to deep learning and higher cognitive presence (Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2005) and social presence (Annand, 2011). In this study, however, students reported that they did not achieve very high levels of social presence despite their high ratings on the survey (M = 3.3, SD = .090).

Few students mentioned getting feedback from their instructors while others did not receive much. Feedback can enhance teaching, social and cognitive presence meaning that it may strengthen the perception of a community of inquiry (Ice, Curtis, Phillips & Wells, 2007). The way the feedback was given to the students may be one reason for the non-significant results: Despite high levels of

presences reported, the feedback might not have been given in a way and/or at a level to contribute to a community of inquiry. After all, while facilitation is one of the key elements in teaching presence, it may be insufficient without quality feedback, challenging task design and instructions. Likewise, the more interactive instruction is, the stronger the results are likely to be (Zirkin & Sumler, 2008) since collaborative learning promotes higher-level learning (Gokhale, 1995). Arbaugh et al. (2008) stated "cognitive presence is reflective of the purposeful nature of collaborative knowledge construction inherent in constructivist educational experiences" (p. 134). As such, while social presence average rating was above three on the CoI survey, it may not have directly reflected quality social interactions.

The interaction quantity is more important than its quantity for fulfilling educational goals (Garrison, 2007) and deeper learning (Garrison & Cleveland-Innes, 2005). The fact that interviewees reported low social presence implies that effective interaction may not have occurred fully, which may have resulted in a relatively low cognitive presence level because "social presence supports cognitive objectives through its ability to instigate, sustain, and support critical thinking in a community of learners" (Rourke, Anderson, Garrison, Archer, 1999, p. 52). Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that in a more quality learning community, teaching, social and cognitive presences interact with each other more effectively.

Collaborative projects provide an opportunity that facilitates a sense of community and social presence (Richardson & Swan, 2003). In that respect, the present task seems to have failed considerably since the participants also indicated that the task did not trigger quite an effective learning community. That is, they may not have experienced a challenging enough learning experience, which can also be partly due to the lack of effective collaboration and the task design. This would be another reason why the presences could not predict the task achievement. The task used in the current study also had problems in motivating the participants thereby not creating enough interest and curiosity on average as shown by the interview results. After all, setting effective goals increases students' motivation as they trigger "arousal, discovery, and/or use of task-relevant knowledge and strategies" (Locke & Latham, 2002, p. 707). Therefore, the task goals may have been set in such an effective and challenging way that it would have led to better task performance (Locke & Latham, 2002).

The task was also criticized in terms of its instructions and design by the interviewees. Further, most participants regarded the task as an individual activity rather than group work. They also reported to have shared overall ideas and worked collaboratively while designing the magazine only. In other words, the interaction among the participants was mainly irrelevant to the task itself: they just shared ideas as to the length and the general design of the task. As previously stated, interaction is a key factor in students' achievements (e.g., Zirkin & Sumler, 2008). Similarly, lack of substantial interaction among students taking online courses was found to restrict the integration of knowledge

and various ideas as well as the process of higher-level learning in previous studies (e.g., Slagter van Tyron & Bishop, 2009). Accordingly, the way the task was designed may also have impeded the integration of knowledge, transferring and building meaning by sharing and exchanging ideas. As such, more properly designed tasks that involve negotiation of meaning and discussion could contribute to meaningful collaboration resulting in higher level learning as suggested previously (e.g., Han & Hill, 2007).

Limitations, Recommendations and Implications

The present results are limited to one single collaborative task at one school and one proficiency level thereby limiting the external validity or generalizability. Therefore, it calls for replication studies to be conducted on more than one task, school and level. Comparing different collaborative tasks could also be a good area for further research. Moreover, the results do not provide any casual implications since the quantitative data were analyzed through regression that is about relationship (e.g., Pallant, 2007). Likewise, considering that students from different classes took part in the study, the grading of the collaborative tasks can be another limitation since, regardless of the common criteria, the instructors' evaluation might not have been standard enough while evaluating the task outcomes.

This study also suggests that there is a need to further reflect on the prediction of students' task achievements by teaching, social and cognitive presences in different types (e.g., face-to-face, blended) of learning environments where students' perceptions of tasks, their attitudes towards them and their level of engagement or motivation are also investigated. Moreover, learners' perception of the collaborative task could also be based on all course elements and the CoI survey may prove to be effective at examining the whole course experience. Therefore, as Akyol and Garrison (2011) highlighted, further studies are recommended to study the relationship between the presences and overall course outcomes.

Further, more than one data source contributed to data triangulation in this study, and the descriptive qualitative data provided complementary insights to the survey results. The trustworthiness was high since the qualitative data were analyzed both by the first researcher and another coder by reaching full consensus. A pilot study was also run on the CoI questionnaire to have insights into its suitability of use with the particular participant sample. On the other hand, the participants completed the survey at their own pace, which implies that history effect might have had an impact on the quantitative data results.

Overall, EFL instructors would be better off designing courses or assignments in such a way that it would promote meaningful collaboration among students, which in return would give them the opportunity to expand their knowledge, share information and negotiate meaning. This result is highly

likely to facilitate higher-level learning, and thus leading to better task achievement through higher levels of teaching, cognitive and social presence. Timely and effective feedback can also contribute to such higher-level learning experiences and communities. Such effective learning communities enabling a higher level of learning are worth further research that would yield more evidence-informed insights.

Acknowledgments

This paper emanates from the first author's MA thesis completed at Bahcesehir University in August 2017.

REFERENCES

Akyol, Z., & Garrison, D. R. (2008). The development of a community of inquiry over time in an online course: Understanding the progression and integration of social, cognitive and teaching presence. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 12*, 3- 22.

Akyol, Z., & Garrison, D. R. (2011). Understanding cognitive presence in an online and blended community of inquiry: Assessing outcomes and processes for deep approaches to learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 42*(2), 233-250.

Akyol, Z., Arbaugh, J. B., Cleveland-Innes, M., Garrison, D. R., Ice, P., Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. (2009). A response to the review of the community of inquiry framework. *Journal of Distance Education, 23*(2), 123-136.

Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Garrison, D. R., Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in a computer conferencing context. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 5*(2), 1-17.

Annand, D. (2011). Social presence within the community of inquiry framework. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 12*(5), 40-56.

Arbaugh, J. B., Cleveland-Innes, M., Diaz, S. R., Garrison, D. R., Ice, P., Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. P. (2008). Developing a community of inquiry instrument: Testing a measure of the community of inquiry framework using a multi-institutional sample. *The Internet and Higher Education, 11*(3), 133-136

Bangert, A.W. (2009). Building a validity argument for the community of inquiry survey instrument. *The Internet and Higher Education, 12,* 104-111.

Beckmann, J., & Weber, P. (2016). Cognitive presence in virtual collaborative learning: Assessing and improving critical thinking in online discussion forums. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education, 13*(1), 52-70.

Caskurlu, S. (2018). Confirming the subdimensions of teaching, social and cognitive presences: A construct validity study. *The Internet and Higher Education, 39,* 1-12.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.

Cross, K. P. (1998). Why learning communities? Why now?. *About Campus, 3*(3), 4-11.

Darabi, A., Arrastia, M. C., Nelson, D. W., Cornille, T., & Liang, X. (2011). Cognitive presence in asynchronous online learning: A comparison of four discussion strategies. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 27*(3), 216-227.

De Lisle, J. (2011). The benefits and challenges of mixing methods and methodologies: Lessons learnt from implementing qualitatively led mixed methods research designs in Trinidad and Tobago. *Caribbean Curriculum, 18*(1), 87-120.

Diaz, S. R., Swan, K., Ice, P., & Kupczynski, L. (2010). Student ratings of the importance of survey items, multiplicative factor analysis, and the validity of the community of inquiry survey. *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*, 22-30.

Edstrom, A. (2015). Triads in the L2 classroom: Interaction patterns and engagement during a collaborative task. *System*, *52*(1), 26-37.

Fjuk, A., & Holmfeld, D. (1997). Articulation of actions in distributed collaborative learning. *Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems*, *9*(2), 1.

Garrison, D. R. (2003). Cognitive presence for effective asynchronous online learning: The role of reflective inquiry, self-direction and metacognition. *Elements of quality online education: Practice and Direction*, *4*(1), 47-58.

Garrison, D. R. (2006). Online collaboration principles. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *10*(1), 25-34.

Garrison, D. R. (2009). Communities of inquiry in online learning. In P. L. Rogers, G. A. Berg, J. V. Boettcher, C. Howard, L. Justice, & K. D. Schenk (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Distance Learning* (pp. 352-355) (2nd ed.). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Garrison, D. R. (2011). *E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Garrison, D. R. (2013). Theoretical foundations and epistemological insights of the community of inquiry. In Akyol Z. (Ed.), *Educational communities of inquiry: Theoretical framework, research, and practice* (pp. 1-11). USA: IGI Global.

Garrison, D. R., & Arbaugh, J. B. (2007). Researching the community of inquiry framework: Review, issues, and future directions.*The Internet and Higher Education*, *10*(3), 157-172.

Garrison, D. R., & Cleveland-Innes, M. (2005). Facilitating cognitive presence in online learning: Interaction is not enough.*The American Journal of Distance Education*, *19*(3), 133-148.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *2*(2-3), 87-105.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2010). The first decade of the community of inquiry framework: A retrospective. *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*(1), 5-9.

Garrison, D. R., Cleveland-Innes, M., & Fung, T. S. (2010). Exploring causal relationships among teaching, cognitive and social presence: Student perceptions of the community of inquiry framework. The Internet and Higher Education, 13, 31-36.

Gokhale, A. A. (1995). Collaborative learning enhances critical thinking. *Journal of Technology and Education, 7*(1), 22-30.

Han, S. Y., & Hill, J. R. (2007). Collaborate to learn, learn to collaborate: Examining the roles of context, community, and cognition in asynchronous discussion. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *36*(1), 89-123.

Ice, P., Curtis, R., Phillips, P., & Wells, J. (2007). Using asynchronous audio feedback to enhance teaching presence and students' sense of community.*Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *11*(2), 3-25.

Kanuka, H., & Garrison, D. R. (2004). Cognitive presence in online learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 15(2), 21-39.

Ke, F. (2010). Examining online teaching, cognitive, and social presence for adult students. *Computers & Education*, *55*(2), 808-820.

Kozan, K. (2016a). A comparative structural equation modeling investigation of the relationships among teaching, cognitive, and social presence. Online Learning Journal, 20(3), 210-227.

Kozan, K. (2016b). The incremental predictive validity of teaching, cognitive and social presence on cognitive load. The Internet and Higher Education, 31, 11-19.

Kozan, K., & Richardson, J. C. (2014b). New exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis insights into the community of inquiry survey. The Internet and Higher Education, 23, 39-47.

Kozan, K., & Richardson, J.C. (2014a). Interrelationships between and among social, teaching, and cognitive presence. The Internet and Higher Education, 21, 68-73.

Liu, S. Y., Gomez, J., & Yen, C. J. (2009). Community college online course retention and final grade: Predictability of social presence. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, *8*(2), 165-182.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, *57*(9), 705-717.

Lodico, M. G., Spaulding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). Organization and Analysis of Qualitative Research Data. *Methods in educational research: From Theory to Practice* (First Ed., pp. 300-314). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 207-228.

Lord, H. G. (1973). *Ex Post Facto Studies as a Research Method*. (Special Report No. 7320) Retrived from ERIC website: http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED090962.pdf

MacGregor, J., & Leigh Smith, B. (2005). Where are learning communities now? National leaders take stock. *About Campus*, *10*(2), 2-8.

Öztürk, E. (2012). An adaptation of the community of inquiry index: The study of validity and reliability. *Elementary Education Online*, *11(2)*, 408-422.

Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual: A step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS version 15*. Nova Iorque: McGraw Hill.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. New Bury Park: SAGE Publications.

Richardson, J., & Swan, K. (2003). Examing social presence in online courses in relation to students' perceived learning and satisfaction. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *7*(1), 68-88.

Roschelle, J., & Teasley, S. D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving. InO'Malley C. (Ed.), *Computer supported collaborative learning* (Vol. 128, pp. 69-97). Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

Rourke, L., Anderson, T., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (1999). Assessing social presence in asynchronous text-based computer conferencing. *Journal of Distance Education, 14*(2), 50-71.

Shea, P., & Bidjerano, T. (2009). Community of inquiry as a theoretical framework to foster "epistemic engagement" and "cognitive presence" in online education. *Computers & Education, 52*(3), 543-553.

Shea, P., & Bidjerano, T. (2012). Learning presence as a moderator in the community of inquiry model. *Computers & Education, 59*(2), 316-326.

Slagter van Tryon, P. J., & Bishop, M. J. (2009). Theoretical foundations for enhancing social connectedness in online learning environments. *Distance Education, 30*(3), 291-315.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153-173.

Swain, M. (1997). Collaborative dialogue: Its contribution to second language learning. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 34*(1), 115-132.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, *97*, 114.

Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). 9. Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22*, 171-185.

Swan, K., Richardson, J.C., Ice, P., Garrison, D.R., Cleveland-Innes, M., & Arbaugh, J.B. (2008). Validating a measurement tool of presence in online communities of inquiry. *E-mentor, 2*(24), 1-12.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 17*(2), 89-100.

Zirkin, B., & Sumler, D. (2008). Interactive or Non-interactive?: That Is the Question!!!. *International Journal of E-Learning & Distance Education, 10*(1), 95- 112.