

Examining the Effects of Google Docs-Based Instruction and Peer Feedback Types (Implicit vs. Explicit) on EFL Learners' Writing Performance

Zari Sadat Seyyedrezaie (zariseyyedrezaie@stu.um.ac.ir)
Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Campus, Iran
Behzad Ghonsooly (Ghonsooly@um.ac.ir)
English Department, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
Hesamoddin Shahriari (h.shahriari@um.ac.ir)
English Department, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
Azar Hosseini Fatemi (hfatemi@um.ac.ir)
English Department, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran

Abstract

The present study aimed at investigating the possible effects of implicit (recast)/explicit (metalinguistic) corrective feedback and two types of writing instructional environments (blended/face-to-face) on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. To this end, 96 EFL students were chosen based on their IELTS writing test scores, and were randomly assigned to two groups (blended group/face to face group). Each group was divided into two subgroups, one receiving implicit and the other receiving explicit feedback. After the treatment was run, both groups received another sample of IELTS writing test as a posttest. The analysis of a Two-way ANOVA revealed that these two types of writing instructional models have different effects on improving students' writing performance. Also, it indicated the students receiving explicit feedback performed better than those receiving implicit feedback. Moreover, the results indicated the learners' writing performance changed based on the type of feedback they received in different instructional models (Google Docs/ F-to-F). The findings of this study revealed the importance of Google Docs-based writing instruction in increasing students' confidence in their writing skill abilities and their willingness to allow others to read and evaluate their written products.

Keywords: Google Docs, Peer Feedback, Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback, Writing Performance

Introduction

Over the past few years, computers and new technologies rapidly made their way into society. To a great extent, many people are using computers and online tools for educational and vocational matters, and learning how to work with computers has been

considered as a fundamental and indispensable skill. One of the areas that is considerably affected by these new technologies is language education (Seyyedrezaie, Ghapanchi, & Seyyedrezaie, 2013). Google Docs as an online language instructional tool provides applicants with opportunities to create, edit and save their documents online (MacDonald, 2006). So, it is regarded as a natural tool for writing instruction.

With regard to writing instruction, in contrast to traditional classroom settings, Google Docs can be very effective from many perspectives. Firstly, Google Docs is user-friendly, and students can work both on their own and collaboratively on writing tasks without any time restrictions. It also has a benefit over email by allowing synchronous communication. Secondly, by using Google Docs, students' motivation for working on an essay collaboratively can be increased, and their thinking skills for commenting and giving feedback on their peers' essays can be improved (Sharp, 2009).

Generally, online integrated instruction, especially Google Docs-based one has a great impact on the learners' writing performance (Godwin-Jones, 2008; Lee, 2004; Lundin, 2008). Although many teachers now provide their students with feedback in Google Docs, few studies have focused on using corrective feedback in Google Docs for writing instruction (Lee, 2004). Moreover, to date, there have been no empirical studies comparing the impacts of corrective feedback, especially the effects of implicit and explicit feedback delivered through peer feedback on the writing performance of EFL learners in blended instruction.

Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to investigate the possible effects of implicit (recast)/explicit (metalinguistic) corrective feedback and two types of writing instructional environments (blended/face-to-face) on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance.

Literature Review

The Importance of Feedback in EFL Writing Classrooms

The facilitative role of feedback in acquiring EFL writing skill, which is perhaps the most challenging skill, has received a lot of attention from researchers in the field of second language acquisition (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlan, 2006). Previous studies indicated that there are different ways of giving feedback that are frequently used in EFL context: teacher feedback, peer feedback, and self-correction (self-monitoring). Most researchers believed that these types of corrective feedbacks can be delivered either explicitly or implicitly (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Yang, 2008). Specifically, metalinguistic feedback and prompts are categorized as explicit feedback while recast is considered as implicit feedback.

In his study, Ellis (2009) examined the impacts of recast and metalinguistic corrective feedback on the acquisition of regular past tense (-ed). The findings of his study revealed that the students receiving metalinguistic feedback outperformed others receiving recast. Also, Golshan (2013) conducted a study to explore the differential effects of three types of corrective feedback, including recast, prompt, and metalinguistic corrective feedback on the Iranian EFL learners' acquisition of definite and indefinite articles. The results of his study indicated that corrective feedback generally improves students' ability to use these articles; but Iranian learners who receive metalinguistic corrective feedback outperformed those receiving recast and prompt. In contrast, the findings of some studies revealed the superiority of implicit feedback (recasts) over explicit feedback. Ahmadi, Maftoon, and Gholami (2012) conducted a study investigating the comparative effects of explicit and implicit feedback on EFL students' writing performance. The results of their study revealed a significant difference in the writing performance of the students receiving implicit feedback and those receiving explicit feedback and those in no-feedback control group. Their study indicated that error correction in general leads to EFL learners' better writing performance; and implicit feedback in comparison with explicit feedback, provided a more effective strategy to react to students' writings. Also, the results of Sauro's (2009) study revealed that there was no difference between the learning of L2 grammar among ESL learners receiving recast and metalinguistic corrective feedback. Similarly, Gholami and Talebi (2012) investigated the comparative effects of recast and metalinguistic corrective feedback on the acquisition of English regular past tense-ed by Iranian EFL learners. They revealed that the learners who received corrective feedback outperformed those who did not receive any types of corrective feedback. Also, the finding of their study indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the two types of feedback (recast and metalinguistic corrective feedback) in terms of learners' performance.

The Advent of Computer Technology into Writing Classes for Giving Feedback

With widespread applications of computer technology in language teaching and learning, many students do their writing exercises synchronously as in chatting, instant messaging, and on live discussion boards (Pan & Sullivan, 2005) and also through Google Docs (Brodahl, Hadjerrouit, & Hansen, 2011) or asynchronously as in emailing and blogging (Ocker & Yaverbaum, 2001; Zeiss & Isabelli, 2005). Therefore, EFL teachers use these tools to develop and improve students' English learning and collaborative skills in an online environment (Beldarrain, 2006). Furthermore, these researchers (Warschauer, 1996; Warschauer & Kern, 2000) believed that by allowing students to quickly access the writing environment, online tools provide learners with opportunities to communicate freely and autonomously, and share ideas collaboratively in small groups. Regarding these features of online tools, Corgan, Hammer, Margolies, and Crossley (2004) enumerated the

multiple benefits of using peer feedback in online environments. In fact, online environments promote the opportunity of giving peer feedback, and are beneficial for both learners giving feedback and those receiving it; they create a humanizing environment and intimidate communication among learners.

Google Docs as an online collaborative tool is useful for students in expressing their ideas freely and commenting on their peers' essays to boost improvement in online writing courses (Hardison, 2012). In their study, Lamb and Johnson (2010) used Google Docs in the EFL classroom and mentioned how this online writing tool can be useful in improving the learners' ability to create their documents online and sharing the materials taught in their class.

As the trend of writing classes is moving towards implementing the new version of Google Docs (Brodahl, Hadjerrouit, & Hansen, 2011) and some Iranian teachers are implementing Google Docs in their class incorrectly by using it only as a file hosting service (Ghadirzadeh & Fernandes Silva, 2012), further research in this area is essential to indicate whether or not a new version of Google Docs is effective in EFL writing classes.

Therefore, based on the gap in the literature, the following research questions were proposed:

1. Is there any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who are exposed to blended writing instruction compared to those receiving face-to-face writing instruction?
2. Is there any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who receive recast compared to those who receive metalinguistic corrective feedback in both main groups in total and in each group separately?
3. Is there any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who receive recast through blended writing instruction compared to those in the face-to-face writing instruction?
4. Is there any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who receive metalinguistic corrective feedback through blended writing instruction compared to those in the face-to-face writing instruction?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of this study were 96 Iranian undergraduate male and female EFL students who were ranged in age from 19 to 27 and were chosen out of 117 students who were volunteers for participating in this course from two branches of Islamic Azad University, including Gorgan and Aliabad Katool branches. In fact, only 96 EFL students whose IELTS writing test scores were between one standard deviation above and below the mean of the normal distribution curve were chosen for the study. They were all sophomore students, because as a requirement, they ought to have passed the first two preliminary Writing Courses (Writing Courses 1 and 2), and also Advanced Writing in order to have enough background knowledge for writing an essay. These students were at the intermediate level of English proficiency.

They varied in computer experience. For example, some students had considerable experience using computers and software applications for making presentations and writing reports and others were less technologically experienced to the extent that they preferred to write a term paper with pen and paper rather than on a computer.

The participants of the study were randomly assigned to two main instructional groups. There were 48 students in one group benefiting from Google Docs-based writing instruction (blended writing instruction) and 48 students in the other group benefiting from face-to-face writing instruction. Each group was divided into two subgroups, one receiving recast as a kind of corrective feedback and the other one receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback from their group members. To help the students give feedback on their peers' essays, they were given the analytic rating scale for features to look for and tick off including 7 aspects of writing developed by Weir (1990, cited in Weigle, 2002).

Instrumentation

In order to achieve the purpose of the study, the following instruments were applied.

IELTS Writing Proficiency Test

A sample IELTS writing test, only its second task revolved around the topic “unhealthy diet”, developed by Cambridge was administered to the participants for both homogenizing the participants and as a pretest for evaluating their writing proficiency level one day before the first session of class. The result indicated that the test had a reliability of .89. At the end of the term, another sample IELTS writing test revolved

around the topic “competitiveness in society” was used as the posttest to evaluate the writing performance of the participants in both main groups.

Weir’s Rating Scale

An analytic rating scale by Weir (1990, cited in Weigle, 2002) comprising seven aspects of writing including relevance and adequacy of content, cohesion, compositional organization, adequacy of vocabulary for the purpose, grammar, and mechanical accuracy (regarding punctuation and spelling) was used for the purpose of rating the participants' performance on their drafts of essay-writing task. The band scores for each of these aspects of writing was 0-3. The reason why this rating scale was used for rating students' performance on the IELTS writing test was that it includes and evaluates all seven aspects of writing which were considered in this research. In this study, in order to assess the students' writing performance on the basis of Weir’s rating scale, two raters were chosen. The raters were EFL instructors teaching and preparing many learners for the IELTS test for ten years. For evaluating the inter-rater reliability, 20 percent of the essays of students (IELTS writing as a pretest) were randomly chosen and were given to them separately. The inter-rater reliability for the two raters was .81 ($P < .05$) showing that there was a significant agreement between the two raters who rated the students' writing essays.

Procedure

In order to answer the research questions, the following procedure was pursued. Initially, in order to have a homogeneous group of participants, a piloted sample of IELTS writing test was administered to 117 sophomore students. Consequently, 96 EFL students were chosen and were randomly assigned to two main groups (Google Docs-based and face-to-face writing instruction (blended writing instruction)/face-to-face writing instruction). Consequently, there were 48 students in one group benefiting from Google Docs-based and face-to-face writing instruction (blended writing instruction) and 48 students in the other group benefiting from face-to-face writing instruction. Each group was divided into two subgroups; one receiving implicit (recast) and the other receiving explicit feedback (metalinguistic) provided by their peers (which were followed and supported by teacher feedback).

The students belonging to blended writing instruction were provided with three extra sessions in the laboratory, in order to become familiar with how to sign into and work with Google Docs for publishing their essays. The blended group received instruction on writing a formal five-paragraph essay in the face-to-face class, but they sent their essays, received feedback from their peers, and chatted with the teacher as a way of receiving her support via Google Docs.

Then, the students in both groups were provided with two extra sessions in which the instructor described and taught two different kinds of feedback (recast and metalinguistic corrective feedback) which the students were supposed to give on their peers' essays. During the treatment (twenty-one sessions), the teacher taught all of the students in both groups how to write a formal essay using the standard five-paragraph format. The students had to write twenty-one essays on different topics during one term.

In both classes (face-to-face and Google Docs-based class), the instructor organized the students of each class into 6 groups of 8 students in order to give comments on each other's drafts (3 groups were asked to give recast and the other 3 groups were supposed to give metalinguistic corrective feedback on their group members' essays). Each group was asked to read the essays of their group members in order to give feedback. To help the students give feedback on the essays, they were given the analytic rating scale for features to look for and tick off including 7 aspects of writing developed by Weir (1990, cited in Weigle, 2002).

To keep the writers (students) anonymous for their group members and other peers, the teacher assigned each student a number. By sharing their documents with their peer reviewers, students allowed their group members to view, discuss, and comment on the document simultaneously. Each reviewer had a different color to distinguish the feedback they gave. When two students edited an essay, the teacher could easily see who had done what by comparing two revisions. The students received their peers' comments regarding recast or metalinguistic corrective feedback (based on the group to which they belonged), and then they revised their drafts by using this information and submitted them to the instructor via Google Docs (for students who were exposed to blended instruction) or in class (for face-to-face students).

In blended instruction and face-to-face instruction, for recast, the student (reviewer) corrected the students' sentences immediately and there was no chance for their peers to reconsider their mistakes by themselves. On the other hand, in the case of metalinguistic feedback, the peer reviewer was supposed to elicit the correct form from students by providing comments, information, or questions in order to lead peers to self-repair. After the students had given comments on their peers' essays, the teacher gave feedback on their comments which might have been incorrect or incomplete, so that the students could receive correct feedbacks on their writings, and their peers could find out whether their comments were correct or not and could learn the ignored parts.

The students who published their drafts in Google Docs could understand how their essays were flawed, make corrections, and publish the corrected draft or part of the

corrected draft through Google Docs again. In addition, they had the opportunity to look at the drafts of other students and read the other peers' suggestions on the peer's draft shared through Google Docs. For the face-to-face learners, the same process was pursued in the form of face-to-face class.

After the end of the treatment, another sample IELTS writing sample test revolved around the topic "competitiveness in society" was given to them as the post-test 5 months later. In order to assess the students' writing performance, two raters who were experienced teachers were chosen. The inter-rater reliability was estimated to be .81.

Results

In order to have a homogeneous group of participants, a piloted version of IELTS writing test was administered to all the 117 sophomore students.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the IELTS Writing Test Used for Homogenization

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Error of Skewness	Kurtosis	Error of Kurtosis
IELTS	96	10.00	17.00	13.7123	2.0107	4.0429	-.147	.287	-.468	.591

As can be seen from the above table, the mean and standard deviation equaled 13.71 and 2.01 respectively. Accordingly, 96 participants who scored one standard deviation above and below the mean constituted the participants in the research. As the table shows, the skewness value turned out to be -.147 and the standard error of skewness was .287. Since this figure fell within -1.96 and +1.96, it was concluded that the distribution was normal.

Before rating the writing performance of all students, 20 percent of the writing essays of students (IELTS writing as a pretest) were rated, based on an analytic rating scale by Weir (cited in Weigle, 2002), by two raters and the inter-rater reliability was estimated (Table 2).

Table 2

Inter-rater Reliability of the Two Raters of the Writing Pretest

	Rater 2

	Pearson correlation	.812 ^a
	Sig (2.tailed)	.01
Rater 1	N	19

a Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

As Table 2 demonstrates, the inter-rater reliability for the two raters who rated the students' writing performance is .81 (Sig. value smaller than .05); which represents that there was a significant level of agreement between the two raters.

Second, in order to check the normality assumption of the distributed scores in each group (Google Docs/face-to-face) and the legitimacy of using parametric tests, one-sample Kolmogorov- Smirnov test was run (Table 3).

Table 3

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (for Google Docs/face-to-face groups)

	Test score (Google Docs)	Test score (F-t-F)
N	48	48
Normal Parameters		
Mean	13.41	13.80
Std. Deviation	2.53	2.74
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	1.33	1.33
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.08	.08

According to the above results, it is clear that the Google Docs-based group ($Z= 1.33$, $p= .08$) and face-to-face group ($Z= 1.33$, $p= .08$) were normally distributed.

To investigate whether there is any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who are exposed to blended writing instruction (Google Docs-based and face-to-face writing instruction) compared to face-to-face writing instruction, the participants' scores on the posttest were gathered and tabulated. The descriptive statistics of the writing performance of the two groups (Google Docs-based/ face-to-face) has been presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Writing Performance Post-test Scores of Two groups

Instruction	Feedback	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Google Docs	Metalinguistic	18.35	2.470	24
	Recast	14.33	2.720	24
	Total	16.34	2.939	48
face-to-face	Metalinguistic	16.25	2.670	24
	Recast	15.10	2.535	24

	Total	15.67	2.845		48
Total	Metalinguistic	17.30	2.681	48	
	Recast	14.71	2.693	48	
	Total	16.00	2.971	96	

In order to see whether the difference between the mean score of the two groups (Google Docs-based/face-to-face) reported above is statistically significant, a Two-way ANOVA was performed (Table 5).

Table 5

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Writing Performance Scores of Two groups

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power ^b
Corrected Model	5173.403 ^a	3	1704.467	276.699	.000	.732	830.097	1.000
Intercept	19736.230	1	19736.230	3203.933	.000	.978	3203.933	1.000
Instruction	2348.330	1	2348.330	381.222	.031	.821	381.222	1.000
Feedback	2837.329	1	2837.329	460.605	.021	.850	460.605	1.000
Instruction * feedback	1459.338	1	1459.338	236.905	.040	.741	236.905	1.000
Error	566.785	92	6.160					
Total	26948.012	96						
Corrected Total	7211.782	95						

Dependent Variable: writing performance score

a. R Squared = .732 (Adjusted R Squared = .712)

b. Computed using alpha = .05

As shown in Table 5, there is a significant main effect for *instruction*, $F(1, 92) = 381.222$, $p = .031$, partial eta squared = .821. So it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who are exposed to Google Docs-based writing instruction (blended writing instruction) compared to face-to-face writing instruction.

The second research question examined whether there is any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who receive metalinguistic corrective feedback compared to those who receive recast in both main groups (Google docs-based writing instruction and face-to-face writing instruction) totally and in group separately. The descriptive statistics, which indicated the mean scores of the writing performance of learners receiving two different types of corrective feedback (metalinguistic corrective feedback and recast), are represented in Table 4.

As depicted in Table 4, the mean score for the writing performance of learners receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback was larger than the mean score of learners receiving recast in both the main groups and in each group separately. The results of a Two-way ANOVA which was conducted (Table 5) indicated there is a significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback compared to those receiving recast in total and in each group separately, $F(1, 92) = 460.605$, $p < .05$, partial eta squared = .850.

To answer the third research question stating whether there is any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who receive recast through Google Docs-based writing instruction compared to those in face-to-face writing instruction, Table 4 represented that the mean of writing performance of learners receiving recast in face-to-face writing instruction was larger than the mean score of those who were taught through Google Docs. In order to find out whether this was a significant difference, the results of the Two-way ANOVA represented the Sig. value (.04) for interaction of instruction and feedback turned out to be smaller than .05, $F(1, 92) = 236.905$, $p = .040$, partial eta squared = .741.

Considering the last research question stating whether there is any statistically significant difference between the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners who receive metalinguistic corrective feedback through Google Docs-based writing instruction compared to those in face-to-face writing instruction, Table 4 represented that in the Google Docs-based group, the mean score for the writing performance of learners receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback (18.35) was larger than the mean score of learners receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback in the face-to-face instructional group (16.25). In Table 5, the result of the Two-way ANOVA represented the Sig. value (.04) for interaction of instruction and feedback turned out to be smaller than .05, $F(1, 92) = 236.905$, $p = .040$, partial eta squared = .741.

Discussion

The present study sheds lights on investigating the possible effects of implicit (recast)/explicit (metalinguistic) corrective feedback and two types of writing instructional environments (blended/face-to-face) on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. With respect to the first research question, the results showed that the students exposed to blended instruction outperformed in the writing posttest in comparison with those exposing to face-to-face instruction.

This finding is especially in line with previous research showing the effectiveness of blended instruction in the improvement of language skills in general and writing ability in particular (Donaldson & Haggstrom, 2006; Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). In fact, it should be noted that the significant difference in the writing performance of blended group (Google Docs-based and face-to-face) and face-to-face group might be attributed to the teachers' employment of some additional links related to the same topics discussed in class. As a result, the students were given more opportunity and this could be one of the reasons why the experimental group (blended group) significantly improved writing performance. On the other hand, this finding is in contrast with Larson and Sung's (2009) finding revealing that there is no significant difference in the performance of students exposed to face-to-face and blended mode of delivery. The difference between the result of this study and Larson and Sung's (2009) study may be because of the implication of different online environments which have different features; for instance, Google Docs is more effective in facilitating teacher/student interaction because of its chatting feature and collaborative nature. Also, it may be due to the differences between course design of this study and different facilities available in these online environments.

Regarding the second research question which sought to find out the possible differential effects of recast and metalinguistic corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance, the analysis of the data through the Two-way ANOVA revealed that metalinguistic corrective feedback yielded more effective results than recast, since participants receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback outperformed those receiving recast in both main groups (blended writing instruction and face-to-face instruction) in total or in each group separately.

This finding confirmed the results of Lyster's (2004) and Tabasi, Khodabandehlou, and Jahandar's (2013) studies showing the superiority of metalinguistic corrective feedback over recast in improving students' writing performance. The finding of this study is against those of Leeman (2003) and Nicholas, Lightbown, and Spada (2001) who found that recast was more effective than other kinds of corrective feedback. The factors leading to the difference between the finding of this study and Nicholas, Lightbown, and Spada's (2001) study, may be the difference in the aspects of writing on which recast was given. In Nicholas et al.'s (2001) study, recast was given only on form (structure) while in this study, recast was given on seven aspects of writing including both form and content. Consequently, recast was the most effective feedback only in structure-focused classes.

Explanation of the effectiveness of metalinguistic corrective feedback over recast may be due to the differential noticeability of both corrective feedback techniques. By explicitly

showing the presence of an error and making learners modify their own writing, metalinguistic corrective feedback may be more noticeable and more effective.

Considering the third and fourth research questions, the results of data revealed that the effectiveness of students' writing performance changed depending on the type of corrective feedback and the type of instruction the learners were exposed to. The result of descriptive statistics showed the mean scores of writing performance of the students receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback via Google Docs-based writing instruction were higher than those in the face-to-face writing instruction.

This finding is in line with the findings of Razagifard and Razzaghifard's (2013) study. They concluded that the instructional models (online environment vs. face-to-face environment) to which the learners were exposed in order to develop their writing performance influenced the effectiveness of explicit feedback (metalinguistic corrective feedback) they receive. On the other hand, this finding contradicts Moradi and Karimpour's (2012) study which investigated the students' experiences of online and face-to-face peer feedback. In fact, the results of their study revealed that there was no significant difference between the effectiveness of explicit feedback students received in two different modes (online and face-to-face groups). A factor counts for the difference between the findings of this study and Moradi and Karimpour's (2012) study may be due to the length of study; i.e. this study lasted a semester but their study took 5 weeks (10 sessions). Also, it may be caused by different course materials and teacher support which was only available in Google Docs through its chatting feature.

One explanation of the influential role of Google Docs-based writing instructional model in promoting the effectiveness of explicit feedback (metalinguistic corrective feedback) may be due to the benefits including the legibility of online feedback (the explanation regarding metalinguistic corrective feedback), and its time-saving nature in doing assignments (because metalinguistic corrective feedback lead the learners to self-repair; they should have enough time to revise their essay on the basis of explanations and questions given by their peers). And, Google Docs provides the students with the opportunity to negotiate with each other; i.e., negotiation of information related to the correctness of learner's utterance which is the basic feature of metalinguistic corrective feedback.

The result of the Two-way ANOVA also showed the mean scores of writing performance of the students receiving recast in face-to-face writing instruction were higher than those via Google Docs-based writing instruction. This finding followed the results of Cabaroglu, Basaran, and Roberts's (2010) study which showed the effectiveness of recast

in face-to-face classes compared to computer-mediated ones. Also, their study indicated that web-based instruction has negative effects on the quality of recast delivered.

Conclusion and Pedagogical Implication

The findings obtained in this study led to the conclusion that two types of writing instruction models seemed to have significantly different effects on enhancing learners' writing performance. As a result, the learners exposed to Google Docs-based writing instruction (blended writing instruction) performed better in the writing posttest than those exposed to face-to-face writing instruction.

According to data analysis, generally, the students receiving metalinguistic corrective feedback outperformed those receiving recast in the writing posttest. In addition, it was revealed that the effectiveness of students' writing performance changed depending on the type of corrective feedback and the type of instruction the learners were exposed to. For instance, Metalinguistic feedback led to better results in Google Docs-based writing instruction than in face-to-face writing instruction. While, the learners receiving recast in face-to-face writing instruction had better writing performance scores than those receiving recast through Google Docs-based writing instruction.

The findings of this study revealed the importance of Google Docs-based writing instruction in increasing students' confidence regarding their writing abilities and their willingness to allow others to read and evaluate their written products. Generally, the findings of this research have important implications for EFL teachers because the present study showed the complementary role of Google Docs in supporting and improving EFL learners' writing performance. They can become familiar with free technologies, such as Google Docs, which can increase the opportunities of exposure and practicing language beyond the classroom environment. The conclusions emerging from this study have implications for EFL teachers, since it informed teachers about the type of corrective feedback which is more effective in improving writing performance. Moreover, it familiarizes teachers with the techniques of providing students with opportunities to give implicit or explicit feedback on their peers' writing performance in order to maintain the communicative nature of language classes.

References

- Ahmadi, D., Maftoon, P., & Gholami, M. A. (2012). Investigating the effects of two types of feedback on EFL students' writing. *Proceedings of the 4th World Conference on Educational Sciences, Barcelona, Spain.*

- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543-574.
- Beldarrain, Y. (2006). Distance education trends: Integrating new technologies to foster student interaction and collaboration. *Distance Education*, 27, 139-153.
- Brodahl, C., Hadjerrouit, S., & Hansen, N. (2011). Collaborative writing with web 2.0 technologies: Education students' perceptions. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 3(10), 73-103.
- Cabaroglu, N., Basaran, S., & Roberts, J. (2010). A Comparison between the effectiveness of Recasts under Conditions of Face-to-Face and Computer-mediated Communication: A Preliminary Study. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(2), 14-23.
- Corgan, R., Hammer, V., Margolies, M., & Crossley, C. (2004). Making your online course successful. *Business Education Forum*, 58(3), 51-53.
- Donaldson, R. P., & Haggstrom, M. A. (2006). *Changing language education through CALL*. New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching* (pp. 31-64). Bristol: Short Run Press Ltd.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.
- Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines*. San Francisco: John Wileys and Sons Inc.
- Gholami, J., & Talebi, Z. (2012). The effects of implicit and explicit feedback on EFL learners' grammatical accuracy: The case of regular past tense in English. *International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 39-62.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2008). Emerging technologies web-writing 2.0: Enabling, documenting, and assessing writing online. *Language Learning & Technology*, 12(2), 7-13.
- Golshan, M. (2013). Corrective Feedback during Communicate Tasks: Do recasts, clarification requests and explicit correction affect EFL learners' second language acquisition equally? *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 559-571.
- Hardison, J. (2012). The sidekick and the superhero: Using Google Drive for peer-assessment. *Proceedings of IEEE 12th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies, Athens, Greece*.
- Lamb, A., & Johnson, L. (2010). Visual expeditions: Google Earth, GIS, and geovisualization technologies in teaching and learning. *Teacher Librarian*, 37(3), 81-85.
- Larson, D., & Sung, C. H. (2009). Comparing student performance: Online versus blended versus face to face. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 13(1), 31-42.

- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 285-312.
- Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 37-63.
- Lundin, A. (2008). Wikis: A collective approach to language production. *ReCALL, 20*(1), 35-54.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 399-432.
- MacDonald, J. (2006). *Blended learning and online tutoring: A good practice guide*. Aldershot, UK: Gower.
- Moradi, R. M. & Karimpour, Z. (2012). The Effect of Online peer Feedback on the Academic Writing Ability of Iranian EFL learners. *International Education Studies, 5*(2), 113-117.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N., (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning, 51*, 719-758.
- Ocker, R. J., & Yaverbaum, G. J. (2001). Collaborative learning environments: Exploring student attitudes and satisfaction in face-to-face and asynchronous computer conferencing settings. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 12*, 427-449.
- Pan, C. C., & Sullivan, M. (2005). Promoting synchronous interaction in an e-learning environment. *Technical Horizons in Education Journal, 33*(2), 27-30.
- Razagifard, P., & Razzaghifard, V. (2013). Corrective feedback in a computer-mediated communicative context and the development of second language grammar. *Teaching English with Technology, 11*(2), 1-17.
- Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of second language grammar. *Language Learning & Technology, 13*, 96-120.
- Seyyedrezaie, Z. S., Ghapanchi, Z., & Seyyedrezaie, M. S. (2013). Relationship between EFL learners' computer anxiety and their preferred feedback method(s) in writing. *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research, 2*(1), 174-182.
- Sharp, V. (2009). *Computer education for teachers: Integrating technology into classroom teaching*. Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley.
- Tabasi, H., Khodabandehlou, M., & Jahandar, S. (2013). The impact of feedback types-based instruction on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' letter writing performance. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences, 3*(1), 256-262.
- Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face to face and electronic communication in the second language classroom. *CALICO Journal, 13*(2), 7-26.
- Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, Y. (2008). *Corrective feedback and Chinese learners' acquisition of English past tense*. PhD dissertation, McGill University.

Zeiss, E., & Isabelli, G. (2005). The role of asynchronous computer mediated communication on enhancing cultural awareness. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 18*, 151–169.