

Research Paper**Fostering EFL Learners' Classroom Engagement: Does Collaborative Writing through Google Docs Make a Difference?**Zahra Hemati¹, Majid Farahian²¹Department of ELT, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.zahra.hemattie12@gmail.com²Department of ELT, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.majid.farahian@gmail.com**Abstract**

The present study investigated the impact of Iranian English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners' collaborative writing through Google Docs on their classroom engagement. To attain the purpose of the study, 50 Iranian EFL learners were selected. Two instruments were used to gather the required data; classroom engagement questionnaire, and a semi-structured interview. At the first session of the class, the first researcher/teacher asked the participants of both groups to fill in the engagement scale as the pre-test. The experimental group received a 60-minute training session to acquaint them with collaborative writing and engage in pre-task modelling of collaboration. During the study intervention, the experimental group received online collaborative writing using Google Docs while the control group underwent conventional methods of teaching. At the end of the treatment, both groups took a post-test. To analyse the obtained data a set of descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test were used. The results revealed that collaborative writing through Google Docs has a significant effect on the participants' classroom engagement since the participants of the experimental group outperformed the participants of the control group in the post-test. The obtained data from the interview were reported qualitatively. The results revealed participants' positive views regarding using Google Docs and it provided their ideas regarding its use in future courses. The findings have implications for EFL teachers and learners.

Keywords:

Collaborative writing, Google Docs, EFL learners; Engagement, Writing skill

***Corresponding Author:** Majid Farahian

Assistant Professor of Department of ELT, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran.

Email: majid.farahian@gmail.com

Introduction

For decades, English language instructors have attempted to find useful ways to enhance learners' engagement in their classrooms. Engagement of learners is defined as the extent to which students actively participate in their learning and their sense of connection to their classes, peers, and educational institutions (Axelson & Flick, 2010). The literature has shown that there is a positive relationship between learner engagement and course satisfaction (Swan, 2001; Wefald & Downey, 2009), persistence (Berger & Milem, 1999; Kuh et al., 2008), and academic success (Carini et al., 2006). Accordingly, teachers are eager to develop students' engagement in the classroom to help them become more proficient learners.

Since the 1950s, there has been a change in language classes from teacher-centeredness to learner-centeredness (Brown, 1987), and accordingly, teaching writing skill has become more common among language teachers and students (Ozdemir & Aydin, 2015). According to Williams (2012), writing should not be viewed solely as an outcome of language learning; rather, it should be seen as a dynamic process or instrument that enhances learning in a second language. Writing provides learners with more chances to learn to use language than those presented by oral interaction since the slower pace at which written discourse is developed lets students think about the language that they use and gives them the opportunity to evaluate it (Hirvela et al. 2016). Moreover, the continuity of writing lets students go back to their writing and assess and re-evaluate their language use (Adams, 2003).

A challenge in EFL courses with independent writing is the absence of continuous feedback that an interlocutor can offer during oral interaction, including cues indicating a lack of complete understanding of the linguistic product (Storch, 2013). In contrast, collaborative writing, as emphasized by Storch (2013), addresses this limitation by offering learners abundant chances to give and receive substantial and timely feedback, potentially enhancing their learning opportunities (p. 156).

Collaborative writing, supported both theoretically and empirically, has gained considerable attention from researchers and educators (Fernández-Dobao, 2020; Storch, 2005). It is defined as “an activity where there is a shared and negotiated decision-making process and a shared responsibility for the production of a single text” (Storch, 2013, p. 3). Typically, this writing approach involves interaction among students in the creation of a written text. The significance of interaction in the learning process has been widely recognized (Kieser & Golden, 2009). Peer interaction is known to enhance learner engagement, problem-solving skills, and information-seeking competencies (Kieser & Golden, 2009). Effective interaction among learners requires a comfortable and non-threatening environment, along with rich social settings (Aghaei & Keller, 2016). However, the emergence of educational technology and online engagement tools has

addressed some of these challenges, providing students with ample time and non-threatening conditions to foster positive and active learning interactions with their peers (Sotillo, 2002). Online interactive platforms encourage collaboration and mitigate uneven student involvement issues (Parsazadeh et al., 2018). Therefore, it seems that collaborative writing, especially using technology like Google Docs, may offer increased advantages in the current era (Woo et al., 2013).

Since L2 engagement may contribute to raising students' learning outcomes (Jarvela & Renninger, 2014; Philp & Nakamura, 2017), the present study aims to investigate the impact of Iranian EFL learners' collaborative writing through Google Docs on their classroom engagement. Moreover, this study explores Iranian intermediate EFL learners' attitudes towards the role of Google Docs in classroom engagement.

Literature review

Engagement

Reschly and Christenson (2012) argue that there is still conceptual vagueness around the engagement construct and that there is no unifying definition (Lester, 2013). As stated by Coates (2006), the conceptualization of engagement is influenced by various learning theories, spanning from early behaviorist perspectives to cognitive and social constructivist theories, leading to changes over time. Trowler (2010) attributes the origin of the term "engagement" to Astin's (1984) work on learner participation. Initial perspectives were shaped by behaviorist ideas, emphasizing the significance of observable individual behaviors. Additionally, engagement is viewed as a form of distributed agency, with the impact of a learning environment on this agency being mediated through reflexivity (Kahn, 2014).

Classroom engagement is characterized by a student's enthusiastic involvement in learning activities within the classroom setting (Reeve et al., 2004). This encompasses the attention, interest, active participation, and effort exerted by students in the learning tasks within the classroom environment (Marks, 2000). According to Fredricks et al. (2004), the three dimensions of engagement are affective (emotional), cognitive, and behavioral. Positive feelings like curiosity, enjoyment, and excitement are examples of affective engagement in the classroom (Skinner et al., 2009). Behavioral engagement may be characterized as time on task, overt attention, classroom involvement, questioning, and the selection of difficult activities (Wang et al., 2014). Meaningful processing, strategy utilization, attention, and metacognition are all examples of cognitive engagement. (Wang et al., 2014).

Student engagement, based on Tross et al., (2000), enhances their grades and academic advancement indirectly. In this regard, Gunuc (2014) states that a lack of student involvement leads to dissatisfaction, which affects academic progress. In the same vein, Krause (2005) stressed the importance of student involvement, arguing that it leads

to a number of positive results like perseverance and satisfaction, both of which are important for academic achievement. Finn and Zimmer (2012) stressed the relevance of student participation in increasing learning quality and Guthrie et al., (2012) suggested that learners' behavioral engagement impacts the quality of their learning experience.

Previous research has linked student engagement to improved general and intellectual abilities (Pike et al., 2003), practical competence and other skills like critical thinking and cognitive development. According to Kuh et al. (2008), disengaged kids miss out on opportunities to improve emotionally and academically. Higher levels of engagement in the shape of a more profound feeling of belonging and connection to both peers and the learning setting, deemed by scholars such as McMahon and Portelli (2004) as the pinnacle of psychological engagement, do not necessarily imply enhanced performance.

Researchers describe engagement as the period when a learner actively takes part in learning—like experimenting, attending, taking part in conversation, enquiring, answering, and taking notes (Hattie, 2009). Engaging learners is achievable when learning goals are obvious and emphasized, clear success criteria are provided, and the learning process is visible to pupils (Hattie, 2009).

Collaborative writing

Collaborative writing is precisely characterized as an activity involving a joint and negotiated decision-making process, along with shared responsibility for creating a single text (Gündüz, 2023). Collaborative or team writing is the process of generating a written work as a group, with all team members contributing to the material and making choices on the group's operation. Collaborative learning of writing skills is strongly recommended in our learning environment, where students must be at the center of the classroom and engage as much as possible with their peers. Collaborative writing is not only a very inspiring learning experience for EFL/ESL students, but also a creative tool for teachers (Montero, 2005, p. 38).

In terms of establishing useful and dynamic learning environments, student collaboration through Google Docs is an intriguing alternative (Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014). Google Docs is a popular collaborative writing tool that is part of Google's Google Drive service, which includes a free web-based software office suite. People may create and modify papers online while collaborating in real time with other users. It provides for a smooth and speedy exchange of information among group members. Collaboration is greatly facilitated by the ability to exchange and modify documents among group members (Chiu et al., 2014). Students may share a draft through email or Google Docs, where they can rapidly modify and offer feedback, saving them from having to totally rewrite their drafts (Curtis, 2013). Google Docs also removes geographical barriers, making it easy to work from anywhere on the planet. Students are also encouraged to respond to their professors' and peers' remarks on Google Docs, which

increases their motivation (Al-Chibani, 2014). This uneven sharing of experiences until the final product is created helps to keep students' motivation levels high (Suwantarathip & Wichadee, 2014).

Collaborative writing also involves students in distinct roles that they would not ordinarily play while doing solo writing, and as a result, this writing technique requires them to do activities that they would not normally perform (Storch, 2013). While writing cooperatively, as Storch puts it, students can function as co-authors, sounding boards, critical peers, and tutors. Because learners perform diverse duties while performing these roles, this may present learners with different chances to learn about language utilization in writing and written conversation. This might involve explaining, offering feedback, soliciting perspectives, or mentioning disagreement with learners, all of which, according to Storch (2013), are activities that are seldom performed in a teacher-led class and are not a necessary aspect of independent writing. Students might learn while they are writing because of the debate that occur between pupils when they are engaged in these actions.

Technology in the EFL context

The imperatives of the era characterized by knowledge and information, along with the necessity to keep pace with advancements in information technology within Iran have prompted the government to make decisions to heavily invest in the swift growth of information and communication technology (ICT). It was recognized that ICT has the potential to significantly influence the attainment of distinct social and economic development objectives and serves a pivotal function in broader national development strategies. As such, the Education Ministry of Iran has developed a charter to steer changes in the country's education system, with the integration of ICT being a fundamental aspect. The significance of an education aligned with the requirements of individuals and society is more pronounced today than ever. In a world interconnected by information networks, there is a heightened need for a workforce equipped with the skills to effectively utilize technology for improving productivity and fostering innovation.

Meanwhile, the outbreak of COVID-19 had an unprecedented effect on education worldwide. The global impact of the coronavirus pandemic extended beyond public health challenges to disrupt education worldwide. Despite significant human and financial losses globally, the pandemic presented an unparalleled opportunity for the educational system to adopt and integrate online learning systems into its primary instructional plans. In response to the virus's spread, Iranian universities, like many others globally, transitioned to distance education. Having already completed two semesters of online education, there arose a necessity to address the quality of online assessments as part of the effort to evaluate the effectiveness of online pedagogical practices and ensure accountability (Farahian et al., 2023).

Additionally, various tools such as forums, blogs, wikis, and Google Docs have been utilized in second language writing courses. These tools offer opportunities for teachers to create online interactive environments for collaborative writing, enabling EFL learners to receive feedback from both their teachers and peers. Engaging in peer feedback and peer editing of writing is facilitated through these platforms (Dizon, 2016; Strobl, 2013). Considering the beneficial features that Google Docs offers for writing courses, including peer feedback, peer editing, redrafting, and tracking changes to texts (Semeraro & Moore, 2016), garnering additional empirical support for the effectiveness of Google Docs could present a promising technology application for EFL writing instruction. (Fathi et al., 2021). Moreover, although many studies have been done to explore the utilization of Google Docs in collaborative EFL writing courses, its effect on some factors such as student engagement has not received enough attention (e.g. Fathi et al., 2021; Kitjaroonchai & Suppasetserree, 2021).

In addition, the main aim of most of the previous research on the use of collaborative writing in EFL classrooms was to investigate the difference between writing produced collaboratively and writing that is developed individually (e.g. Dobao, 2012; McDonough et al., 2018; Storch, 2005; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2007; Villarreal & Gil-Sarratea, 2020; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2009). Kang and Lee (2019) explained that students engaging in collaborative work can achieve the same level of performance and their writing skills will also improve. Accordingly, as an attempt to shed more light on the potential effects of using Google Docs on Iranian learners' classroom engagement, the present study has been carried out. Accordingly, the following research questions were proposed.

Q1. Does collaborative digital writing through Google Docs significantly improve EFL students' engagement in their classrooms?

Q2. What is the perception of the experimental group towards collaborative digital writing through Google Docs?

Method

Design

This study adopted a quasi-experimental design with the inclusion of experimental and control groups. This experimental study followed a pre-post-test research design to investigate the effect of providing comprehensive feedback. Since the researcher chose the participants from two intact classes and randomly assigned them to experimental and control groups, the present study was a quasi-experimental one.

Participants

Fifty intermediate EFL learners from a language school in Kermanshah, Iran participated in the study. Using available sampling, the researcher used two intact classes and

randomly assigned them to control and experimental groups. The participants were both male and female. They were native speakers of Persian and studied English as a foreign language. The participants of the control group went under the conventional method of teaching and the participants of the experimental group were instructed to use digital writing in Google Docs during the study.

Instruments

Two instruments were used in the current study to gather the required data.

The Classroom Engagement Scale

The students' engagement scale was developed by Reeve and Tseng (2011). The scale includes four subscales, namely behavioural engagement items, Agentic engagement items, Cognitive engagement items, and emotional engagement items. The questionnaire comprises a total of 22 items, categorized into cognitive (items 1-7), emotional (items 8-14), and behavioral (items 15-22) dimensions. Reeve and Tseng (2011) have substantiated the questionnaire's validity, and its reliability in Iran was reported by Hajalizadeh (2016) as 0.87, indicating an acceptable level of reliability.

Google Docs

Google Docs originated by Godwin-Jones (2008) and has become widely acclaimed for peer editing due to its collaborative nature, where both authors and reviewers can enhance or modify the published text (Niess & Gillow-Wiles, 2015). For students utilizing Google Docs, changes are automatically saved, and revisions are tracked, facilitating seamless editing processes. Prior research indicates that students engage in various editing activities on Google Docs, such as adding, deleting, rearranging, and substituting text at different levels, from words to aspects beyond sentences (Woodard & Babcock, 2014).

In collaborative writing scenarios, Google Docs emerges as an effective solution for students' challenges. While it encompasses tools like Word documents, spreadsheets, and presentation packages, its word processing practicality stands out in educational settings. Google Docs enables collaborative paper composing and editing across different devices, fostering student collaboration in writing tasks and streamlining the completion of assignments. Additionally, it offers features allowing teachers and students to provide comments and suggestions on papers during writing classes (Angelo et al., 2018). This facilitates easy monitoring and assessment of student activity within groups for educators.

Semi-Structured Interview

A semi-structured interview was used to assess the perceptions of the participants of the experimental group regarding using Google Docs. The other aim of this interview was to

find the level of their familiarity with digital writing in Google Docs, and the level of their motivation to use it. Prior to the interviews, the interviewees were briefed on the interview's objectives. They were assured that their responses would remain confidential and their identities would not be disclosed. Each interview comprised four open-ended questions, as detailed in the Appendix, and typically lasted between 10 to 15 minutes. These interviews were conducted in English via Skype with the chosen participants. Subsequently, all interview recordings were transcribed for thematic analysis.

Procedure

The following stages were followed to conduct the current study.

At the first stage of this study, the researchers chose two intact classes (n=50) in a language school in Kermanshah to participate in this study. Then, they were classified into two groups as control and experimental. In the first session of the class, the first researcher asked the participants of both groups to fill in the engagement questionnaire as the pre-test. The experimental group then received a 60-minute training session to acquaint them with collaborative writing and engaged in pre-task modelling of collaboration. During the study intervention, the experimental group received online collaborative writing using Google Docs while the control group underwent traditional methods of teaching. The treatment included different kinds of writing tasks. For each session, the teacher showed the students of both groups the same pictures and asked them to write a short essay with at least 50 words. The participants of the control group wrote their writings in the classroom and the members of the experimental group did their tasks through digital writing in Google Docs. In the experimental group, students collaborated in small groups consisting of three to four members. In contrast, the control group completed the same tasks individually and only received feedback at the conclusion of the study. At the end of the treatment, both groups took the post-test which was the same as the pretest. The first researcher observed and gathered written drafts from both groups after each class, closely monitoring all writing assignments. Throughout the sessions, participants in the experimental group were consistently encouraged to collaborate on the entire writing process, including prewriting, drafting, revising, editing, and generating the final written product.

At the next stage of the study, the participants were asked to answer the items of the questionnaire as the post-test and the results were used to investigate the effect of the treatment on the level of engagement of the participants of the experimental group. At the last stage, the interview was conducted with 10 randomly selected participants from the experimental group. These interviews took place via Skype and took about 10 to 15 minutes for each learner.

Data Analysis

To analyse the obtained data from the engagement questionnaire and to answer the research questions of the current study, a set of descriptive and inferential statistics were used. To answer the first research question, a set of descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test were used. This test was used to compare the experimental group's and control group's answers to the items of the questionnaire in the pre-test and post-test. The results of the interview regarding the second research question were thematically analyzed and were reported qualitatively.

Results

The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was utilized to determine the normality of the acquired data prior to data analysis. The results of this test are reported in Table 1.

One-Sample Kolmogorov- Smirnov Test of All Data

		pretest	posttest
N		50	49
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	42.9600	63.0408
	Std. Deviation	1.04314E1	2.45993E1
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.131	.148
	Positive	.093	.148
	Negative	-.131	-.088
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.924	1.038
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.360	.232

a. Test distribution is Normal.

Table 1 shows the results of One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of pretests and posttests of classroom engagement. The results showed that the data of all of the tests are normal, because for all of the variables significance was more than 0.05. Accordingly, it was possible to use parametric tests to analyse data.

First research question sought if collaborative digital writing through Google Docs significantly improves EFL students' engagement in their classrooms. As mentioned in the previous chapter, a questionnaire was used to gather the required data to answer this research question. At the first stage of data collection and to clarify the initial level of the participants' classroom engagement, a pre-test of classroom engagement was

performed. To analyse the obtained data, a set of descriptive statistics has been performed and the results are reported in the next Table.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Pretests of Classroom Engagement of Experimental and Control Groups

	groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
pretest	control	25	43.12	10.67	2.13
	experimental	25	42.80	10.39	2.07

As is seen from the above Table, the mean scores of the control and experimental groups on pre-tests of classroom engagement are 43.12 and 42.80, respectively. The standard deviations of classroom engagement pre-tests for the control group and the experimental group are 10.67 and 10.39, respectively. This Table indicates that there is no significant difference between the pre-test mean scores. Then, during the subsequent step of data analysis, an Independent Sample t-test was conducted to compare the mean pre-test scores of the experimental and control groups. The following Table depicts the outcomes of the Independent Sample t-test for the classroom engagement pre-tests of the control and experimental groups.

Table 3

Independent Sample T-test of Classroom Engagement Pretests of Experimental and Control Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
pretest	Equal variances assumed	.065	.800	.107	48	.915	.320	2.98	-5.67	6.31
	Equal variances not assumed			.107	4.79	.915	.320	2.98	-5.67	6.31

As the Table illustrates, under the premise of variance equality, the result of Levene's test indicates that in the independent sample t-test, the sig =0.915, and since sig>0.05, there is no significant difference in the mean scores of the two groups' pre-tests of classroom engagement. Accordingly, there is no significant difference between the two groups' pre-tests of classroom engagement.

A set of descriptive statistics was performed to compare the mean scores of post-tests of classroom engagement of control and experimental groups. The results are reported in the following Table.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Post-tests of Classroom Engagement of Control and Experimental Groups

	groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post-test	control	25	44.56	10.31	2.06
	experimental	25	84.64	15.90	3.18

According to the above Table, the mean score of the control and experimental groups are 44.56 and 84.64, respectively. The Std. deviation of control and experimental groups are 10.31 and 15.90, respectively.

An Independent Samples t-test was conducted to determine the effect of treatment on experimental group classroom engagement. This test was used to compare the post-test results of the experimental and control groups on classroom engagement. The test results are presented in the following Table.

Table 5

Independent Samples t-test of Mean Scores of Posttests of Classroom Engagement of Experimental and Control Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Differen- ce	Std. Error Differen- ce	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Post-test Equal variances assumed	6.49	.014	-1.10	48	.000	-4.17	3.79	-49.3	-3.40
Equal variances not assumed			-1.10	4.11	.000	-4.17	3.79	-49.3	-3.40

Under the premise of variance equality, the outcome of Levene’s test indicates that the sig is 0.00 and sig<0.05. The findings of this test indicate that there is a significant difference between the mean post-test scores of classroom engagement for the control group and the experimental group. This test reveals that the mean score of the experimental group is greater than that of the control group. The results indicated that collaborative digital writing using Google Docs greatly increases EFL students’ classroom engagement.

The second research question of the current study aimed to find the perception of the participants of the experimental group regarding collaborative digital writing through Google Docs. The required data to answer this research question was gathered using an interview that included four questions.

The participants’ answers to these questions are reported qualitatively. To answer the first question, some of the students stated that using Google Docs is an effective and reliable tool to improve their language skills. They added that collaborative writing using Google Docs resulted in gaining more knowledge and consequently made them more proficient. They added that it made them more eager to try to learn new things in language learning and work more collaboratively with their classmates. For example, one of the learners stated that:

In the process of collaborative writing through Google Docs, since I had to work with my classmates, I tried to prepare myself for collaboration in different stages of writing. Therefore, I feel that this preparation made me more proficient, especially in writing skills. Moreover, when my classmates mentioned my errors, I tried to check and find ways to solve them.

The second question of the interview asked the learners if they felt a desire to improve their engagement in the classroom by using digital writing in Google Docs. Several

students concurred that online learning tools had a favorable effect on group interaction and classroom engagement in terms of fostering an environment conducive to increased class participation. They claimed that with Google Docs, teachers and students connect and chat, resulting in increased classroom engagement. One of the students stated that adopting online learning tools such as Google Docs is a good approach to increase classroom engagement, especially among introverted students. She noted that because she is a shy student, she was unable to communicate with her peers face-to-face, and online options helped her become more interested in classroom activities. She added that using Google Docs helped her become more confident even in face-to-face communication since using online tools helped her feel more comfortable in communicating with other individuals. One of the students strongly disagrees that Google Docs can be used to establish a collaborative learning environment since this is their first time using the program, and they are inexperienced with the processes of online engagement. She noted that since it was not easy for her to use Google Docs as a new educational platform and made some challenges for her, it cannot be used to establish a collaborative learning environment. She added that she prefers to have face-to-face interaction and collaboration with her classmates.

The next interview question asked the students If they had the opportunity to use Google Docs for future studies and whether they would do so or not. To answer this question, some of the learners stated that they will use Google Docs for future studies because it automatically saves all the documents that they create. Moreover, some of them agree that they are eager to use educational tools such as Google Docs to learn new educational materials. One of the students who had a neutral opinion noted that

I am not sure would be eager to use Google Docs again because it can only be accessed with an internet connection, which I do not have all the time.

Moreover, some other students mentioned that they would consider using Google Docs again because they are helpful and easy to use. They added that they would like to complete similar writing tasks again because they practiced more and learned a lot from the experience. Moreover, some of the students mentioned that they enjoy using Google Docs as a new educational experience. On the contrary, one of the students disagrees with using Google Docs for future studies because she is not accustomed to using technology in her language courses. She added that since she does not have any tendency to use technology in her language courses, she prefers traditional methods of language learning.

The last question of the interview asked the learners how technology can help EFL learners improve their engagement. According to the students, technology gives simple access to knowledge, rapid learning, and enjoyable possibilities to apply what is learned. It allows students to study new topics and get a deeper knowledge of challenging themes. Students can teach one another through mentorship and cooperative creativity by working on group projects or exchanging papers through technology. Since it is the age of

technology, a majority of them noted that they are keen to use it in all aspects of their lives, including schooling. Since the majority of them love utilizing technology for a variety of tasks, they are more motivated to learn instructional content through technology.

Discussion and Conclusion

The current study was an attempt to investigate the impact of collaborative digital writing through Google Docs on EFL students' classroom engagement and also to find their opinion regarding collaborative digital writing through Google Docs. The results of the current study regarding the first research question indicated that collaborative digital writing through Google Docs has a significant effect on the participants' classroom engagement. In other words, collaborative digital writing through Google Docs improved the level of the participants' classroom engagement since the participants of the experimental group outperformed the control group in the pretest of classroom engagement. The results revealed that the progress of the experimental group in classroom engagement was significantly higher than that of the control group. In sum, the results of this research indicated that the use of Google Docs for collaborative writing had a significant impact on enhancing the classroom engagement of Iranian EFL learners. Specifically, the study found that engaging in online collaborative writing, where learners shared and peer-edited their written assignments, played a significant role in elevating the level of engagement among EFL learners. Based on the results, the research hypothesis was rejected.

Numerous studies have evaluated the influence of online collaborative writing using Google Docs on various aspects and abilities of language acquisition, and their findings are consistent with the current findings. Together with the results of the current study, these studies demonstrate the benefits of online collaborative writing using Google Docs. For instance, Seyyedrezaie et al. (2016); Abrams (2019); Ebadi and Rahimi (2017); Fathi and Rahimi (2020); Rahimi and Fathi (2021) discovered the positive effect of online collaborative writing using Google Docs on a variety of language skills, and their findings are consistent with those of the present study. In addition, the present study's findings are consistent with those of Slavkov (2015), Yang (2010), and Alharbi (2019), who discovered that online collaborative writing using Google Docs had a considerable favourable influence on the language acquisition of EFL learners.

The second research question of the present study was an attempt to find the Iranian EFL learners' perceptions regarding collaborative digital writing through Google Docs. Generally, the students stated that using Google Docs is an effective and reliable tool to improve their language skills and most of them had positive attitudes toward its use and were satisfied with it. They added that collaborative writing using Google Docs resulted in gaining more knowledge and consequently made them more

proficient. They believed that they had to prepare themselves to become able to work with their classmates and it led to the development of their language skills. Moreover, some of the learners stated that online learning tools had a favorable effect on group interaction and classroom engagement in terms of fostering an environment conducive to increased class participation. Meanwhile, some of the learners stated that they are eager to use Google Docs for future studies because it automatically saves all the documents that they create and they will consider using Google Docs again because they are helpful and easy to use. They added that they would like to complete similar writing tasks again because they practiced more and learned a lot from the experience. On the contrary, one of the students disagrees with using Google Docs for future studies because she is not accustomed to using technology in her language courses. Moreover, the participants added that technology gives simple access to knowledge, rapid learning, and enjoyable possibilities to apply what is learned. The results of the second research question of the study are in line with the results of Riley-Huff (2010); Marandi and Seyyedrezaie (2017); and Blau and Caspi (2009) who reported the learners' positive attitudes regarding collaborative writing using Google Docs.

The findings of this study suggest that Google Docs may be included in EFL courses in order to boost the efficacy of writing development by providing learners with online peer-editing capabilities, hence fostering the growth of learners' engagement. However, the successful integration of any type of technology into the normal curriculum requires that both instructors and students be prepared with certain technological abilities that are crucial for the efficient use of technology for educational purposes (Fathi & Ebadi, 2020). Teachers of L2 writing should recognize and value Google Docs as a powerful tool that may facilitate interactive and collaborative learning in the L2 writing process. Therefore, teacher development programs may need to prepare pre-service EFL instructors with technical abilities and urge them to include digital devices into their L2 instruction and EFL writing courses in particular. In the interim, EFL students are obliged to be instructed on how to create online Google Docs, and share their written assignments with their classmates in order to edit and debate the difficulties, therefore enhancing their language skills and their level of classroom engagement.

It is important to note that this study has significant limitations. Due to the fact that the participants in the experimental group had no prior experience utilizing Google Docs to enhance their level of engagement, their rise in classroom engagement may have been influenced by a Hawthorne effect. In addition, this study was conducted with a small number of students. Consequently, the researcher did not intend to generalize the findings of the study.

Given that the participants in this study were few in number and had about the same level of general English competence, it is advised that future researchers do comparable studies with bigger sample sizes from diverse contexts and at varying

proficiency levels. Other researchers can duplicate the current work and evaluate the impact of using Google Docs on the growth of other components of language acquisition.

References

- Abrams, Z. I. (2019). *Collaborative writing and text quality in Google Docs*. 23(2), 22–42.
- Adams, R. (2003). L2 output, reformulation and noticing: Implications for IL development. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 347-376.
- Aghaee, N., & Keller, C. (2016). ICT-supported peer interaction among learners in Bachelor's and Master's thesis courses. *Computers & Education*, 94, 276-297.
- Al-Chibani, W. (2014). The effectiveness of online and on-to-one tutoring in the writing center on the students' achievement: A multiple case study. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 41, 192-197.
- Alharbi, M. A. (2019). Exploring the potential of Google Docs in facilitating innovative teaching and learning practices in an EFL writing course. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(2), 1-16.
- Angelo, G., Iorio, A. Di, Zacchiroli, S., Angelo, G., Iorio, A. Di, Zacchiroli, S., & Characterization, S. (2018). Spacetime characterization of real-time collaborative. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 1–19.
- Astin, A. (1984). Student involvement: a developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 25(4), 297–308.
- Axelson, R. D., & Flick, A. (2010). Defining student engagement. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 43(1), 38-43.
- Berger, J. B., & Milem, J. F. (1999). The role of student involvement and perceptions of integration in a causal model of student persistence. *Research in higher Education*, 40(6), 641-664.
- Blau, I., & Caspi, A. (2009). What type of collaboration helps? Psychological ownership, perceived learning, and outcome quality of collaboration using Google Docs. In T. Brown, D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Carini, R. M., Kuh, G. D., & Klein, S. P. (2006). Student engagement and student learning: Testing the linkages. *Research in higher education*, 47(1), 1-32.
- Chiu, D.K.W., Wang, M., Popescu, E., Li, Q., Lau, R. (2014). New Horizons in Web Based Learning. *ICWL 2011 International Workshops, KMEL, ELSM, and SPeL*, Hong Kong, 1-364.
- Coates, H. (2006). *Student engagement in campus-based and online education: University connections*. New York: Routledge.

- Curtis, A.K. (2013). *Writing 2.0: Google Docs as a Collaborative Writing Tool in the Elementary Classroom*. Utah Valley University Library.
- Dizon, G. (2016). A comparative study of Facebook vs. paper-and-pencil writing to improve L2 writing skills. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(8), 1249-1258.
- Dobao, A.F. (2012). Collaborative writing tasks in the L2 classroom: Comparing group, pair, and individual work. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(1), 40-58.
- Ebadi, S., & Rahimi, M. (2017). Exploring the Impact of Online Peer-Editing Using Google Docs on EFL Learners' Academic Writing Skills: a Mixed Methods Study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 30(8), 787–815.
- Farahian, M., Rajabi, Y., & Gholami, H. (2023). Exploring the cognitions of Iranian University TEFL teachers and students of the efficacy of online assessment practices in the Wake of Covid-19. *Technology Assisted Language Education* 2(1), 1-21.
- Fathi, J., Arabani, A. S., & Mohamadi, P. (2021). The Effect of Collaborative Writing Using Google Docs on EFL Learners' Writing Performance and Writing Self-regulation. *Language Related Research*, 12(5), 333-359.
- Fathi, J., & Ebadi, S. (2020). Exploring EFL pre-service teachers' adoption of technology in a CALL program: obstacles, motivators, and maintenance. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(5), 3897-3917.
- Fathi, J., & Rahimi, M. (2020). Examining the impact of flipped classroom on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency: A case of EFL students. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-39.
- Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 97-131). New York: Springer.
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 59 –109.
- Godwin -Jones, R. (2008). Web -writing 2.0: Enabling, documenting, and assessing writing online. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(2), 7 -12.
- Gündüz, Z., E. (2023). Teaching writing with wiki-based collaborative writing tasks in an EFL context at higher education. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature, and Culture*, 8(1), 68-86.
- Gunuc, S. (2014). The relationships between student engagement and their academic achievement. *International Journal of New Trends in Education*, 5(4), 216-231.
- from https://www.griffith.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/53465/Engaged,inert2005.pdf
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 601-634). New York: Springer.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. New York: Routledge.

- Hirvela, A., Hyland, K. & Manchón, R. (2016). Chapter 2 Dimensions in L2 writing theory and research: Learning to write and writing to learn. In: R. Manchón and P. Matsuda, ed., *Handbook of second and foreign language writing*, pp. 45-64.
- Jarvela, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2014). Designing for learning: Interest, motivation, and engagement. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 668–685). Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, S., & Lee, J. H. (2019). Are two heads always better than one? The effects of collaborative planning on L2 writing in relation to task complexity. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 61-72.
- Kahn, P. E. (2014). Theorising student engagement in higher education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(6), 1005-1018.
- Kieser, A. L., & Golden, F. O. (2009). Using online office applications: Collaboration tools for learning. *Distance Learning*, 6(1), 41-55.
- Kitjaroonchai, N., & Suppasetsee, S. (2021). A Case Study of ASEAN EFL Learners' Collaborative Writing and Small Group Interaction Patterns in Google Docs. *English Language Teaching*, 14(5), 89-108.
- Krause, K. (2005). *Engaged, inert or otherwise occupied?* Deconstructing the 21st century undergraduate student. James Cook University Symposium 2005 'Sharing Scholarship in Learning and Teaching: Engaging Students', (pp.1-10). Townsville/Cairns. Retrieved
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *The journal of higher education*, 79(5), 540-563.
- Lambert, C., Philp, J., & Nakamura, S. (2017). Learner-generated content and engagement in second language task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 21, 665–680. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816683559>
- Marks, H. M. (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 153–184.
- Marandi, S. S., & Seyyedrezaie, M. S. (2017). The multi-course comparison of the effectiveness of two EFL writing environments: Google drive versus face-to-face on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance and writing apprehension. *CALL-EJ*, 18(1), 9-21.
- McMahon, B., & Portelli, J. P. (2004). Engagement for what? Beyond popular discourses of student engagement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3(1), 59-76.
- McDonough, K., De Vleschauwer, J., & Crawford, W. (2018). Comparing the quality of collaborative writing, collaborative prewriting, and individual texts in a Thai EFL context. *System*, 74, 109-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.02.010>
- Montero, A. (2005). What a feeling! Motivating EFL students through collaborative writing with poems. *English Teaching Forum*, 43(3), 36-38.

- Niess, M. L., & Gillow -Wiles, H. W. (Eds.) (2015). *Handbook of research on teacher education in the digital age*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Ozdemir, E., & Aydin, S. (2015). The effects of blogging on EFL writing achievement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 199, 372-380.
- Parsazadeh, N., Ali, R., & Rezaei, M. (2018). A framework for cooperative and interactive mobile learning to improve online information evaluation skills. *Computers & Education*, 120, 75-89.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., & Gonyea, R. M. (2003). The relationship between institutional mission and students' involvement and educational outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 44(2), 241-261.
- Rahimi, M., & Fathi, J. (2021). Exploring the impact of wiki-mediated collaborative writing on EFL students' writing performance, writing self-regulation, and writing self-efficacy: a mixed methods study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-48.
- Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Jeon, S., & Barch, J. (2004). Enhancing students' engagement by increasing teachers' autonomy support. *Motivation and Emotion*, 28, 147-169.
- Reeve, J., & Tseng, C. (2011). Agency as a fourth aspect of students' engagement during learning activities. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 36(2011), 257-267.
- Riley-Huff, D. A. (2010). Using Google Wave and Docs for Group Collaboration. *Library Hi Tech News* 27 (4-5), 12-14.
- Semeraro, J., and Moore, N. S. (2016). *The Use of Google Docss Technology to Support Peer Revision*. In *Writing Instruction to Support Literacy Success*, 203-220. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Seyyedrezaie, Z. S., Ghonsooly, B., Shahriari, H., & Fatemi, A. H. (2016). A mixed methods analysis of the effect of google docs environment on efl learners' writing performance and causal attributions for success and failure. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 17(3), 90-110.
- Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69, 493-525.
- Slavkov, N. (2015). Sociocultural Theory, the L2 Writing Process, and Google Drive: Strange Bedfellows?. *TESL Canada Journal*, 32(2), 80-94.
- Sotillo, S. M. (2002). Constructivist and collaborative learning in a wireless environment. *TESOL Journal*, 11(3), 16-20.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process and students' reflection. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002>.
- Storch, N. (2007). Investigating the merits of pair work on a text editing task in ESL classes. *Language Teaching Research*, 11, 143-159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807074600> 188.
- Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms (Vol. 31). *Multilingual Matters*.

<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847699954>.

- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2007). Writing tasks: The Effects of Collaboration. In M. P. García Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 157–177). London: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599286-011>.
- Strobl, C. (2013). Affordances of Web 2.0 technologies for collaborative advanced writing in a foreign language. *Calico Journal*, 31(1), 1–18.
- Suwantarathip, O. & Wichadee, S. (2014). The Effects of Collaborative Writing Activity Using Google Docs on Students' Writing Abilities. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 13 (2), 148-156.
- Swan, K. (2001). Virtual interaction: Design factors affecting student satisfaction and perceived learning in asynchronous online courses. *Distance education*, 22(2), 306-331.
- Tross, S. A., Harper, J. P., Osherr, L. W., & Kneidinger, L. M. (2000). Not just the usual cast of characteristics: Using personality to predict college performance and retention. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(3), 325-336.
- Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. Retrieved from https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/studentengagementevidencesummary_0.pdf.
- Villarreal, I., & Gil-Sarratea, N. (2020). The effect of collaborative writing in an EFL secondary setting. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(6), 874-897.
- Wang, Z., Bergin, C., & Bergin, D. A. (2014). Measuring engagement in fourth to twelfth grade classrooms: The Classroom Engagement Inventory. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 29(4), 517.
- Wefald, A. J., & Downey, R. G. (2009). Construct dimensionality of engagement and its relation with satisfaction. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143(1), 91-112.
- Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2009). Pair versus individual writing: Effects on fluency, complexity and accuracy. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 445-466.
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role (s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 321-331.
- Woo, M. M., Chu, S. K. W., & Li, X. (2013). Peer-feedback and revision process in a wiki mediated collaborative writing. *Educational technology research and development*, 61(2), 279-309.
- Woodard, R., & Babcock, A. (2014). Designing writing tasks in Google Docs that encourage conversation: An inquiry into feedback and revision. In R. S. Anderson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on digital tools for writing instruction in K-12 settings* (pp. 1 - 29). IOI Global.
- Yang, C. C. R. (2010). Using Google Docs to Facilitate Collaborative Writing in an English Language Classroom Practice. *TESL-EJ* 14(3), 1–6.

Appendix

1. Do you find Google Docs to be a reliable tool for enhancing your English skills?
2. Do you feel desire for improving your engagement in your classroom by using digital writing in Google Docs?
3. If you had the opportunity to use Google Docs for future studies, will you do so or not?
4. How can technology help EFL learners to improve their engagement?