

INTEGRATING CONTENT AND LANGUAGE TO TEACH ESP ONLINE WRITING WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF GOOGLE DOCS

Susilawati

English Literature Study Program, Faculty of Communication and Language
Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: susilawati.sxw@bsi.ac.id

Article Info	Abstract
Article History Received: November 2022 Revised: December 2022 Published: January 2023	<i>The integration of content knowledge and language should be applied while instructing writing in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) lessons. In an online lesson, additional vital support comes from a proper online writing tool. Therefore, the present study aims to portray how to teach writing in ESP classes using remote Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) combined with Google Docs as an online writing tool. The study employed a qualitative case study. 18 students from the Office Administration major at a private Indonesian university in Central Jakarta were involved in the study. Observations and open-ended questionnaires were used to collect the data. The observations were structured based on the writing stage, while the open-ended questionnaires were arranged based on the Uses and Gratification Expectancy (UGE) constructs. The findings revealed that all CLIL elements are applied to teach ESP writing in a full online learning setting; all 4Cs (communication, culture, content, and cognition) are detected during the learning either before or during the writing via Google Docs. Pertaining to the use of Google Docs, based on the cognitive, affective, personal, and perceived e-learning (PeLE) constructs of the UGE, most students give positive views after using it in their writing classes. In short, CLIL and Google Docs make a good collaboration in teaching ESP writing. Recommendations for potential research are also discussed.</i>
Keywords Content and language integrated learning; ESP writing; Google Docs; UGE model;	
How to cite: Susilawati, S. (2023). Integrating Content and Language to Teach ESP Online Writing with the Assistance of Google Docs, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 11(1), pp. 14-26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.6617	

INTRODUCTION

Learning how to write well in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is crucial for ESP students to acquire. The enhancement of students' writing will direct them to complete their specific needs, either for schooling or work. Writing business letters, presenting reports, and arranging notes or minutes of meetings are activities within the current academic and business routines (Pandey, 2020). In daily instruction, teachers may give a task, or exercise that assists students with the development of their writing skills, since learning a language with a purpose-related orientation will require a number of simulations or exercises (Salmani-Nodoushan, 2020) in an effort to prepare students for real job tasks.

However, learning to write for ESP students may not be as easy as it seems. It is viewed as a complex process due to its rules and ethics (Montaner-Villalba, 2021). Research conducted by Wahyuni et al. (2021) revealed that ESP students might find writing difficult due to low ability in General English (GE), lack of mastery of vocabulary and mechanics, the frequent use of translator machines, as well as limited time to practice writing. On this ground, using appropriate learning approaches to accommodate students' needs in specific languages and suitable writing tools to help them practice is absolutely crucial. In this case study, CLIL and Google Docs are used.

The term "CLIL" (Content and Language Integrated Learning) is defined as an approach with a double intention, teaching content and language at the same time (Marsh & Martín, 2012). In the practice, it is applied when teaching non-language subjects in a foreign language (Georgiou, 2012). This approach is conceptualized in 4 elements (known as 4Cs) consisting of content, communication, cognition, and culture (Coyle et al., 2010) which present flexibility in their uses. Further, CLIL lessons might be delivered either in face-to-face or online classes are acceptable (Birdsell, 2021). Based on the approach element and mode of delivery, this indicates that teachers can teach CLIL classes in a variety of ways.

CLIL in the remote setting has been reported to give a positive impact on ESP learners, either on linguistics or non-linguistics aspects, including HOTS (higher-order thinking skills) and learning motivation (Mukadimah & Sahayu, 2021). To be more specific, CLIL is noticed to promote students' vocabulary mastery (Nugroho, 2020). Based on content, CLIL's authentic materials are viewed as relevant by students, while the language, such as grammar or structure (that students have also learned in their GE materials), helps them finalize their ESP learning (Sulindra, 2019). In a more general scope, research has reported that CLIL suits the need of the Indonesian current curriculum (Rosyida & Effendy, 2022). It is obvious that CLIL offers aids both from the standpoint of language and subject-specific knowledge perspectives.

Supporting the use of CLIL in a remote setting, Google Docs can be blended to accommodate online learning, especially synchronous. This tool provides users with real-time document writing and editing, such as spelling and grammar suggestions. It also enables users to have collaborative writing. Henceforth, Google Docs is beneficial in the development of EFL students' writing skills (Valizadeh, 2022), enables interaction (Handayani & Amelia, 2021; Hsu, 2020), as well as presents peculiar experiences (Hidayat, 2020). The facts infer that Google Docs indisputably creates meaningful learning atmosphere.

The use of Google Docs in writing classes has also received positive feedback from EFL students. In a study conducted by Zaky (2021), students shared their good acceptance of the use of Google Docs due to the feedback they receive. Students also gave positive feedback when using Google Docs to collaboratively compose their essay writing (Handayani & Amelia, 2021). According to Hoang & Hoang (2022), students valued Google Docs-based collaboration for promoting and developing their academic English writing abilities. A group of students in the study conducted by Lin et al., (2016) approved the help that Google Docs' feature offers to immediately edit writing and provide revision history. Assuredly, Google Docs provides beneficent assistance for students to develop writing skills.

The above-listed CLIL studies have analyzed how CLIL is implemented in ESP online learning. Separately, the studies of Google Docs have highlighted how the tool is perceived in writing classes, specifically EFL. This study simultaneously will focus on CLIL implementation and Google Docs use in ESP classes. Going into more detail, this study attempts to portray two foci. The first is how CLIL and Google Docs are combined and implemented in an ESP writing class. The second is how students of ESP writing class view Google Docs use based on the UGE framework.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

The present study employed a qualitative approach. As highlighted by Creswell (2012), qualitative research is viewed as an approach of investigating and comprehending the meaning that individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. As means of investigation or exploration a problem or a case, a case study is preferred (Yin, 2018). It may provide exploration to the whole phenomena (processes, events, activities, individuals) being studied by the use of various instruments to collect data (Creswell, 2012). In this study, the case study design was chosen to portray the ESP class learning situation in a natural and contextual setting.

The subjects in the present study comprised 18 students from an Office Administration study program at one private university in Central Jakarta, Indonesia. They were selected as a result of their enthusiastic engagement and active participation in the CLIL and Google Docs-based business correspondence classes. This study used a purposive sampling technique. It was chosen because the researcher wanted to explore the case with a small number of subjects in depth. In light of this, Creswell (2012), suggests that purposive sampling is an appropriate preference, allowing researchers to choose their participants in line with their research objectives.

Instruments

The present study used two instruments to gather the data. The first is observations, which are used purposefully to portray all activities occurring during the teaching and learning process in a natural setting, or claimed by Bell (2005) to see how people do, say, and behave. The focus of the observations was on the steps of how CLIL 4Cs are applied during the writing session included in the Google Docs. The 4 elements observed are communication, content, cognition, and culture. The second instrument to be employed is open-ended questionnaires. The instruments are chosen due as they provides researchers with a holistic and thorough look at the subjects being examined (Albudaiwi, 2017). The questionnaires are arranged based on the constructs of the UGE adapted from Mondri et al. (2007), which are then realized in seven short answer questions. This model is commonly used to measure someone's level of satisfaction on communication media, such as social media and current technology (Khan et al., 2020) including educational technology. The construct adapted in this study consists of cognitive, affective, personal, and perceived e-learning experience (PeLE). The details of each construct are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
The UGE Construct (adapted from Mondri et al., 2007)

Construct	Question number
Cognitive	1-2
Affective	3
Personal	4
PeLE	5-7

Data Analysis

The data gathered from the observations and questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively using the steps suggested by Creswell (2013). The first step conducted to analyze the data was organizing and preparing the data; the observational data were carefully noted, and the data from open-ended questionnaires were sorted. The second step was to read all of the collected data to determine the overall theme; here, the researcher attempts to determine which learning activities and learning modes demonstrated the application of CLIL elements, as well as the students' tendencies based on the UGE (whether they give positive or negative responses).

The third step was to code the data; the observational data were coded based on the elements of CLIL, while the questionnaire data were classified based on the construct of the UGE. In the fourth step, the researcher presented the data. The researcher combined the use of a table with narration to present the findings. The last step to do was interpreting the data. In this step, the researcher presented her analysis and compared the findings to the previous relevant studies. Further, to confirm the data validity, method triangulation (Creswell, 2012) was applied.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

The Results of the Observations

The first findings show the implementation of CLIL during classes and the infusion of Google Docs as the writing tool. The detailed description is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
The Summary of Writing Process Using CLIL and Google Docs

Writing phase	Description	Platform used	Elements detected
Material delivery	The lecturer presented materials (types of business letters focusing on their purpose, language features, structure, letters' format/template, and examples) using bilingual (English and Indonesian). In the Zoom meeting sessions, not all students turned on the camera. Therefore, the lecturer kept reminding them to turn on the camera and pay attention to the materials. In the learning sessions conducted via WhatsApp discussion, only some students responded to the lecturer's questions or asked questions of the lecturer; the rest were silent readers. The lecturer then frequently asked them to be actively engaged in the learning session.	WhatsApp application or Zoom Meetings	Communication Content Culture
Planning	The students were assigned the task of writing a business letter and then asked to create an outline for the letter.	LMS owned by the campus	Content Cognition
Drafting	The students wrote their first draft letter in Google Docs.	Google Docs	Content Cognition
Revising	The lecturer gave feedback to the students' business letters by making comments on the incorrect parts of the letters, and then the students were asked to revise the letters. Some were observed to revise their writing based on the lecturer's feedback, but some others ignored the feedback. The lecturer was observed warning them that they should revise the letter.	Google Docs	Communication Content Cognition Culture
Editing/ proofreading	The lecturer rereads the students' work; if mistakes are still identified, the students should revise their letters before submitting the final draft to the campus LMS. The lecturer rereads the students' work; if mistakes are still identified, the students should revise their letters before submitting the final draft to the campus LMS.	Google Docs	Content Cognition
Publishing	The students published their final draft. However, some of them submitted their work on time, while others did not. The lecturer usually repeats the consequence of the behavior that will affect their final score.	LMS owned by the campus	Communication Culture

From the table above, it is visible that communication takes place three times. Content has the highest frequency with 5 visits. The cognition element has been detected four times. Culture happens three times during the learning process. In particular, the communication element emerges during the material delivery, revising, and publishing phases. Content is noticed in almost all stages except publishing. Cognition is detected in many stages of the writing process. It appeared in the planning, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading processes. The last element identified is culture. It has been observed that culture comes up in the stages of material delivery, revision, and publishing.

The Results of the Questionnaire

The present study also aims at investigating the students' views on the use of Google Docs based on the UGE constructs. The results of the open-ended questionnaire is reported in Table 3.

Table 3
The Students' Views on the Use of Google Docs

Construct	Question	Students' answer	
		Yes	No
	1. I got new knowledge of learning to write business letters in English using Google Docs. What new knowledge did you feel when you first wrote a letter using Google Docs?	18 students - First time using Google Docs - Compatible in many devices - Direct checking and feedback from the lecturer - Collaborative writing - More organized and accurate writing	Still confused
Cognitive	2. Do you think the features in Google Docs help you to write business letters in English? What features in Google Docs help you to write business letters in English?	17 students - Auto saving mode - Document easy converting to PDF format - Auto translation mode - Comment feature for the lecturer to give direct feedback, - Similar to Ms. Word formatting - Writing by voice recognition - Suggestion mode for writing style - Tagging other writers	1 student Still confused
Affective	3. Do you enjoy using Google Docs to write business letters in English? State the reasons why you like/dislike using Google Docs to write business letters in English.	17 students - Triggering students to write - Can be accessed anywhere and anytime - Efficient writing - New experience	1 student - Sometimes the text disappears - Cannot be used in offline mode

Construct	Question	Students' answer	
		Yes	No
			- Classmates can steal our ideas
Personal	4. Writing business letters in English in Google Docs is easy for you	15 students	3 students
	Explain your reasons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Helpful features (translation feature, grammar correction mode) - User friendly (similar to Ms. Word use) - The lecturer gave clear explanation - Sharing writing inspiration with other students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A bit difficult for formatting margin - A bit confusing
	5. Google Docs allows me to always learn to write English letters anytime and anywhere.	18 students	
	Explain your reasons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy use (mobile friendly) - Flexible access - Helpful at language structuring 	
PeLE	6. Do the feedback and suggestions from lecturers in Google Docs help you to write business letters in English?	16 students	2 students
	What kind of feedback and suggestions helped you to write a business letter in English?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy to understand - Easy comprehending instruction - Language use/structure - Vocabulary 	Nothing
	7. Have you got troubles writing business letters in English using Google Docs?	11 students	7 students
	If yes, elaborate/describe the problems you face.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table feature - Auto logging out - Cursor feature does not work well - Cannot find signature feature - Bandwidth 	

Based on the cognitive construct, when asked about new knowledge gained from learning to write with Google Docs, all students (18) agree that they find new insight from it. The 17 students further express their approval that Google Docs has helped them with the business letters' writing, while 1 student does not agree. In the affective construct, 17 students acknowledge that they enjoy using Google Docs in their writing class, but 1 student does not

agree with the statement. Personally, most students (15) approve that writing business letters using Google Docs is easy for them, but others (2) state it is not. Based on the perceived e-learning construct, first, all students (nineteen) agree that using Google Docs makes them learn anytime and anywhere. Second, most students (16) also accept that feedback and suggestions given by the lecturer in Google Docs are helpful for them, while the others (2) think the feedback does not help them. Third, having been asked whether they encountered troubles when using Google Docs, most of them (11 students) say yes, while the rest (7) do not find any difficulties at all. Reasons why the students agree or disagree are also presented in the table.

Discussion

Teaching ESP writing using CLIL combined with Google Docs

The first focus of the present study is to find out how CLIL is implemented in an ESP writing class by the assistance of Google Docs. The results of observation signify that to teach writing in an ESP class using CLIL, the lecturer applies all CLIL elements during the learning process including when they use Google Docs as the online writing tool.

The CLIL 4Cs elements are applied more than once with varying frequencies. The lecturer uses her pedagogical and knowledge competence to determine what elements should come first and what elements should be repeated the most. This shows that the elements can be used in a variety of ways by the lecturer in order to achieve the learning objectives and provide students with meaningful learning. Rodríguez (2018) sees that the flexibility offered by CLIL will assist educators with either successful learning or equipping students with beneficial skills for their academic and professional futures. Each element of the 4Cs is discussed below.

Communication

The communication element emerges in the phases of material delivery, revision, and publication. When delivering materials, the lecturer presents the materials and opens a discussion with the students. The learning platforms used to deliver the materials are the WhatsApp application and Zoom Meetings. By using those media, the lecturer and her students are able to have real-time written and direct oral communication. The lecturer delivers materials by first emphasizing the communication element to make sure that the students are ready for the content of the subject, so the class will be livelier and more interactive. Students can pick up the target language and put it to use by interacting with one another and their teachers in communication-based learning environments (Hussain, 2022).

The second communication occurs when the lecturer gives feedback to the students' writing in Google Docs; the communication is a written communication in which the lecturer utilizes interactive or dialogic feedback facilitated by Google Docs feature (Mohammed & Al-Jaberi, 2021; Saeed & Al Qunayeer, 2022). The lecturer is observed to frequently use the feature "adding comments" to give feedback to the students. Some of the students sometimes reply to the comments, but mostly they just revise the writing based on the feedback. Communication also occurs when students submit their writing to the campus LMS, where the lecturer usually provides more feedback or appreciation for their work; however, this communication is one-way because the LMS does not provide a feature to reply to the lecturer's message. To accommodate students with low levels of proficiency, the lecturer frequently uses bilinguals. This practice is considered appropriate as CLIL is intended for bilingual education by integrating the content of particular fields with their respective languages (Morton, 2018; Sampaio et al., 2021).

Content

Content is noticed in almost all stages except publishing. In the material delivery stage, the content delivered by the lecturer comprises types of business letters with their communicative purposes, language features, structure, letters' format and template, and

examples, which are categorized as content knowledge (Lozada, 2016). Examples of letters are presented to illuminate and give models to students so they can try to recreate letters with similar tones. In the planning stage, the lecturer frequently presents another example of a letter to recall the students' understanding before they start to make the letter's outline. This content modeling is seen as appropriate regarding its effectiveness (Efrianto et al., 2022).

In the drafting stage, the students start to write their first draft in Google Docs. They use the same link when writing their own letters. The lecturer is observed to ensure that the students write based on the letters' purposes, format, template, relevant phrases and vocabulary, and correct grammar. The same content is also checked by the lecturer in the revising stage; here, the students are given written corrective feedback in Google Docs (Yunus, 2020). The feedback generally focuses on the listed content, completed by the structure or grammar, choice of vocabulary, and language style used in the letter.

Cognition

Cognition is identified in the planning, drafting, revising, editing, and proofreading processes. When writing their first draft, the students are required to interpret the task's instructions, such as identifying the sender of letters, the addressees, the purpose of writing the letter, and specific information to be conveyed in the letters. Here the students' HOTS (Krathwohl, 2002) of understanding (C2) and analyzing (C4) are tested while evaluating (C5) and producing (C6) mostly take place in the revising and editing stage.

Cognition is also seen in the revising stage, in which the students are required to correct their letters based on the lecturer's feedback in Google Docs' "adding comments" feature. For the students with high language competence, the lecturer frequently gives feedback and then asks them to explore the exact correction by themselves, such as "pay attention to your spelling." This is expected to enlighten students with metacognitive information (Hanan et al., 2022) before they revise the text. However, for those who are categorized as low achievers, the lecturer directly gives suggestions to them, such as by saying, "Not dear, but dear." Here the lecturer uses explicit and implicit feedback (Babanoğlu et al., 2018), distinguishing the receiver of each type of feedback based on their language competence. Further, synchronous interactive feedback facilitated by Google Docs is reported to affect the accuracy of students' texts in the revising stage (Saeed & Al Qunayeer, 2022).

Cognition is also viewed in the editing or proofreading stage. If the students' letters have not been completely correct, they will be asked to have another revision before submitting the letters to the campus LMS. This practice is applied to enable the students to explore more accurate language structures. It is expected that the students will experience meaningful acquisition of the correspondence content and its language simultaneously (Walenta in Wilkinson, 2018).

Culture

The last element to discuss is culture. It has been observed that culture comes up in the stages of material delivery, revision, and publishing. The lecturer seems to keep reminding her students about what they should do and the consequences if they do not follow her instructions. In the material delivery stage, the lecturer asks for her students to actively engage themselves; for example, during the Zoom meeting sessions, they were asked to turn on the camera and pay attention to the materials being delivered, while during the WhatsApp learning session, the lecturer usually mentioned the students' names to make them come to the discussion. When revising, some students finish the revision, but some other students just ignore it. The lecturer again asks them to have a revision before they submit the letters. She also warns the students about the consequences of not submitting their task.

It seems that the lecturer works quite hard to encourage the cultural awareness of some students during the classes. Being ignorant and refusing to engage in learning is the big

homework until the end of the course. This type of obstacle may be due to demotivation or a lack of face-to-face interaction (Yang & Yang, 2022). The finding of the present research is a bit contrary to the common challenges faced by CLIL teachers, which are frequently about CLIL teachers' competence, resources (Le & Nguyen, 2022), learning strategies, and teachers' support (Lazarević, 2022).

Students' views on the use of Google Docs

The second focus of this present study is on scrutinizing the ESP students' views on the use of Google Docs in their classes. Most students show positive views on the use of Google Docs in their ESP class, according to the UGE construct adapted from Mondri et al. (2007). They feel assisted by the use of the online tool in writing business correspondence. Generally, this finding corresponds to the discovery of previous studies signifying students' favorable acceptance of Google Docs to facilitate their writing (Alharbi, 2020; Handayani & Amelia, 2021). Cognitively, all students approve that they find new insight from using Google Docs, as it is known that they first use Google Docs in this subject. However, when asked about the new knowledge, one student feels confused about the new thing he finds in Google Docs, while most students list the new knowledge they get from Google Docs, such as the first time using it, its compatibility, direct checking and feedback from the lecturer, collaborative writing, and more organized writing. The concurring opinions are in harmony with some previous research discovery, which highlights that Google Docs gives students a meaningful experience (Hidayat, 2020), its compatibility with mobile applications improves writing skills (Gharehblagh & Nasri, 2020). It also provides direct feedback that allows synchronous writing revision (Lin et al., 2016), and enables writing together with peers (Valizadeh, 2022).

Most students also admit that Google Docs has assisted them with the business letter's writing so that it enhances their written productive skills (Alwahoub et al., 2022). They declare that all features are helpful; they are assisted by auto saving mode, easy document conversion to PDF format, auto translation mode, a comment feature for the lecturer to give feedback, similar to MS Word formatting, writing by voice recognition, suggestion mode for writing style, and tagging other writers. Still, one student mentions that he is still confused with the use of Google Docs. Affectively, most students acknowledge that they enjoy using Google Docs in their writing class, but one student does not agree with the statement. When asked why they write, 14 of them state that Google Docs motivates them to write because of its flexibility, efficiency, and new experience in learning to write business correspondence, while three students say that sometimes the text disappears, the application cannot be used in offline mode, and sometimes working together gives some students the idea to copy and paste other students' work. In short, they generally love to use Google Docs for writing business letters. This result corresponds to the research conducted by Mohammed & Al-Jaberi (2021), emphasizing that Google Docs has promoted students' engagement.

Personally, most students approve that writing business letters using Google Docs is easy for them. It has helpful features, is user-friendly, and is completed with clear direction and explanation from the lecturer, making them feel assisted in writing their business letters. They also say that writing becomes easier because they can share writing inspiration with their friends during collaborative writing (Haerazi & Kazemian, 2021; Kazemian et al., 2021). In short, the students value the usefulness of Google Docs in their class (Asih et al., 2022). However, the rest of the students (3) notice that Google Docs does not help them set the margin of their letters, and some features are a bit confusing (Hoang & Hoang, 2022).

Based on the construct of PeLE, the students say that, first, all students agree that using Google Docs makes them learn anytime and anywhere due to its ease of use, flexibility, and assistance with language structuring. Previous research has demonstrated that Google Docs offers conveniences such as accessibility and flexibility (Mukhtar et al., 2020) as a part of supporting an online writing environment (Li & Mak, 2022; Hadi et al., 2021). Second, most

students (16) also accept that feedback and suggestions given directly by the lecturer in the Google Docs comment box are helpful for them; the feedback they prefer is easy-to-understand feedback, feedback with comprehensive instruction, feedback on language use or structure, and the choice of vocabulary. Only two students state that the lecturer's feedback does not help them. The opinion exhibits that the students feel assisted by the feedback provided by the lecturer (Handayani & Amelia, 2021; Wismanto et al., 2022), especially feedback that focuses on grammar and vocabulary (Zaky, 2021; Erickson, 2022).

Third, having been asked whether they encountered troubles when using Google Docs, most of them (11 students) say yes, while the rest (7 students) do not find any difficulties at all. The 11 students mention the troubles they most encounter when using Google Docs: difficult formatting of the table feature, frequent auto-logging out, inappropriate use of the cursor, no feature for letter signatures, and bandwidth. This confirms the research conducted by Hoang & Hoang (2022) that students may also find difficulties when using Google Docs.

CONCLUSION

Writing in the ESP environment may be a challenging task for some students to perform. Therefore, equipping ESP students with sufficient writing skills is crucial to attaining their academic or professional goals in the future. The integration of content and language is predicted to address their needs. Supports from accurate digital writing tools is also crucial. The present study has portrayed how content and language in the CLIL framework are integrated into an ESP writing class with the infusion of Google Docs as the online writing tool. The CLIL elements are detected prior to, during, and after the writing process. There is no specific pattern for how all elements are used, as the approach offers flexibility for educators to use, explore, and enhance their teaching.

Most of the students in the present study also share their positive views (cognitively, affectively, personally, and PeLE) toward the use of Google Docs in their business correspondence writing class. Google Docs has provided the students with assisting features that enable them to learn writing synchronously in a remote environment. In short, an accommodating learning environment can be created by combining CLIL with Google Docs. Blended, hybrid, or even offline learning environment may also adapt the combination of them. Future research might focus on cultural sensitivity in online mode, which appears to be lacking in this case study, in order to get a more complete depiction of CLIL implementation. Continuous use and effectiveness of Google Docs in ESP classes is also worth investigating.

REFERENCES

- Albudaiwi, D. (2017). *The SAGE encyclopedia of communication research methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483381411> NV - 4
- 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>
- Alwahoub, H. M., Jomaa, N. J., & Azmi, M. N. L. (2022). The impact of synchronous collaborative writing and Google Docs collaborative features on enhancing students' individual writing performance. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46541>
- Asih, H. K., Degeng, P. D. D., & Hamamah, H. (2022). Exploring EFL students' perspectives towards Google Docs in writing. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 984–1000. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v10i1.2841>
- Babanoğlu, M. P., Ağçam, R., & Badem, N. (2018). Explicit and implicit written corrective

- feedback in higher EFL education: Evidence from Turkey. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 19(3), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.17679/inuefd.364809>
- Bell, J. (2005). *Doing your research project* (4th ed.). Open University Press.
- Birdsell, B. J. (2021). CLIL in the times of COVID-19 : Content , communication, and creative cognition in remote learning. *The Journal of the Japan CLIL Pedagogy Association*, 3(April), 134–149.
- Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among the five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Efrianto, Boeriswati, E., & Lustyantje, N. (2022). The effectiveness of the modeling method in learning writing poetry skills. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(4), 2147–2155.
- Erickson, E. (2022). An Analysis of Writers' Errors in Producing Descriptive Texts; Intercultural Studies. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(3), 444. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i3.5389>
- Georgiou, S. I. (2012). Reviewing the puzzle of CLIL. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 495–504. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs047>
- Gharehblagh, N. M., & Nasri, N. (2020). Developing EFL elementary learners' writing skills through mobile-assisted language learning (MALL). *Teaching English with Technology*, 20(1), 104–121.
- Haerazi, H., & Kazemian, M. (2021). Self-Regulated Writing Strategy as a Moderator of Metacognitive Control in Improving Prospective Teachers' Writing Skills. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 1(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v1i1.498>
- Hadi, M. S., Izzah, L., & Putra, A. D. (2021). Analysis of the Use of Banksy Image in Improving Students' Writing Skill. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 9(4), 519. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v9i4.4005>
- Hanan, A., Firman, E., & Terasne, T. (2022). Investigating English lecturers' strategies of committing online written corrective feedback during Covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(1), 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i1.4471>
- Handayani, F., & Amelia, M. (2021). Google Docs for collaborative essay writing practices during Covid-19 university restrictions: EFL students' perceptions. *Modality Journal: International Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.30983/mj.v1i1.4504>
- Hidayat, F. (2020). Exploring students' view of using Google Docs in writing class. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 4(2), 184–194.
- 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>
- Hsu, H.-C. (2020). The impact of task complexity on patterns of interaction during web-based asynchronous collaborative writing tasks. *System*, 93, 102328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102328>
- Hussain, S. S. (2022). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in ELT as a link between language learning and content development. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(2), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.26>
- Kazemian, M., Irawan, L. A., & Haerazi, H. (2021). Developing Metacognitive Writing Strategy to Enhance Writing Skills Viewed from Prospective Teachers' Critical

- Thinking Skills. *Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 1(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v1i1.499>
- Khan, B. Y., Faqir, K., Shahzad, M. A., Khan, A., & Khan, R. A. (2020). Uses of social media and needs gratification of university students in Pakistan. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(4), 7047–7063. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.04.765109>
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 212–218. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4104_2
- Lazarević, N. (2022). CLIL teachers' reflections and attitudes: surviving at the deep end. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 25(2), 571–584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1703897>
- Le, N. P., & Nguyen, P. (2022). Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) method and how it is changing the foreign language learning landscape. *Open Access Library Journal*, 09(e8381), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1108381>
- Li, J., & Mak, L. (2022). The effects of using an online collaboration tool on college students' learning of academic writing skills. *System*, 105, 102712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102712>
- Lin, Y.-T., Chang, C.-H., Hou, H.-T., & Wu, K.-C. (2016). Exploring the effects of employing Google Docs in collaborative concept mapping on achievement, concept representation, and attitudes. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 24(7), 1552–1573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2015.1041398>
- Lozada, H. R. (2016). English for Specific Purposes (ESP) didactics: Content knowledge and communicative abilities. *Conference Proceedings International Congress on the Didactics of the English Language*, 1–13. <https://revistas.pucese.edu.ec/ICDEL/article/view/31%0Ahttps://revistas.pucese.edu.ec/ICDEL/article/download/31/40>
- Marsh, D., & Martín, M. J. F. (2012). Content and language integrated learning. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0190>
- Mohammed, M. A. S., & Al-Jaberi, M. A. (2021). Google Docs or Microsoft Word? Master's students' engagement with instructor written feedback on academic writing in a cross-cultural setting. *Computers and Composition*, 62, 102672. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2021.102672>
- Mondi, M., Woods, P., & Rafi, A. (2007). Students' 'uses and gratification expectancy' conceptual framework in relation to E-learning resources. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8(3), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03026472>
- Montaner-Villalba, S. (2021). Students' perceptions of ESP academic writing skills through flipped learning during Covid-19. *Journal of Language and Education*, 7(4), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.17323/JLE.2021.11901>
- Morton, T. (2018). Reconceptualizing and describing teachers' knowledge of language for content and language integrated learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(3), 275–286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1383352>
- Mukadimah, H., & Sahayu, W. (2021). Embedding Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) into English for specific purposes curriculum for vocational high school. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, 11(2), 204–212. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpv.v11i2.41065>
- Mukhtar, K., Javed, K., Arooj, M., & Sethi, A. (2020). Advantages, limitations and recommendations for online learning during covid-19 pandemic era. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, 36(COVID19-S4), S27–S31. <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.COVID19-S4.2785>
- Nugroho, A. (2020). Content and Language Integrated Learning practice in English for

- accounting course. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, 9(2), 172–181. <https://doi.org/10.15642/IJET2.2020.9.2.172-181>
- Pandey, G. P. (2020). Unpacking writing needs of Nepalese university students. *International Journal of Languages and Literary Studies*, 2(2), 257–269. <http://ijlls.org/index.php/ijlls>
- Rodríguez, M. S. (2018). The flexibility of a CLIL teacher. *Anglisticum Journal*, 7(5), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1272645>
- Rosyida, E., & Effendy, M. B. (2022). Using CLIL-based English materials development for business and marketing in vocational high school. *JETLE (Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning)*, 3(2), 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v3i2.15646>
- 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>
- Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (2020). English for specific purposes: Traditions, trends, directions. *SIELE: Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(1), 247–268. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i1.16342>
- Sampaio, C., Régio, M., & Morgado, M. (2021). Implementing Integrated Content and Language in higher education in accounting classes: Implication for international business teaching. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 32(3–4), 236–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2022.2033668>
- Sulindra, E. (2019). Teaching English for Specific Purposes: Content language acquisition vs general language acquisition. *Beyond Words*, 7(2), 122–136. <https://doi.org/10.33508/bw.v7i2.1835>
- Valizadeh, M. (2022). Collaborative writing on Google Docs: Effects on EFL learners' descriptive paragraphs. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 6(2), 277–287.
- Wahyuni, D. S., Darmansyah, D., & J, F. Y. (2021). Writing skills deficiency in English for specific purposes (Esp): English for computer science. *Journal of Applied Studies in Language*, 5(1), 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.31940/jasl.v5i1.2385>
- Wilkinson, R. (2018). Content and language integration at universities? Collaborative reflections. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 21(5), 607–615. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1491948>
- Wismanto, A., Suyoto, S., & Ulumuddin, A. (2022). Developing an Instruction Model for News Writing Based on the Cooperatif Type Group Investigation Strategy. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 10(2), 174. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i2.4956>
- Yang, W., & Yang, L. (2022). Evaluating learners' satisfaction with a distance online CLIL lesson during the pandemic. *English Teaching & Learning*, 46(2), 179–201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-021-00091-5>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA Sage.
- Yunus, W. N. M. W. M. (2020). Written corrective feedback in English compositions: Teachers' practices and students' expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 3(2), 95. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i2.2255>
- Zaky, H. (2021). Google Docs in undergraduate online composition class: Investigating learning styles' impact on writing corrective feedback. *Asian Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 4(1), 65–84. <https://doi.org/10.34256/ajir2117>