

## REVIEW ARTICLE

# A Systematic Literature Review of Web-based Tools Application in ESL and EFL Writing Classes

Asiah Kassim<sup>1\*</sup>, Hafizoah Kassim<sup>1</sup>, Nik Aloesnita Nik Mohd Alwi<sup>1</sup>, Mohd Shukri Nordin<sup>2</sup>, and Mahdalela Rahim<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Modern Languages, Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah, 26600 Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Kulliyah of Education, International Islamic University Malaysia, Jalan Sungai Pusu, 53100, Selangor Malaysia.

<sup>3</sup>Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Cawangan Melaka, Kampus Alor Gajah, KM 26 Jalan Lendu, 78000 Alor Gajah, Melaka, Malaysia.

**ABSTRACT** - The 1990s saw the advent of internet use, eventually termed as web 1.0. Embracing this technological evolution, language learning classrooms have been using this digital tool in the teaching and learning processes. The paper systematically analysed the literature on this digital use for writing in ESL/EFL classes published between 1990 and 2023, aiming at identifying the most frequently used web-based tools in writing classes, exploring their facilitative features in developing learner's writing skills and evaluating their effects on the development of varied writing types. Ninety-three articles retrieved from five major databases - Science Direct, Scopus, SpringerLink, Taylor & Francis and Web of Science - were analysed using the content analysis method. Findings revealed that writing classes in recent years have been primarily utilising social media channels, such as Facebook, collaborative authoring platforms, for example, Google Docs and data-driven learning tools like Corpus, optimising the interactive and interconnectedness of these applications. Further exploration disclosed the facilitative features contributed mainly by the interactive element of the web, enabling teaching and learning of writing to take place in and outside of the classroom. Discussions also highlighted certain facilitative features perused in relation to different types of writing. This review affirms the facilitative benefits of web technology in enhancing the learners' writing skills. It concludes by suggesting future studies for the teaching and learning writing for ESL and EFL learners.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 26 January 2024

Revised: 5 April 2024

Accepted: 25 April 2024

Published: 3 May 2024

## KEYWORDS

English as a foreign language

English as a second language

Systematic literature review

Web-based tools

Writing skills

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The utilisation of technology in the classroom opens enormous opportunities for all involved, such as regulating learners with individualised learning, equipping learners with the much-needed skills of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and providing instructors with abundant access to authentic and diversified materials and resources (Bryant et al., 2020). Moreover, the pandemic has ensured the certainty of technology development and its inclusion in education. At the global scale, educational institutions are striving to transform programmes and instructions with the integration of technological and digital tools, and it has become evident that investment into technology in education is a vital agenda.

Technology use in language teaching and learning echoes the world's practices. The integrations of technology to enhance language teaching and learning have been reported in a good number of studies since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, and in particular, the use of web-based tools in the teaching and learning of writing in ESL and EFL classrooms has been extensively researched. These studies have discussed integrating digital tools from various angles, such as efficacy, attitudes, and motivation, bearing both advantages and disadvantages of these learning instruments. These reported studies show a trend of using different types of technology, moving from individual computer-based to a more social and interactive web-based integration.

### 1.1 Web-based Tools in Writing Classes

The Web which made its way into the masses approximately in the mid-1990s has become more ubiquitous in recent years, as reported in many studies (Chen, 2016; Dede, 1996; Dousti & Amirian, 2023; Lee et al., 2020; Schmid et al., 2014; Su et al., 2023; Zhang & Zou, 2021) and language educators have been making use of these digital wonders to facilitate learners in the development of different language skills. In the realm of writing skills, the boons and the banes of these web-based apps, like Facebook, Wikis and Blogs have been illustrated through extensive use in various learning contexts (Alberth, 2019; Barrot, 2016; Barrot, 2021; Canham, 2018; Dizon, 2016; Kuimova & Zvekov, 2016; Susanto et al., 2020) and more recently, the use of artificial intelligence (AI), such as Chatbot is becoming more common in the realm of teaching and learning (Huang et al., 2022; Yan, 2023). However, studies integrating AI focusing specifically on writing are still scant, where most reported literature research revolves around learning in various fields.

Many studies have reported the effective use of web-based tools in facilitating collaborative writing tasks (Ho, 2020; Jiang & Eslami, 2021; Kılıçkaya, 2020). Utilised as computer-mediated communications, Wikis, Google Docs and Facebook, for instance, have been proposed as providing access to collaborative platforms primarily for group interactions (Cho, 2017; Li & Zhu, 2017), asynchronous editing of written work (Abrams, 2019; Wang, 2015) and learning resources (Selcuk et al., 2019; Woo et al., 2013). A more recent trend of employing augmented reality (AR) in writing classes exhibits a facilitative environment for learners' writing skills development (Chen et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2020). Current and emerging trends of web-based apps utilised in writing classes have furnished learners with varied and creative means of learning and learner engagement.

Reports from the vast number of studies may have revealed arrays of results. Some have discussed these tools' facilitative effects on developing learners' language accuracy, fluency, and content development (Cao, 2015; Ebadi & Rahimi, 2017; Grami, 2020; Lucas, 2020). Others have suggested that cautions need to be taken in integrating these tools due, to some extent, results showing adverse effects in their empirical findings (Ahmadi & Besharati, 2017; Li et al., 2015; Wihastyanang et al., 2020). From another view, studies have also reported learners' attitudes towards the use of these web-based aids indicating acceptance as well as reluctance and resistance, thus influencing the development of their writing skills (He, 2016; Hosseini et al., 2020; John & Yunus, 2019; Lin, 2019).

## 1.2 Review Studies on the Use of Web-based Tools in Writing Classes

Another systematic literature review (SLR) studies have extensively analysed the use of technology tools in writing teaching and learning, such as Ahmadi and Marandi (2014), which focused on Wikis to scaffold collaborative learning and the Al Wasy's (2020) study that explored the stages of writing, language context, learners' educational level and language proficiency level. Also, Chen's (2016) study perused studies published between 1990 and 2010 on the characteristics of technology-supported peer-feedback activities, focusing on synchronous and asynchronous types of peer interactions. Similarly, Cao et al. (2022) analysed studies that focused on peer feedback in writing classes, suggesting the efficacy of online peer feedback in contrast to offline peer feedback.

Another study by Çiftçi and Aslan (2019) examined studies between 2000 and 2017 on using computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools concerning the contexts, languages, learners, task types, writing stages and writing aspects. Focusing on collaborative writing, Stoddart et al. (2016) reported studies that utilised wikis to aid this type of writing task. More recently, also centred on collaborative writing, Zhang and Zou (2021) reviewed studies on the use and the effects of educational technologies on the learning outcomes and perceptions of learners engaged in technology-enhanced collaborative writing.

Since the advent of AI into the world of language teaching and learning, literature conveying review studies of AI integration has been reported in many publications in recent years. Zhang et al. (2023) performed a meta-analysis on 18 studies utilising Chatbot in language learning. They concluded that this web-based tool has facilitated various aspects of language learning, like language skills, learning outcomes and duration of instructions. In another review study, Kuhail et al. (2023) examined the use of chatbots in a broader educational domain, focusing on interactional elements of the widget. This study has also presented evidence of the effectiveness of using Chatbot in the learning process, with some challenges, such as lack of dataset training and distractions, as cited in several studies reviewed.

Although previous review studies synthesised the use of technological tools in diverse writing classes, focus on the various types of web-based tools for different writing tasks has not been the emphasis. Thus, the current study attempted to review studies to address this issue, guided by the following three research questions:

1. What were the most frequently used web-based tools in teaching and learning writing in ESL/EFL classrooms between 1990 and 2023?
2. What features of these digital tools facilitate the development of ESL/EFL learners' writing skills?
3. How do these features affect the development of writing skills in different writing types?


## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

An extensive search of existing literature was carried out to identify studies published between 1990 and 2023 regarding the effectiveness of Web-based tools in facilitating ESL or EFL learners' writing development. 1990 was decided to be the starting point of the search because, according to Schmid et al. (2014) and Lee et al. (2020), that was the decade when the Internet generally first reached the masses with the availability of personal computers for teaching and learning purposes.

The literature search was conducted on five significant databases: Science Direct, Scopus, Springer Link, Taylor & Francis, and the Web of Science, which included only research articles. As summarised in Figure 1, this process went through three major stages.

### 2.1 Phase 1: Database Search

The first phase was conducting a database search using the search strings that are the combinations of the following keywords: a) writing; b) web, internet, online, software, technology, computer, laptop, digital, multimedia, blended; and c) ESL, EFL. In this first stage, after removing duplicates, 8330 articles potentially relevant to the study were retrieved from these five databases.

**Figure 1***Three-stage review process*

## 2.2 Phase 2: Inclusion and Exclusion Screening

In the second stage, the articles were screened for inclusion or exclusion to address the specific research questions of this review study. For this purpose, using the title, the abstract and the methodology section, the articles were screened based on the following criteria:

- The articles were written in English.
- The scope of the study was in the context of ESL or EFL.
- The articles reported empirical studies employing experimental or quasi-experimental methods.
- There was a considerable clear description of the effects of web-based tools on the development of writing skills.

Four hundred thirty-two articles were identified to have fulfilled all these criteria. Further thorough screening was conducted on these 432 articles, perusing the methodology, findings, and discussion sections. Articles that did not address the inclusion criteria and did not address the research questions were excluded. Articles excluded from the list reported learners' attitudes or perceptions towards web-based tools. Still, the findings and discussion did not discuss the effects of web-based tools on writing skills development, literature review, and meta-analysis papers. At the end of this phase, after excluding duplicates, 192 articles were selected to be reviewed to answer the research questions of the present study.

## 2.3 Phase 3: Coding and Analysis

The final stage was to code and analyse the articles. Two researchers coded approximately 25% of 192 articles separately to ensure inter-rater reliability. After thorough reading and coding of these articles, 93 articles were finally included in the analysis. Findings that addressed the research questions discussed in this paper were deduced from these 93 articles.

## 3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 The Most Frequently Used Web-based Tools in the Teaching and Learning of Writing in ESL/EFL Classrooms between 1990 and 2023

The first question was to identify the web-based tools most frequently used in writing classes, as reported in studies published between 1990 and 2023. Figure 2 illustrates the number and different types of web-based tools utilised over three decades.


Facebook topped the list with 11 studies reported for a decade (Abdallah & Mansour, 2015; Abdul Majid & Stapa, 2017; Alias et al., 2012; Altakhaine & Al-Jallah, 2018; Barrot, 2016; 2021; Dizon, 2016; Razak & Saeed, 2014; Saeed & Ghazali, 2017; Shih, 2011; Yusof et al., 2012). With the same number of reported studies, Google Docs was also frequently used in writing classes, with the earliest report of use in 2015 (Ahmadi & Besharati, 2017; Alharbi, 2020; Hoang & Hoang, 2022; Dzekoe, 2017; Ebadi & Alizadeh, 2021; Ebadi & Rahimi, 2018; Fathi et al., 2021; Pham et al., 2020; Saeed & Al Qunayeer, 2020; Zheng et al. 2015). Corpus and Concordances, which were also common in writing classes, utilised varied types of corpora such as computer science lexical bundle (Birhan, 2021), PREFER, a corpus-based online aid to help learners with paraphrasing tasks (Chen et al., 2015), Google search (Kvashnina & Sumtsova, 2018), Chinese-English bilingual concordances (Yang et al., 2019), TANGO (Yeh et al., 2007), TOTAL recall combined with Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) (Liou, 2019) and W-matrix, which was a corpus containing samples



of selected and organised language that occurs in natural setting (Wong, 2018). Apart from the in-house developed software, Reference Suite, Yoon (2016) also used Google search and dictionaries to aid learners in completing academic writing tasks. These uses of corpus and concordances were part of what was categorised as data-driven learning (DDL).

**Figure 2**

*Most frequently used web-based tools in EFL/ESL writing classes*



Blogs came in fourth (Cequeña, 2020; Fathi et al., 2019; James, 2016; Lin, 2014; Lin, 2015; Lin, 2019; Xu & Yu, 2018; Zheng & Warschauer, 2015), while Wikis followed very closely with eight reported uses in writing classrooms (Alshumaimeri, 2011; Li, 2013; Mak & Coniam, 2008; Wang, 2014; Wang, 2015; Woo et al. 2013). In addition, there were various types of in-house developed software used in writing classes, which included among others, Summary Writing-Pal (Chew et al., 2020), AccurIT ESL (Grami, 2020), Concise Collocation Checker (Grami & Alkezemi, 2016), Grammar Clinic (Li & Hegelheimer, 2013), E-Feedback (Tuzi, 2004), Process-Writing Wizard (Yeh et al., 2011) and Reference Suite (Yoon, 2016). More recently, Dugartsyrenova and Sardegna (2022) reported promising findings on using an in-house web-based tool, Online Academic Writing (OAW) tutor, to facilitate ESL learner's research proposal writing. These customised tools were developed by learning institutions to cater for the specific needs of their writing courses and the learners.

In some studies, combinations of varied digital tools were integrated into a writing course, and to list down these tools, they were grouped under the CALL combination in Figure 1. Abdallah and Mansour (2015) combined Facebook with a game-based software, "Second Life", in their task-based pragmatic writing tasks, such as resumes and email writing. Al-Jarf (2004) utilised the freeware Blackboard in combination with access to sources from websites such as "Yahoo Movies", "Yahoo Health", "WebMD", and "Encarta". Another study incorporated the use of Multimedia classes, which included, among others, an online dictionary, LAN and grammar check (Cao, 2015). Dzekoe (2017), in a computer-based multimodal composing activity (CBMCAs), used Google Docs, Glogster, and NaturalReader to facilitate learners' self-revision of their writing tasks. To enhance the tendency of learners to explore when completing writing tasks, James (2016) employed Quizlet, WebQuest, and Blog in a blended learning class. Focusing on enhanced self-learning and peer activities, a study combined Edpuzzle, Padlet and Google Docs in a scientific report writing class (Zou & Xie, 2019).

Edmodo, which was first launched in 2008, was a global learning network reported to be utilised in some selected studies (Ekmekci, 2017; Hosseinpour et al., 2019; Karami et al., 2019; Ma'azi & Janfeshan, 2018; Miftah, 2018), though now it is no longer used in writing classes after it was officially shut down in September 2022. Web-quest was also gaining popularity among language instructors as a tool to aid learners in developing their writing skills (Alshumaimeri & Bamanger, 2013; Awada et al., 2020; Dousti & Amirian, 2023; Ebadi & Rahimi, 2018; James, 2016). Other web-based tools reported in less than three studies selected for this analysis were not included in the findings and considered not to have fulfilled the criterion as being frequently used tools in ESL/EFL writing classes.

### 3.2 Features of the Web-based Tools that Facilitate the Development of ESL/EFL Learners' Writing Skills

This question probes further into technology integration in the teaching and learning of writing by analysing the facilitative features in developing ESL/EFL learners' writing skills. Examining the selected studies regarding the facilitation afforded by the digital tools discussed led to three main deductions.

#### 3.2.1 Interactive Features for Both Synchronous and Asynchronous Writing Tasks

Tools like Facebook, Blogs, Google Docs, and Edmodo allowed whole group and subgroups discussions, which were facilitative for collaborative writing activities in both synchronous and asynchronous settings (Alharbi, 2020; Barrot, 2021; Chang & Lu, 2018;

Ekmeççi, 2017; Hosseinpour et al., 2019; Razak & Saeed, 2014; Wang, 2015; Zheng et al., 2015). These features assisted learners in generating new ideas for content development cooperatively, and they were also facilitative in improving language use, such as word choice and grammatical accuracy in compositions. These were achieved through the postings that can be made in posts and message menus by both learners and instructors. Learners could write essays and post their compositions to be read by everyone or by the members of the subgroups, and comments on language use could be shared. All learners could make use of these comments to improve their writing piece. If the need arises, individual assessments could also be carried out on these platforms, such as Google Docs, with the instructor giving feedback to the learners' writings on time since these tools could be easily accessed regardless of time and space, provided that there was internet connection for synchronous discussions to take place. Asynchronous collaborative tasks were completed offline and could be accessed by intended participants when connected online.

Al Asadi (2020), Ebadi and Rahimi (2018), and James (2016), for example, conducted studies utilising WebQuest to enhance learners' engagement in collaborative writing tasks. Dodge (1997), who was the founder of this site, defined WebQuest as "an inquiry-oriented lesson format in which most or all the information that learners work with comes from the web" (p. 1). Each quest was structured into an Introduction, Task, Process, Conclusion, and Evaluation. These studies pointed out that the readings required by the pursuit enriched the learners' knowledge in general and vocabulary in particular, which could enhance written production. Citing Doughty and Long (2002), Ebadi and Rahimi's study inferred that the materials gathered online to complete the WebQuest tasks could be considered as providing the language input, equipped with "linguistic complexity, quality, quantity, variety, genuineness and relevance" (para. 3) which was needed to enhance writing. The other parts of WebQuest enabled learners to work collaboratively to produce well-developed written work.

### **3.2.2 Access to Language Inputs and Learning Materials from Both Natural and Controlled Settings**

Another facilitative feature of these web-based tools in assisting learners in developing their writing skills was the affordance of rich learning resources. For instance, McEnery et al. (2006) defined corpus and concordances as collections of language that occurred in natural settings and were sorted based on explicit linguistic features, displayed as a sample of language used in varied contexts. Generally, many studies suggested using corpus for language learning due to its ability to provide learners with diverse and authentic English language uses by both native and non-native speakers (Birhan, 2021; Liou, 2019; Tsai, 2021; Wong, 2018; Yang et al., 2019; Yeh et al., 2007; Yoon, 2016). Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA) was considered a concordance that provided considerable amounts of reliable examples regarding the sources. Its sophisticated search options and operators allowed users to creatively elicit and verify phraseologies and grammar.

With this access to language inputs and learning materials, these web-based tools could assist learners in developing their writing skills by increasing lexico-grammatical accuracy in compositions (Ebadi & Rahimi, 2017; Yoon, 2016). It was achieved through the references to typical and frequent patterns of a linguistic item extracted from language data that occurred in natural settings. In other words, referring to authentic data, such as words and sentences in actual language use, could make sentences composed more naturally and contextually accurate. Yeh et al. (2007) focused their study on the reference to synonyms using a bilingual collocation concordancer, TANGO, a Chinese-English concordancer. Learners could retain knowledge of word synonyms for an extended period using the concordance as manifested in the appropriate use in their writing over time.

Kvashnina and Sumtsova (2018) used Google as a readily available web corpus. This use of Google as a web corpus could provide learners with hundreds of billions of words, and it was freely accessible with no special training needed. However, using Google as a web corpus must be made with caution because although it could provide many authentic texts, these language uses might only sometimes be essential and accurate regarding the language and speech standards. Some might be inaccurately used, negatively affecting the learners' writing development. Nevertheless, they concluded that Google searching allowed learners to evaluate accuracy and appropriateness using any language unit or patterns occurring in natural speech, eventually assisting learners in producing written work closer to native speakers. The samples provided through Google Corpus can raise learners' awareness of using words or language patterns in context while expanding their comprehension of the meaning of words, enabling them to use these words appropriately in their writing. Similarly, access to authentic learning materials was afforded when learners were tasked to work with WebQuest, thus enhancing the learning experience (Al Asadi, 2020; Dousti & Amirian, 2023).

### **3.2.3 The Low Anxiety Learning Environment**

Some studies reporting on the use of web platforms such as Edmodo, Google Docs and in-house developed software, which were customised for specific needs of the learners, highlighted the conducive learning environment that these tools provided (Ebadi & Alizadeh, 2021; Ekmeççi, 2017; Fathi et al., 2021; Hosseinpour et al., 2019; Karami et al., 2019; Ma'azi & Janfeshan, 2018; Miftah, 2018). These studies, for instance, discussed the safe environment in which learners could interact and complete writing tasks. Safe means that a social media platform was operated in a closed group-based channel, like Edmodo and some other customised in-house developed software, like AccurIT ESL (Grami, 2020) and Summary Writing-Pal (Chew et al., 2020). An instructor created a group that could only be accessed by selected members. Activities on this platform could be seen and participated in by these members, thus significantly limiting any uninvited interventions from external parties, such as malicious comments and irrelevant elements that could threaten the learners' learning process, creating a low-anxiety environment conducive to learning.

Abdallah and Mansour's (2015) study that made use of learning software, "Second Life", developed by Linden Lab, as cited in Schwenhorst (2002), claimed that the "virtual presence can result in reduced apprehension and embarrassment" (p. 153) in which the use of "Second Life" provided a relaxing environment for learners to complete writing tasks. Reducing learners' anxiety and apprehension facilitated language learning development and utilising a game-like web tool. Abdallah and Mansour reported the enhancement of learners' pragmatic writing skills, which included, among others, writing a curriculum vitae and formal business

letters/emails. Lin (2019) asserted that “combining [certain] refined elements creates a relatively suitable and sensible way of using blogs for EFL purposes, thus helping in reducing learners’ anxiety and increasing learner’s writing development” (p. 8).

### 3.2.4 *The Influence of Web-Based Tools on the Development of Different Types of Writing*

Some studies reporting on the use of web platforms such as Edmodo, Google Docs and in-house developed software, which were customised for specific needs of the learners, highlighted the conducive learning environment that these tools provided (Ebadi & Alizadeh, 2021; Ekmekci, 2017; Fathi et al., 2021; Hosseinpour et al., 2019; Karami et al., 2019; Ma’azi & Janfeshan, 2018; Miftah, 2018). These studies, for instance, discussed the safe environment in which learners could interact and complete writing tasks. Safe means that a social media platform was operated in a closed group-based channel, like Edmodo and some other customised in-house developed software, like AccurIT ESL (Grami, 2020) and Summary Writing-Pal (Chew et al., 2020). An instructor created a group that could only be accessed by selected members. Activities on this platform could be seen and participated in by these members, thus significantly limiting any uninvited interventions from external parties, such as malicious comments and irrelevant elements that could threaten the learners’ learning process, creating a low-anxiety environment conducive to learning.

Abdallah and Mansour’s (2015) study that made use of learning software, “Second Life”, developed by Linden Lab, as cited in Schwenhorst (2002), claimed that the “virtual presence can result in reduced apprehension and embarrassment” (p. 153) in which the use of “Second Life” provided a relaxing environment for learners to complete writing tasks. Reducing learners’ anxiety and apprehension facilitated language learning development and utilising a game-like web tool. Abdallah and Mansour reported the enhancement of learners’ pragmatic writing skills, which included, among others, writing a curriculum vitae and formal business letters/emails. Lin (2019) asserted that “combining [certain] refined elements creates a relatively suitable and sensible way of using blogs for EFL purposes, thus helping in reducing learners’ anxiety and increasing learner’s writing development” (p. 8).

### 3.3 *The Influence of Web-Based Tools on the Development of Different Types of Writing*

The third research question attempted to analyse the elements of these web-based tools that could assist learners in enhancing their writing skills in different writing types. The selected studies reported various kinds of writing tasks which learners were required to complete, among others were descriptive essays (Yeh et al., 2007), research papers by postgraduate participants (Yoon, 2016), narrative essays (Yang et al., 2019), news writing (Wong, 2018), a combination of narrative, analysis, and comparison or contrast (Liou, 2019), and various written assignments such as essays and abstract writing (Birhan, 2021; Kvashnina & Sumtsova, 2018). What could be deduced from the findings of these studies is that using digital tools like Corpus and WebQuest as references helped learners improve performance in these different writing types by enriching vocabulary use and appropriate language patterns suitable for different writing contexts.

According to Ekmekci (2017), whose study required learners to write argumentative essays, the resources such as links to YouTube videos facilitated the development of learners’ writing performance because these easily accessible inputs helped them enrich the content of the argumentative essay they were working on. Even though this was the deduction made by the author, data that were reported did not specifically illustrate the relation between this feature and each component of the essay rubric, which assessed learners in six dimensions, which were a) organisation and structure, b) relevance and content, c) lexical range/word choice, d) grammar/sentence structure, e) mechanics, and f) overall section which evaluated the whole paragraph.

Therefore, a definite claim could not be made about whether the assumption that the resources and inputs provided had specifically facilitated content or the language use of the essay production. Hosseinpour et al. (2019), on the other hand, were specific in reporting their findings by relating improvement in the five aspects of writing assessed on five essay types, which were classification, process, comparison-contrast, problem-solution, and cause-effect, of which it was revealed that Edmodo managed to assist learners to improve in aspects of organisation, vocabulary, and mechanics of writing. As an LMS, Edmodo provided learners various learning supports, such as comment sharing, to enhance collaborative writing. Library and Backpack were some of the functions that were useful to store learning resources and inputs, as well as varied types of testing functions that could assess learners’ progress in groups or individually.

The studies that reported the integration of WebQuest to aid learners in developing writing skills highlighted the authenticity of tasks and the inputs provided to the learners via the reading required in completing the quest (Dousti & Amirian, 2023). Ebadi and Rahimi (2018) further related the improvement in writing to the high level of critical thinking ability that WebQuest afforded, and this was assumed to be facilitative in enhancing academic writing skills, focusing on opinion essays and descriptive writings that assessed learners in terms of task achievement, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammatical range and accuracy. The essay’s topic was another trait that could be related to the writing type that learners were to produce. For example, Al Asadi (2020) required the participants to write persuasive and descriptive essays on intercultural topics. Findings indicated that WebQuest aided learners in significantly improving their writing style and intercultural awareness issues. These were manifested in clear topic sentences, linking sentences and appropriate details in the learners’ written work for persuasive and descriptive essays.

## 4.0 CONCLUSION

Findings of this SLR analysis studies that reported on using web-based tools in developing ESL and EFL learners’ writing skills indicate that the most frequently integrated tools included social media platforms such as Facebook and collaborative authoring tools such as Blogs, Google Docs and Wikis. Other studies highlighted several in-house developed web-based apps to address learners’ writing needs. The facilitative features of these technological tools mainly revolved around interactivity, resourcefulness, and a low anxiety learning environment, eventually leading to learners focusing on different aspects of the writing produced. Concerning the facilitative features enhancing different writing types, studies illustrated that learners made use of these technological supports to enhance



vocabulary building, grammatical accuracy, organisation, writing mechanics, as well as critical thinking, contributing to the development of meaningful content in different types of essays, which included among others, opinion, argumentative, descriptive, narrative, news and research essays.

Among the selected studies for analysis, some reported insignificant results or even adverse effects of technology integration on the teaching and learning of writing. These can be due to varied factors, such as the efficacy of tools selection, learners and learning environment and technical challenges. That is why it is crucial for educators to efficiently select the appropriate tools for teaching and learning, whether they are for web-based modes or conventional face-to-face settings, to ensure that learning takes place effectively and that this effort yields benefits for the learners in enhancing their language proficiency, in general, and writing skills in particular.

Finally, it is recommended that future SLR or meta-analysis studies explore the effects technology tools have on different aspects of writing, conventionally classified into content and relevance, organisation, cohesion and coherence, vocabulary or lexical range, grammar and sentence structure, and writing mechanics. Systematic analysis of such studies may give insights to effectively select digital tools to optimise facilitating learners' enhancement of specific writing skills. Analysing correlational studies integrating technology in language learning by looking at the relationship between performance and motivation will provide detailed accounts of selecting digital tools to facilitate learners in both performance and affective realms.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported with grants from the Sustainable Research Collaboration Grant 2020 UMP-IUUM-UiTM (Grant No: RDU200726).

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Asiah Kassim (Conceptualisation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Data curation, Investigation, Resources, Visualisation, Writing)

Hafizoah Kassim (Conceptualisation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Investigation, Resources, Visualisation, Writing)

Nik Aloesnita Nik Mohd Alwi (Conceptualisation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Investigation, Resources, Visualisation, Review & Editing)

Mohd Shukri Nordin (Conceptualisation, Investigation, Resources, Visualisation, Review & Editing)

Mahdalela Rahim (Conceptualisation, Investigation, Resources, Visualisation, Review & Editing)

## REFERENCES

- Abdallah, M. M. S., & Mansour, M. M. (2015). Virtual task-based situated language-learning with second life: Developing EFL pragmatic writing and technological self-efficacy. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL*, 2, 150-182. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2843987>
- Abdul Majid, A. H. & Stapa, S. H. (2017). The use of scaffolding techniques via Facebook in improving descriptive writing among ESL learners. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 23(4), 77-88. <http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2017-2304-07>
- Abrams, Z.I. (2019). Collaborative writing and text quality in Google Docs. *Language Learning & Technology*, 23(2), 22-42. <https://doi.org/10.125/44681>
- Ahmadi, A., & Besharati, F. (2017). Web-based versus face-to-face interactionist dynamic assessment in essay writing classrooms - a comparative study. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 7(1), 1-29. [https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jltl/issue/42178/507805#article\\_cite](https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jltl/issue/42178/507805#article_cite)
- Ahmadi, S. D., & Marandi, S. S. (2014). Social software in the classroom: The case of Wikis for scaffolding. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 100-108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.394>
- Al Asadi, S. S. (2020). Intercultural awareness and writing through the use of WebQuest: Iraqi students at Al-Awsat Technical University as a case study. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on CALL*, 6, 378-392. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3676015>
- Al Wasy, B. Q. (2020). The effectiveness of integrating technology in EFL/ESL writing: A meta-analysis. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 17(4), 435-454. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-03-2020-0033>
- Alberth (2019) Use of Facebook, students' intrinsic motivation to study writing, writing self-efficacy and writing performance. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 28(1), 21-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2018.1552892>
- Alharbi, M. A. (2020) 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(3), 227-242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1572157>
- Alias, A. A., Ab Manan, N. A., Yusof, J., & Pandian, A. (2012). The use of Facebook as a language learning strategy (LLS) training tool for college students' LLS use and academic writing performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67, 36-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.305>

- Al-Jarf, R. S. (2004). The effects of web-based learning on struggling EFL college writers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 46-56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02172.x>
- Alshumaimeri, Y. (2011). The effects of wikis on foreign language students writing performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 28, 755-763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.139>
- Alshumaimeri, Y. A., & Bamanger, E. M. (2013). The effects of WebQuest writing instruction on the writing performance of Saudi Male EFL learners. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 960-968. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.179>
- Altakhaineh, A. R. M., & Al-Jallad, M. Z. (2018). The use of Twitter and Facebook in teaching mechanics of writing to Arabic-speaking EFL learners. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(9), 4-14. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i09.8457>
- Awada, G., Burston, J., & Ghannage, R. (2020). Effect of student team achievement division through WebQuest on EFL students' argumentative writing skills and their instructors' perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 275-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1558254>
- Barrot, J. S. (2021). Effects of Facebook-based e-portfolio on ESL learners' writing performance. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 95-111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1745822>
- Barrot, J. S. (2016). Using Facebook-based e-portfolio in ESL writing classrooms: Impact and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 29(3), 286-301. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2016.1143481>
- Birhan, A. T. (2021). Effects of teaching lexical bundles on EFL students' abstract genre academic writing skills improvement: Corpus-based research design. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(1), 585-597. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i1.14917>
- Bryant, J., Heitz, C., Sanghvi, S., & Wagle, D. (2020, January 14). How artificial intelligence will impact K-12 teachers. McKinsey & Company. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/education/our-insights/how-artificial-intelligence-will-impact-k-12-teachers#/>
- Canham, N. (2018). Comparing Web 2.0 applications for peer feedback in language teaching: Google Docs, the Sakai VLE, and the Sakai Wiki. *Writing and Pedagogy*, 9(3), 429-456. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.32352>
- Cao, F. (2015). An empirical study on the application of CALL in writing classroom. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 10(1), 74-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v10i1.4297>
- Cao, S., Zhou, S., Luo, Y., Wang, T., Zhou, T., & Xu, Y. (2022). A review of the ESL/EFL learners' gains from online peer feedback on English writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article (1035803). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1035803>
- Cequeña, M. B. (2020). Correlations of self-perception in reading and writing, reading and writing performance in web-mediated and conventional writing instruction. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25, 1067-1083. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-10002-8>
- Chen, M., Huang, S.-T., J.S. Chang, J. S., & Liou, H. -C. (2015). Developing a corpus-based paraphrase tool to improve EFL learners' writing skills. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(1), 22-40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2013.783873>
- Chen, M. P., Wang, L. C., Zou, D., Lin, S. Y., Xie, H., & Tsai, C. C. (2022). Effects of captions and English proficiency on learning effectiveness, motivation and attitude in augmented-reality-enhanced theme-based contextualised EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(3), 381-411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1704787>
- Chen, T. (2016). Technology-supported peer feedback in ESL/EFL writing classes: A research synthesis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(2), 365-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.960942>
- Chew, C. S., Wu, W.-C. V., Idris, N., Loh, E. F., & Chua, Y. P. (2020). Enhancing summary writing of ESL learners via a theory-based online tool: System development and evaluation. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 58(2), 398-432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633119837765>
- Cho, H. (2017). Synchronous web-based collaborative writing: Factors mediating interaction among second-language writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.05.013>
- Çiftçi, H. & Aslan, E. (2019). Computer-mediated communication in the L2 writing process: A review of studies between 2000 and 2017. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 9, 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.2019040102>
- Dede, C. (1996). Emerging technologies and distributed learning. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 10(2), 4-36.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2016.1266369>
- Dodge, B. (1997). Some thoughts about WebQuest. [http://WebQuest.sdsu.edu/about\\_WebQuests.html](http://WebQuest.sdsu.edu/about_WebQuests.html)
- Doughty, C., & Long, M.H. (2002). Creating the optimal learning environment in a DL language course. Paper presented at Title VI Conference on Distance Learning of the Less Commonly Taught Languages.
- Dousti, M. & Amirian, Z. (2023). The effect of web-mediated, blended, and purely online learning on EFL learners' writing achievement in the Iranian context: A comparative study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 1675-1696. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11215-0>
- Dugartsyrenova, V. A., & Sardegna, V. G. (2022). Enhancing genre instruction on research proposal introductions with an online academic tutor. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 58 (2022), Article 100908. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2022.100908>



- Dzekoe, R. (2017). Computer-based multimodal composing activities, self-revision, and L2 acquisition through writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(2), 73-95. <https://dx.doi.org/10.125/44612>
- Ebadi, S. & Alizadeh, A. (2021). The effects of online learner-driven feedback on IELTS writing skills via Google Docs. *Teaching English with Technology*, 21(3), 42-66. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1063456>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1363056>
- Ebadi, S., & Rahimi, M. (2018). An exploration into the impact of WebQuest-based classroom on EFL learners' critical thinking and academic writing skills: A mixed-methods study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 31(5-6), 617-651. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1449757>
- Ekmekçi, E. (2017). The flipped writing classroom in a Turkish EFL context: A comparative study on a new model. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 18, 18-20. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.306566>
- Fathi, J., Ahmadinejad, M., & Yousofi, N. (2019). Effects of blog-mediated writing instruction on L2 writing motivation, self-efficacy, and self-regulation: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 159-181. <https://doi.org/10.22055/rals.2019.14722>
- Fathi J., Arabani A. S., Mohamadi P. (2021). The effect of collaborative writing using Google Docs on EFL learners' writing performance and self-regulation. *Language Related Research*, 12, 333-359. <https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.5.12>
- Grami, G. M. A. (2020). An evaluation of online and automated English writing assistants: Collocations and idioms checkers. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 15(4), 218-226. <https://www.learnedtechlib.org/p/217234/>
- Grami, G. M. A., and Alkazemi, B. Y. (2016). Improving ESL writing using an online formulaic sequence word-combination checker. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 32, 95-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12115>
- He, H. (2016). A survey of EFL college learners' perceptions of an on-line writing program. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 11(4), 11-15. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v11i04.5459>
- Ho, J. (2020). Gamifying the flipped classroom: How to motivate Chinese ESL learners? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(5), 421-435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1614185>
- Hoang, D. T. N., & Hoang, T. (2022). Enhancing EFL students' academic writing skills in online learning via Google Docs-based collaboration: A mixed-methods study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2083176>
- Hosseini, M. S., Bavali, M., & Rezvani, R. (2020). Wiki-based collaborative writing in EFL classrooms: Fluency and learners' attitudes in focus. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 7(1), Article 1826649. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1826649>
- Hosseinpour, N., Biria, R., & Rezvani, E. (2019). Promoting academic writing proficiency of Iranian EFL learners through blended learning. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 20(4), 99-116. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.640525>
- Huang, W., Hew, K. F., & Fryer, L. K. (2022). Chatbots for language learning-Are they really useful? A systematic review of chatbot-supported language learning. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 38(1), 237-257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12610>
- James, J. (2016). ICT integration in academic writing: An experiment in blended learning. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(3), 336-355. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2859282>
- Jiang, W., & Eslami, Z. R. (2021). Effects of computer-mediated collaborative writing on individual EFL writing performance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2701-2730. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1893753>
- John, D. S., & Yunus, M. M. (2019). Students' perceptions on the use of mobile learning to improve writing proficiency in the MUET. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 27(3), 1481-1492.
- Karami, S., Sadighi, F., Bagheri, M. S. & Riasati, M. J. (2019). The impact of the application of electronic portfolio on undergraduate English majors' writing proficiency and self-regulated learning. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1319-1334. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1201377.pdf>
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2020). Learners' perceptions of collaborative digital graphic writing based on semantic mapping. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(1-2), 58-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1544912>
- Kuhail, M. A., Alturki, N., Alamlawi, S., & Alhejori, K. (2023). Interacting with educational chatbots: A systematic review. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 973-1018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11177-3>
- Kuimova, M.V., & Zvekov, O.D. (2016). Blogs as a means to enhance writing skills in EFL classes. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 11(4), 157-160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v11i04.5430>
- Kvashnina, O.S., & Sumtsova, O. V. (2018). Using Google to search language patterns in web-corpus: EFL writing pedagogy. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(3), 173-179. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v13i03.7712>
- Lee, R. S. P., Verezub, E., Adi Badiozaman, I. F., & Chen, W. S. (2020). Tracing EFL students' flipped classroom journey in a writing class: Lessons from Malaysia. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 57(3), 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1574597>

- Leis, A., Tohei, A., & Cooke, S. (2015). The effects of flipped classrooms on English composition writing in an EFL environment. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 5, 37-51. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.2015100103>
- Li, J., Link, S., & Hegelheimer, V. (2015). Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 27, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.10.004>
- Li, M. (2013). Individual novices and collective experts: Collective scaffolding in wiki-based small group writing. *System*, 41(3), 752-769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.021>
- Li, M., & Zhu, W. (2017). Explaining dynamic interactions in wiki-based collaborative writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(2), 96-120. <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/writing-linguistics-facpubs/1>
- Li, Z., & Hegelheimer, V. (2013). Mobile-assisted grammar exercises: Effects on self-editing in L2 writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(3), 135-156. <http://lt.msu.edu/issues/october2013/lihegelheimer.pdf>
- Lin, M. H. (2014). Effects of classroom blogging on ESL student writers: An empirical reassessment. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23, 577-590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0131-8>
- Ming Huei Lin. (2015). Learner-centered blogging: A preliminary investigation of EFL student writers' experience. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18(4), 446-458. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.18.4.446>
- Lin, M. H. (2019). Language blogging community: Fostering the learning attitudes and writing skills of EFL students. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(3), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.5539/IJEL.V9N3P1>
- Lin, V., Liu, G. Z., & Chen, N. S. (2022). The effects of an augmented-reality ubiquitous writing application: A comparative pilot project for enhancing EFL writing instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(5-6), 989-1030. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1770291>
- Liou, H.C. (2019). Learner Concordancing for EFL College Writing Accuracy. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43, 165-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00022-5>
- Lucas, M. (2020). Cross-linguistic influence and plural marking: Enhancing error recognition and written accuracy among Japanese EFL learners through web-based awareness-raising. *Language Awareness*, 29(2), 155-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2020.1737096>
- Ma'azi, H. & Janfeshan, K. (2018). The effect of Edmodo social learning network on Iranian EFL learners' writing skills. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), Article1536312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2018.1536312>
- Mak, B., & Coniam, D. (2008). Using wikis to enhance and develop writing skills among secondary school students in Hong Kong. *System*, 36(3), 437-455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.004>
- Mcenery, T., Xiao, R., & Tonio, Y. (2006). *Corpus-based language studies: An advanced resource book*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zrs.2010.050>
- Miftah, M. (2018). Utilisation of Edmodo as an online tool in EFL writing classes to increase students' writing ability. *Register Journal*, 11(1), 37-58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v11i1.28-43>
- Pham, T. N., Lin, M., Trinh, V. Q., & Bui, L. T. P. (2020). Electronic peer feedback, EFL academic writing and reflective thinking: Evidence from a Confucian context. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914554>
- Razak, N.A., & Saeed, M.A. (2014). Collaborative writing revision process among learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) in an online community of practice (CoP). *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 30(5), 580-599. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.786>
- Saeed, M. A., & Al Qunayeer, H. S. (2022). Exploring teacher interactive e-feedback on students' writing through Google Docs: Factors promoting interactivity and potential for learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 50(3), 360-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2020.1786711>
- Saeed, M. A., & Ghazali, K. (2017). Asynchronous group review of EFL writing: Interactions and text revisions. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(2), 200-226. <https://dx.doi.org/10.125/44618>
- Schmid, R. F., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Tamim, R. M., Abrami, P. C., Surkes, M. A., Wade, C. A. Woods, J. (2014). The effects of technology use in postsecondary education: A meta-analysis of classroom applications. *Computers & Education*, 72, 271-291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2013.11.002>
- Schwiehorst, K. (2002). Why virtual? Why environments? Implementing virtual reality concepts in computer-assisted language learning. *Simulation & Gaming*, 33(2) 196-209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046878102332008>
- Selcuk, H., Jones, J., & Vonkova, H. (2019). The emergence and influence of group leaders in web-based collaborative writing: self-reported accounts of EFL learners. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(8), 1040-1060. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1650781>
- Shih, R.-C. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating Facebook and peer assessment with blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(5). <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.934>
- Stoddart, A., Chan, J. Y.-Y., & Liu, G.-Z. (2016). Enhancing successful outcomes of wiki-based collaborative writing: a state-of-the-art review of facilitation frameworks. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 24(1), 142-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2013.825810>



- Su, Y., Liang, J.-C., Zheng, C., & Tsai, C.-C. (2023). Co-regulation strategies and their associations with writing self-efficacy in a computer-mediated collaborative writing setting. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 59, Article 100972. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.100972>
- Susanto, Arifani, Y., Khaja, F. N. M., & Paulina. (2020). Facebook aided lesson study design: Investigating its potentials on EFL students' literature review writing skill. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(4), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.1414a>
- Tsai, Y. R. (2021). Exploring the effects of corpus-based business English writing instruction on EFL learners' writing proficiency and perception. *Journal of Computer in Higher Education*, 33, 475-498. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-021-09272-4>
- Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and Composition*, 21, 217-235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003>
- Wang, Y.-C. (2014). Using wikis to facilitate interaction and collaboration among EFL learners: A social constructivist approach to language teaching. *System*, 42, 383-390. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.007>
- Wang, Y.-C. (2015). Promoting collaborative writing through wikis: A new approach for advancing innovative and active learning in an ESP context. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(6), 499-512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.881386>
- Wihastyanang, W. D., Kusumaningrum, S. R., Latief, M. A., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Impacts of providing online teacher and peer feedback on students' writing performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 21, 178-189. <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.728157>
- Wong, D. (2018). A corpus-based study of peer comments and self-reflections: how did ESL learners use peer comments in an online news writing project? *International Journal of Pedagogy and Curriculum*, 8, 65-90. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJOPCD.2018100105>
- Woo, M.M., Chu, S.K.W., & Li, X. (2013). Peer-feedback and revision process in a Wiki-mediated collaborative writing. *Education Tech Research Dev*, 61, 279-309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-012-9285-y>
- Xu, Q., & Yu, S. (2018). Action research on computer-mediated communication (CMC) peer feedback in EFL writing context. *Asia-Pacific Edu Res*, 27, 207-216. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0379-0>
- Yan, D. (2023). Impact of ChatGPT on learners in an L2 writing practicum: An exploratory investigation. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 13943-13967. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11742-4>
- Yang, Y.-F., Harn, R.-F., & Hwang, G.-H. (2019). Using a Bilingual Concordancer for Text Revisions in EFL Writing. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 22(1), 106-119. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26558832>
- Yeh, SW., Lo, JJ. & Huang, JJ. (2011). Scaffolding collaborative technical writing with procedural facilitation and synchronous discussion. *Computer Supported Learning*, 6, 397-419. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11412-011-9117-9>
- Yeh, Y., Liou, H.-C., & Li, Y.-H. (2007). Online synonym materials and concordance for EFL college writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20(2), 131-152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701331451>
- Yoon, C. (2016). Individual differences in online reference resource consultation: Case studies of Korean ESL graduate writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 67-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.04.002>
- Yusof, J., Ab Manan, N. A., & Alias, A. A. (2012). Guided peer feedback on academic writing tasks using Facebook notes: An exploratory study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 67, 216-228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.11.324>
- Zhang, R., & Zou, D. (2021). Types, features, and effectiveness of technologies in collaborative writing for second language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(9), 2391-2422. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1880441>
- Zhang, S., Shan, C., Lee, J. S. Y., Che, S., & Kim, J. H. (2023). Effects of chatbot-assisted language learning: A meta-analysis. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 15223-15243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11805-6>
- Zheng, B., Lawrence, J., Warschauer, M., & Lin, CH. (2015). Middle school students' writing and feedback in a cloud-based classroom environment. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 20, 201-229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-014-9239-z>
- Zheng, B., & Warschauer, M. (2015). Participation, interaction, and academic achievement in an online discussion environment. *Computers & Education*, 84, 78-89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.01.008>
- Zou, D. & Xie, H. (2019). Flipping an English writing class with technology-enhanced, just-in-time teaching and peer instruction. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 27(8), 1127-1142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1495654>