

Using Google Bard to Promote the Writing Skills and Motivation of High School EFL

Dina Ziad Qasem Awadit*

Received 10/11/2023

Accepted 3/2/2024

Abstract:

This research aimed to investigate how using the Google Bard can improve the writing skills and motivation of high school EFL students. The study took place in Mafraq City at Rehab Secondary School during the first semester of 2023/2024. A quasi-experimental research design was used, with two groups chosen randomly between the ages of 16 and 18 (experimental and control). To assess writing skills and motivation, pre and post tests were utilized. Reliable and valid measurement instruments were employed. Both groups completed the pretest and motivation scale initially. Then the experimental group received instruction using the Google Bard while the control group followed regular instructions. After completing the program both groups underwent a post test. Completed the motivation scale again. A t test was used to compare scores. The results indicate that students who frequently utilized Google Bard demonstrated improvement in content organization, language usage and mechanics effectively. Employing Google Bard can be an approach for improving EFL writing skills and fostering motivation, among secondary school students.

Keywords: Google Bard, EFL Writing Skills, EFL students' Motivation, EFL students', High School.



The Ministry of Education\ Jordan\ Diawadit93@gmail.com *

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

استخدام جوجل بارد لتعزيز مهارات الكتابة والدافعية لدى طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في المدارس الثانوية

دينا زياد قاسم العويدات *

ملخص:

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى استكشاف تأثير استخدام جوجل بارد في تحسين مهارات الكتابة والدافعية لدى طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة ثانية في المرحلة الثانوية. وأجريت الدراسة في مدينة المفرق بمدرسة رحاب الثانوية للبنات خلال الفصل الدراسي الأول من العام الدراسي 2023-2024. تم استخدام تصميم بحث شبه تجريبي، إذ تم اختيار مجموعتين عشوائيًا بين سن 16 و18 عامًا (تجريبية وضابطة). لتقييم مهارات الكتابة والدافعية، تم استخدام اختبار قبلي والاختبار البعدي. وتم استخدام أدوات قياس موثوقة وفعالة. أكملت المجموعتان الاختبار القبلي ومقياس الدافعية في البداية. بعد ذلك، تلقت المجموعة التجريبية التعليم باستخدام جوجل بارد. بينما اتبعت المجموعة الضابطة التعليمات الاعتيادية. بعد إكمال البرنامج، خضعت كلتا المجموعتين لاختبار بعدي. وأكملت المجموعتان (الضابطة والتجريبية) مقياس الدافعية مرة أخرى. تم استخدام اختبار المقارنة النتائج. أشارت النتائج إلى أن الطلاب الذين استخدموا جوجل بارد بشكل متكرر أظهروا تحسناً فعالاً في تنظيم المحتوى واستخدام اللغة والياتها. ويمكن أن يكون استخدام جوجل بارد نهجاً لتحسين مهارات كتابة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة ثانية وتعزيز الدافعية بين طلاب المدارس الثانوية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: جوجل بارد، مهارات الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، الدافعية لطلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، المرحلة الثانوية.

* وزارة التربية والتعليم/الأردن/ Diawadit93@gmail.com

Introduction

Writing was initially defined as a means of communication involving symbols or visual signs. Brown (2001, 335) highlighted that "a simplistic view of writing would assume that written language is simply graphic representation of spoken language". According to Helal (2003) writing is considered as a tool for learners to present themselves and convey their philosophy. The writing skill of a student can be evaluated through their ability to write two brief paragraphs about a given text. The first paragraph should serve as a summary while the second paragraph should capture the student's response and opinion on the content of the text as stated by Sangcharoon (2010).

Writing is an effort to uncover our thoughts and express ourselves. It serves to explore our ideas, record them, and convey our thoughts and emotions. The process of writing involves capturing the concepts we gather from reading, weaving them together into a text and then revisiting it to ensure it accurately reflects what we truly intend to communicate. Teachers play a role in assisting students with organizing their ideas and using proper language forms. Writing is a skill that does not enhance students thinking abilities but also reinforces their comprehension of written and spoken language. Moreover, writing is not valuable in its merit but also because it facilitates the integration of all four language skills through activities, like summarizing and note taking. These activities can be combined with reading as they prompt students to reconsider their thoughts and articulate them effectively (Hess, 2001).

Bachani (2010, 4) defined the process approach as an approach that involves stages starting from generating ideas to express them. These stages include pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing. Thus, many teachers have expressed enthusiasm for the process approach because the main concern is the learner, which encourages students to think while offering support and guidance throughout the writing process. For instance, Zamel (1983:147) held that "writing is a process through which students can explore their thoughts" He also thought that writing involves the process of thinking and students can gain a deal from engaging in this activity. As, per Nemouchi (2008) The main goal of this approach is to educate students, on generating ideas for writing arranging those ideas considering the intended audience and then crafting and revising their work in order to create a written piece that effectively communicates their views.

However, Badger and White (2000) had raised criticisms regarding

the process approach. One major concern is that it tends to treat the writing process as applicable of what is being written or who is doing the writing. Additionally, it may not adequately address the importance of purpose and social context when it comes to crafting a piece of written work.

In order to address these limitations, the Genre Approach emerged. According to Swales (1990; 22) a genre can be defined as "a class of communication events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes". As stated by Hyland in 2003, language is continually situated within cultural contexts. Consequently, it cannot be comprehended in isolation, from its surrounding environment. In this approach writers are tasked with creating texts that effectively address the context and cater to an audience. The Genre Approach has shifted the focus from the process of composition to the interplay, between discourse and the contextual utilization of language. The main concern of this approach is then to teach students particular genres that. they need to employ them in particular contexts. This might include a focus on the language and discourse features of the texts as well as the context in which the text is produced (Nemouchi, 2008, pp. 92-3). Through the Genre Approach writing is viewed as a social endeavor that aims to connect with an audience, in exact circumstances.

The Process Genre Approach has emerged as a way to combine two approaches: the Process Approach and the Genre Approach. The main goal of this approach is to assist students in their writing process by following stages and considering the goal and context. According to Badger & White (2000) This unique model allows students to delve into the connection between purpose and structure in a genre. It involves stages, such as brainstorming writing a draft, revising, and editing. In the end this method will foster students' creativity. Deepen their grasp of genres.

Writing promotes thinking and learning while fostering communication and providing an opportunity for self-examination (Abu Rass, 2001). Even though teachers put in their effort to teach writing, students' compositions often still lack correctness, different construction, and effective usage. (Wan g, 2005:24) The main cause of this situation is that the learners have not actively participated in their learning process. They have not been encouraged to develop self-reliance skills. In order to help students devote their efforts to language. Students should have a desire to learn and become involved in learning. (Wang, 2005:24).

Erkan & Saban (2011:35) mentioned that "since writing is an active,

production skill, students learning to write in a foreign language face multiple challenge. They stated that the difficulty of teaching writing stems from the following three factors: the difficult nature of the writing skill itself, the difficulty of teaching writing to foreign language learners, and the difficulty of teaching writing to prospective teachers of English". They also asserted that the idea of dealing with Writing as a task for students who enrolled in writing courses causing them to feel anxious. This anxiety can prevent them from having a positive attitude towards writing.

As Al Khasawneh (2010) precisely highlighted Arab students who are learning English still encounter challenges, especially in writing. One such challenge is the difficulty in organizing their ideas due to the newness of the experience. As specified by Al Khasawneh foreign language learners can only truly succeed if their language learning environment incorporates opportunities for practicing the language.

Other studies attribute the difficulties to both teachers and the English learning environment. According to Abbad (1988) these difficulties arise from ineffective teaching procedures and the learning circumstances itself. In Jordan English is typically not utilized beyond school settings.

EFL learners encounter challenges and obstacles when it comes to developing their writing skills. Numerous studies have highlighted these difficulties. For example, students may struggle with the processes involved in organizing their thoughts, generating ideas, and expressing them in coherent sentences (Richards & Renandya 2003). Another complex issue for learners is finding the words. Using grammar accurately to ensure cohesive and coherent writing. Furthermore, factors like self-confidence, distrust, apprehension, and fear of unsucccess can negatively impact students' ability to write effectively. Moreover, a lack of motivation to write poses another barrier for students seeking to enhance their EFL writing competences (Allen, Crossley, Snow & McNamara 2014).

Motivation plays a role, in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classes being essential for learning. It holds importance as it aids students in learning, retaining information and actively participating in the learning process. Additionally, motivation helps individuals understand the reasons behind their learning journey and how it influences language acquisition. Recognizing this connection enables teachers to make the most out of their teaching efforts by aligning them with students' passions and interests (Anwaruddin, 2013; Loima & Vibulphol 2016).

Wery and Thomson (2013) highlighted the importance of motivation in the classroom when it comes to enhancing students' language abilities. In order to achieve desired results, it is crucial to inspire students from both internal perspectives. The progress made in information, communication, and technology (ICT) has offered educators avenues, for teaching English language skills to learners.

Artificial intelligence is widely regarded as a groundbreaking innovation of our time. It has successfully integrated into aspects of our lives from automated electronic applications to computer systems that efficiently process data and store files (Ma, Yizhi & Siau 2018).

Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to the utilization of technology to perform tasks and assignments that involve the replication of intelligence. Luckin, et al. (2016) defined AI as "Computer systems that have been designed to interact with the world through capabilities (for example, visual perception and speech, recognition and intelligent behaviors) assessing the available information and then taking the most sensible action to achieve a stated goal) that we would think of as essentially human" (p. 14).

AI powered tools have become increasingly valuable in language learning because of the effects they bring to learners. Azevedo et al. (2020) shared their perspective on this matter stating that "AI-powered tools in education are seen as potentially beneficial to both students and teachers since they offer the opportunity to experience personalized, flexible, inclusive, and engaging learning. They also provide teachers and learners with the tools that allow them to respond to how it is being learned, and how the student feels rather than what is being learned"(P. 8).

AI powered tools have an influence on both the learning environment and the independence of learners. For example, Aly (2020) elaborated on the advantages of utilizing AI powered tools in language learning and evaluation emphasizing that "AI and flipped learning amalgamate in the blended classes and this combination provides many positive impacts to the learning of the language. In terms of self-efficacy, it was found that students were more positive in learning English. Students' extrinsic motivation was higher compared to intrinsic motivation in that the former factor "(P.4).

AI can be used to improve motivation and enhance the teaching and learning experiences, in the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). There is AI applications specifically designed to boost learner motivation.

In a study conducted by Muhammad (2014) The focus was on identifying AI applications that contribute to learner motivation. The study explored tools, such as systems, neural networks, algorithm development applications, electronic self-assessment tools, adaptive platforms and sophisticated control systems. It provided an overview of how AI tools are widely utilized in diverse educational settings.

When it comes to using Artificial Intelligence in education and English language learning, it is important to have designed plans and strategies that cater to the needs of students. Al Mukhallafis (2020) research examined the perspective of students, regarding the use of AI for improving English language skills. The study employed an approach revealing the impact of AI on teaching and learning from a student's point of view. It emphasized the need for incorporating AI applications within foreign language education. Similarly, Abdel Khalek, Mawgoud & Ahmed (2020) conducted research on EFL education. Identified ten key applications that can enhance teaching and learning experiences. These applications include learning techniques, automated grading systems, chatbot assistance, virtual campus communities, data analysis tools, personalized learning approaches, proctoring systems, intelligent content delivery methods, virtual facilitators, for guidance and PopBots.

Utilizing AI in the context of teaching English as a language (EFL) addresses challenges encountered in both instruction and learning. As mentioned by Radwan (2017) these advantages encompass benefits. "building the ability to comprehend reading passages, developing translation skills, correct pronunciation, used for blind and visually impaired students, developing student's vocabulary, developing speaking skills, and developing essay writing" (p.2).

Despite the abundance of resources to support students in enhancing their writing abilities there is a concern regarding the difficulties faced by high school students studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL) when it comes to writing assignments. This struggle often hampers their motivation preventing them from honing their skills and achieving desired results. Hence the purpose of this research is to explore how Google Bard, an AI driven platform can effectively tackle this challenge by promoting both the development of writing skills and heightened motivation, among EFL high school students.

Statement of the Problem

High school students who are learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) often encounter difficulties when it comes to tackling writing

assignments. The content organization, language usage, grammar intricacies and mechanics can be overwhelming leading to frustration and a decrease, in their motivation to improve. While traditional teaching methods offer resources, they may not always cater effectively to the needs and learning styles of these students.

This research explores the potential of Google Bard, an AI powered platform in bridging this gap and reigniting students' enthusiasm for writing. Bards' distinctive features include feedback engaging exercises and tailored guidance that promise an inspiring learning experience specifically designed for EFL students unique challenges.

Questions of the study

- Are there any statistical differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups due to method of teaching (regular method, Google board) on writing skills?
- Are there any significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups due to method of teaching (regular method, Google board) on student motivation?

Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study is to examine the effect of using Google Board on high school EFL students' writing skills and motivation.

Limitations of the study:

- The results of the study are limited to the following points:
- The population of the study is related to the high school EFL students who studied English at Rhib Secondary School, in the first semester of the academic year 2023/2024.
- This study used (Google Board) strategy.
- It is limited to observing students' writing skills and their motivation toward the suggested strategy of using Google Board.
- The duration of the study is limited to a period of 16 weeks.
- Aspects of writing skills are limited to spelling, grammar and organizing.

Significance of the Study:

Addressing the issue discussed in this study, which focuses on enhancing the writing skills and motivation of high school English, as a Foreign Language (EFL) student through the utilization of Google Board holds importance for reasons. Firstly, writing is a skill that plays a role in academic and professional achievements. However, many high school EFL

students encounter difficulties in developing and mastering this skill due to many reasons, especially cultural barriers. By implementing technology like Google Board, which offers writing prompts, feedback mechanisms and collaborative features teachers can reinforce students' proficiency in writing while fostering their motivation to engage in writing.

Secondly incorporating technology into language learning has become increasingly essential in today's time. It provides chances for students to interact with language resources beyond the restrictions of the classroom while also training them with literacy skills that are necessary for 21st century learners. Consequently, this research sheds light on how Google Board can serve as a tool for promoting both writing skills and motivation among high school EFL students. Moreover, it explores how this technology can complement and enhance teaching methods.

Because English is becoming the language for communication and the growing need for proficiency, it is crucial to develop the quality and effectiveness of language education. This research offers insights that can assist educators and policymakers in developing methods tailored to the specific requirements and obstacles faced by high school students learning English as a foreign language. Additionally, it highlights the significance of integrating technology in ways that are both meaningful and efficient.

Operational Definitions of Terms

Writing skills:

The operational definition of writing skill is having the capacity to utilize language conventions accurately employ a diverse range of suitable vocabulary, formulate lucid and succinct sentences arrange ideas, in a logical and coherent manner and establish smooth connections between thoughts in written assignments.

Motivation

In this study the researcher operationalized motivation, as the student's tendency to avoid, neglect or ignore writing tasks due to feelings of worry and fear about not comprehending and effectively expressing themselves.

Google Board:

In this study the researcher refers to the Google Board as a AI modal developed by Google. It allows high school students to collaborate and share ideas in time. The purpose of using the Google Board is not only to help these students develop their writing skills but also, promoting their motivation through activities.

EFL: English as a foreign language.

Method:

The study utilized a quasi-experimental research design. The independent variable (IV) was the use of Google Bard while the dependent variables (DV) were the writing skills and motivation of forty EFL students, at the high school level. These students were randomly selected from Rehab Secondary Schools located in Mafraq City for the first semester of the year 2023-2024. All participants were between 16 and 18 years old. Enrolled in a course developed by the researcher. The researcher followed the quasi-experimental approach collecting data through pre-post tests and questionnaires. The study spanned over a period of 16 weeks. The participants were divided into two groups; one group consisting of twenty students received instruction using Google Bard to enhance their writing skills and motivation while the other twenty students received instruction through regular methods. Both groups underwent pre-Post EFL writing tests, well as a motivation scale to evaluate their attitude towards learning writing skills before and, after the program.

The group undergoing the experiment had access to Google Bard, a tool designed to support their writing alongside classroom instruction. They were introduced to the features of Bard with a focus on grammar, vocabulary expansion and different writing prompts. They were encouraged to use Bard throughout the intervention period. On the hand the control group received traditional writing instruction.

The structure of the course involved teaching The Process Genre Writing Approach. Which was divided into units that focused on writing skills. Within each unit students learned about processes or genres while working on writing exercises and assignments that aimed at improving content organization, language usage and mechanics. Both Bard and their teacher provided feedback on their written work throughout the course, which took place twice a week for 16 weeks. To facilitate instruction specific parts of Action books of 10th, 11th and 12th grade were used. For every essay type covered in the course students were required to compose a paragraph followed by two or three body paragraphs and a concluding paragraph.

Throughout the teaching process, for each essay type Google Bard was used as a tool to guide students through stages of writing such as planning their essays drafting them out revising content and structure editing for improvements before submitting their essays. During the

planning phase students were given time to think about the topics for their writing assignments. They used Bard to brainstorm ideas and find inspiration. Moving on to the drafting stage before starting their writing process and transforming their ideas into a draft, Google Bard asked them questions related to their interests, experiences, and knowledge. It also provided them with prompts or topics to help kickstart their writing journey. Once the students completed their drafts, including the introduction, body paragraphs and conclusion they received feedback from both Google Bard and their teacher.

Group	No.
Class A	20
Class B	20
Total	40

Instrument:

The following instruments were used for collecting data:

- A. Pre-post: To gather the data the researcher employed a pre-post test that focused on assessing writing skills and motivation. This test comprised 5 questions each containing 5 sub questions related to the course topics. The primary objective of these questions was to evaluate students’ proficiency in areas of writing; their ability to structure and organize ideas coherently within written compositions; secondly their proficiency, in using appropriate and varied vocabulary to effectively convey meaning; thirdly their command of spelling, punctuation and capitalization in written work. Additionally, we aimed to assess students’ attention to detail in mechanics such as formatting and paragraph organization.
- B. Questionnaire In order to gain insights into students’ perspectives on the use of Google Board, for enhancing writing abilities and motivation researcher administered a questionnaire. This involves understanding their thoughts, expectations, and experiences with the modal. Assessing Writing Skills; The survey aims to evaluate how Google Board has impacted students writing skills, including their ability to organize content use language effectively and handle mechanics. It aims to gain insights, into how students perceive the platforms influence on their writing abilities. Understanding Motivation; The survey aims to explore the impact of Google Board on students’ motivation to engage in writing activities. It seeks to determine whether the platform has positively influenced students’ interest, enthusiasm, and willingness to participate in writing tasks.

Identifying Challenges and Benefits; The survey aims to identify any difficulties or advantages associated with using Google Board for writing purposes. This includes gathering feedback on the platforms user friendliness effectiveness in providing writing support and any perceived obstacles or benefits it offers. Informing Teaching Practices; The survey aims to provide data that can inform teaching practices related to writing instruction. It seeks to identify areas where utilizing Google Board has been helpful and areas where adjustments or additional support may be necessary. Lastly Enhancing Student Engagement; By capturing students' perspectives the survey intends to contribute towards enhancing student engagement in writing activities. It strives to identify strategies for leveraging technology to increase student involvement and interest in writing. Furthermore, in order to understand the reasons behind students writing a researcher created a questionnaire using a Likert scale. The questionnaire provided five response options; strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. Each option was assigned a score between 1 and 5 with 1 representing the response. To ensure clarity, in assessing preferences we did not include the option of "neither agreeing nor disagreeing."

Reliability of the test

To assess the reliability of the test the test-retest method was employed. A group of twenty students, randomly chosen from the school as the sample, took the test initially. Two weeks later the same group retook the test under conditions, in terms of location timing, item clarification and discipline. This indicates that the test is highly reliable. After conducting an analysis using SPSS on both pre and post tests several results were obtained. These results helped confirm the clarity of the assessed skills and items determine difficulty levels, for items assess item power establish test reliability and calculate average time required to answer each item. Additionally, Cronbach alpha. Retest values were computed for the pilot study as presented in the following table.

Table (1) Cronbach alpha and re test for the study writing skills

Scale	Cronbach alpha	Re-test
Writing skills	0.90	0.88
Motivation scale	0.92	0.91

Statistical analysis

The data analysis and evaluation of any differences, in scores between

the two groups before and after the test were conducted using the Statistical Package, for Social Sciences (SPSS) software, by estimating mean scores, standard deviations, significance levels and a t test were utilized to address the study’s questions and objectives.

Answering the first question which states:

Are there any statistical differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control group due to method of teaching (regular method, Google board) on writing skills at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.

To determine the difference in the means of the scores between the two groups, a pre-test was conducted. The pre-test was done at the beginning of the frist semester of the academic year 2023-2024 to know the actual level of the students before starting the experiment. As shown in the following table:

Table (2) Means and Standard Deviations of the Experimental and Control Groups on the Pre-Test

Test	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.
Writing skill	Control group	20	8.1500	2.94	0.156	0.877
	Experimental group	20	6.7500	3.81		

As it can be seen, the results showed there is no statistically significant difference between the control group and the experimental group on the pre test exam, their writing skills. Therefore, it could be concluded that the two groups were equivalent. Also, the researcher answered the question by computing the means and standard deviations and compute the t-test for the writing skills between the control and experimental group in the post test, as shown in the following table.

Table (3) Mean scores and Standard deviation for the Two Groups in the Post-Test for the writing skills.

TEST	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Writing skills	Control group	20	8.8000	2.63	5.507	0.000
	Experimental group	20	15.4500	4.72		

Table (3) shows the mean scores obtained by the experimental group and the control group on the post-test. The mean score of the control group were (8.8) with SD (2.62), and the experimental group were (15.45) with SD (4.71). also, from the table which showed that there are a significance differences at ($\alpha < 0.05$) among writing skills in favour for the experimental group who exposed to Google board.

However, the improvement in students writing can potentially be attributed to the activities that precede writing, such as brainstorming

organizing ideas and seeking inspiration. During the phase of writing preparation students were encouraged to gather information pertaining to topics they were focusing on. The Aliso Google Board offered a discussion platform that student engagement and idea exchange. Additionally, the positive outcomes can also be credited to employing a writing approach that encompasses five stages: pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and publishing. The collaborative environment provided by Google Board allowed students to collaborate at each stage of their writing process. By utilizing Google Board as an AI tool students received convenient feedback which aided them in reorganizing and refining their ideas. Prior to commencing their writing process and transforming their thoughts into a draft form Google Bard prompted them with questions relating to their interests, experiences, and knowledge. It also supplied them with prompts or topics to jumpstart their journey as writers. The provision of feedback and revision options heightened students' motivation and engagement towards producing content since the modals content was readily available for all users at any given time. Nevertheless, these current findings align, with studies conducted by Yuting, 2019, and Chong, 2020.

Answering the second question which states:

Are there any significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups due to method of teaching (regular method, Google board) on student motivation at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.

To determine the difference in the means of the scores between the two groups, a questionnaire was conducted. The pre-questionnaire was done at the beginning of the first semester of the academic year 2023-2024 to know the actual level of the student's motivation before starting the experiment. As shown in the following table:

Table (4) Means and Standard Deviations of the Experimental and Control Groups on the motivation questionnaire

Items	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
I am interested in learning EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.00	.000	-3.943	.000
	Experimental group	20	1.90	1.021		
I am motivated to improve my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	2.40	1.603	2.219	.033
	Experimental group	20	1.55	.605		
I think it is important to have good EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.65	.988	-.476	.637
	Experimental group	20	1.80	1.005	-.476	.637

Items	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
I feel confident in my EFL writing abilities.	Control group	20	1.55	.605		
	Experimental group	20	1.90	.912	-1.430	.162
I practice writing in English outside of class.	Control group	20	1.75	.786		
	Experimental group	20	2.05	.826	-1.177	.247
I enjoy writing in English.	Control group	20	1.70	.733		
	Experimental group	20	1.85	.745	-.642	.525
I feel it is important to receive feedback on my writing.	Control group	20	1.70	.923		
	Experimental group	20	1.80	.834	-.360	.721
I receive enough feedback on my writing in class.	Control group	20	1.50	.946		
	Experimental group	20	1.50	.688	.000	1.000
I am comfortable with receiving constructive criticism on my writing.	Control group	20	1.60	.681		
	Experimental group	20	1.50	.688	.462	.647
I ask for help with my writing in English.	Control group	20	1.50	.761	1.552	.129
	Experimental group	20	1.20	.410		
I think my EFL writing skills will benefit me in the future.	Control group	20	1.45	.605	.246	.807
	Experimental group	20	1.40	.681		
I feel confident when I write in English.	Control group	20	1.65	.671	1.505	.141
	Experimental group	20	1.35	.587		
I set goals for improving my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.80	.696	.872	.389
	Experimental group	20	1.60	.754		
I think I need to put effort in to improve my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.70	.571	.806	.425
	Experimental group	20	1.55	.605		
My teacher can help me improve my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.55	.510	-.284	.778
	Experimental group	20	1.60	.598		
all items	Control group	20	25.95	6.395	-.156	.877
	Experimental group	20	26.25	5.720		

As it can be seen, the results showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the control group and the experimental group on the motivation questionnaire. Therefore, it could be concluded that the two groups were equivalent. Also, the researcher answered the

question by computing the means and standard deviations and compute the t-test for motivation scale between the control and experimental group in the post test, as shown in the following table.

Table (5) Mean scores and Standard Deviations for the Two Groups in the Post-Test for the motivation scale.

Items	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.
I am interested in learning EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.95	.826	-8.103	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.10	.852		
I am motivated to improve my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.75	.786	-9.000	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.00	.795		
I think it is important to have good EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.80	.834	-9.400	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.15	.745		
I feel confident in my EFL writing abilities.	Control group	20	2.00	.858	-7.935	.000
	Experimental group	20	3.95	.686		
I practice writing in English outside of class.	Control group	20	2.25	.851	-6.668	.000
	Experimental group	20	3.95	.759		
I enjoy writing in English.	Control group	20	2.15	.813	-5.942	.000
	Experimental group	20	3.85	.988		
I feel it is important to receive feedback on my writing.	Control group	20	2.15	.875	-5.897	.000
	Experimental group	20	3.80	.894		
I receive enough feedback on my writing in class.	Control group	20	1.90	1.119	-7.399	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.10	.718		
I am comfortable with receiving constructive criticism on my writing.	Control group	20	2.30	1.261	-4.896	.000
	Experimental group	20	3.95	.826		
I ask for help with my writing in English.	Control group	20	2.05	1.191	-6.685	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.15	.745		
I think my EFL writing skills will benefit me in the future.	Control group	20	2.20	1.281	-5.107	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.00	.918		
I feel confident when I write in English.	Control group	20	2.35	1.268	-5.720	.000
	Experimental group	20	4.20	.696		
I set goals for improving my	Control group	20	2.50	1.100	-5.287	.000

Items	GROUP	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.
EFL writing skills.						
	Experimental group	20	4.10	.788		
I think I need to put effort in to improve my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	2.40	1.095	-4.480	.000
	Experimental group	20	3.90	1.021		
My teacher can help me improve my EFL writing skills.	Control group	20	1.90	.912	-3.543	.001
	Experimental group	20	3.10	1.210		
all items	Control group	20	33.75	12.632	-8.158	.000
	Experimental group	20	62.20	9.146		

Table (5) shows the mean scores obtained by the experimental group and the control group on the post questionnaire. The mean score of the control group was (33.75) with a standard deviation (12.632), and the experimental group was (62.20) with a standard deviation (9.14). Also, from the table which showed that there was a significant difference at ($\alpha < 0.05$) between the motivation scale for control and experimental group in favour of the experimental group which exposed to Google board.

Interacting with the Google Bard model has had an impact, on students' motivation to learn languages. They have become more interested in learning English resulting in increased motivation and effective language acquisition. Additionally, they have gained confidence in their language learning abilities recognizing the importance of English for their endeavours. These findings align with the research conducted by Hong & Ganapathy.(2017)

Discussion and Conclusion

This research examined into the potential of Google Bard, an AI tool to enhance the writing abilities and motivation of high school students learning English as a language (EFL). The results indicated that Bard had an impact on both aspects, suggesting its value as a writing aid.

To begin with the improvement in writing skills can be attributed to factors. The collaborative platform facilitated brainstorming sessions gathering information and exchanging ideas creating an environment for writing. The five-stage approach to writing, which included writing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing provided a structured framework for students to develop their ideas. Crucially Bards feedback capabilities empowered students to reorganize and refine their work resulting in enhanced clarity and quality. Moreover, the prompts and topics offered by Bard served as starting points for initiating the writing process. Lastly the availability of feedback and revision options within the environment

heightened student's engagement and motivation since they could easily track their progress.

Furthermore, the findings suggested that Bard also played a role, in motivating students to learn English. The interactive nature of the tool fostered interest and enjoyment in the language which led to increased motivation ultimately resulting in language acquisition. The feedback and recognition students received through Bard likely played a role in boosting their confidence in language abilities thereby further motivating them to learn.

In conclusion this research examined the impact of Google Bard on high school EFL students writing skills and motivation. The results demonstrate that Bard has the potential to be a resource in both these areas. By providing a platform for collaboration a structured framework for writing and AI powered feedback Bard can empower students to enhance their writing abilities and increase their motivation to learn English. Further research is necessary to explore Bards long term effects on student learning and its effectiveness across contexts. Nonetheless these findings suggest that Google Bard represents an avenue for improving EFL learners' writing skills and motivation.

References

- Abdel Khalek, W., Mawgoud, R. & Ahmed, H. (2020). Models of Artificial Intelligence (AIA) Applications for preschool education. *Fayoum Journal of Early Childhood Education*, (11), retrieved: https://ojom.journals.ekb.eg/article_90626.html.
- Abdel Latif, M. (2007). "Factors accounting for Egyptian EFL University students negative writing affect." *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language and Linguistics*, pp.57-82.
- Abu-Rass, R. (2001). Integrating language and content in teaching English as a second language: A case study on a precourse. In Ruwaida, A. *Integrating reading and writing for effective language teaching. Forum*, 39 (1), pp.30-39.
- Al Mukhallafi, T. (2020). Using artificial intelligence for developing English language teaching/ learning: An analytical study from university students' perspective. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10 (6).
- Al-Khasawneh, M. S. E. (2010). Writing for academic purposes: Problems faced by Arab postgraduate students of the college of business, UUM. *ESP World, Issue 2*(28), Volume 9.

- Allen, L. K., Crossley, S. A., Snow, E. L., & McNamara, D. S. (2014): L2 writing Practice: *Game Enjoyment as a Key to Engagement. Language Learning & Technology*, 18(2), 124-150.
- Aly, Z. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): A Review of its Uses in Language Teaching and Learning. *Materials Science and Engineering*, doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/769/1/01 2043
- Anwaruddin, S. M. (2013). Web 2.0 and language learners' motivation: an action research study. *The Canadian Journal of Action Research*, 14(1), 5-68.
- Azevedo, A., et al. (2020). *Artificial intelligence adaptive learning tools: The teaching of English in focus*. DOI: 10.15448/2178-3640.2020.2.38749
- Bachani, N. (2010). Teaching writing. Oxford University Press.
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153–160.
- Boscolo, P., & Hidi, S. (2006). Motivation and writing. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of Writing Research* (pp. 144-157). The Guilford Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed)*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brunning, R., & Horn, C. (2000). Developing motivation to write. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 25-37.
- Chong, D. (2021). Research on artificial intelligence -based english writing blended teaching mode. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. 1852. 032018 IOP Publishing doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/1852/3/032018
- Dornyei, Z. (2002). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EAP [Electronic version]. Oxford University Press: *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160
- Erkan, S., & Saban, A. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(1), 164-192.
- Harmer, J. (2004). How to teach English writing? Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hess, N. (2001). Teaching multilevel classes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hong, Y.C. & Ganapathy, M. (2017). To Investigate ESL Students' Instrumental and Integrative Motivation towards English Language Learning in a Chinese School in Penang: Case Study. *English Language Teaching*, 10(9), 17-35.
- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (1), 17-29
- Isleem, H. (2012). A Suggested program based on individualized activities for developing palestinian sixth graders' writing skills. [A Doctoral Dissertation]. Islamic University, Gaza. Palestine
- Leki, I. (2003). A challenge to second language writing professionals: Is writing overrated? In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 315-332). Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, P.E. & Tsai, M.K. (2013). Using augmented-reality-based mobile learning material in EFL English composition: An exploratory study. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. 44(1), 1-4.
- Loima, J., & Vibulphol, J. (2016). learning and motivation in thailand: a comparative regional study on basic education ninth graders. *International Education Studies*, 9(1), 31-43.
- Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M. & Forcier, B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in Education*. London: Pearson.
- Ma, Yizhi and Siau, Keng L., (2018). Artificial intelligence impacts on higher edu7rdeszcation. MWAIS 2018 Proceedings. 42. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/mwais2018/42>
- Muhammad, E. (2014). Motivation applications in artificial intelligence. *Unpublished M.A. thesis*. Al-Neelain University, Khartoum
- Mukundan, J. and Nimehchisalem, W (2011). Effect of peer review and tutor conferencing on English as a second language *Learners' Writing Performance*. , 19(1):25-38.
- Nemouchi, A. (2008). Writing connection with grammar and literature in the study organization of the LMD system, University 'of Constantine.
- Polkinghorne, M. M (2013). Top research based writing strategies for motivating early elementary Stage. [Unpublished Master Thesis]. Northern Michigan University. Michigan, USA.
- Prensky, M. (2003). Digital game-based learning. *Computers in Entertainment (CIE)*, 1(1), 21-21.
- Radwan, M. (2017). *Artificial intelligence and its effect on development*. ASABAR Council. Retrieved: <http://multaqaasba.Com/index.Php>

- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2003). *Methodology in language teaching: an anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salem, M. (2007) The effects of journal writing on written performance, Writing apprehension and attitudes of Egyptian English Majors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Pennsylvania State University, Penn. USA.
- Sangcharoon, T (2010). Reading and writing skills development: The Use of SQSR Technique. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University.
- Shanahan, T. (2004). Overcoming the dominance of communication: Writing to think and to learn. In Graham, S.. & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools* -A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Shang, H.F. (2007). 'An exploratory study of email application on FL writing performance. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 20, 1: 79-96.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, . Y. (2005). Improved EFL writing skills, *English teaching forum*, vol.42(1), 24.
- Wery, J., & Thomson, M. M. (2013). *Motivational strategies to enhance effective learning in teaching struggling students. Support for learning*, 28(3), 103-108. <http://doi: 10.1111/1467-9604.12027>
- Yuting, Li (2019). Design and Application of Smart English Classroom Teaching in Senior High School[D]. Kashgar University.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 165-187.