



PROYECTO DE TITULACIÓN

Peer Feedback to Improve Students' Writing Through Google Docs

Thesis presented to Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral to fulfill the requirements
for the ESPOL

Master's Degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language

EDSON ISAAC VÁSQUEZ RODRÍGUEZ

Loja, Ecuador

2023

Acknowledgments

My sincere thanks to the dean of “UNIDAD EDUCATIVA GONZANAMÁ” to the students in 2nd year of baccalaureate for letting me apply the thesis project necessary to reach my master's degree in English. At the same time, I want to express gratitude to the ESCUELA SUPERIOR POLITÉCNICA DEL LITORAL for accepting me into the master's program.

Finally, I would like to thank my tutor Evelyn Macias, my thesis director, for her invaluable support, direction, and suggestions, which guided me correctly to successfully carry out this research study.

Edson Isaac

Dedication

With much love to my beloved wife, who has always been by my side supporting me; to my parents for their unconditional support during the development of this research work and to my grandmother Merceditas who blesses me from heaven all the time.

Edson Isaac

Thesis Committee Members

APPROVED BY:

Evelyn Carolina Macias Silva, MATEFL.
Thesis Advisor

Jenny Villarreal Holguín, Ma.TEFL

Katia Rodríguez Morales, M.Sc.

Declaración Expresa

“La responsabilidad del contenido de este Trabajo de Titulación, corresponde exclusivamente al autor, y al patrimonio intelectual de la ESCUELA SUPERIOR POLITÉCNICA DEL LITORAL”

EDSON ISAAC VÁSQUEZ RODRÍGUEZ

Abstract

This action research suggested peer feedback as a practical method for enhancing students' writing abilities through Google docs. Its potential was used with baccalaureate students in a public school in Gonzanamá, Ecuador. Sixteen students were tested to see if they would become better writers using quantitative and qualitative tools. This pedagogical innovation used a rubric for both the pre-test and the post-test—moreover, a checklist for the peers chosen randomly for the feedback sessions. The pre-test and the post-test were taken into account for the statistical results. The significant findings indicate that students made moderate improvements to their writing after six peer feedback sessions, as measured by a Cohen's d of 0.49. Students' perceptions meant they had trouble writing in English, but they still participated in this method because they thought it helped enhance writing. The use of ICTs is beneficial for individual and group writing Google docs. Additionally, it is advised for any institutions willing to develop pedagogical innovations that encourage students to improve their writing skills.

Keywords: EFL writing, Google docs, peer feedback, rubric, students' perceptions.

Resumen

En esta investigación, se propuso la retroalimentación entre pares como un método práctico para mejorar las habilidades de escritura de los estudiantes mediante el uso de Google docs. Su potencial se utilizó con estudiantes de bachillerato en un colegio público de la ciudad de Gonzanamá, Ecuador. Se evaluó a 16 estudiantes para ver si se convertían en mejores escritores utilizando herramientas cuantitativas y cualitativas. Esta innovación pedagógica utilizó una rúbrica tanto para el pretest como para el postest. Además, se utilizó una lista de control para los compañeros que se eligieron al azar para las sesiones de retroalimentación entre pares. Para los resultados estadísticos se tuvieron en cuenta el pretest y el postest. Los principales resultados indican que, después de seis sesiones de retroalimentación entre compañeros, los estudiantes mejoraron moderadamente su escritura, según Cohen's d of 0,49. Las percepciones de los estudiantes indicaron que habían tenido muchas dificultades para la escritura. Las percepciones de los estudiantes indicaban que tenían problemas para escribir en inglés, pero aun así participaron con este método, porque los estudiantes pensaban que ayudaba a mejorar la escritura. El uso de las TIC es beneficioso para la escritura individual y en grupo tal como Google docs. Además, se aconseja a cualquier institución que desarrolle innovaciones pedagógicas que animen a los estudiantes a mejorar sus habilidades de escritura.

Palabras clave: EFL writing, Google docs, peer feedback, rubric, students' perceptions.

Contenido

Acknowledgments	2
Dedication	3
Thesis Committee Members	4
Declaración Expresa	5
Abstract	6
Resumen	7
Contenido	8
Table List	10
Appendix List	11
Chapter 1	12
Introduction	12
Justification	13
Rationale	14
General Objective	14
Specific Objectives	14
Research Questions	14
Hypothesis	15
Chapter 2	16
Literature Review	16
Writing	16
Writing Limitations	17
Collaborative Writing	17
Collaborative Writing Limitations	18
Google Docs	18
Peer-Feedback	18

PEER FEEDBACK TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING THROUGH GOOGLE DOCS	9
Backward Design	19
Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)	19
Chapter 3	21
Research Methodology	21
Participants	21
Description of the Intervention in the Class	22
Instruments	23
Proficiency Test	23
Pre and Post-Test	23
Survey	24
Interview	24
Class Notes and Students' Reflections	24
Chapter 4	25
Findings	25
Chapter 5	30
Discussion and Conclusions	30
Limitations and Recommendations	31
Reference List	33

Table List

Table 1	22
Table 2	25
Table 3	26
Table 4	27

Appendix List

Appendix 1	39
Appendix 2	40
Appendix 3	41
Appendix 4	42
Appendix 5	43
Appendix 6	44

Chapter 1

Introduction

Since the pandemic began, more than 100 million teachers have been affected, and 1.6 billion students have lost access to education (One Year into COVID-19 Education Disruption: Where Do We Stand? 2020). In different countries, academic activities have been greatly affected, generating new educational habits in students and educators (Nguyen & Pham, 2020) (Dwivedi et al., 2020). In addition, students' emotional and personal development is trimmed by confinement. In this context, schools switched resources and material from the traditional face-to-face education system to online classes throughout the academic year.

The Ecuadorian government realized that English is crucial for the evolution of countries, especially in the development of human resources. Therefore, the World Health Organization (2020) states that it issued the rule of law as a government policy. The number was 20 in 2003 for the national education system and the government regulations and the no. 19 in 2005 for the national education standard aimed at all components of education in Ecuador. Furthermore, due to the appearance and application of technology in regular classes, English as a foreign language could be included. This has allowed a new way of learning this language.

However, the pandemic somehow affected learning, forcing students and teachers to leave the classroom to teach classes physically. Nevertheless, not all students had access to the internet or a mobile device to connect to types, so learning became monotonous and slow. As a result, some gaps have been evidenced in the student's learning process.

Due to a lack of self-confidence, learners need help writing in English to convey their views clearly and understandably or to create a piece of work (Ibnian, 2017). This

is the skill that students need help with the most, either in delivering their ideas correctly or by using the wrong grammar structures.

In the Ecuadorian context, Cabrera et al. (2014) stated that Grammar errors, a lack of vocabulary words, mother tongue interference, and a lack of experience with writing procedures are all issues that students face. Students need more time to develop these skills during online classes. Because writing skill is rarely used in the EFL classroom, many students infrequently write, failing to rectify faults in grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and concept organization, even at the university level (Shokrpour & Fallahzadeh, 2007).

Justification

Internationally, writing at the beginner level is fine. For example, English skills are taught and assessed in Ecuador with a set of standards according to the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe, 2018). However, in terms of English knowledge, students from this country are ranked 65th out of 80 Latin American countries. This is why teachers need to find new ways to teach these skills.

Writing is, without a doubt, an essential aspect of the language acquisition process (Harmer, 1998). On the other hand, Godwin-Jones (2018) stated that “the complexity of online writing environments has increased the need for both learner and teacher training.” (p.5). Therefore, for native and non-native English learners, writing is the most challenging skill to master (Jahin & Idrees, 2012). This issue has led to various reforms in the country's foreign language curriculum, including the enclosure of the International Baccalaureate Program in the national curriculum (Ministerio de Educación, 2017). Local government works very hard to raise student proficiency. Research has been done on improving this skill for high school and university students.

Rationale

According to Anggraini et al. (2020), engaging in collaborative activities in EFL contexts positively impacts EFL learners' writing abilities. In addition, according to Nisbet and Austin (2013), using various technological tools assists EFL students in enhancing their vocabulary and writing and collaborative English skills.

To assist pupils in improving the quality of their writing. The themes and goals of the curriculum that the students were learning were also considered when choosing the topics for the papers. It took place for six weeks. Students attend three hours of class per week. This study aims to enhance writing output while ensuring that grammatical constructions like present simple, present continuous, and past simple are used correctly, along with punctuation, capitalization, and coherence.

General Objective

This study examines peer feedback's influence on improving online writing. This study will be carried out on students from the second year of baccalaureate who belong to a public school in Gonzanamá, Ecuador.

Specific Objectives

To determine students' level of English, to create an experimental and a control group for the study to give validity to the research.

To report the effect of peer feedback on the student's writing.

To describe the perceptions of the student's writing development.

To report the perspectives of the students on peer feedback on online writing.

Research Questions

The subsequent research inquiries are proposed per the specific objectives:

What is the effect of Google Docs on students' improved writing?

What are the student's perceptions of peer feedback to improve writing skills?

Hypothesis

Null: Students need to improve after being exposed to peer feedback and online writing.

Alternative: Students who received peer feedback during an online writing assignment outperformed those who did not.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This section explains the fundamental ideas around the peer-feedback strategy and writing skills as the primary components of the research and the components that structure the design of the invention with the authors' and their findings' supporting evidence.

Writing

According to Danhya and Alamelu (2019), writing is the most crucial skill for communication. However, it can be challenging to learn because it demands learners' attention, reflection, skill mastery, and an extensive understanding of grammar, vocabulary, and linguistic components. According to Laksmi (2006), writing has crucial stages, including prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and publication. These processes are recursive and not sequential for writing. Özdemir and Aydin's (2015) research on integrating various writing stages with computers where students had the chance to work together to improve their writing.

According to Kim et al. (2021), students are expected to write in the factual, narrative, and opinion genres for various audiences, purposes, and specialized tasks, making writing a problematic and essential component of learning. In addition, the same author mentions that it emphasizes a broad range of abilities, including working memory, language (vocabulary), transcribing (spelling and handwriting), higher-order cognition (monitoring, goal planning, perspective taking, inferencing), socio-emotional, topical, and discourse knowledge.

Writing Limitations

Fareed et al. (2016) found that various factors, including interference from L1, a lack of motivation, instructions, feedback, and others, had an impact on learners' development of writing skills. Solano et al. (2017) highlighted other limitations, like the absence of technological applications in public organizations, and explained why technology is not widely used in Ecuador, especially for writing purposes.

Jabali (2018) stated, "The writing process is very likely to be negatively affected by several factors, including students' feelings about themselves as writers, about the atmosphere, or even about the writing task itself" (p. 11).

Collaborative Writing

According to Elola (2010), collaborative writing entails at least two people working together to create a document as a group, and they are ultimately responsible for the final product. Therefore, collaborative writing can benefit students to improve their writing, not only for academic purposes. In addition, Yan (2019) described collaborative learning could successfully decrease students' fear of writing to develop confidence in that skill and respect peer's opinions.

Khatib and Meihami (2015) noted that collaborative writing in EFL contexts is essential to enhancing students' writing component skills, including content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. These stages can improve the students writing, and at the same time, the students can learn from each other to create better writing not only for an EFL context. In addition, collaborative activities, according to Chen (2017), can boost second language learners' academic success and learning motivation by giving them additional chances to hone their communication, social, and problem-solving skills.

Collaborative Writing Limitations

According to Suwantarathip and Wichadee (2014), students can now not connect effectively because they need more time to read during class, form relationships with partners, and access technology. Collaborative writing is a fantastic approach to help learners improve their skills; thus, it is crucial to have areas where teachers may check students' writing assignments to monitor the student's progress.

Google Docs

Zhou et al. (2012) stated that Google Docs is a collaborative learning program for online word processing with many educational benefits. Google Docs is considered a technological tool that can improve students' writing skills while they share a document; the students can give and receive feedback from their peers and the professor anytime. Google Docs is a free web-based version of Microsoft Word with collaborative features that can assist collaborative writing in foreign language schools (Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014). According to Graham (2013), Google Docs fosters a productive, collaborative learning environment where students and teachers may browse, edit, and publish documents.

Peer-Feedback

Peer feedback is a valuable addition to learning from peers while also contributing to developing a socially and collectively meaningful educational environment, strategies, and comments (Yu & Lee, 2016). Vygotsky (as cited in Woolfolk, 2016) stated that contact with peers, family, and instructors, as well as using digital technologies, stimulates cognitive development in pupils. Peer feedback is essential for this study as the students need the professor's input and their peers; they can learn more and feel more comfortable while developing a task. In addition, peer feedback can benefit the students as they learn to assess themselves and other students

by assessing to improve their writing. Wiggins (2012) stated that receiving feedback improves the writing process, which aids people in achieving their goals.

To foster a connection in which participants provide, receive, and respect various learning methods, Golparian et al. (2015) defined peer review as a feedback practice in which students must alternate between the roles of the reviewee and reviewer. Students' confidence is greatly influenced by peer criticism since it allows them to use terminology, transitions, and the author's claims more effectively (Money Penny et al., 2018). Peer feedback must be goal-related, concrete and transparent, actionable, user-friendly, timely, continuing, and consistent with being practical (Wiggins, 2016).

Backward Design

According to Reynolds and Kearns (2017), backward design is a valuable technique for creating in-class learning activities and instructional materials that improves students' performances through a worthwhile process to accomplish the teaching objectives. On the other hand, Hosseini et al. (2019) stated that curriculum development should be centered on problem-solving with critical understanding. Thus, Wiggins and Mc Tighe (2005) underlined that UbD, or backward design, is centered on the needs of learners to achieve their objectives. The benefits of the backward design are that teachers begin by assessing what pupils know, comprehend, and intend to give a solution. Second, they look for proof that the goals have been met. Last, they define the strategies and procedures that learners will use to complete their tasks.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

The term "communicative language teaching" (CLT) refers to a set of guiding principles regarding the objectives of language instruction, various tasks that support language learning, the process by which a student picks up a language, and the primary

functions that teachers and students carry out in the classroom (Richards, 2005). A branch of pedagogy that promotes the study of and motivation for concepts like communication, task-based learning, and meaningfulness in classrooms of all ages to understand better what communicative activities function best and how education might advance from these advances (Belchamber, 2007).

The CLT approach “aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching and to develop procedures for teaching the four language skills, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing.” (Alamri, 2018). According to Rea and Roman (2019), backward design is a valuable framework that enables the creation of appropriate action plans, the selection of helpful resources, and assessment through a performance assignment in an actual situation. It is appropriate for both learners and educators.

Chapter 3

Research Methodology

A mixed-design study was applied. It included qualitative and quantitative instruments. As Bryman (2012) described, qualitative research usually emphasizes an analytical field related to words. On the other hand, quantitative data gather information in terms of numbers. Both deal with theory.

Participants

For this study, 32 students between men and women were part of the research study from a public high school in the city of Gonzanamá, Ecuador. The ages ranged from 14 to 16 years old, their mother language is Spanish, and all of the students come from families with an intermediate monetary outcome (middle class). The students are required to obtain a B1 level in English by the end of the bachelorette. The researcher divided the study group into two classes, the control group, and the experimental group. It is important to note that while this study was completed within class time, no additional coursework or extracurricular activities were required.

The experimental group received the online peer assessment writing as part of the regular class, and the control group received regular classes, Laboratory #1 was used for this purpose at the institution of Gonzanamá. Their progress was monitored to check their improvement.

All participants were asked to participate in this research. Since they are teens, a letter describing the purpose of the study was also sent to their parents and the institution's dean to get consent from both.

A proficiency test was applied to measure the students' current level at the beginning of the research. The proficiency test results indicate that most participants

were beginners, and few students were assigned to the upper intermediate level. In addition, the experimental and control group features had the same characteristics.

Table 1

The proficiency level of the participants

Level/Group	Experimental	Control
Beginner	12	12
Intermediate	4	4

Description of the Intervention in the Class

Students read and listened to a few stories to check how short stories were created. Then, the teacher scaffolded students' writing ability to create paragraphs using past simple, present perfect, and past perfect to create short stories. Next, the teacher shows the students how to work on short stories using (narrative tenses). Also, the students were introduced to how to create, share, and comment on a document on Google Docs. Then students had to create and share their own stories with a peer randomly chosen. Finally, the teacher shows the students how to provide meaningful feedback to their peers to improve their writing for future processes.

On the other hand, the teacher monitors each of the writings to ensure that the students give constructive feedback to their peers. At the beginning of the implementation, only some students needed to take the feedback strategy seriously. However, throughout the teacher's assessment of how to be responsible by giving constructive criticism, everything changed. This intervention lasted six weeks, 90 minutes a week, and two presential classes per week, totaling six implementations.

Instruments

This action research involved quantitative and qualitative data analysis, and the instruments applied for the study were: pre and post-test, a checklist, a rubric, a survey, and field notes.

Proficiency Test

Students took a test to measure their English competence so the researcher could make appropriate plans for the distribution of the groups, trying to make them equally competent to obtain better results. Free access test from EF website.

(<https://www.efset.org/quick-check>).

Pre and Post-Test

Participants in the study completed a pre-test to determine the class average at the beginning of the intervention and a post-test to see whether the innovation applied to the experimental group affected the students' learning process. Both tests evaluated students' writing skills through a rubric (Appendix 3). For example, the students were asked to write two paragraphs describing a vacation they had in the past using narrative tenses, this topic (Language and Culture) was part of the regular classes, and the pre-test (Appendix 2) and the post-test followed the same format.

The researcher piloted this test. Before the intervention, students took a test to determine their writing ability. These tests were taken in the institution's regular classroom in computer base lab #1; they had 25 minutes to complete the pre-test at the beginning and the post-test at the end of the intervention. Then, those tests were graded by the researcher through the use of a rubric. Finally, a comparison between the pre-test and the post-test administered following the investigation was made. It determined whether the research's application produced favorable or unfavorable results.

The data was analyzed following these steps. First, the test results were posted into an excel sheet after they had been graded. There were descriptive statistics were used. Finally, measures including mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation were tabulated to compare and contrast the results.

Survey

A survey (Appendix 4) was conducted to find out if students had ever shared documents online, using Google Docs or other programs of a similar nature, and what kinds of stories they had written. This survey assisted in identifying the participants' backgrounds and gathering data on their preferences to help the research.

Interview

An interview (Appendix 5) was taken at the end of the implementation to learn more about their experiences with the writing process, the obstacles they face when trying to produce quality English writing, their perspectives about peer feedback, and their point of view regarding Google Docs. Some of the students chosen randomly for this interview were asked to answer the questions. Due to the student's level, the questions were held in English and Spanish. Therefore, students could respond in the language they felt more comfortable with.

Class Notes and Students' Reflections

Students provided feedback on their writing experiences weekly (Appendix 6). This was used to explain all the difficulties that regular students face while acquiring a foreign language—their initial challenges, fears, and how they face all these obstacles during the implementation.

Chapter 4

Findings

The findings are compiled in this section. The study's research questions arrange them. This section details how the students struggle with writing in English, their perception of peer feedback during the writing process, and their improvement in peer writing.

The pre-test and post-test outcomes, as well as the gathered descriptive statistics. The data was stored in an Excel file after the tests had been graded so that it could be imported into the IBM SPSS Statistics program to determine the minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation (descriptive statistics). This data is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Experimental group: pre-test and post-test results

	Min	Max	Mean	SD	<i>p</i> value
Pre-test	0.00	3.00	1.49	0.8071	0.00
Post-test	1.00	4.00	3.51	.6508	

Table 2 shows differences in the final scores of the pre-test and post-test performance. According to the findings, the students' writings increased in content, communicative achievement, organization, language, and punctuation/spelling. Thus, three parameters had a better improvement than the rest:

- Regarding communicative achievement, there was an improvement of 0.64 (from 1.36 to 2 points over 5).
- Organization of ideas, there was an improvement of 0.57 points (from 2.38 to 2.95 points over 5).
- Finally, language use improved by 1.32 points (from 1.44 to 2.76 points over 5).

The effect size was determined by the mean (M) samples and standard deviation (s) for the 16 experimental group participants.

Table 3 shows that there was not a significant change in the control group. The scores changed a bit, with no meaningful results over the pre-test. Few scores improve after the post-test. The post-test mean suggests that the scores are spread and acquired by different students, which indicates an ordinary parameter. Thus, these results are statistically significant, according to the p-value.

Table 3

Control group: pre-test and post-test results

	Min	Max	Mean	SD	p value
Pre-test	0.00	3.00	1.25	0.9104	0.00
Post-test	1.00	3.00	1.55	0.6863	

The effect size was determined by the mean (M) samples and standard deviation (s) for the 16 control group participants.

These findings support the notion that using Google Docs and peer feedback helps students to improve their writing ability. Therefore, in the pre-test, there were similarities between the experimental and control group. Thus, the post-test revealed a significant improvement in the experimental group.

On the other hand, this second section details the students' English writing difficulties, the types of writing exercises they complete, and their perspectives on peer feedback for writing purposes.

For the first research question: "What is the effect of Google docs on students' improved writing?" A *Likert survey* was applied, also the students' perceptions at the end of the implementation. The scale contained five different options. The choices were categorized as *great extent* (5), *A lot* (4), *Some* (3), *A little bit* (2), and *None* (1).

Participants needed help mastering the edition and commenting on writings on Google docs (M=3.32). Besides, results show that participants struggle with writing the appropriate sentence structure (M=3.53). In addition, participants' difficulties in writing on Google docs are related to developing a good topic sentence (M=3.27) and developing a sequence of ideas to support their writing (M=3.27).

Table 4

Likert survey the effect of Google docs on writing.

Google Docs to Improve Writing	Mean
I can create a word document on Google docs	3.52
I can share a document on Google docs	3.32
I can edit and comment a writing on Google docs	3.23
I can recognize and use punctuation marks	3.46
I know how to spell words in English	3.52
My paragraphs include a topic sentence	3.27
I can support the topic sentences with a sequence of ideas.	3.53
I can provide meaningful feedback to my peers	3.37

The second research question is “What are the student’ perceptions of peer feedback to improve writing skills?” This is answered through interviews and learning logs compiled during and after the implementation.

The students, in their learning logs, list the primary challenges. The learning logs were written in Spanish and then translated into English by the researcher to be more reliable for the study.

One student said, "Writing phrases and sentences to form paragraphs is challenging." Different students agree, "When we are not familiar with *the topic, it is more challenging because I have no idea what to write or how to start the writing.*" Some other students declare that "*Punctuation is just as crucial as words since the genuine meaning of the writing can get lost.*" Many students mentioned that structuring different sentences into paragraphs requires more than just combining sentences; it also needs connectors, transition words, and punctuation.

In conclusion, they considered that writing involves four skills to create meaningful writing. Even though many students have been learning the language since primary school, they still need help creating paragraphs using narrative tenses in English. Four students mentioned, "I have a clear idea of what I want to write in Spanish, but it *is hard to put it into the target language.*" The lack of vocabulary plays a vital role for Spanish speakers who have a clear idea and understand the topic. However, unfortunately, the little knowledge of EFL and the interference of L1 do not let the students develop a blooming structure writing process.

An interview was applied to help answer the second research question listed. The interview shows the secondary challenges listed in this section; this was taken to all the students at the end of the intervention. Once again, the questions were translated into Spanish to ensure the students understood.

One of the students mentioned, "*The use of Google docs is a wonderful gift, especially when we receive feedback from our partner to help us improve in the writing*" some other students have similar thoughts regarding this statement. Therefore, three students mentioned something similar for question number four "*At the beginning, I did not feel comfortable receiving feedback from our peers, but at the end, I understood that it helped us to improve our writing.*" For the fifth question, some

students mentioned, *"I am not ready to work with a longer piece of writing, but the peer review could help us improve faster as we understand in a better way our mistakes."*

The students believed it was crucial to teach the students the correct use of the techniques before the sessions (Google Docs and peer feedback).

Among the benefits, the students mentioned that using Google Docs improves their writing performance. In addition, the students change their perspectives about peer feedback. They believe this strategy can help them achieve better results by giving meaningful and constructive criticism. Thus, the technological tool and the strategy were essential for the success of this innovation.

In the field notes, the researcher stated that students' comprehension has improved due to the implementation. Ultimately, their performance was superior compared to the control group results.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusions

According to the results, the research shows there are benefits to applying peer feedback. First, it helps the students to be more active during the participation of receiving and giving feedback. Fakomogbon and Bolaji (2017) stated that collaboration entails interaction in which students are accountable for their academic acts, participate with their classmates, and value their contributions. Andrade and Du (2007) agreed that through the peer feedback strategy, students could construct better sentences, identify errors, and concentrate more on the objectives of becoming better writers. Nevertheless, Naeini (2011) declared that peer assessment was crucial for the students to write better paragraphs, and the students concurred that this technique could be applied in various academic fields. These statements give validity to the hypothesis that Students who received peer feedback during an online writing assignment outperformed those who did not.

Therefore, the use of innovative sites like Google docs helps the students improve not only in the target language. Suwantarathip and Wichadee (2014) mentioned that Google Docs has many advantages when EFL students collaborate in groups to complete writing exercises inside and outside the classroom. The results from the study show many advantages of Google docs, especially when the students write cooperatively rather than when they do it alone. Blankenship and Margarella (2014) stated that technology is a good motivator in the classroom. Many students believe that Google docs are a remarkable technological tool that can be applied by anyone who would like to improve the EFL learning process. Results from the descriptive statistics showed that participants significantly improved between the pre-and post-performance

tasks as a result of being able to work with peers to provide comments using Google Docs.

On the other hand, regarding challenges, something that caught the researcher's attention was that many of the students had internet and technological devices at home. Nevertheless, unfortunately, many of the students need to learn how to use them correctly for academic purposes. This was the case with Google docs for collaborative work. Some students declared that the lack of knowledge is essential for Spanish speakers who want to place their thoughts into a foreign language.

Thus, their inability to write is also a result of their limited vocabulary. Wilkins (1972, as cited in Adam, 2016) highlighted the critical relevance of vocabulary since it facilitates communication and enables learners to advance their writing, reading, listening, and speaking skills.

Limitations and Recommendations

While developing this research, some obstacles were encountered. One of the main obstacles was the allotted time to complete the task. Time was a limitation as computer lab #1 was used to develop the writing activities and to read and give feedback to their peers. As a result, some students needed more time to do it and had to finish the task at home.

Another problem appeared when four students dropped out of the study as they had low interest in the implementation, so they made excuses to avoid doing the task. The initial stage began with 36 students from the class, and as 4 dropped the study, 32 students remained, dividing the class into an equal number of 16 students for the experimental and 16 for the control group.

To conclude, the primary purpose of the current study was to investigate how students might enhance their collaborative writing abilities with the aid of Google Docs

and peer feedback to improve. Most students said that using Google Docs was enjoyable for writing purposes. Also, the outcome will vary depending on the ICT skills that the students possess and their attitudes about using technology in their tasks.

It is a fact that educators are constantly looking for new approaches to enhancing the writing abilities of their students. The use of ICTs can be very beneficial for both students and teachers. Therefore, it is highly recommended to apply further research to continue developing new tools and approaches for writing acquisition.

Reference List

- Adam, M. (2016). *Role of Vocabulary Learning Strategies in Promoting EFL Learners' Performance*. [Master's dissertation, Sudan University of Science and Technology]
<https://repository.sustech.edu/bitstream/handle/123456789/15469/Role%20of%20Vocabulary%20Learning....pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Alarm, W. A. (2018). Communicative language teaching: Possible alternative approaches to CLT and teaching contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 132–138. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1192263.pdf>
- Al-Muslin, I. (2015). *EFL instructors' and learners' attitudes to authentic reading materials*. Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Andrade, H., & Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria referenced self-assessment. *Educational Administration & Policy Studies Faculty Scholarship*, 32(2), 159-181. DOI: 10.1080/02602930600801928
- Ingrain, R., Roseola, Y., & Anwar, D. (2020). The effects of collaborative writing on EFL learners' writing skills and their perception of the strategy. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(2), 335-341.
- Bedchamber, R. (2007). The advantages of communicative language teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 13(2), 122-149. Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Belchamber-CLT.html>
- Blankenship, M. U., & Margarella, E. E. (2014). Technology and secondary writing: A review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 5(2), 146-160.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners* Cambridge: the University of Cambridge Press.

- Charissi, A.; Timpa, E.; Karavida, V. Impact of the COVID-19 Disruption on the Perceptions and Behaviours of University Students. *EUR.J. Educ. Stallion*. 2020, 7, 222–238.
- Chen, Y. (2017). Perceptions of EFL College Students toward Collaborative Learning. *English Language Teaching*, 11(2), 1–4. doi: 10.5539/elt.v11n2p1
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Encyclopaedia Encyclopaedia of Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Danhya, M., & Alamelu, C. (2019). Factors influencing the acquisition of writing skills. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 7(6), 1399-1404. <https://bit.ly/3hru7z2>
- Dwivedi, YK; Hughes, D.L.; Coombs, C.; Constantiou, I.; Duan, Y.; Edwards, JS; Gupta, B.; Lal, B.; Misra, S.; Prashant, P.; et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on information, research, and management practice: transforming education, work, and life. In *t. Information Manage* 2020, 55, 102211.
- Elola, I. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(3), 51–71.
- Fakomogbon, M. A., & Bolaji, H. O. (2017). Effects of collaborative learning styles on students' performance in a ubiquitous collaborative mobile learning environment. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 8(3), 268-279.
- Fareed, M., Ashraf, A., & Bilal, M. (2016). *ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors, and suggestions*. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 81–92.
- Graham, M. J. (2013). *Google apps meet the common core*. Corwin Press.
- Golonka, EM, Bowles, AR, Frank, VM, Richardson, DL, & Freynik, S. (2014). Technologies for learning foreign languages: a review of the types of technology and their effectiveness.

- Golparian, S., Chan, J., & Cassidy, A. (2015). Peer review of teaching: Sharing best practices. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching*, (8), pp. 211–218. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1069765.pdf>
- Hosseini, H., Chalak, A., & Biria, R. (2019). Impact of backward design on improving Iranian advanced learners' writing ability: Teachers' practices and beliefs. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(2), 33-50. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.1223a>
- Ibrahim, A.E. (2010). Information and communication technologies in ELT. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 1(3), 211-244
- Jabali, O. (2018). Students' Attitudes towards EFL University Writing: A case study at An-Najah National University, Palestine. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2018.e00896>
- Jahin, J., & Idrees, M. (2012). *EFL Major Student Teachers' Writing Proficiency and Attitudes Towards Learning English*. *Journal of Taibah University* 4 (1).
- Khatib, M., & Meihami, H. (2015). Languaging and writing skill: The effect of collaborative writing on EFL students' writing performance. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(1), 203-211.
- Kim, Y. S. G., Yang, D., Reyes, M., & Connor, C. (2021). Writing instruction improves students' writing skills differentially depending on focal instruction and children: A meta-analysis for primary grade students. *Educational Research Review*, pp. 34, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100408>
- Laksmi, E. D. (2006). "Scaffolding" students' writing in EFL class: Implementing process approach. *TEFLIN Journal: A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 17(2), 144–156. Retrieved from

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.668.1486&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Ministerio de Educación. (2014). Standards of educational quality. Retrieved from [https://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/09/01-](https://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/09/01-NationalCurriculum-Guidelines-EFL-Agosto-2014.pdf)

[NationalCurriculum-Guidelines-EFL-Agosto-2014.pdf](https://educacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2014/09/01-NationalCurriculum-Guidelines-EFL-Agosto-2014.pdf)

Mukundan, J., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2013). Writing materials – was this the case of the runaway bandwagon? In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and materials development* (pp. 213–230). London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Money Penny, D., Evans, M., & Kraha, A. (2018). Student Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Peer Review, *American Journal of Distance Education*, 32(4), 236–247. doi:10.1080/08923647.2018.1509425

Naeini, J. (2011). Self-assessment and the impact on language skills. *Educational Research*, 2(6), 1225–1231. <https://bit.ly/3hrBSVo>

Nguyen, D.V.; Pham, G.H.; Nguyen, DN Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the perceptions and behaviors of university students in Vietnam. Data Summary 2020, 31, 105880. [PubMed]

Osman, MET Global Impact of COVID-19 on Education Systems: Emergency Remote Teaching at Sultan Qaboos University. *J. Educ. Teach.* 2020, 46, 463–471.

Özdemir, E., & Aydin, S. (2015). The Effects of Blogging on EFL Writing Achievement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199(1), 372-380, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.521>

Rea, M. O., & Román, J. L. S. (2019). Implementing backward design to improve students' academic performance in EFL classes. *Espiraes Revista Multidisciplinaria de investigación*, 3(24), 42-50.

Reynolds, H. L., & Kearns, K. D. (2017). A planning tool for incorporating backward design, active learning, and authentic assessment in the college classroom. *College Teaching*, 65(1), 17-27.

Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Sangeetha, V. (2020). Inculcating self-editing skills for enhancing the writing skills of the EFL students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 509–522.
<https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13133a>

Solano, L., Cabrera, P., Ulehlova, E., & Espinoza, V. (2017). Exploring the use of Educational Technology in EFL Teaching: A Case Study of Primary Education in the South Region of Ecuador. *Teaching English with Technology*, 17(2), 77-86.
Retrieved from: <http://www.tewtjournal.org/issues/volume-2017/volume-17-issue-2/>

Suwantarathip, O., & Wichadee, S. (2014). The effects of collaborative writing activity using Google Docs on students' writing abilities. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 13(2), 148-156.

Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven Keys to Effective Feedback. *Educational Leadership*, 70(1), 10–16. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept12/vol70/num01/Seven-Keys-to-Effective-Feedback.aspx>

Woolfolk, A. (2016). *Educational Psychology: Active Learning Edition*. Pearson.
Retrieved from: <https://www.pearson.com/content/dam/one-dot-com/one-dot-com/us/en/highered/en/products-services/courseproducts/woolfolk-13e-info/pdf/0134013522.p>

- Yan, L (2019). A study on weChat-based collaborative learning in college English writing, *Canadian Center of Science and Education* 12(6) 1:9 doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n6p. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n6p1>
- Yu, S. & Lee, I. (2016). Peer Feedback in Second Language Writing (2005–2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461– 493. doi: 10.1017/S0261444816000161
- Zhou, W., Simpson, E., & Domizi, D. P. (2012). Google Docs in an out-of-class collaborative writing activity. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(3), 359–375.

Appendix 1

Consent Letter

Gonzanamá, 20 de junio de 2022

Lcdo. Romel Torres
RECTOR (E) DE LA UNIDAD EDUCATIVA GONZANAMÁ

Con un cordial saludo me dirijo a usted para hacer de su conocimiento que me encuentro desarrollando la tesis **Peer Feedback to Improve Students' Writing Through Google Docs** en el programa de Maestría **Teaching English as a Foreign Language**, de la **Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral (ESPOL)**.

Por lo antes expuesto, de la manera más comedida me permito solicitar a usted se digne autorizar por el lapso de dos meses, a partir del lunes 20 de junio de 2022, para cumplir con las siguientes actividades:

1. Recepción de un examen de suficiencia (ONLINE)
EF., Cambridge, etc.
2. Taller dirigido a los estudiantes sobre cómo utilizar y crear Google docs., en parejas
3. Aplicar un pretest y un post-test
4. Aplicar un survey para recolectar las expectativas de los estudiantes.

En la seguridad de merecer su atención, le expreso mis sentimientos de consideración y estima,

Atentamente,



Lcdo. Isaac Vásquez Rodríguez
DOCENTE

Recibido
20-06-2022



Appendix 3

Rubric for the pre and post-test.

Bands	Features	Excellent (10-9)	Very Good (8)	Good (7)	Not so Good (6-fewer)
Content	The candidate answered the task. They done what they were asked to do.				
Communicative Achievement	The writing is appropriate for the task. The candidate used a style which is appropriate for the specific communicative context.				
Organization	The writing is put together well. It is logical and ordered.				
Language	There is a good range of vocabulary and grammar. They are used accurately.				
Punctuation/ spelling	There is a good use of punctuation marks, and no spelling mistakes.				

Adapted from Cambridge (2020).

Appendix 4

Likert survey

Google Docs to Improve Writing	5 To a Great Extent	4 A Lot	3 Some	2 A Little Bit	1 None
I can create a word document on Google docs					
I can share a document on Google docs					
I can edit and comment a writing on Google docs					
I can recognize and use punctuation marks					
I know how to spell words in English					
My paragraphs include a topic sentence					
I can support the topic sentences with a sequence of ideas.					
I can provide meaningful feedback to my peers					

Appendix 5

Interview

1. Does Peer feedback writing assignments strengthen social practice?
¿La práctica de evaluación por pares ayuda a fortalecer la práctica social?
2. Do you think Google docs writing assignments applying peer feedback helps you to increase your knowledge?
¿Crees que las asignaciones de escritura de documentos de Google que aplican la evaluación por pares te ayudan a aumentar tu conocimiento?
3. Do you think Peer feedback helps you to understand mistakes while writing?
¿Crees que la retroalimentación de tus compañeros te ayuda a comprender los errores mientras escribes?
4. Do you feel motivated when you work with peers to improve your writing?
¿Se siente motivado cuando trabaja con sus compañeros para mejorar la escritura?
5. Are you ready to create longer writings?
¿Estás listo para crear escritos más largos?

Appendix 6

Students' Reflections and Field Notes

Date:

Students' difficulties while writing

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Students improvements

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....