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Abstract

English

This study aimed at analyzing how students’ collaboration when writing encourages peer review and provides effective written feedback through Google Docs. The research addressed the revising stage of the writing process. An action research investigation analyzed quantitative and qualitative data collected from a group of 26 participants of a private higher education institution in Ecuador. The instruments used to collect data included pre-and-post-tests, field notes, and face-to-face interviews. The results evidenced that collaborative work improved students’ performance at the time of writing and enriched their texts. The analyzed constructs included the topic sentence, supporting details, organization and transition, style and mechanics. All constructs tested at the end of the innovation improved in more than 99.38%. The effect size in all constructs had a value greater than 0.8, which means that the improvement was significant. The most important progress for the study was shown in the results of Supporting Details and Topic Sentence with a coefficient of variation of 0.1489 and 0.1433 respectively, which means that there is 14% dispersion among their data. This result indicates that the values are close to their mean.
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Español

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar cómo el trabajo colaborativo de los estudiantes al momento de escribir fomenta la revisión de pares y proporciona efectiva retroalimentación a través de Google Docs. La investigación abordó la etapa de revisión del proceso de escritura. La Investigación Acción analizó datos cuantitativos y cualitativos recopilados de un grupo de 26 participantes de una institución de educación superior privada en Ecuador. Los instrumentos utilizados para recopilar datos incluyeron pruebas iniciales y finales, notas de campo y entrevistas personales. Los resultados evidenciaron que el trabajo colaborativo mejoró el rendimiento de los estudiantes en el momento de la redacción. Los constructos analizados incluyeron la oración principal, oraciones de apoyo, organización y transición, estilo y mecánica. Todas los constructos analizados al final de la innovación mejoraron en más del 99.38%. El tamaño del efecto en todos los constructos tenía un valor mayor que 0.8, lo que significa que este mejoró significativamente. El progreso más significativo para este estudio se mostró en los resultados del Supporting Detail y Topic Sentence, con un coeficiente de variación de 0.1489 y 0.1433 respectivamente, lo que significa que existe el 14% de dispersión entre sus datos. Este resultado indica que los valores se aproximan a su media.

Palabras clave: colaboración, revisión por pares, retroalimentación, proceso de escritura, revisión
Improving the revising stage when writing through collaborative work on EFL students

Individuals who are keen to learn a foreign language attempt to communicate through the written word for personal and academic reasons. Students who are learning a second language face problems at the time of writing, mainly at a university level where they write collaboratively to perform critical thinking tasks. For Tan (2011), these deficiencies in the ability to write could compromise the academic success of students. Even more, Javadi-Safa (2018) states that to develop the writing skills educators should consider what students learn and build, through social interaction, and what motivates them to learn.

For many EFL educators, communication can happen while developing any of the language skills; nevertheless, for most teachers, it is through speaking and writing that students demonstrate language acquisition. Some educational institutions in Ecuador, through the EF program study (2018), undertook an adaptive online test to classify the linguistic skills of the examinees in one of the six levels established by the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). The results obtained were that Ecuador is located at number 65 of 80 Latin American countries evaluated which is lower than the same adaptive test taken in 2014 where Ecuador was located at number 55 of 80 which means that as a country, Ecuador is situated at a low level regarding the knowledge of the English language. From the first result, the Ecuador Education Ministry established the use of English Language Learning Standards (ELLS) when preparing curricular plans, including higher education. According to Ecuador Education Ministry (Ministerio de Educación, 2012), “The English Language Learning Standards are outcomes students are expected to achieve at the end of a proficiency level in terms of knowledge and skills gained throughout the process.”

One of the Learning Standards focuses on the writing skill that for English teachers is challenging to develop since writing should not only allow people to communicate but give power to their ideas. Due to the demands of the higher education system that involves students in scientific, social, and cultural activities, learning writing may encourage them to
work collaboratively, provide feedback, and join ideas to produce a powerful message. The study carried out at one private University of Ecuador by Harutyunyan and Poveda (2011) considered that writing skill is concatenated with critical thinking and collaborative work; and that the quality of writing is developed at the time of peer review practice.

The Ecuadorian government through the Ministry of Education (2012) tried to guarantee that students who complete their secondary education finish their high school studies with a B1 English level. Hence, the students, at the time of accessing higher education, should manage a proficiency level that would allow them to understand academic English texts in their chosen careers. However, this is not the reality of some Ecuadorian Universities, and English educators have noticed that students do not reach the minimum level of proficiency, which in the CEFR is A2. Considering the data that has been gathered at the institution where the current study took place and the feedback obtained via conversation with other English instructors, it corroborates the fact that students lack a clear notion of what revising texts is about. Students’ scores at the university level attest to the fact that learners at the time of writing are not familiar with the revising stage in the writing process. Therefore, student-writing samples show poor language fluency, lack of organization, vague ideas, among others, which make texts difficult to understand. However, teachers also recognize that they usually give feedback on students’ final writing results but not to the writing process itself. Moreover, they focus more on the grammatical structures. Consequently, the lack of sufficient instruction and guidance affect students’ writing process (Ying, 2018).

Another concern among teachers is students’ lack of interest when writing tasks are assigned to be done in the classroom. On the other hand, in a large class, the teacher may not be able to answer all students’ questions, leaving the rest of the students unmotivated to continue with the assignment.
Language teachers are aware that there must be a change in the teaching of writing. It is necessary to incorporate new methodological strategies. There are studies at an international level about the importance of the revision stage in the writing process; however, there are no studies that report an investigation in EFL students at A2 level. In addition, at a national level, Ecuador does not present studies with the one presented in this article with same characteristics. Consequently, the innovation in this study is relevant and it will benefit future investigations.

**Literature Review**

Writing is essential to socialize and inform ideas and opinions. Celce-Murcia (2001) considers writing as a process that requires interaction between the writer and the reader. In education, working collaboratively motivates students to perform peer review and peer feedback so that they were able to elaborate coherent documents. Peer interactions help students to acquire new strategies of learning, construct knowledge, and strengthen their content area proficiency (Chen, 2013).

Peer review is a practice whereby students provide and receive feedback from peers on their work (Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014), which could be an issue among the participants if they are not satisfied with the feedback provided. This raises the question: how do peers and teachers know when feedback is accurate? For Wiggins (2016) effective feedback is goal-referenced, tangible and transparent, actionable, user-friendly (specific and personalized), timely, ongoing, and consistent. Peer review is a feedback practice and students must take into account that its regular application provides to the reviewee and reviewer opportunities to give, receive and appreciate different styles of learning (Golparian, Chan, & Cassidy, 2015). In the current study, the participants’ interaction not only encouraged them but also compelled them to revise their documents more than once.
Revising is the stage at which writers try to improve the text they produced while planning and constructing an initial draft. However, O'Neill and Gravois (2017) consider that students often struggle with it, particularly through substantive revisions. They undervalue the importance of revision and resist making changes to their first draft. There is a study by Allen, Jacovina, Johnson, McNamara, and Roscoe (2016) that supports the importance of the revising process. The study included a sample of 85 students of a high school who wrote an essay. The essay received feedback from peers and the teacher during different moments. The results were that the essays proved noticeable changes in linguistic features from original to revised drafts. Revised essays were longer, included more transitional phrases, and were somewhat more cohesive. To O'Neill and Gravois (2017) the practice to write more than one draft helps the students to examine their writing from a new perspective during each revision in order to strengthen it. When writing, the writer’s objective is to produce a text that represents their intent and audience needs, and revision is necessary to achieve this objective.

During a writing revision, the relationship and interaction between the student and the teacher, as well as the communication that exists between peers of a working group, allow the synergy of knowledge, points of view, and the critical reflection of the members of the working group, which in turn, generate the construction of knowledge. This synergy according to Contreras and Castro (2017) includes social and intellectual involvement of students, accountability to the task they perform, and more critical collaboration among participants.

Vygotsky's theory (1978) proposes from the sociocultural perspective, that social environment affects the individual’s learning and considers social interaction essential to generate and consolidate knowledge. A collaborative work environment in a classroom can bring significant benefits to the students who have different backgrounds, skills, and opinions that contribute to a final performance. A recent study of Castillo, Heredia, and Gallardo
(2017) evaluated 46 teams in order to estimate their collaborative work competency level. A collaborative competency checklist was designed for this purpose. Results confirmed a positive correlation between the high level of collaborative work competency and academic achievement. Collaborative work helps the student academically, socially, and psychologically as it improves critical thinking, the learning process, develops social support, and develops positive attitudes towards teachers (Roberts, 2005). Brown emphasizes the community practice where interdependence stimulates an atmosphere of cooperative responsibility, mutual respect, and a sense of group identity (Brown, 1994).

Even though collaboration brings benefits to academic performance, Azari and Pouyan, (2016) state that collaborative work is time-consuming and might create a chaotic situation in the classroom. For the latter study, one of the concerns was students’ behavior when working collaboratively. Furthermore, there was the possibility that some learners could not work with others and conflict could happen. However, for authors like Thurlow et al. (2004) there is an effect when social interaction and technology are integrated that helps create peer social interaction language environment.

Google Docs is considered a web learning resource that encourages students to interact with their classmates both in the classroom and beyond. As communication flows, it lets the students’ participation be constant and motivating. Google Docs. is a free and convenient resource that facilitates carrying out tasks concerning the writing process, as well as encourages peer feedback. Google Docs enables users to view what has been, and who is editing in real time (Park, 2013). The study of Seyyedrezaie, Ghonsooly, Shahriari, and Fatemi (2016) supports the current research because it revealed that students showed positive attitudes towards the implication of Google Docs., which enhance students’ ability to express their ideas and comment on their peers’ writing for improvement. Nevertheless, Collins and Halverson (2018) claim that if higher education institutions decide to include technology as
part of the learning process for future professionals, it is necessary to take into account that education will not improve just by using it and technology can fail. Some questions are necessary to consider such as the following: “How can teachers make learning technology available to more people?” “What tools can support students’ learning on their own?” “What will be the teacher’s strategy to adapt a class if technology fails?”

Due to the findings regarding the problems the students face at the time of writing it is necessary to conduct this research towards the practice of collaborative work, peer feedback, and the application of the revising phase of the writing process. The questions that arose from this study are:

1. To what extent does peer feedback enhance writing in the revision phase of the writing process?
2. How does shared text enhance participants’ peer collaboration?
3. To what extent does Google Docs benefit the students’ revising stage in the writing process?

Innovation

The innovation implemented was designed to enhance writing focused on the revising stage of the writing process, using collaborative work and peer feedback. The appropriate use of technological resources during learning has been proven to engage students and improve academic performance. Where possible, the participants used Google Docs to perform peer review, provide peer feedback, prepare questions for an interview, and verify the information collected to write a paragraph on a topic related to the students’ professional field. The period of innovation lasted 24 teaching hours.

During the first two weeks of the innovation and according to the lesson plan (Appendix A), the students learned the parts of a paragraph and the use of Google Docs. The researcher modeled for the students a Mentor Text (Appendix B) to demonstrate how to break down a
paragraph (Appendix C). The students performed activities related to the writing process in Google Docs so that the collaborative contribution could be evidenced, monitored and registered. The following weeks, the students learned to provide peer review and feedback and they applied the revising process. The researcher provided the rubrics to the students. The first rubric was to evaluate peer feedback, as self-assessment (Appendix D). The students were introduced to the *Seven Effective Feedback* by Wiggins (2016) who states that feedback is information about how the students are doing in their own efforts to reach a goal. The second rubric was related to the revision stage, so the students knew how to assess their writings during the activities (Appendix E). The third rubric was the components of a paragraph (Appendix F).

Throughout the weeks in which the innovation was run, the students carried out individual and collaborative activities, in which the topics were focused on their professional careers. The last week of class and as an assignment, the students performed a final task, which was also done by the control group. The writings were scored with a rubric by different English professors to raise validity.

**Methodology**

**Participants**

The participants for this research were students enrolled in English level 5 course at a private institution of Higher Education. The students at the end of level 4 must take a mock KET exam; therefore, the students who are promoted to level 5 have an entry level that corresponds to the level A2 of the CEFR. The study included two groups of participants, the control and the experimental group. There were twenty-six male and female participants with an age range of 20 to 24 in each group. Both groups assent to participate in the study.
Research Design and Procedure

For this project, the investigator carried out an Action Research study that included a quasi-experimental design. It involved quantitative and qualitative data analysis. The control and experimental group participated in the study during the first partial of the Semester B-2018, which spans from October to December 2018. Both groups were measured with a pre-and-post test.

The validity of the study is supported by the triangulation of the study results that included the outcomes of a pre-and-post test, field notes (Appendix G), and interviews (Appendix H).

Before collecting data, the researcher asked three academic peers to score the writings of the post-test.

The instruments for data collection answered the three research questions:

1. To what extent does peer feedback enhance writing in the revision phase of the writing process?

2. How does shared text enhance participants´ peer collaboration?

3. To what extent does Google Docs benefit the student´s revising stage in the writing process?

Instruments

Pre and Post Test

Regarding quantitative data and for the pre-test, taken during the first class session, the students of the experimental and control group were asked to write a paragraph on paper about the topic given in class. For the post-test, taken in the final session of the class, the participants of both groups wrote a two-or three-paragraph letter as a final performance task in a Google document. The experimental group used Google Docs. as a supportive resource to save time on tasks that required the teacher´s monitoring in real time while students were
working collaboratively. However, the control group used Google Docs. to write the final performance task as a resource to store information. The pre-test and the post-test were graded based on the same rubric to evaluate the components of a paragraph. To validate the scoring and avoid bias, three academic peers graded five samples of the post-test from the experimental and control group.

The grades for the control and experimental group were recorded in a standardized template and analyzed in an SPSS Program. The data collected was processed in the software SPSS to obtain descriptive statistical information. The figures helped to measure the impact after applying the revising stage and peer feedback in the writing process.

The Field Notes helped to record students’ behavior during the innovation. They included a summary of session feedback from the students. The purpose of the data collected was to interpret students’ behavior in each session of class during the innovation that included the students’ perspectives of each class. The field notes provided the researcher direction about misunderstandings and concerns of the tasks performed in class to be improved in the following intervention sessions. Furthermore, the field notes helped to acknowledge the perceptions of the participants towards the use of Google Docs to enhance collaborative tasks when revising their writings and giving peer feedback to produce coherent writing. Taylor, Bogdan, and DeVault (2015) mention that field notes are based in the constructivist model that recognizes the importance of context and the co-construction of knowledge between researcher and the participants to understand and interpret.

The face-to-face interview was carried out. Eight students agreed to participate in an interview to understand the student’s perception of the writing process. The students were selected according to those who had the highest grade points and the lowest grade points. The interview was recorded with the students’ approval and then transcribed into a word document. Brannen (2017) states, the interview helps to balance or support the findings
during a study. Each interview lasted between 4 to 9 minutes. That time allowed participants
to express their ideas naturally. During the interview, there were moments where other
questions arose to clarify a response.

**Results**

The results are organized to address the research questions:

1. To what extent does peer feedback enhance writing in the revision phase of the
writing process?

2. How does shared text enhance participants’ peer collaboration?

3. To what extent does Google Docs benefit the student’s revising stage in the writing
process?

**Pre-test and Post-Test Experimental Group**

The improvement of the constructs denotes that the practice of the revising and
collaborative work in the writing process helped the students to upgrade their writings.

Table 1

*General Results: Pre and Post-test of the Experimental Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-and-post results</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.26</td>
<td>-3.54</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( N \) = population, \( M \) = mean, \( SD \) = standard deviation, \( MD \) = mean difference, \( d \) = Cohen’s \( d \), \( r \) = effect sized, Sig. = \( t \)-test

The above table shows the overall results of the pre-and-post test of the experimental
group. Before applying the innovation, the group had an average in the grades of 4.64, which
improved after the innovation, obtaining a final average of 8.90. The Cohen’s \( d \) has a value
greater than 0.8, which indicates that the size of the effect is large. To interpret Cohen’s value
in percentage, 99.38% of the students improved after the innovation.
Table 2

Descriptive Analysis: Pre-test and post-test of the Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>PRETEST</th>
<th>POSTTEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Sentence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Detail</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.0385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Transition</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.3462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = population, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, CV = coefficient of variation, MD = mean difference

The table above shows that, according to the results in the experimental group, the constructs improved greatly, from 4.1 to 4.5 points in each area when comparing the pre-and-post tests. The average of the grades in the different constructs in the pretest is between 4.34 (Style) to 5.03 (Supporting Detail). After applying the innovation, the average of the grade in the constructs in the post-test is between 8.69 (Organization and Transition) to 9.23 (Mechanics). It is important to point out that the result of Mechanics corresponds to the fact that the revision of this component during the writing process is a usual practice of the previous courses that the students have taken.

The variability of the data in comparison of pre-and-post test decreased between one case and the other in the different constructs. In the pre-test Mechanics and Topic Sentence have a high dispersion of 27.14% and 25.70% respectively compared to the other ones, and the lowest is the Style with a 20.51% variability. In the experimental group, the percentage of variation in the construct Mechanics is only 8.83%, which is the lowest value of all, followed by Supporting Details with a percentage of variation of 14.33%, while in the Organization and Transition construct, the dispersion between their data is only 17.75%, that is the highest. The lowest the percentage of variation of the constructs, the closest to the mean they are.

Post-Test of the Control and Experimental Group

The following tables show the posttest results of the control and experimental group after six weeks of class. The experimental group was exposed to an innovated academic
program while the control group participated in regular classes where no innovation was
applied.

Table 3

Descriptive Analysis: Post-test of the Control and Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>MD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic Sentence</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.1538</td>
<td>1.3173</td>
<td>0.2556</td>
<td>8.8462</td>
<td>1.3173</td>
<td>0.1489</td>
<td>-3.6924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Detail</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.8077</td>
<td>1.1669</td>
<td>0.2009</td>
<td>9.1154</td>
<td>1.3062</td>
<td>0.1433</td>
<td>-3.3077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Transition</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.9231</td>
<td>0.8910</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>8.6923</td>
<td>1.5432</td>
<td>0.1775</td>
<td>-3.7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.0000</td>
<td>1.0583</td>
<td>0.2116</td>
<td>8.7692</td>
<td>1.3655</td>
<td>0.1557</td>
<td>-3.7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.2692</td>
<td>0.7243</td>
<td>0.1374</td>
<td>9.2308</td>
<td>0.8152</td>
<td>0.0883</td>
<td>-3.9616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = population, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, CV = coefficient of variation, MD = mean difference

The table above shows that the constructs of the control group evidence a low
average in all of them where Organization and Transition is the lowest with an average of
4.92, followed by Style with a mean of 5.00. The highest construct is the Supporting Detail
construct with an average of 5.80. In contrast, the constructs of the experimental group, their
averages improved by 4.2 points approximately. Thus, for example, in the construct, that has
the greatest mean; Mechanics has 9.23 out of 10, and the lowest is Organization and
Transition, with 8.69 points.

In the control group, the Topic Sentence construct has a high dispersion of 25.56%
compared to the other ones, and the lowest is the Mechanic at 13.74% variability. In the
experimental group, the percentage of variation in the construct Mechanics is only 8.83%,
which is the lowest value of all, followed by Supporting Details with a percentage of variation
of 14.33%, while in the Organization and Transition construct the dispersion between their
data is only 17.75% that is the highest. Even though the post-test result of the control group
shows that the result increased in all the constructs, it is more perceptible that after the
innovation in the experimental group there was a great improvement in each construct.
Table 4

Effect Size: Post-test of the Control and Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control and Experimental</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Control and</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.0822</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>1.2544</td>
<td>-3.7615</td>
<td>-3.1328</td>
<td>-0.8429</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = population, M = mean, SD = standard deviation, MD = mean difference, d = Cohen’s d, r = effect sized, Sig. = t-test

Table 4 shows the overall results obtained in the Control and Experimental group, in which the scores of the post-tests of the control group demonstrated values (M = 5.23, SD = 1.08), whereas the experimental group obtained values higher than the control group (M = 8.90, SD = 1.25). It is evident that the students of the experimental group improved their writings after practicing the revising stage in the writing process through collaborative work.

The Cohen’s d has a value greater than 0.8, which indicates that the size of the effect is large because the greater the value in the Cohen’s d, the greater the value of r. The Cohen’s d value (3.13) can be interpreted in that 98.68% of the students in the experimental group in comparison with the control group improved because of the innovation. The p-value was 0.000, which implies that there is a significance difference between means.

Figure 1

General Comparison of Experimental and Control Group
The figure above shows the average of the pre-and-post test results of the control and experimental group. The average results of the experimental group in the pretest was 4.63, while after the innovation it increased to 8.92. For the control group, the average of the grades in the pretest is 4.23 and the posttest results show an average of 5.22. Both groups improved after six weeks of class; however, the scores obtained in the experimental group after the innovation evidence a considerable improvement.

Field Notes

The field notes registered the students' attitude toward the process of the innovation and the perspective of some tasks. The phenomena observed during the sessions of class showed that the students felt more confident in their tasks performance as the class sessions were developed. At the beginning of the innovation, the students did not feel confident about the use of the rubrics and they were not familiar with the use of them to assess the paragraph, the revising stage, or feedback. After some explanations, the rubric revision and the rubric to assess the paragraph were easier for them to understand and follow. However, the rubric to assess the peer's feedback had to be explained in detail.

Students were also introduced to the use of Google Docs. and had to be explained its function and features. Two students knew about it and helped classmates to create the Gmail accounts and a Google document.

During the second session of class, the students were introduced to the Mentor Text that helped them understand the components of a paragraph. During the following sessions of class, it was noticeable that the students participated and spoke more in class after they had worked in-group or pairs. Group work through Google Docs. enabled the students to be more confident to comment in a peer writing or ask for clarification within the document. The students felt more confident to work collaboratively, and they showed respect to the peers’ feedback. By the end of the innovation, the students performed better and faster on their own,
and started asking questions to their classmates and not to the teacher. The students also
provided feedback following the rubric and self-assessed their writings.

It is relevant to mention that during a session, the Internet service went down, so the rest
of the activities had to be done in paper. The activities that were not accomplished on that day
were completed the next session of class. It was evidenced that technology facilitates the
performance of the tasks when it works.

**Students’ Feedback**

During each session of class, students were asked to answer the following questions in
order to complement and support the information collected through the Field Notes.

1. **How did working in a group help you to engage in a discussion?**

   Most of the students answered that working in-group helped them to create a better
   relationship with their classmates. Besides, it helped them to express their viewpoints by
   learning their peers’ viewpoints. Some students also said that they had problems expressing
   their ideas, so learning that they were not the only ones, made them feel better and they could
   say anything without criticism.

2. **How did Google Docs help you work collaboratively?**

   The students answered that Google Docs. helped them to share the document, revise the
document, and give feedback in real time. They also mentioned that since they could see other
classmates’ comments, they could notice if what they were doing was on the right track.

3. **Was the Rubric easy to understand?**

   The students answered that the rubrics were easy to understand. However, they had to
   check them every time they were asked to write or re-write the document.

4. **Was your peer’s feedback good enough to revise your document?**

   The students answered that it was good enough because the teacher supported their
   peer’s feedback.
5. Do you find the rubric a useful instrument to self-assess your writing?

The students said that the rubric is important to self-assess their writing because it was the only way to know what the teacher expects from them when they write a text.

Student’s Interviews

All eight students answered the same questions and expressed that peer feedback helped them to improve their writings. Six students mentioned that in their previous English courses, they usually give attention to correcting grammatical mistakes, and less or no attention to other writing components such as audience, support for arguments, organization, transitions, and style. Consequently, it took them time to become familiar with the revising process. Even though, the students preferred to correct grammar before the other components of a paragraph.

Students also mentioned that collaborative work made them feel more confident since after receiving the feedback, they could ask their peers and not necessarily the teacher about their comments. They perceived that their writings improved after considering their peer’s suggestions and the rubrics to rewrite their documents.

One student mentioned that she did not know about Google Docs. and noticed that at the beginning of the intervention, it was a little confusing to their classmates. But, the fact that she worked in groups, it helped them to understand its uses quickly. All eight students mentioned that doing the revising stage and providing feedback through Google Docs. made them work better with more confidence. Three students mentioned that they would consider using Google Docs when working on their thesis at the end of their career studies.

Discussion

Findings from the Post-Test

The results of this study are explained regarding the social-constructivism understanding of learning in which the premises that social interaction and collaborative work
stimulates cognitive development. As explained in the literature, social interaction is essential to generate and consolidate knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978).

At the beginning of the research, the students evidenced to be unskilled writers, and only took time to review grammar, ignoring other components of the writing. After the innovation, there is evidence that the students who worked in collaboration were able to improve each of their writings after following the revising stage since they gave and received feedback from others during interactions. To O'Neill and Gravois (2017) the practice of writing more than one draft helps the students to review their writing from a different perspective during each revision to improve it. Additionally, collaborative work helps the student academically, socially and psychologically as it improves critical thinking, the learning process, develops social support, and develops positive attitudes towards teachers (Roberts, 2005).

On the other hand, even though the results of the control and experimental group improved, it is noticeable that the post-test results of the experimental group are considerably higher than the post-test results of the control group. So, when analyzing grades, it was possible to infer that the students’ writing performance quality was related to collaborative work competency they developed when practicing peer review and peer feedback. It is noticeable that the construct that improved the most in the experimental group was mechanics. This construct is related to the fact that for students it is easier to focus first on the grammar context just as for teachers. Also, learners had put more effort into assessing grammar during their previous English courses. It is important to consider that the second construct that improved was Supporting Detail, which means the students were able to build substantial information on their own related to a well-structured topic sentence.
Findings in the Field Notes and students´ reflection.

The notes registered during the sessions of the class evidenced the participant's behavior. At the beginning of the intervention, the students seemed confident when writing a text; however, they struggled to revise their documents and felt discouraged when they had to use rubrics for that purpose since they were not familiar with them. Nevertheless, after implementing group work and peer review tasks, the students´ positive attitude to do collaborative work helped them to perform better and gained the confidence to give feedback to their peers´ writings. For Golparian, Chan, and Cassidy (2015) peer review provides the students the opportunity to receive and give information on their work and therefore, learn from different styles of learning.

At the same time, collaboration in the academic field helped them to recognize that group work is beneficial to perform better, develop critical thinking, and respect peers’ opinion. Furthermore, as they learned how to use rubrics, they felt more confident to review others’ writing, assessed their texts, and consequently accomplish better writings. Ibarra et al. (2015) state that “rubric is a document that provides the expected level of performance as described by various indicators, and it is useful to certify competence acquisition.” A student’s reflection was “rubric was important to know what the teacher expect when I write.”

It is relevant to state that during the intervention the researcher modeled a mentor text and break down its components. The model helped them to understand and match the constructs used in the rubric to assess them with the content of the mentor text. The participants used the document during the time the intervention lasted. According to Liaghat and Biria (2018) modelling a mentor text when teaching writing helps EFL and ESL students to improve their writing competence since they are instructed how to imitate an accurate and fluent text.
Findings in the interview

The answers of the participants revealed that working with others not only helped them to improve their writings but also committed them to participate with responsibility. The students highlighted that peer collaboration plays an essential role during the writing process because they felt more confident to write and rewrite their texts after considering their peers’ opinions. Brown (1994) mentions that group work practice stimulates an environment of cooperative responsibility to pursue a general and individual goal. One of the interviewees mentioned, “I learned how to express some of my ideas by learning others’ viewpoints.”

Other findings from the interviews were the use of Google Docs while working in their writings. The students agreed that Google Docs. helped them to work collaboratively and as Thurlow et al. (2004) state, there is an academic impact when social interaction and technology are integrated. The students mentioned that even though Google Docs. allowed them to work in collaboration, the flow of the class was affected when the Internet service went down. One student recalled that day and expressed “The day the Internet service went down I enjoyed writing down in my notebook again. I like Google Docs. but sometimes I prefer to write down in a piece of paper.” Thus, Google Docs. is a learning resource that facilitates students collaboration but its use should not be a constant methodological requirement when preparing an instructional design.

Conclusion

The current study reveals that the results of the experimental group evidenced a considerable improvement in the scores obtained after the intervention. The instructional design of the experimental group facilitated the conditions to develop group work, individual responsibility and peer assessment, which led to generate collaborative teams to acting kindly, responsibly, and developing tasks on schedule.
The first research question refers to how peer feedback enhances participants to revise their writings. The results of the experimental and control group demonstrate that the participants who applied the revising stage during the writing process created opportunities to improve the students’ writings and helped them think about how their work is projected to the audience. Hence, it helped the participants to understand the importance of revision to make their writings better. The students who were taught about effective feedback self-assessed their writings, assessed their peers’ writing and produced up to two coherent paragraphs. Modeling a paragraph and break down its components was necessary for the participants to use it as a reference when writing their assignments.

Regarding the second research question, share texts to enhance participants’ peer collaboration. In the introduction it was explained how the teacher could not monitor all students so by collaborating and getting peer feedback, the students can strengthen knowledge between each other. The educator facilitates the learning process. The students who shared their documents faced two opportunities; they improved and organized their ideas by learning others, and felt confident enough to speak up their opinions. Group and peer assignments encouraged the students to work with confidence, responsibility and tolerate peers’ suggestions.

The third research question, students’ perception of using Google Docs. in the writing process. There was a constancy in the answers from the students given in the interviews. Google Docs, encouraged the students to work collaboratively, revise a peer writing, and give feedback. However, they also mentioned that there is a risk to rely on technology different academic or professional assignments. The information can get lost if the computer fails and more important, as future professionals they should be able to perform their assignment with or without technology. Teachers must take into account that this learning tool requires internet to work and classes cannot depend on it in case of failure.
Findings from this study are significant and contribute to the teaching of the writing field since they revealed the importance for teachers and students to review the document during the writing process. When writing practices at lower English levels focus on collaboration, the students become aware of their mistakes, confident to perform a task, and therefore improve their writing skills. The writing process is interrupted when students skip the revising stage, which affects the final product. Therefore, monitoring students throughout the process is critical.

Limitations

The limitation of this research refers to the amount of time the students use to learn English. Students attend classes at the Language Center once a week and they are from different careers of the University. Based on University academic-administrative regulations, students’ priority concerning attendance is in their career subjects. Hence, if they have any academic activity in their departments, missing English class is justified. Therefore, attendance in a class of thirty students could easily be reduced to 20 students on any given week. The irregular attendance can affect the class performance and therefore the expected results.

Recommendations

There were difficulties regarding the days of class and the number of participants attending each session of class. Even though they agreed to participate, the researcher had to insist on their weekly attendance since it could have affected the performance of the students at the time of working collaboratively. Therefore, it is recommended to carry out research where the students might attend daily classes and extend the length of the intervention for better results.

Rubrics to assess writing is an important resource for the students to know in advance what is expected from them. Even though the students struggled to assess with rubrics, they
finally accomplished to use them properly. Consequently, further research in applying rubrics to assess and self-assess writings is required in this issue too.

Google Docs. supported the students when they were writing their texts but there were difficulties when the internet went down. Different authors state that Google Docs. is a learning tool that enhances collaborative work but the experience after this innovation is that technology provides great support when it works. In further investigations, it would be relevant to learn how the teaching and learning process could be affected if educators and learners rely on their performance through technology.
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Appendix A
Lesson Plan

Design from Your Goals

Instructional design of units for transfer of learning to real life contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution:</th>
<th>Universidad Católica Santiago de Guayaquil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of study:</td>
<td>Semester B-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student description:</td>
<td>Students of English level 5 course (A2), of non-bilingual academic careers which curriculum includes six English levels as a requirement to culminate their academic studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor:</td>
<td>Sandra Bustamante Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit title:</td>
<td>Learning Through Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks:</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours:</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Transfer Goal (Stage 1)

Standards the unit will work with:

- Produce longer, more detailed and complex transactional texts as well as short, simple texts (e.g. essays, advertisements, cartoons) by linking a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence.
- Use appropriate interpretation strategies to deal with the corresponding text types (argumentative, expository, procedural, narrative, transactional, and persuasive).
- Exchange, check and confirm information to deal with less routine situations and explain why a problem.
- Sustain a straightforward description of a subject or a variety of matters within the personal, educational, public, and vocational domains rather fluently, presenting it as a linear sequence of points.

Goal:

I want my students to learn and apply the revising stage by reflecting on peer feedback during the writing process while working collaboratively, so in their own, in the long run, they will be able to produce short and coherent authentic texts of their personal and professional interests for real and varied audiences in the target language.


Breakdown of the transfer goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. If we see and hear them do this, they CAN transfer this learning.</th>
<th>B. If we see and hear them do this, then they CANNOT (yet) transfer:</th>
<th>C. What I will commit to doing differently in my classroom to ensure my results look like Column A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use vocabulary to make the writing attractive to the reader</td>
<td>Weak vocabulary/repeat words</td>
<td>Create word banks/Transition words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a topic sentence and supporting ideas</td>
<td>There is no connection between the topic sentence and the supporting ideas</td>
<td>Create collaborative work for peer feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide voice to topic with supporting ideas</td>
<td>Weak supporting sentences</td>
<td>Provide feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver meaningful peer feedback</td>
<td>Peer feedback shows advice and judgments</td>
<td>Model feedback in real time of some students’ writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write more than one draft of the text</td>
<td>No significant changes after the revising stage</td>
<td>Provide feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use examples or evidence to bring clarity to the writing</td>
<td>No examples, no evidence in the text.</td>
<td>Create collaborative work and feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Summative Performance Assessment Task (Stage 2)

The Research Department of your University has decided to invest money in a Faculty to develop a project called “Improving the Community.” The project consists of carrying out a social intervention from the professional field of each faculty. As a student, you want the Research Department to distribute the money to your Faculty. Write a short statement to the Director of the RD and mention three reasons why your faculty should have the financial support to carry out the intervention.
**Goal**

Students will learn about the characteristics of the revising stage in the writing process as they provide feedback while working collaboratively. They will write a paragraph about a particular topic and support the topic sentence with reasons as supporting ideas.

**Role**

A university student who should write a short letter to the Director of the Research Department.

**Audience**

The Director of the Research Department.

**Situation**

The Research Department has money to give away to only one Faculty that is interested in working in Social Interventions projects. The Faculties of the University want to have the financial support and each one has asked a student to write a letter with compelling reasons why his or her faculty should have the money.

**Performance**

Interview one or two professors of the faculty to know different viewpoints of how the faculty can contribute to the community and write a letter with compelling reasons why your faculty should have the money.

**Standards**

The writing should be authentic and should evidence the revising stage. It should have an attractive topic sentence and strong supporting sentences to connect with the audience. Organizational structure reaches the purpose and audience.

---

**III. Knowledge and skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What students will need to know</th>
<th>The skills students will need to be able to do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● The elements of a paragraph (topic sentence, supporting ideas and concluding sentence).</td>
<td>● Identify the topic sentence, supporting sentences and conclusion in a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The seven keys to effective feedback</td>
<td>● Apply the writing process when writing an authentic text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The revising stage</td>
<td>● Use Google Docs to work collaboratively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Google Docs features</td>
<td>● Give meaningful feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Peer review</td>
<td>● Use the information collected when writing a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Follow Conventions of Standard English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Essential Questions

Essential questions support the transfer goal, signal inquiry, guide instruction, and can be asked over and over throughout the unit without reaching a final answer.

- To what extent does peer feedback enhance students to practice the revision phase of the writing process?
- To what extent does shared writings through Google Docs encourage collaboration among the participants?
- To what extent does applying the revising stage improve the participants’ writings?

V. Learning Activities

Transfer goal:
I want my students to learn and apply the revising stage during the writing process while working collaboratively, so in their own, in the long run, they will be able to produce short and coherent authentic texts of their personal and professional interests to real and varied audiences in the target language.

Abbreviated Performance Task:
- Use of Google Docs in the revising process
- Peer feedback
- Group discussion
- Write
### Stage III. Learning Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Activities</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>A Acquisiton</th>
<th>M Meaning making</th>
<th>NT Near Transfer</th>
<th>T Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Session 1 – (4 hours)

**Learning Objectives:**
- The students will learn to work in-group to gain confidence and to engage in a discussion.

**Students feedback – Reflection – Expected outcome**
- How working in a group helped you to engage in a discussion?
- How confident do you feel to speak and express your opinion after today's lesson?

**Activities:**

*Diagnostic phase. Pre-test Paragraph (rubric)*
- Teacher asks students to write a paragraph of the topic: “Advantages of Smartphones”.
- Students don’t receive any instructions to carry out the task.
- Teacher corrects the paragraphs at the end of the class. Feedback is given the next session.

**Class discussion**
- Students watch a video about *The Advantages and Disadvantages of the Internet* and discuss questions. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xtQfV6COHbU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xtQfV6COHbU)
  - How has technology changed over time?
  - What benefits does the Internet bring to your academic assignments?
  - What do you think will technology in education be like in the future?

**Develop vocabulary**
- What personal devices do the students use for personal and academic purpose?
- Use “Word Cloud” tool to brainstorm words to express some characteristics of the devices. Examples: powerful, user-friendly, compact, etc.
- Define words, expressions, and phrases related to the use of the Internet
  - Connectivity
  - E-mail
  - Shopping online
  - Scholar
  - Social networks
  - Website

**Give Context**
- Teacher assigns each student to a *home group* of 4 students to reflect on the reading.
Teacher divides the reading in four segments and assigns each student to read one segment. Students within the group, discuss the following questions. The answer of the questions will help the students to have opinions for further writing.

- How technology has revolutionized from your professional field?
- How technology connects people around the world?
- How technology can contribute to your career?
- Has technology changed the way students learn?
- How do you think will technology evolve in time?
- What are the negative aspects of technology, if any?

Students answer the questions in Google Docs. Then they discuss the answers within the group. Teacher opens the discussion to the class to compare answers and students can gather more information.

### Session 2.

**Learning Objectives:**

- The student will learn to elaborate a paragraph.
- The students will learn to work collaboratively in Google Docs.
- The students will learn the process of revising.
- The students will learn how to self-assess their writing from a rubric
- The students will learn to provide feedback to a peer with a rubric

**Students feedback – Reflection – Expected outcome**

- How did Google Docs help you to work collaboratively?
- Was the Rubric easy to understand?
- Was your peer’s feedback good enough to revise your document?

**Activities:**

**Lecture and discussion**

- Teacher shows in class slides of some of the revised paragraphs to the class.
- Teacher explains the difficulties found in the writings they did the previous class.
- Teacher gives a brief lecture of the parts of the paragraph (topic sentence, supporting ideas and conclusion), and the importance of revising the document before submitting it.
**Class activity to activate Mechanic:**
*Teacher gives some wrong written sentences, taken from their own writings, and ask them to review and correct the grammar structure, punctuation and spelling mistakes*

**Class Participation**

- Students watch the video “Effective Feedback” and answer questions. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3uYcgtnvDgc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3uYcgtnvDgc)
  - How does feedback help you to reach your learning goals?
  - What do you understand by “Every classroom is a team and every teacher is a coach”?
  - How do you relate this phrase to collaborative work?

➢ Teacher writes the questions in different flip-chart papers and gives the students small sticky notes to write the answers.
➢ Students paste the sticky note in the flip-chart paper and read to appreciate their differences or similarities about their responses.
➢ Teacher give a brief lecture of effective feedback (seven keys of effective feedback)

**Pair Work (Innovation)**

- Teacher introduces the topic of the following written task: “Technology in Education”.
- Students open a Google Docs file and brainstorm ideas.
- Students complete, in the same Google Docs file, the paragraph template.
- Students share the document with the teacher.

**Revising Stage - Peer Feedback (Innovation)**

- Students share the paragraph with a peer.
- Students revise the document and give feedback within the document.
- Teacher gives the feedback rubric to the students.
- Students discuss each other’s feedback.
- Teacher makes comments on peer’s feedback within the document.
- Students self-assess their feedback and improve it.

**Give Context**

- Students watch the video “Teaching Kids About Revising” and answer the questions.
## What does the writing process involve?

- How does the revising stage differ from editing?
- How many drafts do you usually write before submitting the document to your teacher?
- How important is it that a peer review your document?

> **Teacher shows a “Mentor Text”**

### Individual Work and final discussion (Innovation)

- Students re-write their own paragraph
- Teacher hands in the Revising Rubric
- Students self-assess their written document.
- Students rewrite the paragraph and present the first and second draft to class.
- Students make comments on the changes (more feedback).
- Students rewrite again the paragraph

### Field notes: Teacher registers the students’ behavior towards the use of Google docs while working in field notes. Teacher also, registers students’ feedback and reflections of questions asked at the end of each class.

### Session 3 Learning objectives

- The students will learn how to work collaboratively on Google Docs. on their paragraphs

### Students feedback – Reflection – Expected outcome

- The students can give meaningful feedback
- Do you find the rubric a useful instrument to self-assess your writing?

### Class activity to activate Mechanic:

**Teacher gives some wrong written sentences, taken from their own writings, and ask them to review and correct the grammar structure, punctuation and spelling mistakes**

### Activities:

**Recap and class discussion**

- Students watch the video “Collaborative Learning Builds Deeper Understanding”  
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rWEwv_qobpU
- Students discuss questions:
  - How did collaborative work help you to finish the task?
● Does Google Doc help you to work collaboratively?
● How does learning improve when working with a peer?
➢ Teacher chooses one or two student’s writing and shows the changes of the text through the drafts.
➢ Teacher recalls the importance of revision the document before submitting it.

Introduction to the class
➢ Students watch a video about “The Evolution of Technology”
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NoX6mOg2EZQ

Answer questions:
● What gadgets did you see and how many of them do you use?
● Do you think life was easier in the past or now?

Give Context – Class Discussion
➢ The students watch two videos: “Technology: Good or Bad?” and “Accepting The Role of Technology in Our Lives”
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HMxJm8TTL
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EOZvrTZeb

➢ Students answer questions.
● How has technology changed the society?
● How has technology improved communication?
● How has technology improved business?
● How is the role of technology in our lives?

Group work.
➢ Students brainstorm the benefits of using technology.
➢ Students search for information about the benefits of technology in one professional field.
➢ Students watch the video “The importance of Research”
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5rSP-n2g15M

➢ Students discuss and evaluate their information collected:
● What is the source? (Newspaper, journal, article, blog, etc.)
● Is the source reliable?
● Is the information collected reliable?
● Is the information collected something I have learned in my career?
● Is possible to confirm this information with an expert?
➢ Students work in the link
   https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mz7PWgc5A5QkqAcvEL8WnshsYLAt065XvMj3c_MiXQ/edit?usp=sharing
➢ Students self-assess the information collected using the previous questions.
➢ Students prepare a short presentation and copy the link in the file.
➢ Students share the information in class.
➢ Students take notes to collect information for future writing
➢ Write questions (in class) and ask an expert (assignment)

Individual work
➢ Students write a journal to reflect: How important is technology in my personal and professional environment?

Assignment: Ask a professor of your career questions to confirm information collected from classmates’ presentation and your own research. Audiotape and record the interview

Lesson 4
Learning Objectives
➢ Students will continue to learn how to use a rubric
➢ Students will learn to work Collaboratively
➢ Students will learn the importance of using trustworthy information

Students feedback – Reflection – Expected outcome
➢ Do you find the rubric a useful instrument to self-assess your writing?

Class activity to activate Mechanic:
Teacher gives some wrong written sentences, taken from their own writings, and ask them to review and correct the grammar structure, punctuation and spelling mistakes

Activities:
Class discussion
➢ Teachers recap the benefits of using Google to work collaboratively
➢ Teacher recaps the importance of having real evidence
➢ Students watch the video “Evaluating Sources for Credibility”
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PLTOVoHbH5c
➢ Students discuss the questions:
   ❖ How important is research to support your ideas?
   ❖ Is an interview part of a research?
   ❖ How important is an interview?
   ❖ How important is doing research in my profession?
   ❖ What do you think is more effective? Look for information in books, on the Internet or ask someone?
   ❖ How can you avoid Bias?
### Pair Work (Innovation - Students work on their own)
- Teacher introduces the topic of the following written task: “Technology Serves Different Purposes”.
- Teacher presents again the Mentor Text to the Students.
- Students open a Google Docs file and brainstorm ideas and use information collected from the previous session.

### Individual Work.
- Students write a paragraph and share it with the teacher and a peer.
- Students, in the same Google Docs file, use the template given to identify that the paragraph has all its parts: topic sentence, supporting ideas and a conclusion.
- Students share the document with a peer and the teacher.

### Revising Stage - Peer Feedback (Students invite the teacher in Google Docs to monitors the tasks)
- Students revise the document and give feedback within the document.
- Students on their own use the same given Rubric.
- Students discuss each other’s feedback.
- Students self-assess their feedback.

### Revising Stage - Peer Feedback (Students invite the teacher in Google Docs to monitors the tasks)
- Students re-write their own paragraph (second draft).
- Students self-assess their written document using the given Revising Rubric.
- Students rewrite the paragraph (third draft).

### Session 5

#### Learning Objectives
- Student will learn to support the topic sentence with a second paragraph.
- Student will learn to use the rubric on their own.

#### Students feedback – Reflection – Expected outcome
- Do you feel confident to write the second paragraph on your own?

#### Class activity to activate Mechanic:
*Teacher gives some wrong written sentences, taken from their own writings, and ask them to review and correct the grammar structure, punctuation and spelling mistakes.*

#### Activities:

**Individual Work**
- Teacher recap the previous session.
  - Write a paragraph
Use the template to divide the paragraph and confirm it is complete.
Follow the process of revising
Provide feedback

- Students write the second paragraph about the same topic “Technology Serves Different Purposes”. Use the notes taken in previous classes, and teacher and peer’s feedback.
- Students self-assess their own work

**Final Presentation**
- Students present their final two paragraphs to the class.

### Session 6

**Learning Tasks**
- Students will write a short paragraph.
- Students will use attractive vocabulary to give voice to the text.
- Students will self-assess assess the revising process

**Performance Task**
The Research Department of your University has decided to invest money in Technology in a Faculty to develop a project called “Improving the Community.” The project consists of carrying out a social intervention from the professional field of each faculty. As a student, you want the Research Department to distribute the money to your Faculty. Write a short statement to the Director of the RD and mention three reasons why your faculty should have the financial support to carry out the intervention.

**Evaluation**
- The document will be scored with a rubric

Learning process:  A = Acquisition, M = Meaning Making, T = Transfer
Intention:  Hook, **formative assessment**, initiating, developing, review, closure, **research**, other.
Indicate Week 1, 2, etc. and number of hours.

#### VI. On-going Self-Assessment

As I reflect on student learning, what will I do if my plan is not yielding my expected results?

During the innovation, each session of class will have two elements that will help the process to achieve the expected results.

The first element is the Learning Objective stated at the beginning of each class session. The Learning Objective will help the teacher to focus each task according to the desired results. Therefore, the tasks will scaffold during the following sessions.

The second element corresponds to Students’ feedback. The information obtained from the students will help me to readjust the following sessions and recap the appropriate learning content the students might need to accomplish the activities.

Lesson plans are subjects to adaptation during the learning process.
Appendix B
Mentor Text

Internet Serves Different Purposes

Many people use the Internet for personal, professional, and academic interests. In the past, if people wanted to write to their friends, they had to wait for days or weeks for their letters to reach them. Now e-mail helps to communicate with people in seconds. E-mail is very useful if someone wants to send the same message to several friends. Instead of having to write multiple letters, they can now just enter multiple e-mail addresses. For business purposes, many companies' profits have increased by selling on the Internet. For example, Amazon.com sells products only through the Internet, and it is a very successful company. Consumers can also sell items through the Internet. Companies such as eBay allow both buyer and seller to conduct business easily. More people can work from home and get work done more quickly because of the Internet. Another reason to use the Internet is that it is more accessible than libraries, is quicker than tracking down books, and has a bigger database. Google Advanced Scholar is a wonderful resource where a student can find information on any subject. Encyclopedias can be accessed on the Internet. Students can also find a tutor for any subjects online, which allows them to receive timely help for academic success. The Internet is a wonderful asset to the new generations and if it is used wisely, it can be a great help in their lives.
### Appendix C

**Mentor Text – Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Paragraph Mentor Text Break Down</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internet Serves Different Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Sentence</strong></td>
<td>Many people use the Internet for personal, professional and academic interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the past, if people wanted to write to their friends, they had to wait for days or weeks for their letters to reach them. Now e-mail helps to communicate with people in seconds. E-mail is very useful if someone wants to send the same message to several friends. Instead of having to write multiple letters, a person can now just enter multiple e-mail addresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Sentences</strong></td>
<td>For business purpose, many companies’ profits have increased by selling on the Internet. For example, Amazon.com sells products only through the Internet, and it is a very successful company. Consumers can also sell items through the Internet. Companies such as eBay allow both buyer and seller to conduct business easily. More people can work from home and get work done more quickly because of the Internet. Another reason to use Internet is that it is more accessible than libraries, is quicker than tracking down books, and has a bigger database. Google Advanced Scholar is a wonderful resource where a student can find information on any subject. Encyclopedias can be accessed on the Internet. Students can also find a tutor for any subjects online, which allows them to receive timely help for academic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Sentences</strong></td>
<td>The Internet is a wonderful asset to the new generations and if it is used wisely, it can be a great help in their lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**
Appendix D

Rubric to Assess Feedback

Rúbrica Para Evaluar Retroalimentación

OBJECTIVE OF THE RUBRIC: Assess the seven keys of essential feedback

Instructions: Select the closest choice to what you think regarding each of the following criteria
Instrucciones: Seleccione la opción más cercana sobre lo que usted piensa respecto de cada una de las afirmaciones siguientes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tangible and Transparent</td>
<td>Information is value neutral and the student recognizes how the feedback relates to the task.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actionable</td>
<td>Student can use it to improve on their own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User-friendly</td>
<td>Information is not overly technical or vague. Information is appropriate to the cognitive level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td>Information was delivered immediately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>Information is accurate and trustworthy. No bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Seven Keys to Effective Feedback by Grant Wiggins
http://tobink8.org/ILT/SevenKeysToEffectiveFeedback.pdf
Appendix E

Rúbrica para Evaluar la Etapa dela Revisión en el Proceso de Escritura

Rubric to evaluate the revising stage in the writing process

REVISION: Ability to refine text, including line of thought, language usage, and tone as appropriate to audience and purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Poor 0</th>
<th>Fair 1</th>
<th>Good 2</th>
<th>Excellent 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in the writing</strong></td>
<td>Student spent little to no time revising. Little to no changes were made to piece based upon the class directions or student's revising goal.</td>
<td>Student attempted to make changes to their writing. However the changes were minimal. (at least 1 draft)</td>
<td>Student revision shows adequate changes made to content and ideas in writing. Details were added to enhance writing. (at least 2 drafts)</td>
<td>Student made numerous changes to writing, changing/adding details and description to make writing more attractive to reader. (3 or more drafts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deletion</strong></td>
<td>Did not make any deletions that were needed. Did not add any relevant material</td>
<td>Some information such as weak or irrelevant material were deleted.</td>
<td>Most information such as weak or irrelevant material were deleted and substitute for some relevant material</td>
<td>All unnecessary information such as weak or irrelevant material were deleted and substitute for more relevant material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer review</strong></td>
<td>Made no changes during peer review</td>
<td>Made at least 1 change during peer review</td>
<td>Made from 2 to 4 changes during peer review</td>
<td>Made more than 4 changes during peer review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grading Criteria

| Changes in Writing | | | | |
|-------------------| | | | |
| Deletion          | | | | |
| Peer Review       | | | | |
| **Total Points**  | | | | |
# Appendix F

## Rubric to Evaluate the Components of a Paragraph
Rúbrica Para Evaluar Los Componentes De Un Párrafo

**OBJECTIVE OF THE RUBRIC:** Assess the components of an elementary paragraph
Objetivo de la Rúbrica: Evaluar los componentes de un párrafo elemental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>2 points</th>
<th>1 points</th>
<th>0.5 points</th>
<th>0 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic Sentence</strong></td>
<td>Main topic is clearly stated in a complete opening sentence with correct sentence structure</td>
<td>Main topic is stated in an opening sentence but sentence structure is not correct.</td>
<td>Main topic is not clearly stated but sentence structure is not correct.</td>
<td>Main topic is not clearly stated. Sentence structure is not correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Details</strong></td>
<td>Student has written at least three supporting details. Supporting details deliver interesting, concrete and descriptive examples and details with explanations that relate to the topic sentence.</td>
<td>Student has written at least 3 supporting details but only 2 sentences are on topic. Examples and details relate to the topic and some explanation is included.</td>
<td>Student has written at least 3 supporting details but only 1 sentence is on topic. Sufficient number of examples and details that relate to the topic.</td>
<td>Student has attempted to write supporting details but none are on topic. Insufficient, vague, or undeveloped examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization and Transitions</strong></td>
<td>Thoughtful, logical progression of supporting examples; Mature transitions between ideas.</td>
<td>Details are arranged in a logical progression; appropriate transitions.</td>
<td>Acceptable arrangement of examples; transitions may be weak.</td>
<td>No discernible pattern of organization; Unrelated details; no transitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>Appropriate tone, distinctive voice; pleasing variety in sentence structure; Vivid diction, precise word choices.</td>
<td>Appropriate tone; Clear sentences with varied structures; Effective diction.</td>
<td>Acceptable tone; some variety in sentence structures; Adequate diction and word choices.</td>
<td>Inconsistent or Inappropriate tone; Awkward, unclear, or incomplete sentences; Bland diction, poor word choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics</strong></td>
<td>Consistent standard English usage, spelling, and punctuation. No errors.</td>
<td>Some errors, but none major, in usage, spelling, or punctuation. (1-2)</td>
<td>A few errors in usage, spelling, or punctuation (3-4)</td>
<td>Distracting errors in usage, spelling, or punctuation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adapted from: https://www.mesacc.edu/~paoih30491/RubricParagraphAssignment.html*
Appendix G

Field Notes to Register Students’ Attitude Towards Google Docs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD NOTES</th>
<th>Students’ Participation in Google Docs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course level:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of observation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBSERVATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Student Feedback

- *How working in a group helped you to engage in a discussion?*

- *How confident do you feel to speak and express your opinion after today's lesson?*

- How did Google Docs help you to work collaboratively?

- *Was the Rubric easy to understand?*
  - Was your peer’s feedback good enough to revise your document?
  - *Do you find the rubric a useful instrument to self-assess your writing?*
  - *Do you feel confident to write the second paragraph on your own?*

- **Other Comments**
Appendix H

Interview to Know the Perception of the Student about the Use of Google Docs for Academic Purposes

Entrevista para Conocer la Percepción del Alumno sobre el Uso Google Docs para Fines Académicos

Objective: The purpose for this interview is to know how the student perceives the use of the Google Docs tool as a didactic resource in the classroom.

Objetivo: El motivo de esta entrevista es conocer cómo el estudiante percibe el uso de la herramienta Google Docs como recurso didáctico en el salón de clases.

General Information:

Code: ___________________
Edad (age):______  Sexo(gender): Hombre (male):____  Mujer (female):____
Semester: ______________  Career: ________________

Preguntas (Questions):

1. In what ways did collaboration help you? (¿En qué formas te ayudó la colaboración?)

2. How did getting feedback from your peer improve your writing? (¿Cómo la retroalimentación de tu compañero mejoró tu escritura?)

3. What was it about working with technology that made the experience positive or negative? (¿En qué consistió trabajar con tecnología que hizo que la experiencia fuera positiva o negativa?)

4. How does using Google Docs. help you revise your document? (¿Cómo le ayuda Google Docs. a revisar su documento?)

5. What would encourage you to participate in a Google Docs. activity in the future? (¿Qué lo animaría a participar en una actividad en Google Docs. en el futuro?)