

Sociocultural Theory and Google Docs : A Case Study in Peer and Teacher Feedback and Motivation in Academic Essay Writing in the EFL Composition Classroom

Jared McKee* Silla University

Jiin Kang** Silla University

논문요약

비고츠키(Vygotsky)의 사회문화 이론은 특히 제2외국어 학습에 있어서 중요한 의미를 갖는다. 학생들은 협동적인 학습 활동을 하면서 영어를 더 잘 배우고 성장하며 발전한다. 게다가 쓰기단계는 사회적 상호작용을 통해 복잡한 인식과정을 거쳐 향상되고 발전한다. 본 논문은 쓰기 수업을 하는 학생들로부터 피드백을 도출하기 위해 구글 독스(Google Docs)를 이용하여 사회문화이론이 쓰기수업에 어떻게 적용되었는지를 설명하고자 한다. 본 연구는 한국 모 대학의 영어수업에서 진행되었고, 참가자는 영어교육과 학생 11명이다. 연구자는 반성적 실천(Reflective Practice), 비계설정(Scaffolding), 동료 피드백 촉진(Peer Feedback Facilitation) 등의 과정을 통해 강사가 학생들이 한 문장에서 시작하여 단락까지 씬으로써 결국은 영어로 에세이를 쓸 수 있게 효과적으로 준비할 수 있었다. 이 연구에서 다섯 단락 정도의 에세이를 쓸 수 있을 만큼 학생들의 작문실력은 향상되었고, 격려를 통해 서로 성장하고 발전할 수 있었다. 또한 이 과정에서 학생들의 사회적 기술과 공감능력이 향상되었고 수업 분위기도 개선되었다. 이러한 기술적인 동료 피드백은 동기부여를 위한 효율적인 방식이며, 학생들에게는 영어쓰기학습에서 자신감을 주는 것으로 나타났다. 사회문화이론의 적용을 통해 학생들은 제2외국어에 대한 지식을 습득하고 더 발전시킬 수 있으며, 낮은 단계의 이해에서 더 높은 수준의 지식으로 나아가게 하는 상호작용의 시너지를 만들어 낸다.

주제어 : 제2외국어 쓰기, EAP, 기술, 구글 독스, 사회문화이론, 동료 피드백, 강사 피드백

I. Preface

This action research project took place at a Korean university in an EFL composition class for English Education majors. The instructor was given the task of teaching academic writing to the students and then took on the task of exploring research questions that could guide in the understanding of how students learn to write structured and well-written five-paragraph academic essays.

At the beginning of the fall semester, the teacher had certain goals of exploration in the undergraduate writing course. First, he wanted to teach students how to write from a paragraph level to a formal essay structure. Using the textbook *From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays*, he directed the students informal essay structure that began with the carefully guided instruction of how to write a paragraph with a topic sentence, supporting details, and a concluding sentence. Following that format and relying heavily on the textbook, the instructor wanted to move away from a close focus on the book during the second half of the semester. With less textbook-focused and intensive practice of the first half of the semester, students were given a more directed approach on their own writing using Google Docs as an instrument to guide them in reaching essay competence.

The instructor provided the scaffolding for this experiment by teaching students a step-by-step process of writing their essays. Having begun with exclusively individualistic writings, students proceeded to give each other feedback on their

writing. Then, the instructor wanted to find ways of engaging students in a collaborative writing process, which would help them improve at a rapid and deliberate rate, given the time constraints of a semester-long writing class.

For the research questions of this project, the teacher wanted to explore the following:

In what ways can Google Docs and peer editing work together to improve students' writing from the paragraph level to write five-paragraph essays?

1. What role do peer assessment and teacher guidance play in helping students write their essays?
2. How can writing promote social interaction and group harmony in a classroom?
3. How does this approach utilize the sociocultural theory of Vygotsky? How is language socially mediated and supported?

With the given resources, including a computer lab and students' Gmail accounts, the class was led in a series of experiments, which would test how well students collaborated, motivated each other in writing, and improved the quality of their writing. It was found that Google Docs and peer-feedback provided an effective method of teaching students to extend from paragraph level to five-paragraph essays. Given that previous research has begun to explore the effectiveness of Google Docs in peer editing (Slavkov 2015), it was found that more work could be done in the method of implementing Google Docs using a theoretical framework of sociocultural theory. Furthermore, this study built its foundation on this landmark theory in education and applied the important tenets to the

methodology of peer and teacher feedback, to demonstrate how the use of Google Docs was a motivating factor in the success of the students in their academic writing efforts. Also, this study examined in depth the factors of motivation of students to learn to write in a second language.

II. Theoretical Framework: Sociocultural Theory

Second language writing is a complex learning process that has been extensively investigated in research in the past few decades. The process of learning to write in a second language is informed and developed by a wide variety of influences and factors. Different theories have been applied to explain how students learn how to write in a second language. Some theorists have applied a cognitive perspective, which emphasizes brain activity and mental engagement with the individualized task of writing. Other theorists may apply a more socially oriented perspective using what is known as the sociocultural theory, which was first defined by Vygotsky. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory has important implications for education, especially in second language learning.

While writing involves a solitary endeavor that is particular to all learners, it has the potential to be something that furthers the development of all learners within a group. In many second language classrooms, writing has become an activity that is seen as simply used to assess what students have acquired in the classroom, whether that is through speaking, listening or reading. However, not much attention is given to how students

can learn from one another in the writing process. Collaborative learning is the hallmark of the communicative learning classroom, and, as such, is an important part of how students develop their skills in a foreign language. A lot of attention has been given to how communicative learning fosters learning through a variety of speaking activities. After all, much emphasis is given to how students speak in a foreign language. At the same time, not enough research has been given to how students can develop their L2 essay writing skills by working together in peer learning and assessment. Peer editing has been viewed as simply an afterthought of students' work and not to assess or bring another student up to a certain level. However, as sociocultural theory explains, peer-to-peer mentoring can be a source of support for students, which enables them to rise from one echelon of understanding to a new level of knowledge.

One aspect of the sociocultural theory that Vygotsky explained was the zone of proximal development (ZPD), which is now known as the zone of potential development (ZPD). The former refers to the proximity of members of a group, which permits peer to peer mentoring; whereas, the latter refers to the ability of a given person to develop and reach his or her full potential. Vygotsky argued that learning happens through a process of collaborative understanding and mentoring, which happens between a learner and a more mature or able person. That person could be an adult or a peer in the process, who is also known as the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). Vygotsky defines the zone of proximal development (ZPD) as the following:

The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (Vygotsky 1978, 86)

Within the zone of proximal development, the learner is coached on how to perform a given task through a lot of structure and guidance. This process is known as *scaffolding* (Wood, Bruner and Ross 1976). However, Vygotsky did not actually use this term when he defined the zone of proximal development. Scaffolding refers to the pedagogical process of teaching a person a given task through a series of steps that eventually guides the learner in understanding how to complete an action independently without the support of the more experienced learner or mentor. The eventual objective is for the learner to thrive autonomously without any structure or scaffolding.

1. Scaffolding

The process of scaffolding was later defined by Leo Van Lier (1996) to include five distinctive parts. First, scaffolding requires contextualized learning, which provides support for learners and provides a safe space for them to make errors but quickly and efficiently correct them (Barnard and Campbell 2005). Secondly, the process requires continuity, which includes a series of repeated actions that happen over a given time and accomplish a set of goals that the learners achieve on a regular basis. Thirdly, there is an element of inter

subjectivity, which involves the thinking processes of more than one person (Barnard and Campbell 2005). In a sense, it is the adage that two heads are better than one. Fourthly, there is an aspect of flow that makes the interaction natural and unforced or coerced (Barnard and Campbell 2005). The scaffolding happens in a seamless way. Fifthly, scaffolding involves an aspect of contingency, in that the learning process depends on the subsequent reaction and response of the learner, who is receiving the coaching and mentoring. After this process, the learner is given free rein and autonomy and is invited to complete the task independently.

In addition to the scaffolding of second language writing, there is also the element of social interaction that plays an important part in how a person learns to write in their second language. Numerous studies have talked about learning as a dialogical process, which can happen within social interactions (Prior 2006; Vreeland & Wimberley 2015; Behizadeh 2014; Rish et al. 2015; Bazerman & Prior 2004). Rish et al. (2015) applied four basic tenets of social interactions to writing and how writing could use the sociocultural theory. The first tenet of social interactions in writing is the social relationships that are formed. Students learn through a complex set of processes, but this does not happen in a vacuum without reference to others. Individuals are dependent on one another and, as such, will require time to get to know others. Learning processes emerge as students develop meaningful relationships with one another. The second tenet is that authorship is shared between learners (Prior 2006). When co-authorship happens, learners give feedback to one another and provide

ongoing support, which makes them both authors of a given work (Prior 2006). The third tenet is the process of invention, wherein the authors construct meaning and create the work flow (Rush et al. 2015). Finally, there is the intertextuality of the two writers in which both collaborate and form ideas that make a cohesive product (Rush et al. 2015).

2. Process-Based Writing

Using a sociocultural theory of writing, it is possible to view writing considering the processes that allow its creation. Many researchers and practitioners have seen writing as a process rather than merely a product of a student's efforts and dedication (Flower and Hayes 1981; Chenoweth and Hayes 2001, 2003; Sasaki 2000; Hedgcock and Ferris 2013; Weigle 2005; Friginal & Weigle). Furthermore, these principles have been applied to second language writing through various studies (Silva 1990, 1993; Badger and White 2000; Raimes 1985, 1991, 2002). The writing process involves multiple steps that are required to go from draft to finished product. By applying the sociocultural theory, peer collaboration would play an active role in the dissemination of knowledge as students participate in pre-writing using think-alouds, give each other feedback, edit and revise one another's paper, and continually repeat the process. This process is necessarily collaborative and requires students to work together in all parts of the process.

The person who is directing and orchestrating this synchronization is the teacher of writing. As students do the peer feedback

and help one another, the teacher provides the scaffolding, support, and feedback throughout the process to guide students. The students generally are dependent on the quality of the feedback of the teacher, unless they are more advanced, at the undergraduate or graduate level. Therefore, the teacher has a fundamental role to play in the development of the learners and serves as the more knowledgeable other (MKO), who imparts important knowledge about grammar, syntax, and other factors in the process.

3. Teacher feedback

As the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) in the classroom, the teacher plays an important part in helping students reach a level of competence in the classroom through the guidance and structuring of the lessons. Because he or she has a background in providing quality feedback throughout the process, the class can be well supported in learning various skills. The writing process illustrates this point. For the teacher of composition, one of the most formidable and important tasks is providing quality feedback to students. However, it is also one of the most challenging of tasks, and many teachers do not know where to start in assessing students and giving them the feedback, they need to succeed. Little research has been done on the actual teacher commentary of students' work, although a lot of attention has been devoted to error correction in ESL writing (Ferris 2011; Bitchener & Ferris 2012). Additionally, research on student

improvement through revision from the teacher feedback has been scarce, as well. Therefore, a study in the development of students' writing as a result of feedback would be necessary.

Some studies have also talked about the response of students to feedback from teachers and have concluded that students value their teacher's feedback because they think it will help them improve as a writer (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). They also value the feedback, because it focuses, not just on the grammatical errors but also the quality of the work itself (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). On the other hand, students become frustrated with feedback if it is illegible, cryptic, or provides no direction as to where students should take their writing to the next level (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Finally, student writers want to receive both praise and criticism, which help them to improve in their writing (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014).

Current research has found that teacher feedback should be provided during the early stages of the written process instead of at the end when the assignment is complete. Additionally, it has found that teachers must provide support to their students through both the linguistic and ideas of the work (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). Although teachers may provide certain feedback, they should also be encouraged to avoid appropriating texts to suit their own view and thus making the text their own, rather than the student. This is the unfortunate reality of so many teachers, who want to give large amounts of feedback but do so while exhausting themselves and sometimes giving too much information either too soon or too late. Because the teacher has limits in terms

of what feedback can be given to students, it is appropriate and well-advised that teachers should incorporate aspects of peer editing in the process, because they can be supported by student endeavors and can also make the learning process more student-centered rather than teacher-centered.

4. Peer Editing

Although peer editing may be substantially different from the teacher's feedback, it can also provide a tool for students that utilizes the guidance that the teacher provides for students to assess one another's writing. Peer feedback has been shown to have some positive benefits that complement a teacher's feedback (Nelson & Schunn, 2009; Ferris, 2003; and Diab, 2010). Peer feedback uses what is known as metacognition, which helps students to become aware of their linguistic skills and needs (Pintrich, 2002; Wenden, 1999). Metacognition is defined as "an appreciation of what one already knows, together with a correct apprehension of the learning task and what knowledge and skills it requires, combined with the ability to make correct inferences about how to apply one's strategic knowledge to a particular situation, and to do so efficiently and reliably (Taylor, 1999, p. 37)." Students use their metacognition to make decisions about how to assess different issues within their writing.

5. Peer editing in L2 Writing

Peer editing has been shown to provide unique advantages to L2 writing as seen in Ferris, 2003, among other studies. Through mutual scaffolding, the task of editing each other's writing enhances the overall quality of the work that is given to them. However, it is dependent on several factors, including the level of the student, who may be more competent than another. The way to enhance a student's writing is through having another student with a higher ability to assist another student of lower ability. The process of scaffolding, which begins with the teacher's instruction, becomes a part of how students give feedback to their peers, which is a process of negotiation and mentoring, aligning well with sociocultural theory.

6. Google Docs and the Synchronization of Feedback

Bringing together all the aspects of teaching and feedback, it is possible to see the benefits of using technology in the process. Technology has been shown to greatly enhance students' learning in the classroom (West and Graham, 2005). Google Drive provides a way to collaborate and share documents with different people. It also allows people to edit, make suggestions, and comment on other's writing, which makes it a unique solution to the problem of written feedback, which could be illegible, unhelpful, or tedious for students. Additionally, Google Drive allows students to work from home in an uncluttered and comfortable environment. As can be seen in

Slavkov's study (2015), Google Drive permits instructors the chance to monitor closely students' writing during the process. Google Drive "provides a meaningful and cost-effective technology-enriched instruction that entails potential advances in technological practice (Slavkov 2015)." Through the sharing of documents, students can, in real-time, provide ongoing support for one another through the help and guidance of the teacher, who continues to make the scaffolding for the task.

7. Previous Research in South Korea

Jeong (2016) led a study at a Korean university that investigated the use of Google Docs in EFL writing instruction, which demonstrated its effectiveness. Leading from this study, further inquiries into the nature of peer feedback, and the effectiveness of Google Docs could be more closely examined. To build upon this existing research and address the gaps in terms of the integration of sociocultural theory and Google Docs in the Korean university EFL writing classroom, this study could provide answers to questions of the motivation of students to improve their writing at the behest of the teacher and their fellow students' feedback.

Given the wealth of resources available on the topic of sociocultural theory, feedback, and the dearth of research provided on the use of Google Docs in the EFL classroom, the study provided grounding to explore learner motivation, response to feedback, and the incorporation of feedback from both teacher and fellow student in the final product of

student's writing.

III. Methods

This study utilized qualitative research method tools to collect data. At the beginning of the semester, students gave a short writing sample to the instructor and completed a pre-course survey. Additionally, the instructor kept notes of instruction throughout the semester and the student writings. As students began to work on Google Docs during the second half of the semester, the instructor began relying on the computer and Gmail addresses to conduct the research. Throughout the process of writing phase, the instructor carefully monitored the drafts of students and took individual screen shots of student work as students were working on their assignments in the computer lab and afterward. The instructor was alerted to changes in the document through Gmail, which indicated when students had commented on other students' work. Subsequently, the final drafts were sent to the instructor's email as a Microsoft Word document. Other data points included a survey at the end of the semester and individual interviews with 9 out of the 11 students in the class. Through voice recordings, the instructor was able to learn about the motivations of the students and their opinions about writing, peer editing, Google Docs, and the classroom environment.

1. Participants

The participants in this study were ten Korean and one Chinese student in the Department of English Language

Education of a Korean university. Five students were male, and six students were female. The writing class was a mixed level class with students of different writing abilities. All students are majoring in English Education and intend to pursue a career in English language teaching in a Korean public school and took this course as part of their major.

2. Course Design

The writing class met for three hours each week on Wednesday for one hour and Friday for two hours. The class duration was 15 weeks during the fall semester of 2019. The course was designed so that students would learn to work in peer groups. Different ability levels were monitored, and students were partnered up based on their ability. Students attended lectures where the instructor would provide didactic instruction on Wednesdays and then on Fridays, students would apply what they had learned through interactive pair work activities based on their homework assignments of preparing essays, outlines, and other sources of work.

3. Course Venue

Students met in three different types of classrooms. One classroom was in a multimedia building, where students would come once a week. Students met in another classroom in the Education building. Finally, students met in the computer lab for four intensive sessions, where they would type and give feedback in class under the supervision of the instructor. This

type of interaction took place for a total of 8 hours in class.

4. Assessment

As part of their semester grade, students were evaluated based on their presence and participation, one assignment, and three essays. The first essay assignment was a paper with two paragraphs (descriptive and comparison). This assessment built on previous intensive work on paragraph development. The second essay was a descriptive paragraph written in an academic style. For the final essay, students wrote a problem-solution paper on climate change, which included referencing using the APA style.

IV. Data Analysis

1. Evidence that the Peer Feedback Provided Social Interaction for Students

From the screen shots that the instructor collected, it was evident that students were developing their social skills through this activity, which became socially mediated. Students were more willing to help one another out and support one another in the process. They were less likely to compete, although that is an aspect of the students' major, which is quite competitive, as students attempt for the best grade. Only three people in the class can get an "A" in the class, due to the university grading curve. Therefore, it was quite difficult. Even then, the instructor noticed how student were actively engaged throughout the class. Here are some examples of the

student feedback process.

In addition to the peer feedback, the instructor intervened in situations with students to create a culture of intertextuality, which enabled all students to see the evidence of how to make essays more correct and meaningful.

2. Interview Feedback

The instructor conducted one interview for most of the students in the class (9 out of 11) and provided the same questions for them. Here are the questions he asked at the interview.

1. *How do you feel about your writing in general?*
2. *How do you think this class has helped you with your writing?*
3. *How do you feel about peer editing in class? Is it helpful, difficult, or easy?*
4. *What are your goals for writing this semester?*

Overall, students felt that their writing was improving during the semester. A common theme was the fact that most students had limited vocabulary and ways of expressing themselves in English. With the guidance and help of integrating academic vocabulary into the course, students felt more confident in writing using rich lexis. Vocabulary was a large portion of the instructional method, as the instructor introduced about 100 words throughout the semester that could be used in each context and students were asked to use these words often in their work. Students were encouraged to go above

and beyond these words. However, the instructor provided for them at least one hundred of the most common words from the academic perspective.

Interview with Student V:

Professor: How do you feel about your writing?

Student V: About my writing: Actually not enough to be a teacher. I want to hone my English skills but there are so many sentences I want to say, but I can't write exactly what I want to say, so almost my sentence is not clear, so I want to write more clearly.

Professor: How do you think this class has helped you with your writing?

Student V: First, [the teacher] teach various vocabularies I never heard so it helped me. Also, he give many grammar tips like capitalization and some descriptive paragraph... It makes me can write more logical.

Another common theme was the fact that students felt that they had developed more structure and that they could effectively organize their ideas in their essays. Before, students mentioned that they felt they could not express ideas clearly in a paragraph. But after the class, students were able to more deeply reflect and write their thoughts. Before this semester, students felt that they were reluctant to use peer feedback and felt that it was difficult for them in the process.

Student H: (about peer editing): It's difficult, because we

don't know how to write paragraphs and we don't know all of grammar and we don't know a writer's mind, so writer express this, but we interpret the other way.

Student N: I feel a bit difficult, because my major is Japanese and English, so English is difficult than Japanese, so I need more study.

(About peer editing): I don't usually use Google Docs so this time I tried the typing, so it is a very new experience.

(About this class): It is helpful for me and this class is very organized so it is developing to me. I feel more developed than before.

However, as they continued the semester, they felt as though they could provide feedback for their fellow students. An example of how the peer feedback process worked was with two students (Y and S). Y. had a much higher level of English than S, and she spent the semester coaching and mentoring S. She demonstrated a willingness to help her partner and to correct mistakes in his writing, although she herself did not have a difficult time creating words.

Student Y: At first, it was hard to me using various vocabularies but I learned many vocabs especially for academic writing, so it was very helpful.

Student Y: (about peer editing): I think it's really helpful, because even though I do not make any mistakes on my own writing, but I can find other mistakes from the others. I can catch those mistakes and try to not make the same mistake next time in my writing.

In this example, there is a clear application of sociocultural theory in that a peer, who was the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO), was able to provide support and guidance to a peer of lesser ability, in order for him to grow and develop as a writer.

S. also voiced that he appreciated the collaboration with his partner.

Student V: Before I write on my paragraphs, [now] can I write longer paragraphs. About peer editing: I think it is hard...but Y is very kind. She help my writing a lot.

Although students had some reservations about the peer editing process, they discovered the benefits of peer editing and were willing to share their insights about it.

V: (About peer editing)

It's beneficial. Write and edit or revise with my classmate so just finding errors develop my English skills, but various disadvantage. It is important to find errors in peer editing, but I can't find all errors.

Student: It is good because if I write an essay alone, it is very difficult to find some mistakes. But if we do a peer editing, we can revise our writing more efficiently.

Student: I think it's okay but I think we cannot have an ability to correct other things. Almost students don't want to see other ones, because they want to see more their own ones. But it has very good things, because you can save the time and you can learn a lot of things by seeing other ones.

3. Final Exam Feedback

For the final exam, the instructor introduced the topic for the essay, climate change. Using an engaging video lecture, students learned about the problem of climate change and were introduced to ways that they could mitigate or deal with the problem. Students did some discussion, brainstorming, and outlining of the topic. The instructor provided the scaffolding for the activity, including a sample outline with paragraphs and structure that would enable students to complete the project both independently and interdependently with one another. Students also had to cite one or two sources in their essays. The instructor introduced students to APA style but encouraged only one usage of a quote or citation in the essay. He also closely monitored the drafts of the essay, which had been shared in the form of Google Docs and ensured that there was no plagiarism throughout and checked students' writing in the process. The whole process went on for two weeks. Students brain stormed, wrote their first draft, and then the instructor checked students' writing and offered advice to students. During this phase, the feedback focused a lot less on the grammatical structure in the writing and much more on the ideas and overall formal structure of the essays.

4. End of the Semester Post-Course Survey

At the end of the semester, the students took a post-course survey, which indicated their thoughts about the course.

Overall, 60% (7 out of 11 students) said they were confident with their writing skills and 40% (4 out of 11) mentioned that they were more confident. Overall, 40% (4 out of 11) of students thought that peer editing was helpful and 40% found it to be very helpful for their writing skills. According to student feedback, their writing had improved dramatically, and they felt that they were doing better than before.

Student 1:

After studying the course, I have a certain understanding of the grammar of English writing, and I am very happy about it. In the future, I will work hard to expand my English vocabulary and work hard to learn English writing.

Student 2:

I feel more confident in selecting suitable academic words and organizing the paragraphs, and etc.

Student 3:

I feel like I can write more systematically than before. When talking about their overall experience, students commented on the use of Google Docs and how they helped them in their writing.

Student 4:

It was fascinating that the teacher uses various tools such as Google Docs. Another student emphasized the student-centered aspect of the course and how that helps students to engage with their learning.

Student 5:

This class enabled us to think deeply and actively. (I mean,) It was student-centered learning. Therefore, I think that this composition class was very helpful.

V. Findings

During this study, students applied the fundamentals of sociocultural interaction as they used Google Docs to support one another in creating quality work. Starting from a paragraph level at the beginning of the semester, students eventually became competent in writing five-paragraph essays. The process from start to finish took one entire semester to complete. With the variety of paragraphs, the students learned, they were able to write descriptive, comparison, compare-contrast, argumentative, and problem-solution papers.

With the first essay, students received feedback exclusively from the instructor. Students were advised to begin the writing process in class through outlines and other methods of writing. For the second essay, students were given more autonomy but also used Google Docs. As each student shared the Google Doc, they were monitored closely to make sure they were writing on-topic and not plagiarizing any work.

Following the instructor's instruction, students started commenting on each other's work. At first, the students did not know how to comment on the other person's work. But the instructor provided a marking scheme with notes on what to comment on and then the teacher provided his own grammatical feedback, which was corrective of the students' writing and then students started to comment more actively.

Later, the instructor noticed the increase of quality in the overall structure and content of the essays produced. With the structure and guidance, students were able to improve their

overall essay writing. By looking at the instructor's model essay, they were able to work with the materials they had so they could do a great job on the essay.

There was evidence of the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) in the project in that one of the students was actively mentoring her classmate in helping him to achieve a higher level. She gave a lot of feedback and corrective advice on grammar and sentence structure, which would aid in the student's overall improvement in his style. Overall, this pairing was quite successful in the process.

One student demonstrated self-reflexive characteristics in that she made comments about her own writing. To advance this study, it is important to provide students with more thoughtful ways of self-correcting their own writing. To make this more substantial, it would require making students write more.

In the process of learning to write, students learned from one another and helped each other. In general, as students read their own writing that had been critiqued by peers, they were able to provide guidance and support to their peers. The more knowledgeable other (MKO) could help the weaker vessel to go farther with their writing.

Feedback given from the teacher included the rubrics that were followed with the grading of students' work alongside the comments that the teacher provided which were both based on grammatical corrections and qualitative data (including the quality of arguments and structure of the essay, which were fundamental to the pedagogical approaches)

In his comments, the teacher provided a mixture of grammatical

corrections, as well as suggestions for improvement in student writing.

In order to actively apply sociocultural theory to the teaching of giving feedback in second language writing, students need to have guidance on how they can give feedback to one another. The instructor must be the More Knowledgeable Other (MKO), who provides the scaffolding to the students, so they can operate on their own. Without the scaffolding, however, students cannot make the quality feedback they need to succeed and to improve each other's writing. Therefore, modeling with feedback is a crucial aspect of the writing process. The teacher needs to specify how to give feedback as well as what needs to be done to effectively comment on other student's writing. This aspect needs to go beyond mere grammatical structures and includes more metacognitive development. As students learn more about the writing process and apply it to their lives, they will be able to effectively implement it in their lives without even thinking about it. They will become independent and autonomous knowers. Such a consequence is the result of the endeavors of both student and teacher. When these individuals work together, they can produce wonderful work that can happen in as little as a semester or even a few weeks' time. As students become independent knowers and learners, the application of sociocultural is complete and the project is a success. Learning takes a substantial amount of time, and the journey to full independence is a long one. However, within one semester's time, the difference could be seen in the work of students.

VI. Discussion and Implications for Asian Contexts

Given that this study occurred in an Asian country, there are implications for Asian countries, in addition to Korea. The grammar-translation method remains in vogue throughout Asia, and many universities still employ this method to teach students how to read and write in English. Consequently, students will have a difficult time learning how to write well in English, if they are constantly translating between languages.

The method used in this study was peer editing through Google Docs, which brought together students, who might have had a spirit of rivalry toward one another due to grades. Instead of creating a competitive atmosphere, the class invited students to partake in group mentoring and support in order to bring one another to a new level of understanding. If this method were used in other Asian countries, it could greatly reduce the stress of competition in small academic writing EFL classes. Instead of having students chase after an “A,” the focus has a more important goal and focus of getting students to improve in their overall English writing skills. Such a focus would bring forth support and collaboration.

In addition to support and encouragement, students will develop social skills with one another. With the use of Google Docs, students who were previously uninvolved with one another were partnered up and interacted with one another on the document and helped one another to choose the right words, phrases, or grammatical construction. More than that, students become critical readers of each other’s writing and

not only became more mindful of grammar but also the ideas and concepts that they communicate. This aspect requires higher-level thinking, which is what universities are teaching.

VII. Conclusion

It can be concluded that sociocultural theory and Google Docs can work together seamlessly in the editing and writing of five-paragraph academic essays in the EFL classroom. With the integration of technology in an EFL writing classroom, students become more engaged and ready to take on the demands of the twenty-first century. Through the engagement with new topics that are relevant to their lives, they can become the learners, who are autonomous learners, who will change the face of education. Through the use of Google Docs in the peer editing process of writing, students will learn how to write effectively and in a structured way so that they can become competent communicators in their various fields. As students learn more about using technology in the classroom, then they will be able to express themselves in the 21st century. Second language learners, in particular, can benefit from using Google Docs and applying sociocultural methods so they can become uniquely positioned to write essays that will prepare them to become the next generation of teachers and responsible citizens in this world.

<Reference>

- Applebee, A.N. 2000. "Alternative models of writing development." In R. Indrisano & J.R. Squire (Eds.), *Perspectives on writing: Research, theory and practice*. Newark, NJ: International Reading Association. 90-110. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Badger, R., & White, G. 2000. "A process genre approach to teaching writing." *ELT Journal*, 54, No.2, 153-160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Barnard, R., & Campbell, L. 2005. "Sociocultural theory and the teaching of process writing: The scaffolding of learning in a university context." *The Tesolanz Journal*. 13, 76-88. (last search date: 2020/04/8)
- Behizadeh, N. 2014. Mitigating the dangers of a single story: Creating large-scale writing assessments aligned with sociocultural theory. *Educational Researcher*, 43. No. 3, 125 - 136. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. 2012. *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/> (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Chenoweth, N. A., & Hayes, J. R. 2001. *Fluency in writing. Written Communication*, 18.No.1, 80-98. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Chenoweth, N.A. & Hayes, J.R. 2003. "The inner voice in writing." *Written Communication*, 20, 99-118. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Diab, N. 2010. "Effects of peer- versus self-editing on students' revision of language errors in revised drafts." *System* 38. No.1. 85-95. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Ferris, D. 2003. *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D., Brown, J., Liu, H.S., and Stine, M. E. A. 2011. "Responding to L2 Students in College Writing Classes: Teacher Perspectives." 45. No. 2, 207-234. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Ferris, D. & Hedgcock, J. 2014. *Teaching L2 Composition: Purpose, Process, Practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Flower, L. and Hayes, J.R. 1981. *A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. College Composition and Communication*, 32, 365-387. (last search date: 2020/04/08)

- Folse, K., Solomon, E.V. & Clabeaux, D. 2014. *From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays*, 3rd Edition. Cengage Learning.
- Friginal, E. & Weigle, S.C. 2014. "Exploring multiple profiles of L2 writing using multi-dimensional analysis." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 26, 80-95. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. 2009. "The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance." *Instructional Science*, 37. No. 4, 375 - 401. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Jeong, K. 2016. "A Study on the Integration of Google Docs as a Web-based Collaborative Learning Platform in EFL Writing Instruction." 9. No. 39, 1-7. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Pintrich, P. 2002. "The Role of Metacognitive Knowledge" in *Learning, Teaching, and Assessing, Theory Into Practice*, 41: 4, 219-225. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Prior, P. 2006. "A sociocultural theory of writing." In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research*. New York, NY: Guilford Press. 54 - 66.
- Raimes, A. 1985. "What unskilled writers do as they write: A classroom study of composing." *TESOL Quarterly*, 19. No. 2, 229-258. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Raimes, A. 1991. "Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing." *TESOL Quarterly*, 25. No. 3, 407-430. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Raimes, A. 2002. "Ten steps in planning a writing course and training teachers of writing." In J. C. Richards & W.A. Renyanda (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. 306-314.
- Rish, R. M., Bylen, K., Vreeland, H., & Wimberley, C. C. 2015. "Using Google Drive to write dialogically with teachers." In M. L. Niess & H. W. Gillow-Wiles (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education in the digitalage*. IGI Global: Hershey, PA. pp. 357 - 379.
- Sasaki, M. 2000. "Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9. No. 3, 259 - 291. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Silva, T. 1990. "Second language composition instruction: Developments, issues and directions" in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge

- University Press. 11-23.
- Silva, T. 1993. "Toward an understanding of the distinct nature if L2 writing: The ESL research and its implication." *TESOL Quarterly*, 27. No.4, 657-677. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Slavkov, N. 2015. "Sociocultural Theory, the L2 Writing Process, and Google Drive: Strange Bedfellows?" *TESL Canada Journal*, 32. No. 2, 80-94. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Taylor, S. 1999. "Better learning through better thinking: Developing students' metacognitive abilities." *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 30. No.1. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the curriculum: Awareness, autonomy & authenticity*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weigle, S.C. 2005. "Second Language Writing Expertise." In Johnson, K (eds.). *Expertise in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Wenden, A. 1999. "An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics [Special Issue]." *System*, 27, 435-441. (last search date: 2020/04/08)
- West, R. & Graham, C. 2005. "Five powerful ways technology can enhance teaching and learning in higher education." *Educational Technology* 45. No. 3, 20-27.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J.S., & Ross, G. 1976. "The role of tutoring in problem-solving." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100. (last search date: 2020/04/08)

투고일 : 2020년 4월 10일 . 심사일 : 2020년 5월 20일 . 게재확정일 : 2020년 6월 5일

* Jared McKee is an assistant professor at Silla University in Busan, South Korea. He is interested in the field of language and literacy education, especially second language writing skills in English. Within this subfield, he explores the connection between reading and writing skills, as well as the socio-cultural aspects of learning a foreign language.

* Jiin Kang is a postgraduate student in Silla University, she is majored in Korean studies as a second language. Her research interest is Korean teaching, multi-cultural studies.

<Abstract>

Sociocultural Theory and Google Docs : A Case Study in Peer and Teacher Feedback and Motivation in Academic Essay Writing in the EFL Composition Classroom

Jared McKee·Jiin Kang
(Silla University)

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory has important implications for education, especially in second language learning. As students engage in collaborative learning activities, they learn and grow and develop in their study of English. Furthermore, second language writing involves complex processes of cognition that can be improved and developed in socially mediated ways. This article will explain how sociocultural theory was applied to a study on second language writing in a classroom by using Google Docs as a means to encourage students to give peer feedback. The study took place in a university composition class at a Korean university. Participants included 11 students from the department of English Education. Through a process of reflective practice, scaffolding, and peer feedback facilitation, the instructor was able to effectively prepare students to write essays in English, having begun at a sentence to paragraph level. From this study, students were able to enhance their writing output and compose well-written five-paragraph essays and encouraged one another to grow and develop. Additionally, the class atmosphere was improved as students developed social skills and empathy in the process. It can be concluded that peer feedback through technology is an efficient way to motivate and encourage students in their learning of writing in English. Through the

application of sociocultural theory, students can develop and further their knowledge of a second language and create a synergy of interaction that enables them to move from one echelon of understanding to a higher level of knowledge.

Keywords : Second Language Writing, English for Academic Purposes(EAP), Technology, Google Docs, Socio Cultural Theory, Peer Feedback, Teacher Feedback