Abtadi English Program to Improve the Production of Descriptive Texts in Peruvian Students

Abel Tapia-Díaz[1]; Isabel Menacho-Vargas[2]; Maribel Cubas-Díaz[3]; Jenny Grados-Moreno[4];
María Ysabel Huari-Álvarez[5]

[1]Universidad César Vallejo, Perú.
[1]https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3367-3490
[2]Universidad Privada San Juan Bautista, Perú.
[2]https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6246-4618
[3]Universidad César Vallejo, Perú.
[3]https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1481-2002
[4]Universidad César Vallejo, Perú.
[4]https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6169- 0074
[5]Universidad Privada Norbert Wiener, Perú.
[5]https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7831-85915

Abstract

The purpose of the research was to determine to what extent the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the production of descriptive texts in English. It is a study with a quantitative approach, applied type and a quasi-experimental design, it had 82 students as a population, the evaluation instrument was a rubric, for hypothesis testing the Krukal Wallis statistic was used. Likewise, from the results of the hypothesis tests, it was obtained that the average range of the 3 groups are different and whose significance is .000, with p<0.05, it is interpreted that the researcher's hypothesis must be accepted. And consequently, it is inferred that the Abtadi strategy improves the production of descriptive texts in English and in their respective dimensions through G-suite for education, in this context of a global pandemic and remote teaching.

Key-words: Learning Method, Teaching Method, Educational Strategies, Writing, Writing Techniques.

1. Introduction

English as a second language has gained a relevant value in the world; according to Crystal (2003) and Ortiz (2013), English is a global language appreciated in international academia and

business; therefore, learning a lingua franca is mandatory in university classrooms and in basic education. According to Education First (2020), English is the second most studied language in the world, and human beings need to learn it in order to communicate and relate to the world. Likewise, the importance of this language lies in the process of communicating and that students develop divergent thinking, as mentioned by Krashen (2007).

The writing of texts in the English language takes on real importance in the different areas of both formal or informal communication; on the other hand, it becomes important when taking a university entrance exam, taking a proficiency exam, presenting research papers, writing scientific articles, among others. Rao (2019) argues that writing is one of the four most complex skills to acquire; but, at the same time, it is of real importance to write adequate texts about personal aspects of life. In addition, students should systematically organize the process of writing, be committed to the practice and commitment to text production.

In addition, good writing allows for an adequate presentation of a speaker; however, in countries of the world where the mother tongue is not English, there are many difficulties in the adequate production of texts; in this regard, Arrieta de Meza and Meza (2000) mention that students have difficulties in writing correctly the various words, do not know enough vocabulary and do not know the grammar; Consequently, with the emergence of covid-19, this reality increases; remote classes and students require technology to continue receiving classes; UNICEF (2020) stated that in the world there are more than 1.2 billion students affected by not having access to technological tools.

According to the UN (2020), in the world, there are about 1500 million students affected by the pandemic, the ministries of education of countries such as Chile (2020) have provided 122 thousand laptops with internet to continue with the education of the most needy; in Argentina (2020), they have implemented the broadcasting of classes on television 14 hours and radio 7 hours a day and, in Peru (2020), they have provided the platform "I learn at home". An emergency decree was also approved for the purchase of 840 thousand tablets to be sent to rural areas.

On the other hand, Cronquist and Fiszbein (2017) refer that English language learning in Latin America is essential and it is required to implement national strategies, in addition to teachers managing strategies and mastering the English language to improve writing in the second language; followed by control, training, selection and evaluation mechanisms by the ministries of education of each country to integrate suitable teachers in the positions.

In addition, according to Unesco (2020), in Peru, only 35% of teachers have access to the Internet and own a computer; therefore, the Ministry of Education chose to implement the "Aprendo en Casa" platform; for the Minedu (2020), this is a means of support for teachers and students to

develop learning activities; given the conditions of virtuality, the competence with greater emphasis is the production of texts; undoubtedly, it is an opportunity to strengthen the capabilities and performance of this competence.

2. Literature Review

Both Ferrari and Basa (2017) and Ubilla, Gómez and Sáenz (2017) highlight the importance of collaborative writing; the authors concluded that technology is a good support to work collaboratively on text production. In addition, Harlena (2020), Hatika (2017) and Chandra (2015) mention that collaborative writing can be used as a strategy to teach. Harlena in his research obtained a mean of 76.23 in the GE and from the CG 66.88; Hatika achieved a mean of 73.30 in the posttest and 59, 32 in the pretest of his experimental group; and Chandra obtained a mean of 78.05 for the GE and 50.25 for the CG.

Researchers Noprianto (2017), Del Valle and De Pinto (2016) and Crespo and Pinto (2016) showed that the main problems of a second language learner is writing descriptive texts. In addition, Susanti (2017) conducted a research work to improve the descriptive production skill, concluding that the ability to write texts in the language has been improved according to the established criteria from an average of 73.86% to 82.42%.

Rojas, Logroño, Lara and Yumi (2018) and Kalpari (2015) concluded that to increase the production of descriptive texts in English a strategy should be applied, they also mention that of the four steps for writing, identifying errors in the first process of writing is essential to give feedback to students and that collaboratively they can improve in the following processes, the results in the first process were an average of 61.93, and 71, 29 in the second process.

Oblitas (2018) and Espino (2016), who conducted research on collaborative work, concluded that students improve their reasoning skills; also Huamán (2019) and Soto (2017), in their research on collaborative work, conclude that it helps in student motivation. For Villar, Fuerte, Vértiz, Gálvez and Arévalo (2018), collaborative learning improves comprehension and production in students of a private university in Lima; as a conclusion they obtained that collaborative work has an importance to improve discourse markers in students.

As theoretical bases, we have the socio-cognitive conflict supported by Roselli (2016), who mentions that the School of Psychology from Geneva was responsible for the systematization of socio-cognitive conflict; likewise, Dillenbourg et al. (1996) mention that socio-cognitive conflict is

an elementary part to develop people's intellect, given that learning occurs in a social and fundamental context with the help of peers or groups.

The theory of intersubjectivity for Vigotsky is external processes to human thought. This explains that the consciousness of each human being comes out through communicative interactions with other people. Social interaction allows the internalization of structured modes of communication of an individual. In this sense, Baquero (1996), Cubero and Rubio (2005), Rogoff (1993), Santigosa (2005) and Valsiner (1991) propose that the sociocultural approach is applicable in the communicative context, where psychological development comes into play through learning.

Next, the Theory of Distributed Cognition supported by Roselli (2016) is presented, who states that the information processing carried out by each human being is linked to the social and cultural context; therefore, the cognitive function is distributed because it is given by social agents and external or intervening tools. For Perkins (2001), a part of thinking is the environment; in this sense, it can be said that a student, with the help of essential materials such as notebooks, computer, annotations, etc., exercises a thought.

Hutchins (1991), Dillenbourg and Self (1992), Minsky (1986) and Resnick (1991) stated that social systems are cognitive aspects that make people open to the idea of knowledge distributed through various individuals whose interactions determine the solution of certain problems. This concept was developed in order to address and understand human-computer interaction. Both Hollan, Hutchins and Kirsh (1999) and Dillenbourg et al. (1996) argue that user-system interaction is a socially distributed process.

In order to develop the Abtadi strategy, the student is provided with the necessary tools before starting the writing process; therefore, the proposal is supported by Da Silva and Signoret (2005) who argue that foreign languages are learned in a formal way, and it is also a conscious process of each student. In this sense, the Abtadi strategy seeks that students have previous knowledge of vocabulary and grammatical elements in the English language. Likewise, another relevant factor to develop the strategy is the affective filter, which is the attitude of the learner and affects the disposition of the learner; Krashen (2007) calls this a state of mind that is explained in the theory of the natural approach. Therefore, it is considered important within this strategy to aim at having an adequate classroom climate.

After establishing the previous points of preparation to start with the writing process, Harmer (2007) is quoted, who mentions the steps starting with the "planning" step, which helps to establish

conditions regarding the purpose of writing and the audience; the second step is "writing", which is the process that results in the first version of the text; the third step is "editing", which is reviewing and reflecting on what has been written, and the last step of writing is the "final version", that is, having the text written to be sent to the intended audience according to the purpose.

Collaborative learning is supported by Roselli (2016) as a concept of great importance for the application of learning. Likewise, Dillenbourg (1999) states that collaborative learning occurs horizontally. Furthermore, he argues that the collaborative learning approach is in the context of socio constructivist theory; likewise, for Bruffee (1993), using the words of Quiamzade, Mugny and Butera (2013), it is a social psychology of knowledge.

Knowledge is a process of joint construction and negotiation of meanings; that collaborative learning is developed as a competence, where the teacher must provide concrete strategies planned and highly guided Roselli (2016). For Barkley, Croos and Major (2007), collaborative learning implies changes of structure in didactic models that are more orientation actions than specific procedures.

The proposals of collaborative strategies, in the context of remote work, were worked through G-suite for education, we have brainstorming by Google Drive and Meet, group reciprocal evaluation by Google Classroom, reflective critical discussion of achievements and progress in the writing of descriptive texts in the English language by Google Meet, elaboration of visual organizers for the process of writing descriptive texts in Google Drive, collective writing by Google Drive, proposals adapted from Roselli (2016).

The production of descriptive texts in the English language is a communicative competence influenced by culture, where a person develops and concretizes learning; the Ministry of Education (2016) mentions that it implies using written language appropriately to communicate a message to other people; this process should be reflective and of permanent revision. Likewise, a descriptive text is an illation of coherent ideas; for Niño (2011), Cervera et al. (2007) and Horcas (2009), a descriptive text is a superior communication unit that is supported by three main characteristics: coherence, cohesion and adequacy.

After presenting the definition of text production in the English language, and according to Canale (1980), Barton, Hamilton and Ivanic (2003), we have the following dimensions: the first is to adapt the text to the significant situation; the second is to organize and develop ideas in a coherent and cohesive manner; the third is to use conventions of written language in a pertinent manner and, as

a fourth, the form, content and context of the written text must be reflected upon and evaluated, the learner permanently reviews the content, coherence, cohesion and adaptation to the communicative context with the objective of improving it; Therefore, it implies analyzing, comparing and contrasting characteristics of the uses of written language and its possibilities, as well as the impact on other people or its association with other texts according to the sociocultural context.

3. Method and Materials

To establish the type of research, Valderrama (2013) and Ñaupas, Mejía, Novoa and Villagómez (2018) were used, who state that applied research seeks to provide solutions to problems objectively.

Likewise, for the research design, we have taken into account Hernández-Sampieri and Mendoza (2018) who point out that the quasi-experimental design is one that can manipulate at least one independent variable to observe the effects on the dependent variable; in the present study we have two independent variables which are the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning, and the variable to be measured or observable is the production of descriptive texts in English.

The present research presents the positivist paradigm, which according to Koetting (1984) is interested in explaining, controlling and predicting variables in a tangible way. Likewise, the approach and method, taking the methodology of Hernández and Mendoza (2018), is quantitative because information was collected to perform the hypothesis testing based on numerical data and, by performing the respective statistical analysis, the theories were tested and patterns of behavior of the study variables were established; likewise, the method is hypothetical deductive, because the veracity of the hypotheses was contrasted.

In this sense, the scheme for the research is presented:

G.E.1 = O1XO2

G.E.2 = O1XO2

G.C= O3---O4

Where:

G.E.1: Experimental group of the Abtadi strategy variable.

G.E.2: Experimental group for collaborative learning variable

G.C: Control group

X: Application of Abtadi Strategies or collaborative learning

O1: Pretest of the experimental group.

O2: Posttest of the experimental group.

O3: Pretest of the control group.

O4: Posttest of the control group.

In the present investigation, the population was the students of the third grade of secondary education of the educational institution Federal Republic of Germany; there are 82 students distributed in 3 sections.

The technique used was observation; the evaluation instrument was the rubric for the collection of data on the production of descriptive texts in English; the application of the instrument took place before and after the application of the items in the established groups, a pretest and posttest were taken. Likewise, data collection implied elaborating a detailed plan of procedures that lead us to gather data with a specific purpose (Hernández, et al., 2014).

According to Aiken's theory, for an instrument to have internal validity, the coefficients must be greater than 0.70; the present instrument was validated by five experts; for the reliability test, a pilot test was conducted and obtained from a number of 30 students. For Hernández and Mendoza (2018), an instrument is reliable if in the face of repeated application to the same sample, the instrument produces the same results.

For the collection of information from the fieldwork and data collection, the observation technique was applied, having as an instrument an evaluation rubric; the data obtained were organized to be processed with the help of the statistical program SPSS Version 26.0. The reliability of the instrument was evaluated through Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient. The information of the results was shown in tables and, for the contracting of the hypotheses, inferential statistics was applied.

4. Results and Discussion

After having applied the posttest and the results through the evaluation rubric for the variable production of descriptive texts in English in the different experimental groups and the control group, the normality test of the data is presented below.

Table 1 - Normality Test for the Production of Descriptive Texts in English and its Dimensions

		Estadíst.	gl	Sig.
	Grup-exp_EA	,868	28	,002
Matches the text to the significant situation.	Control Group	,939	27	,112
	Exp_Group EC	,928	27	,061
	Exp_Group EA	,933	28	,076
Organize and develop ideas in a way that	Group Control	,937	27	,105
	Exp_Group EC	,924	27	,041
	Exp_Group EC	,928	28	,054
Uses conventions of written language in a relevant manner.	Control Group	,944	27	,157
	Exp_Group EC	,920	27	,040
	Exp_Group_EA	,905	28	,015
Reflects on and evaluates the form, content and context of written text.	Control Group	,975	27	,743
	Exp_Group EC	,906	27	,018
	Exp_Group EA	,945	28	,146
Produces descriptive texts in English.	Control Group	,959	27	,357
	Exp_Group EC	,907	27	,019

Since the sample is less than 30 data in the three groups observed, the Shapiro Wilk normality test is taken into account, and the production of descriptive texts in English, where the results were obtained from the experimental group of the Abtadi strategy and the control group have a parametric behavior. On the other hand, the results of the group where the collaborative strategy was applied show non-parametric behavior, for which the Kruskal Wallis H test was applied for the general hypothesis test and the specific hypotheses.

Table 2 - General and Specific Hypotheses

Study groups	General Hypotheses			General Hypotheses 1			General Hypotheses 2			General Hypotheses 3			General Hypotheses 4		
	Exp_Group EA	Control Group	Exp_Group – AC	Exp_Group _EA	Control Group	Exp_Group – AC	Exp_Group _EA	Control Group	Exp_Group – AC	Exp_Group _EA	Control Group	Exp_Group – AC	Exp_Group _EA	Control Group	Exp_Group – AC
N	28	27	27	28	27	27	28	27	27	28	27	27	28	27	27
Average range	59,23	14,83	49,78	51,04	23,39	49,72	54,57	20,70	48,74	56,70	16,89	50,35	56,25	20,39	47,31
Kruskal-Wallis test	52,888			24,127			32.53			44,717			34,176		
Gl	2			2			2			2			2		
sig.	,000			,000			,000			,000			,000		
Total	82			82			82			82			82		

Exp_Group= Experimental Group

EA= Abtadi Strategy

AC= Collaborative learning

As a general hypothesis test, from table 2, we have that the average of the ranges of the three groups is different being 59.23 for the application of the experimental group of the Abtadi strategy; 14.83 for the control group and 49.78 for the experimental group of the collaborative strategy; being the significance p=0.00 less than p<0.05 inferring that the Abtadi strategy and the collaborative learning improve the production of descriptive texts in English.

Then we have hypothesis 1 of table 2, we have the averages of the ranges 51.04 for the application of the experimental group of the Abtadi strategy, 23.39 for the control group and 49.72 for the experimental group of the collaborative strategy. Likewise, the significance is p=0.00, being this less than p<0.05, inferring that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the adequacy of the text to the significant situation.

Next, hypothesis 2 of table 2 is presented, it is found that: the averages of the ranges are 54.57 for the application of the experimental group of the Abtadi strategy; 20.70 for the control group and 48.74 for the experimental group of the collaborative strategy. Likewise, the significance is p=0.00 being this less than p<0.05 having that the Abtadi strategy and the collaborative learning improve the organization and develops the ideas in a coherent and cohesive way.

We have the hypothesis test 03 of table 2, we have that the average of the ranges of the three groups are different being these 56.70 for the application of the experimental group of the Abtadi strategy; 16.89 for the control group and 50.35 for the experimental group of the collaborative strategy. Likewise, the significance p=0.00 being less than p<0.05; it is inferred that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the use of written language conventions in a pertinent way.

Finally, we have hypothesis 04 of table 2, it is found that the average of the ranges of the three groups are different being 56.25 for the application of the experimental group of the Abtadi strategy; 20.39 for the control group and 47.31 for the experimental group of the collaborative strategy. Likewise, the significance is p=0.00 being less than p<0.05; it is deduced that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the reflection and evaluation of the form, content and context of the written text.

According to Ferrari and Basa (2017) and Ubilla, Gómez and Sáenz (2017), the importance of collaborative writing, which through the use of Google drive, is that it manages to improve the production of descriptive texts; undoubtedly, Google drive is a tool to develop collaborative learning; but it is not enough since the indications of development of learning activities according to the learning purpose must be strengthened in video conferences; therefore, to develop the collaborative strategy, it is supported by the use of digital tools of the g suite for education.

The use of these tools is associated with the theory of cognitive distribution in which, according to Hutchins (1991), Dillenbourg and Self (1992), Minsky (1986) and Resnick (1991), people are open to the idea of distributed knowledge through various individuals whose interactions determine solutions to problems. This concept was developed in order to address and understand human-computer interaction; for Hollan, Hutchins and Kirsh (1999), Dillenbourg, et al. (1996), human-system interaction is a socially distributed process. In this sense, it is important to note that technological tools are vital to carry out collaborative work and develop the Abtadi strategy.

From Table 2, we can see that the student adapts the text to the significant situation; through the Abtadi strategy, a better level of achievement is achieved and, using the collaborative strategy, the level of achievement is a little lower; both strategies improve the adequacy of descriptive texts in English; in this sense, we can mention that it is in agreement with Noprianto (2017) and Del Valle and Pinto (2016), who conducted studies that show that the main problems of the student are limited to grammatical structures; likewise, to the inability to adjust the social function of the text, the difficulty to write systematically and chronologically, and the problem to use the right words in sentences. Likewise, Baquero (1996), Cubero and Rubio (2005), Rogoff (1993), Santigosa (2005) and Valsiner (1991) propose that this sociocultural approach is applicable in all communicative contexts.

From table 2, we have that the student develops ideas in a coherent and cohesive way, the evaluated ability refers to order, relationship, cohesion, vocabulary and extension of ideas. The results agree with authors such as Susanti (2017) who conducted an applied research work that aimed to improve the descriptive production skill. Both Rojas, Logroño, Lara and Yumi (2018) and Kalpari (2015) conducted an applied research whose results were that students, when using writing processes, have errors in planning which is the first process, hence the explanation that students have difficulties in writing texts in a coherent and cohesive manner.

In addition, Table 2 shows the use of conventions of written language in a pertinent manner; that is, it refers to orthographic resources, uses of language and meaning of the written text; it is found that students have managed to obtain lower performance in the collaborative strategy than in the Abtadi strategy. In agreement, we have the thesis carried out by Villar, Fuerte, Vértiz, Gálvez and Arévalo (2018) who obtained that collaborative work has a significant importance as a strategy applied to improve discourse markers in students. Likewise, Hermosa Del Vasto (2015) concluded that using collaborative strategies improves the different competencies, abilities, skills and performances of students given that the Abtadi strategy provides better results; therefore, the use of the same is recommended.

Table 2 shows that students reflect and evaluate the form, content and context of the written text; the experimental groups improve the reflection and evaluation of their evidences, which are the revision, comparison, contrast and use of written language. The students' achievements for collaborative learning are lower than for the Abtadi strategy. This is due to the fact that in the Abtadi strategy there are processes in which the student reflects in order to write his/her text.

Therefore, according to Oblitas (2018) and Espino (2016), collaborative work helps students develop their reasoning skills; also Huamán (2019) and Soto (2017) reached the following conclusions: that collaborative work is associated with academic performance, seeing these results of collaborative learning it can be deduced that this strategy provides positive results in different areas. However, the use of the Abtadi strategy that provides better opportunities for reflection for students should be taken into account.

5. Conclusions

After the application of 12 learning sessions, it was determined that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the production of descriptive texts in English in students; this learning achievement is obtained by using the tools of the g suite for education accompanied by collaborative strategies and the application of writing processes, added to this the guidance in the grammatical structure and strengthened by the good classroom climate between teacher and students.

It was determined that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the adequacy of the text to the significant situation; in this sense, the student was able to use the following criteria: the purpose of the text, chose the appropriate addressee, the type of text, discursive genre, sociocultural contexts and used formal and informal language when it corresponded to write the text.

The Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the adequacy of the text to the significant situation, the student managed to logically order the ideas around a proposed topic, expanding and complementing them, as well as establishing cohesion and coherence, and also took into account the relevant vocabulary.

It was demonstrated that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the use of written language conventions in a pertinent manner, the student was able to adequately use textual resources to ensure clarity, the aesthetic use of language and the meaning of the written text.

Finally, it was concluded that the Abtadi strategy and collaborative learning improve the reflection and evaluation of the form, content and context of the written text; the student managed not only to improve, but also to analyze, compare and contrast characteristics of the uses of written

language and its possibilities, as well as the impact on other people or its relation with other texts according to the sociocultural context.

References

Arrieta, B. y Meza, R. (2000). Some strategies for improving reading and writing in newly-en-entry college students. *Research and Postgraduate Journal.* Vol. 15, No.1, April. Liberating Experimental Pedagogical University. Caracas - Venezuela.

Baquero, R. (1996). *Vigotsky and school learning.* Buenos Aires: I said.

Barkley, E., Croos, P. and Major, C. (2007). *Collaborative learning techniques.* Madrid: Morata.

Barton, D., Hamilton, M. e Ivanic, R. (2003). *Situated literacies. Reading and writing in context.* New York: Routledge.

Bruffee, K. (1993). *Collaborative Learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Canale, M. (1980). Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1) p.1- 47.

Cervera, S. (2007). *Know how to write. Bogota: Aguilar*. Printed.

Chandra, R. (2017). *Collaborative Learning for Educational Achievement*. https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-052

Cook, J. (2006). *The social construction of literacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crespo, A. and Pinto, E. (2016). *The development of English writing in secondary education: a possible* mission. 28–53. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=6219285

Cronquist, K. and Fiszbein, A. (2017). *Learning English in Latin America.* https://www.thedialogue.org/wp-content/uploads /2017/09 /El-learning-del-English%C3%A9s-en-Am%C3%A9rica-Latina-1.pdf.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge, Inglaterra: Cambridge University Press.

Cubero, M. and Rubio, D. (2005). *Historical-cultural psychology and the nature of psysyism.*

Da Silva, H. and Signoret, A. (2005). *Topics on the acquisition of a second language.* Mexico: Trillas.

Del Valle, A. y De pinto, E. (2016). The development of English writing in secondary education: a possible mission. *Multidisciplinary Journal of the Ological. 13*(2), 28-53. http://revistas.upel.edu.ve/index.php/dialogica

Dillenbourg, P., & Self, J. (1992). A computational approach to socially distributed cognition. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 7*(4), 353-371.

Dillenbourg, P., Baker, M., Blaye, A., & O'malley, C. (1996). *The evolution of research on collaborative learning*. In E. Spada & P. Reiman (Eds) Learning in Humans and Machine: Towards an interdisciplinary learning science, Oxford: Elsevier, 189- 211.

Dillenbourg, P. (1999). *What do you mean by collaborative learning?* In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), Collaborative-learning: Cognitive and Computational Approaches. Amsterdam: Elsevie Science.

EF Education First. (2020). *EF EPI: EF English proficiency index.* http:// www.ef.edu/epi/downloads/

Hawthorn, W. (2016). *Collaborative learning in the development of automotive mechanics capabilities in an IESTP – Ica:* https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12692/18998/Espino_PWC.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Ferrari, L., & Basa, L. (2017). Collaborative writing and metallic activity vol. (4) Latin American *Journal of Reading and Writing: Argentina.*

Harlena, D. (2020). *Collaborative Writing Strategy for Teaching Writing Descriptive.* Text. 411(Icoelt 2019), 276–279.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English.* England: Pearson Education Limited.

Hatika, N. (2017). *The implementation of a collaborative technique in Improving students' writing descriptive texts at the Second grade of smp n 19 bandar Lampung.* https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/194207-EN-the-implementation-of-a-collaborative-te.pdf

Beautiful, P. (2015). Influence of information and communication technologies (ICTs) on the teaching-learning process: an improvement of digital skills. *Rev. Cient. Gene. José María Córdova 13*(16), 121-132.

Hernandez, R., Fernández, C. and Baptista, P. (2014). *Research Methodology.* (6aed.). Mexico: Mc Graw-Hill

Hernández-Sampieri y Mendoza, C. (2018). *Research Methodology. Quantitative, qualitative and mixed routes.* Mexico: Mc Graw-Hill.

Hollan, J., Hutchins, E., & Kirsh, D. (1999). *Distributed cognition: a new foundation for human-computer interaction research.* www.HCI.UCSD.EDU

Horcas, J. (2009). "Descriptive *text". Contributions to social sciences.* www.eumed.net/rev/cccss/ 03/jmhv6.htm.

Huaman, D. (2019). *Collaborative work and motivation in attitude to the area of mathematics.* https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/handle/20.500.12692/26709

Hutchins, E. (1991). *The social organization of distributed cognition.* In L. Resnick, J. Levine, & S. Teasley (Ed.), Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition. Washington: American Psychological Association, pp. 283-307.

Kalpari, D. (2015). *Using collaborative learning in descriptive text writing on the eleventh grade students of sman 3 sungai ambawang.* https://www.neliti.com/publications/216240/using-collaborative-learning-in-descriptive-text-writing-on-the-eleventh-grade-s

Koeting, J. (1984). *Foundations of naturalistic inquiry: developing a theory base for understanding individual interpretations of reality.* Dallas: Association for Educational Communications and Technology

Krashen, S. (2007). *Theory of Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge, Inglaterra: Cambridge University Press.

Ministry of Education of Argentina. (2020). *The Minister of Education of the Nation held a videoconference with the Ministers of Education of the 24 jurisdictions.* https://www.argentina.gob.ar/

Chilean Ministry of Education. (2020). *ICT Scholarships: Mineduc advances the delivery of 122,000 computers with free internet access to 7th basic students.* https://www.mineduc.cl/

Ministry of Education of Peru. (2020). *I learn at home. https://aprendoencasa.pe/*

Minedu. (2016). *National Curriculum of Basic Education, Lima: Ministry of Education.* National Curriculum of Peru (2016)

Minsky, M. (1986). *The Society of Mind.* Buenos Aires: Galapagos Editions.

Child, V. (2011). *Competences in communication: towards the practices of* discourse. Bogota: Ecoe editions.

Noprianto, E. (2017). *Student's Descriptive Text Writing in SFL Perspectives*. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v2i1.53

Ñaupas, H., Mejía, E., Novoa, E. and Villagómez, A. (2018). *Research Methodology*. (5th ed.). Colombia: U editions.

Oblitas, B. (2018). *Collaborative work and its influence on the development of mathematical logical reasoning capacity in IE first-degree secondary education students: "Antonio Torres Araujo", Trujillo – 2017*. https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/handle/20.500.12692/22684

UN (2020). *Lto education, ECLAC Report, OREALC and UNESCO.* https://www.iesalc.unesco.org/2020/08/25/informe-cepal-y-unesco-la-educacion-en-tiempos-de-la-pandemia-de-covid-19/

Ortiz, I. (2013). *The importance of the English language in* education. The New Diary. Managua, Nicaragua. http://www.elnuevodiario.com.ni/desde-la-u/305910-importancia-idioma-ingles-educacion/

Perkins, D. (2001). *The Escuela Inteligente. Barcelona:* Gedisa.

Quiamzade, A., Mugny, G., & Butera, F. (2013). *Social Psychology of Knowledge.* Grenoble: Grenoble University Press.

Rao, P. (2019). The significance of writing skills in ell environment. *Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 9*(3), 5. https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2019.00035.1

Resnick, L. (1991). *Shared cognition: thinking as a social practice.* In L. Resnick, J. Levine, & S. Teasley (Eds.), Perspectives on Socially Shared Cognition. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1-20.

Rogoff, B. (1993). *Children's guided participation and participatory appropiation in sociocultural activity.* In R. Wozniak, & K. Fisher (Eds.), Development in Context. Hillsdale, NJ: LEA, 121-153.

Rojas, C., Logroño, M., Lara., L. and Yumy, L. (2018). Diagnosis of the production of descriptive texts in English. *European Scientific Journal* November 2018 edition Vol.14, No.32. http://dx.doi.org/10.19044/esj.2018.v14n32p29

Roselli, N. (2016). Collaborative learning: Theoretical bases and strategies applicable in university teaching. *Purposes and Representations*, 4(1), 219-280. http://dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2016.v4n1.90.

Santigosa, A. (2005). *The notion of interiorization from a cultural vision of development.* In M. Cubero and J. Ramírez (comps.), Vigotsky in Contemporary Psychology. Buenos Aires: Minho and Dávila.

Soto, J. (2017). *Relationship of cooperative learning and learning styles with the academic performance of the area of Science Technology and Environment of students of the I.E. Tungasuca de Carabayllo, 2016.* https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/handle/20.500.12692/8479

Susanti, I. (2017). *Improving student's ability at writing descriptive text by using the learning cell strategy at the first year of MTS Yayasan Islamiyah Medan in 2016/2017 academic year.* Skripsi thesis, State Islamic University of North Sumatera Medan.

Ubilla, L., Gómez, L., & Sáenz, K. (2017). *Collaborative writing of argumentative texts in English using Google* Drive. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1735/173553246019.pdf

UNESCO. (2020). *1.5 billion students do not attend school for covid-19.* https://es.unesco.org/

UNICEF. (2020). The lack of equality in *access to distance education in the context of COVID-19 could aggravate the global learning crisis.* https://www.unicef.org/es/comunicados-prensa/falta-igualdad-acceso-educacion-distancia-podria-agravar-crisis-aprendizaje

UNICEF. (2020). The lack of equality in *access to distance education in the context of COVID-19 could exacerbate the global learning crisis.* https://www.unicef.org/es/comunicados-prensa/falta-igualdad-acceso-educacion-distancia-podria-agravar-crisis-aprendizaje.

Valderrama, S. (2013). *The steps to develop scientific research projects.* Quantitative, qualitative and mixed. (2nd ed.) Peru: San Marcos.

Valsiner, J. (1991). Building theoretical bridges over a lagoon of everyday events. A review of apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in social context by Barbara Rogoff. *Human Development*, 34, 307-315.

Villar, E., Fuerte, A., Vértiz, J., Gálvez, E. and Arévalo, J. (2018). Collaborative activities in the learning of discursive markers in university students. *Purposes and Representations* 6(2), 607-629. http:// dx.doi.org/10.20511/pyr2018.v6n2.250