TÜBAD TÜRKİYE BİLİMSEL ARAŞTIRMALAR DERGİSİ Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi | TURKISH SCIENTIFIC RESEARCHES JOURNAL TUSREJ | ISSN : 2602-4632

TÜBAD Cilt VIII, Sayı I, Mayıs, 2023

Sınıfta Teknoloji Kullanımı: Ileri Düzey İngilizce Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerinin Yazma Doğruluğunu Geliştirmede Ters Yüz Sınıf Öğretiminin Etkisi

Elham ZARFSAZ[1]

Serpil UÇAR[2]

Gönderim Tarihi: 22.09.2022 Yayın Tarihi: 31.05.2023 Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

Öz

Bu çalışma, ileri düzey İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerinin yazma doğruluğunu geliştirmede ters yüz sınıf öğretiminin etkisini araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Belirlenen amaca ulaşmak için Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretmenliği Bölümünde öğrenim gören 18-24 yaş aralığında 42 erkek ve kadın ileri düzey Türk İngilizce Öğretmenliği bölümü öğrencisi seçilmiş ve homojen dağılımdan sonra rastgele deney ve kontrol gruplarına atanmıştır. Yazma modülleri ile ilgili video ve powerpointler araştırmacı tarafından öğretmen yardımıyla hazırlanmış ve derse gelmeden önce izlenmesi için araştırmacı tarafından oluşturulan Telegram grubu aracılığıyla deney grubundaki katılımcılara konular gönderilmiştir. Kontrol grubu için geleneksel öğretim yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Deney grubu için, videolar katılımcılarla paylaşılmadan önce tüm deneklerden IELTS hedefleri ve akademik yazma modülüne dayalı ön test olarak bir kompozisyon yazmaları istendi. Uygulamanın 16. oturumunun sonunda tüm deneklerden son test olarak başka bir yazı yazmaları istendi. Verilerin analizi, EFL ileri seviyedeki öğrencilere yazma öğretiminde ters-yüz öğretiminin, geleneksel sınıf içi öğretime kıyasla daha etkili olduğunu ve ileri seviyede İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrencilerin yazma doğruluğunu daha iyi geliştirmeye katkıda bulunduğunu ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ters yüz edilmiş sınıf, Gelenekler sınıf içi eğitim, yazma doğruluğu, İngilizce öğrenenler (yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenenler)

Technology in Classroom: Flipping Classroom to Enhance Writing Accuracy of Advanced Turkish EFL Learners

Abstract

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of flipped classroom instruction on the writing accuracy enhancement of advanced Turkish EFL learners. To achieve the set goal, 42 male and female advanced Turkish EFL students within the age range of 18-24 studying at the ELT Department at Gaziosmanpaşa University in Tokat, Turkey, were selected and, after being homogenized were randomly assigned into experimental and control groups. The video PowerPoints were prepared by the researcher with the help of the teacher about writing modules and were sent to the subjects of the experimental group through the Telegram group created by the researcher with the help of the teacher to be watched before attending the class to get familiarized with lesson contents. For the control group, traditional classroom instruction, which involved the ordinary teacher instruction process, was used. Before sharing the videos

[1] Sorumlu Yazar :, ,Elham Zarfsaz, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, Türkiye, elham.zarfsaz@gop.edu.tr, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6172-6388

[2] Serpil Uçar, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi, serpil.ucar@gop.edu.tr, Türkiye, ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9722-8236

with the participants, all the subjects were asked to write an essay as a pre-test based on the IELTS objectives and academic writing module. At the end of the 16th session of treatment, all the subjects were asked to write another piece of writing as a post-test. The analysis of the data revealed that using Flipped Classroom Instruction in teaching writing to advanced EFL students was more effective in comparison to traditional in-class instruction and contributed to better writing accuracy enhancement of advanced Turkish EFL learners.

Key Words: Flipped Classroom, Traditions in-class instruction, writing accuracy, EFL learners (English as a foreign language learner)

Introduction

Writing is considered to be one of the most complicated skills to be mastered by second or foreign-language learners. Yet, writing is not only one of the main requirements for many university majors and future professions but also one of the main tools for reaching academic success. Most students, especially in English as a foreign language settings, have to master writing skills and should be able to write a simple paragraph, learn summarizing skills, and the ability to write essays and academic articles (Lee, 2003). Alsamadani (2010) asserts that "writing is considered a challenging and difficult process since it involves multiple skills of figuring out the thesis statement, providing support in details, and editing (p. 55). Nunan (1999) believes that "it is a skill that even most native speakers can never master because it requires the production of a long, coherent and fluent piece of writing" (p.271). He attributes the reason to the fact that creating a piece of writing requires to have adequate lexical and grammatical knowledge and taking into account the organization, coherence, and cohesion in paragraphs; accordingly, language teachers are in great demand for innovative approaches and methods that can facilitate the process of teaching writing.

One of the common problems that all teachers in all fields of education experience are with students who are continuously absent and miss teaching sessions. Facing this problem, Bergmann and Sams (2012) tried to video record their class lectures to provide access to the materials instructed in the class for absent students. They were surprised to notice that their videos were also watched by present students with tremendous enthusiasm; therefore, they created Flipped Classroom Instruction to assist learners in reviewing the key concepts before coming to class (Talbert, 2012).

Since writing is a difficult skill to master, as was mentioned above, the student's absences in the sessions in which this skill is instructed in the class can create even much more difficult not only for learners in mastering this skill but also for teachers in instructing it; moreover, even those students who are present in the class may go home to complete their homework assignments and may encounter problems, and that could not be answered right away which increases the students' disappointment if they cannot fulfill the task. This happens since most of the time, due to the limited time of the class, teachers do not have sufficient time to thoroughly cover and practice all dimensions of writing; much of the class time is spent mainly on theoretical explanations of the teacher rather than the practice which is the usual process in traditional student-centered teacher-driven classrooms (Rennie, 2000). Brown (2007) asserts that good learning outcomes are achieved when English practitioners consider students' engagement inside and outside the classroom by creating a more independent learning environment.

Flipped Classroom Instruction which is a kind of blended learning is an innovative method of teaching intended to move the learning experience out of the borders of the classroom to create freedom for learners in time and in learning content which can lead to more productive learning outcomes; it is mainly used to guide the classroom learning towards practical learning instead of theoretical explanations. It allows the opportunity of more individualized and personalized learning which leads to an increase in the motivation and engagement of students, providing opportunities

for directing their learning, making the utmost benefit from the on-site instructional time, and fostering their autonomy (Bergmann & Sams, 2014).

Enfield (2013) believes that a flipped-classroom approach can prepare students for taking responsibility for their learning since this approach leads to independent learning outside of the classroom and promotes active learning. In this approach, the students have the advantage to "pause to reflect on what is being said, rewind to hear it again, listen to as much or as little of the lecture as their schedules permit, and view the lecture on a mobile device rather than in a fixed location"(Talbert, 2012, p. 101). Abeysekera and Dawson (2015) assert that flipped classroom instruction has three beneficial aspects: "learning activities are active and social inside the classroom," "most information-transmission teaching is moved outside the classroom" and "students should be benefited from in-class work by completing pre-and/or post-class activities" (p.3).

In recent years with the popularity of technological devices such as cell phones, tablets, i-pads, etc., methods and approaches that use these technologies have gained lots of attention in all fields of education, especially language learning (Whyte, 2011). Ituma (2011) asserts that "to address some of the limitations associated with the exclusive use of e-learning [or F2F learning for that matter], there is a need to adopt a more 'blended' approach to learning" (p. 59). Blended Learning combines online and on-site learning between learners and instructors (Bonk & Graham, 2006). Oliver and Trigwell (2005) also define blended learning as the mixture of traditional learning along meditating through internet-based online approaches. The main advantage of blended learning is related to the fact that it is not completely contingent upon face-to-face interaction, nor absolutely upon online interaction. However, it is a "carefully designed synthesis of online and face-to-face learning incorporating a range of media based upon a sound constructivist pedagogical framework" (Buckley, Pitt, Norton, & Owens, 2010, p. 57).

Blended learning is also a combination of various teaching theories and approaches, including the constructivist and cognitive approaches, in which there is an attempt to create learning environments that smooth the way for the progress of a type of instruction that concentrates on increasing students' motivation and self-regulation by proactive engagement with other students (Astin, 1999). Sharma (2010) also claims that the Present-Practice-Produce (PPP) phases and Task-Based Teaching (TBLT) methods are used in blended learning too. In blended learning teacher engages learners, exposes them to the rules by the use of videos, examples, and practice which provides time for learners to do various tasks in the class.

To have a successful English language learning in blended learning it is necessary for the instructor, through the use of guided practice, to extend the amount of time to present materials and take practice outside the classroom. Blended Learning can increase self-efficacy and learning in EFL situations and reduce anxiety by assisting learners to shift from external control, such as a teacher-centered approach to internal control in a learner-centered approach (Richards, 2010).

There are various roles done by both the teacher and the learner in blended learning that, if not clarified sufficiently can lead to confusion (Ocak, 2011). Although blended learning involves independent learning on the part of learners, the instructor must constantly monitor online work to reach an optimum face-to-face learning outcome and enhance learners' online participation (Kupczynski, Stallone Brown, & Davis, 2008). The instructors should also regularly reflect on their face-to-face interaction with learners, as their specific technical skills are needed for flipped classroom instruction. The instructors of BL should actively guide learners through different forms of guidance such as tutoring, coaching, managing, and facilitating the online course to help learners reach success (Richards, 2010).

In a situation where knowledge is conveyed through technology, learners can work collaboratively, share information, actively engage in all tasks, and learn independently. This leads to active learning in which learners are no longer passive learners receiving information from the teacher. This independent learning can lead to autonomous learning ability which according to Green (2000), is not innate but gained either through natural means or through formal, systematic, and deliberate learning which is necessary for independent lifelong learning on the part of learners. Learner autonomy is boosted in BL, where "learning is genuinely in the hands of the learner" (Smith, 2008, p. 50).

The shift from a teacher-oriented method of teaching to learner-oriented, along with the emergence of the possibility of student-teacher and student-student interaction out of the classroom provided by blended learning has led to the emergence of other methods and approaches of teaching as Flipped Classroom Teaching (Richards, 2010).

The main characteristic of traditional classroom teaching is the restriction of instruction and other activities to a class environment and class time; however, in recent years, the emergence of technology has led to other methods and approaches of teaching which are not restricted to instruction inside a classroom, but instead pay more attention to out of class instruction which can leave more time for in-class practice (Huitt, 2003). As was mentioned earlier, flipped classroom instruction is a reversal in the class setup, which leads to changes in-class instruction and assignments. Learners receive the information out of class, so they "pause to reflect on what is being said, rewind to hear it again, listen to as much or as little of the lecture as their schedules permit, and view the lecture on a mobile device rather than in a fixed location" (Talbert, 2012, p. 101).

According to Wai Pong (2015), flipped classroom instruction and traditional classroom instruction vary not only in teaching methods but also in the activities inside and outside of the classroom. While the method of teaching in traditional classroom instruction involves teacher-centered instruction, whole-class learning, individual work, and individual learning, flipped classroom instruction involves student-centered instruction, small-group learning, generally collective, and less individual work.

Active learning strategies in which the students acquire knowledge by working together cooperatively are considered the key elements of a student-centered learning environment (Michael, 2006). Cooperative learning, in which students learn by working together and assisting each other, is also termed peer instruction (Crouch & Mazur, 2001) combined with the pre-training, also known as advanced organizers (Ausubel, 1960) in which the students gain knowledge in advance before attending the class constitutes the primary goal of the video lectures students view as homework within the flipped classroom model of instruction. According to Kohn (2006, as cited in Orlich, Harder, Callahan, Trevisan, Brown, & Miller, 2013, p.33), a cooperative learning environment "where all participate, including the teacher" provides the opportunity of interdependent learning where all the members in small groups share their ideas and can have face-to-face interaction. These features are among the common norms of flipped classroom instruction for enhancing active learning and learners' responsibility. The video lectures are designed mainly to substitute for the teachers' lectures in the class. Students can watch the video lectures before attending the class, which omits the theoretical lecture part of the class period and provides opportunities for in-class student-centered approaches to foster cooperative learning experiences (Wiley, 2015).

Other language learning theories in an English writing class, such as Cognitive Learning and the Noticing Hypothesis, fit within the norms of flipped classroom instruction. The cognitive school of thought also recommends that learners need to engage in active learning and problem-solving.

Teachers' direct instruction in flipped classroom instruction can improve students' cognitive and metacognitive skills (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). The noticing hypothesis, which was proposed by Swain (1995) claims that to change input into the intake, the learners noticing ability should be improved by teachers' direct instruction, consciousness-raising, and input enhancement. Consciousness-raising can increase learners' noticing of their linguistic problems and share their learning with others in a cooperative learning environment (Kohn, 2006, cited in Orlich et al., 2013).

In traditional classroom instruction, learners are primarily passive and receive the information from the teacher without any interference and are mainly affected by the classroom instruction constructed by the teachers in the process of teaching or brainstorming; on the other hand, learners in flipped classroom instruction undergo active learning in which they can critically think about their learning process.

According to Bishop and Verleger (2013), student-centered instruction and active learning are rooted in the theories of Piaget's Constructivism, which asserts that the students construct knowledge; on the other hand, teacher-centered instruction and passive learning are rooted mainly in theories of Positivism indicating that teachers convey knowledge through lecturing while learners reflect the information by taking notes (Knowlton, 2000).

The shift from a teacher-centered approach into a student-centered approach in flipped classroom instruction also changes the teachers' role. According to Bergmann, Overmyer, and Wilie (2012), the role of the teachers in traditional classes can be described as the "sage on the stage" in which the teacher, like a sage on the stage presents the information and tries to attract the attention of students into what is being presented. The role of the teacher in the flipped classroom, on the other hand, is "guide on the side" who guides the students in their individual learning experiences. The two methods are also different based on learning/teaching activities outside the classroom. While learners in traditional classroom instruction prepare themselves for the next session through self-learning and reading examples in the textbook, learners in flipped classroom instruction prepare themselves through individual learning by watching videos. In traditional classroom instruction, learners are provided with some repeated exercises for a concept and some problem-based exercises (Closed-ended and open-ended problem-solving exercises); in flipped classroom instruction, learners are provided with practical exercises for a concept (mostly closed-ended exercises).

In his study, Metcalf (2015) investigated the impact of flipping a middle school classroom on students' achievement at the middle school level as well as examined their perception of the learning experience. Eighty-five students selected from 4 classes from a middle school in America formed the study population. The classes were selected randomly, and two of the classes were assigned as control groups (n=40), and two of the classes were assigned as experimental groups (n=45), again randomly. Before starting the treatment sessions, all the participants were given a pre-test. During the treatment sessions, the control groups were instructed traditionally through the teacher's lectures during class time, allowing students to take notes while the teacher was lecturing. Traditional homework was assigned according, which was corrected the next session in the class. The experimental groups watched video lectures at home using a home PC, tablet, or Smartphone and were required to take notes as the control group did in the class. After watching the video lecture, students were then asked to answer practice problems for which immediate feedback was provided. In the class, they were involved in interactive group-based problem-solving activities as well as completing the same homework as the control group did at home. At the end of the treatment, a post-test was administered to all the participants. The findings revealed that the experimental group outperformed the control group indicating the overall positive impact of flipped

classroom instruction on students' achievement and perception during the flipped classroom learning experience.

Sung (2015) examined the effect of flipped classroom instruction in English content-based classes. The participant of the class consisted of college students who were directed to preview lesson materials such as readings through videos and using online activities. In each session, they were encouraged to do class activities collaboratively, such as sharing their thought papers, discussing the questions on weekly readings developed online, and doing a final project of designing an evaluation plan. Based on the results, it was revealed that flipped classroom instruction had a positive effect on students' learning process despite their initial difficulties in adjusting themselves to the flipped classroom instruction.

In another study, Wiley (2015) examined the impact of the flipped classroom model of instruction on fifth-grade mathematics students. The study participants included 112 fifth-grade students from four classrooms in a Midwestern suburban school district. Two unit post-tests and an attitude were used to gather the quantitative data; classroom observations and student and teacher interviews were used to gather qualitative data. Qualitative and quantitative data indicated the positive effect of flipped classroom instruction. The data also revealed that low-achieving students had less access to the videos at home and more frequently found them frustrating or confusing.

In a recent study, Webb and Doman (2016) strived to pinpoint whether flipped classroom instruction leads to increased gains in learning outcomes in ESL/EFL contexts. They selected 64 students. They were divided into two experimental groups, one experimental class in Macau and one in the US, forming a total of 39 students. There was also one control class in Macau and one in the US, with 25 students in both contexts. All the participants, including 25 students in the control group and 39 students in the experimental group, were given a 32-item grammar pre-test and a post-test. This test included questions about the ten grammar principles being taught during the semester. In addition, a four-item, 5-point Likert-scale grammar survey was also given to the participants before the grammar test to get a more precise picture of how students perceived their grammar skills. The study's findings showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group in the tests indicating the positive effect of flipped classroom instruction on the learning outcome of the ESL/EFL learners.

As was mentioned before, flipped classroom instruction is a relatively new concept that has recently entered the area of education. A brief review of the literature also revealed that most of the studies in the area of flipped instructions are new; moreover, it was revealed that the number of research in the area of language teaching and learning is scarce, and few studies were found to be conducted in Turkey about the impact of flipped instruction on writing accuracy.

Therefore, this study aims to research the effect of flipped classroom instruction on the writing accuracy enhancement of advanced Turkish learners in an EFL context and to compare the differences between the writing ability of students in the flipped classroom instruction method and those who received traditional classroom instruction. Accordingly, to achieve its objectives, the study addressed the following research questions:

RQ1: Does Flipped Classroom Instruction significantly affect the enhancement of writing accuracy of advanced Turkish EFL learners?

RQ2: Are there any meaningful differences between the writing enhancement of learners who received the Flipped Classroom Instruction and those who received traditional on-site instruction?

Method

The present study's design is quasi-experimental and benefited from a pre-test and post-test as well as a comparison-group design. This study was carried out during the academic year 2018-2019.

Participants

To investigate the impact of flipped classroom instruction approach on the writing accuracy of advanced Turkish EFL learners, 42 male and female advanced EFL students aged 18-24 studying at the English Language Teaching Department at Gaziosmanpaşa University in Tokat. The participants were selected from two co-educated classes, including 25 and 22 students. To homogenize the participants and omit the outliers, Nelson Proficiency Test (NELSON Series 400 B) was used in the current study. Having administered the Nelson Proficiency Test (NELSON Series 400 B), five outliers were omitted, and the rest of the participants were assigned into two groups. One of these groups was randomly assigned as the experimental group (N=20) and the other as the control group (N=22).

Data Collection Procedures

The procedure that the researcher followed to determine the effect of flipped classroom instruction on the writing accuracy enhancement of advanced Turkish EFL learners was as follows:

Obtaining Participants' Consent of Participation

As mentioned above, 47 male and female advanced EFL students aged 18-24 studying at the English Language Teaching Department at Gaziosmanpaşa University in Tokat were selected. After obtaining the required permissions from the institute authorities and explaining the procedure of the study by the researcher, a consent form was distributed among the participants asking for their consent to participate in the current study.

Administering Nelson Proficiency Test

After obtaining the participants' consent to participate in the study, the Nelson Proficiency Test (NELSON Series 400 B) was used to homogenize the subjects and omit the outliers. Having administered the Nelson Proficiency Test (NELSON Series 400 B), five outliers were omitted, and the rest of the participants were assigned into two groups.

Administering Pre-test

Before the treatments, the researcher discussed applying the flipped classroom instruction with the teacher of the classes, who were the same person. The researcher prepared the video PowerPoint with the teacher's help in writing modules. Having gotten the teacher's consent, the teacher agreed to share the videos with the students through an online Telegram group, to be watched out of class time and practiced for about 40 minutes in the class for 16 sessions. Before sharing the videos with the participants, all the participants were asked to write a piece of an essay as a pre-test, and their writings were assessed according to the IELTS rubric and academic writing for accuracy at the beginning of the treatment phase to be compared with the results of the post-test.

Treatment

Having administered the pre-test, later, during the treatment phase of the study, which lasted for 16 sessions, the content of lessons was sent to the experimental group in advance; hence, in every session, the subjects in the treatment group received a video PowerPoint through the Telegram group created by the researcher with the help of the teacher to be watched before attending the

class to get familiarized with lesson contents. The traditional classroom instruction involving the ordinary teacher instruction process was used for the control group. The teacher presented all the explanations of the content of the lessons and the materials inside the class. In both groups, the participants were taught the textbook New Insight into IELTS Book by Jakeman and McDowell (2008).

Administering the Posttest

Having completed the treatment, at the end of the 16th session, the subjects were asked to write another piece of writing as a post-test to enable the researcher to compare the performance of participants. To establish the validity and reliability of the evaluation, we asked another colleague to rate the writings based on IELTS scoring rubrics. Triangulation of the results confirmed the reliability of the scoring.

Data Analysis

After collecting all the required data for analyzing the data, and to answer the first question, and see whether there was a difference between the writing accuracy of each group in the pre-test and post-test, the researcher ran two paired samples t-tests. Afterward, to answer the second research question and compare the two groups' writing performance in the post-test, the researcher used an independent t-test to check which group outperformed the other.

Results

The analysis of data obtained from the homogeneity test and omitting the outliers

The Nelson proficiency test was used to homogenize the study participants. The descriptive statistics obtained from the data are summarized in Table 1. The outliers were omitted, and therefore, the participants were homogenized

Table1. *Descriptive Statistics of Homogeneity Test Scores*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	
Nelson	47	28	47	37.43	2.819	Nelson
Valid N (listwise)	47					Valid N (listwise)

According to the illustrated data in Table 1. the maximum score is 47, the minimum is 28, the mean score is 37.43, and the SD is 2.81. Comparing the scores of participants, 5 outliers out of 47 participants were omitted, and the rest of the students (N=42) were assigned to control (N= 22) and experimental groups (N=20). Having homogenized the participants, they were given a writing pre-test. To ensure whether the scoring procedure is reliable enough to be coded just by a single researcher, another experienced teacher at Gaziosmanpaşa with similar qualities to the researcher's scored some of the data to establish inter-rater reliability.

Table2. *Analysis of Pre-test Scores of both experimental and control Groups*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Pre-test	Equal variances assumed	1.357	.251	1.536	40	.132	.777	.506	-.245	1.800
	Equal variances not assumed.			1.550	39.658	.129	.777	.501	-.236	1.791

The results of the independent-samples t-test conducted to compare the mean scores of the experimental and control groups are summarized in Table 2 (p = .13). Therefore, the practical significance between the mean scores of groups was not statistically significant. It was concluded that the experimental and control group participants were not different regarding their writing proficiency.

Comparing Participants' Performances in Pre-test and Post-test

The mean scores of the participants' scores in post and pre-test are compared using two paired samples t-tests to address the first research question stating if Flipped Classroom Instruction contributes to the enhancement of writing accuracy of advanced Turkish EFL learners.

Table 3. *Descriptive Statistics of the Data Obtained by the Control Group in the Pre and Post-test*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre control	27.27	22	1.778	.379
	Post control	28.77	22	1.602	.341

According to Table 3, the control group's mean score and standard deviation in pre and post-tests are M = 27.27, SD = 1.77 and M = 28.77, SD = 1.6, respectively.a paired samples t-test was carried out on the data to ensure the statistical significance of the data.

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics of the Data Obtained by Experimental Group in the Pre and Post-test*

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre experimental	28.05	20	1.468	.328
	Post experimental	31.50	20	2.115	.473

Table 4. illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations of the pre and post-test of the treatment group, that is, M = 28.05, SD = 1.46 and M = 31.5, SD = 2.11, respectively. Progress regarding their writing proficiency is shown in Table 4. A paired sample t-test was run on the scores of tests to indicate whether the observed increase was significant.

Comparing Participants' Performances of Both Control and Experimental Groups in Post-test

As mentioned above, both groups showed an increase in the mean; the statistical results are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. *Descriptive Statistics Comparing Experimental and Control Groups in Post-test*

	Grouping	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test	Experimental	20	31.50	2.115	.473
	Control	22	28.77	1.602	.341

Comparing the mean score of the two groups, (M = 31.5, SD = 2.11) and (M = 28.77, SD = 1.6), it was seen that the experimental group outperformed the control one, while they did not differ in the pre-test. To decide whether this outperformance was statistically significant and address the second research question, another independent sample t-test was carried out on the post-test scores. The results are abridged in Table 5.

(M = 28.77, SD = 1.6)

Table 5. *Comparing the Post-test Scores of Experimental and Control Groups*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Post-test	Equal variances assumed	1.734	.195	4.738	40	.000	2.727	.576	1.564	3.891
	Equal variances not assumed			4.675	35.293	.000	2.727	.583	1.543	3.911

To address the second research question, the independent samples t-test was run to check the significance of the mean score difference between the two groups. According to the test results summarized in Table 5, the significance level (p = .00) was smaller than the cut-off p-value indicating that the difference was significant. Accordingly, comparing the mean scores, the second null hypothesis of the study was rejected. Hence, it was concluded that using Flipped Classroom Instruction in teaching writing to advanced EFL students was more effective than traditional in-class instruction and contributed to better writing accuracy enhancement of advanced Turkish EFL learners.

Discussion and Conclusion

The main aim of the present research was to investigate whether using Flipped Classroom Instruction contributes to the writing accuracy enhancement of advanced Turkish EFL learners. In other words, this study investigated to what extent Flipped Classroom Instruction could develop EFL learners' writing accuracy and whether it had any enhancing effects in the long run compared to traditional in-class instruction. The study's results showed a significantly meaningful difference between the writing enhancement of learners who received the Flipped Classroom Instruction and those who received traditional in-class instruction. Thus, it is concluded that with the use of Flipped Classroom Instruction, the writing accuracy of the experimental group has been enhanced significantly.

Concerning the first research question, in the data collected from the pre and post-tests administered, it was explored that using Flipped Classroom Instruction could enhance the writing ability of the EFL learners. Comparing the writing accuracy of both the experimental and control groups yielded efficient results. The data analysis revealed Flipped Classroom Instruction's outperformance over traditional in-class instruction.

It may support the claims of scholars (e.g., DewiSuryani, 2014; Enfield, 2013; Haake, 2013; Han, 2015; Hung, 2015; Obari & Lambacher, 2015) who believe in the positive effects and advantages of applying Flipped Classroom Instruction on EFL learners' language skills. For instance, Enfield (2013) believes that a flipped-classroom approach enhances learner autonomy and outside-classroom learning. In this approach, the students have the advantage to "pause to reflect on what is being said, rewind to hear it again, listen to as much or as little of the lecture as their schedules permit, and view the lecture on a mobile device rather than in a fixed location" (Talbert, 2012, p. 101).

In line with the result of the present study, Baranovic (2013) scrutinized the effect of flipped classroom instruction on university writing courses in the United States. He created lecture videos for creative writing instead of traditional lectures carried out in the class. The study's results confirming the present research revealed that flipped classroom instruction significantly affected the learners' writing improvement. Similarly, Szparagowski (2014) investigated the effect of the flipped classroom on students' learning. For this purpose, he compared a flipped classroom with another classroom context to compare the two teaching methods. Based on the findings of his study, the positive effects of the flipped classroom in educational settings were demonstrated.

Moreover, in their study, Webb and Doman (2016) tried to pinpoint whether flipped classroom instruction has any possible effect on learning outcomes in a foreign language context or not. According to their findings, flipped classroom instruction significantly affected the EFL learners' learning outcomes. The results of the present study differ from those performed by Bell (2015). In his study, he investigated the impact of a flipped classroom instruction method to find out the high school students' attitudes toward the learning context and subject matter. His study's findings showed no statistically meaningful difference in the mean scores of experimental and control groups.

The results of this current study might have significant pedagogical implications for syllabus designers and EFL teachers. By implementing Flipped Classroom Instruction, learning will happen in a more interactive atmosphere, leading to curriculum reform in teaching writing skills for advanced EFL learners. The current study's limitations indicate the need for future research on other proficiency levels to examine the research's consistency. The second limitation is the limited sample size of the participants. More participants might have been generalizable to the population.

References:

Abeysekera, L. & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: Definition, rationale, and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development, 34*(1), 1-14.

Alsamdani, H. A. (2010). The relationship between Saudi EFL students' writing competence, L1 writing proficiency, and self-regulation. *European Journal of Social Science, 16*(1), 53-63.

Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(5), 518–529.

Ausubel, David P. (1960). The use of advanced organizers in the learning and retention of meaningful verbal material. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 51(5), 267-272.

Baranovic, K. (2013). *Flipping the first-year composition classroom: Slouching toward the pedagogically hip*. Retrieved June 3, 2016, from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1441087946?accountid=12206

Bax, S. (2003). CALL – past, present, and future. *System, 31* (1), 13–28.

Bell, M. R. (2015). *An Investigation of the Impact of a Flipped Classroom Instructional Approach on High School Students' Content Knowledge and Attitudes Toward the Learning Environment*. (Master's

Thesis). Brigham Young University. Retrieved November 25, 2016, from http://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4444

Bergmann, J., Overmyer, J., & Wilie, B. (2012). The flipped class: What it is and what it is not. Retrieved May 7, 2016, from http:// www.thedailyriff.com/articles /the-flipped-class-conversation-689.php

Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). Flip your classroom reach every student in every class every day. Eugene, Or.: International Society for Technology in Education.

Bergmann, J. & Sams, A. (2014). Flipped Learning: Maximizing face time. *American Society for Training and Development*, 68(2), 28-31. Retrieved June 1, 2016, from http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.buid.ac.ae/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=6d342182-a238-4df3-ad7d-75702d89bbee%40sessionmgr4003&vid=5&hid=4207

Bishop, J., & Verleger, M. A. (2013, June), *The Flipped Classroom: A Survey of the Research* Paper presented at 2013 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, Atlanta, Georgia. 10.18260/1-2—22585

Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals Handbook I*. New York, NY: McKay; Longman.

Bonk, C. J., & Graham, C. R. (2006). *The handbook of blended learning: Global perspectives, local designs*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.) (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.

Buckley, C. A., Pitt, E., Norton, B., & Owens, T. (2010). Students' approaches to study, conceptions of learning and judgments about the value of networked technologies. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*(1), 55–65.

Crouch, C. H., & Mazur, E. (2001). Peer instruction: Ten years of experience and results. *American Journal of Physics*, *69*(9), 970–977.

Cuban, L. (1983). How did teachers teach, 1890-1980. *Theory Into Practice, 22*(3), 159.

DewiSuryani, A. (2014). The use of "flipping classroom" for teaching story-telling to the tenth graders. Ejournal of Universitas Negeri Surabaya. Retrieved December 3, 2016, from ejournal.unesa.ac.id/article/16417/58/article.pdf

Enfield, J. (2013). Looking at the impact of the flipped classroom model of instruction on undergraduate multimedia students at CSUN. *TechTrends: Linking Research & Practice to Improve Learning, 57*(6), 14–27.

Fulton, K. (2012). 10 Reasons to Flip. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *94* (20), 20-24.

Green, S. (Ed.). (2000). *New perspectives on teaching and learning*. Great Britain: Cromwell Press.

Haake, S. (2013). 'English in the Cloud': The experience of one school in moving its curriculum and learning content online. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 21*(3), 41.

Han, Y. J. (2015). Successfully flipping the ESL classroom for learner autonomy. *NYS TESOL Journal*, *2*(98), 98–109.

Huitt, W. (2003) *A transactional model of the teaching /learning process*. Educational psychology interactive. Valdosta, G.A: Valdosta State University.

Hung, H. T. (2015). Flipping the classroom for English language learners to foster active learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 28*(1), 81–96.

Ituma, A. N. (2011). An evaluation of students' perceptions and engagement with e- Learning components in a campus based university. *Active learning in Higher Education Journal, 12*(1), 57–68.

Jakeman, V., & McDowell, C. (2008). *New insight into IELTS: Student's book with answers* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, C. P. (2014). Increasing students' academic involvement: Chilean teacher engagement with learners in blended English as a foreign language courses (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Kain, D. J. (2002). Teacher-centered versus student-centered: Balancing constraint and theory in the composition classroom. *Pedagogy*, *3*(1), 104–108.

Knowlton, D. S. (2000). A theoretical framework for the online classroom: A defense and

delineation of a student-centered pedagogy. In R. E. Weiss, D. S. Knowlton, & B. W. Speck (Eds.), *Principles of effective teaching in the online classroom* (pp. 5–14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kupczynski, L., Stallone Brown, M., & Davis, R. (2008). The Impact of Instructor and student interaction in Internet-based courses. Journal of Instruction Delivery Systems, 22(1), 6-11.

Lage, M. J., Platt, G. J., & Treglia, M. (2000). Inverting the classroom: A gateway to creating an inclusive learning environment. *The Journal of Economic Education, 31*(1), 30–43.

Lee, S. (2003). Teaching EFL writing in the university: Related issues, insights, and implications. *Journal of National Taipei Teachers College, 16*(1), 111–136.

Lewis, G. (2009). *Bringing technology into the classroom.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Metcalf, D. (2015). The impact of flipping middle school classroom on student achievement. Unpublished Masters's degree. California State University, Stanislaus. Retrieved November 25, 2016, from http://scholarworks.csustan.edu/handle/011235813/947

Michael, J. (2006). Where's the evidence that active learning works? *Advances in physiology education*, *30*(4), 159–167.

Musallam, R. (2013). A pedagogy-first approach to the flipped classroom. On CUE, 35(1), 6–8.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning.* Boston: Heinle& Heinle Publishers.

Obari, H., & Lambacher, S. (2015). Successful EFL teaching using mobile technologies in a flipped classroom. In F. Helm, L. Bradley, M. Guarda, & S. Thouësny (Eds), *Critical CALL – Proceedings of the 2015 EUROCALL Conference, Padova, Italy* (pp. 433-438). Dublin: Research-publishing.net.

Ocak, M. A. (2011). Why are faculty members not teaching blended courses? *Insights from faculty members. Computers & Education, 56* (3), 689–699.

Oliver, M., & Trigwell, K. (2005). Can Blended Learning be Redeemed?. *E-learning, 2*(1), 17-26.

Orlich, D.A., Harder, R.J., Callahan, R.C., Trevisan, M.S., Brown, A.H.& Miller, D.E. (2013). *Teaching Strategies: A Guide to Effective Instruction*. Wadsworth CENGAGE Learning.

Rennie, C. (2000). *Error Feedback in ESL Writing Classes: What do students really want?* (Unpublished master's thesis), California State University, Sacramento.

Richards, J. C. (2010). Competence and performance in language teaching. *RELC Journal, 41*(2), 101–122.

Sharma, P. (2010). Blended learning. *ELT Journal, 64*(4), 456–458.

Smith, R. (2008). Key concepts in ELT: Learner autonomy. *ELT Journal, 62*(4), 395–396.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sugar, W., Brown, A., & Luterbach, K. (2010). Examining the anatomy of a screencast: Uncovering common elements and instructional strategies. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 11*(3), 1–20.

Sung, K. (2015). A case study on a flipped classroom in an EFL content course. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, 18*(2), 159–187.

Szparagowski, R. (2014).The effectiveness of the flipped classroom. *Honors Projects, 127,* 1-31.

Talbert, R. (2012). Inverted classroom. *Colleague, 9*(1), 1–7. Retrieved December 3, 2016, from http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/colleagues/vol9/iss1/7

Wai Pong, A. Y. (2015). *The influence of flipped classroom instruction on students' understanding and performance in solving quadratic equations*. Unpublished doctorial thesis. University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong SAR. Retrieved December 3, 2016, from http://dx.doi.org/10.5353/th_b5703773

Webb, M., & Doman, E. (2016). Does the flipped classroom lead to increased gains on learning outcome in ESL/EFL contexts? *The CATESOL Journal, (28)*1, 39-67.

Wiley, B. (2015). The Impact of the Flipped Classroom Model of Instruction on Fifth Grade Mathematics Students. Retrieved from the University of Minnesota Digital Conservancy, http://hdl.handle.net/11299/174907

Whyte, S. (2011). Learning theory and technology in university foreign language education: The case of French universities. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 10*(2), 213–234.