

# USING LINOIT IN TEACHING WRITING IN THE GENERAL ENGLISH COURSE FOR FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS AT HAI PHONG UNIVERSITY

Nguyen Thi Phuong Loan  
Faculty of Foreign Languages  
Email: loanntp@dhhp.edu.vn

*Received: 02/10/2025*

*Revised: 23/10/2025*

*Accepted: 24/10/2025*

**Abstract:** The ability to write effectively in English plays an important role in the career development of Vietnamese university students. However, many first-year students often face challenges in generating ideas, organizing their writing, and maintaining motivation. In the context of digital transformation in education, online tools such as Linoit have emerged as promising solutions for enhancing collaborative and interactive learning. This study investigated the application of Linoit in teaching writing skills to first-year students at Hai Phong University as a part of the General English course. A mixed-method approach was employed, including classroom observations, student surveys, teacher interviews, and analysis of students' written assignments. The findings indicate that Linoit fosters student engagement, encourages idea sharing, and improves the organization of written texts. Students reported increased confidence in their writing and described the learning process as more enjoyable. Nevertheless, challenges such as limited digital literacy and unstable internet connections were also noted. The study concludes that Linoit can be an effective tool for teaching, provides that teachers and students receive adequate training. It recommends integrating digital tools into the formal curriculum of General English course and conducting further research on other AI tools in language learning.

**Keywords:** First-year students, Hai Phong University, Linoit, technology integration, writing skills.

---

## SỬ DỤNG ỨNG DỤNG LINOIT TRONG VIỆC DẠY KỸ NĂNG VIẾT HỌC PHẦN TIẾNG ANH CƠ SỞ CHO SINH VIÊN NĂM NHẤT TRƯỜNG ĐẠI HỌC HẢI PHÒNG

**Tóm tắt:** Việc viết bằng tiếng Anh sao cho hiệu quả có vai trò quan trọng đối với việc phát triển kỹ năng nghề nghiệp của sinh viên Việt Nam hiện nay. Tuy nhiên, nhiều sinh viên

năm nhất lại gặp khó trong việc tạo ra các ý tưởng, tổ chức nội dung và duy trì động lực viết. Trong bối cảnh chuyển đổi số trong giáo dục, các công cụ trực tuyến như Linoit đang trở thành công cụ tiềm năng để cải thiện việc học tương tác và hợp tác. Bài báo này nghiên cứu về việc sử dụng ứng dụng Linoit trong việc dạy kỹ năng Viết học phần Tiếng Anh cơ sở cho sinh viên năm nhất trường Đại học Hải Phòng. Tác giả có sử dụng đa dạng các phương pháp: quan sát trên lớp, khảo sát sinh viên, phỏng vấn giảng viên, phân tích các bài luyện viết của sinh viên. Kết quả cho thấy Linoit thúc đẩy động lực học, khuyến khích chia sẻ ý tưởng và hỗ trợ nhau nhằm đưa ra một kết cấu bài viết tốt. Các sinh viên nói rằng họ tự tin hơn khi viết bằng tiếng Anh và thấy quá trình học thú vị hơn. Tuy nhiên, vẫn còn có những khó khăn như là hiểu biết về kỹ thuật số còn hạn chế, mạng Internet thiếu ổn định. Bài báo kết luận rằng Linoit có thể trở thành một công cụ hiệu quả để dạy kỹ năng Viết nếu giảng viên và sinh viên được trang bị đầy đủ về kiến thức và kỹ thuật. Tác giả cũng đưa ra khuyến nghị tích hợp vào chương trình học học phần Tiếng Anh cơ sở, phát triển và nghiên cứu sâu hơn các công cụ số phục vụ cho việc học ngoại ngữ.

**Từ khóa:** Sinh viên năm nhất, Trường Đại học Hải Phòng, Linoit, tích hợp công nghệ, kỹ năng viết.

## 1. Introduction

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most demanding skills in foreign language acquisition, particularly for Vietnamese university students at the beginning of their academic journey (Nguyen, 2021; Tong, 2024). Unlike receptive skills such as listening and speaking, writing requires a higher level of cognitive engagement, including the ability to generate ideas, organize content coherently, and express thoughts accurately through appropriate linguistic structures (Hyland, 2003; Richards & Renandya, 2002).

In addition to mastering grammar and vocabulary, students must develop the capacity to structure their ideas logically and communicate them effectively in written form. However,

many first-year students at Hai Phong University encounter significant challenges in academic writing. These include limited vocabulary, a tendency to lose focus or run out of ideas, and frequent grammatical errors. Such difficulties are often exacerbated by traditional teaching methods, which tend to emphasize mechanical practice and model texts without fostering creativity or interaction.

To address these limitations, educators and learners are increasingly seeking innovative and engaging approaches to enhance writing instruction. The integration of digital tools into language classrooms has shown promising results in promoting learner autonomy, collaboration, and motivation (Zhao, 2003; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). Among these tools, Linoit – a digital sticky note

application – has gained attention for its potential to support brainstorming, idea organization, and group cooperation. Its user-friendly interface and accessibility make it suitable for students with varying levels of technological proficiency.

This study considers the integration of Linoit for first-year students at Hai Phong University. The purpose of this study is to answer the following research questions:

1. How does Linoit affect students' engagement and participation in writing activities?
2. What impact does it have on the quality of students' written work?
3. What are the challenges and limitations of using Linoit in classrooms?

By addressing these questions, this study seeks to contribute to the growing body of research on technology-enhanced language learning (TELL) and provide practical implications for English teaching at Vietnamese universities.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Context**

According to Hyland (2019), writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) context is not only a means of communication, but also a process of building knowledge that learners must generate, organize, and refine their own ideas. In the EFL context, learners often face additional obstacles compared to native speakers, such as limited vocabulary,

limited grammatical knowledge, and inadequate exposure to authentic writing models (Nguyen, 2021). In Vietnamese universities, educators teach writing using a traditional product-based approach that focuses on grammatical accuracy and imitation of model texts. This method helps students acquire basic sentence structures, but they often do not develop skills at a higher level, such as brainstorming, drafting, and revisions (Nguyen & Nguyen, 2023). As a result, learners tend to create short, simple, and repeatable texts with limited creativity. Scientists such as Tribble (2012) and Richards & Renandya (2018) argue that effective writing lessons must combine both product and process-based approaches to enable students to systematically plan, design, maintain and modify feedback.

### **2.2 Technology - Enhanced Language Learning (TELL)**

The use of technology in language education has grown rapidly in recent years, providing new opportunities for student commitment and team work. The theory of computer-aided language learning (CALL) states that digital tools provide authentic input, increase learner autonomy, and promote interaction (Chapelle, 2001; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). In the field of lesson writing, technology supports brainstorming, peer feedback, collaborative elaboration, and online publishing.

Research has shown that digital platforms such as blogs, wikis, and Google Docs encourage learners to write for a real

audience, enhancing motivation and accountability (Sun & Chang, 2012). Furthermore, collaborative online tools allow students to exchange feedback, construct meaning, and thus improve the quality of their written work (Elola & Okoz, 2010). Despite these benefits, challenges such as students' unequal digital capabilities, technical issues, and the additional time required to prepare teachers (Stockwell, 2017).

### **2.3. Research Context**

At Hai Phong University, the General English program for first-year students is designed to build foundational language competencies aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), targeting an exit level equivalent to B1 (PET). The curriculum emphasizes vocabulary related to familiar topics such as personal information, daily routines, housing, food and drink, clothing, and fashion. It also introduces key pronunciation features and essential grammar structures. Writing instruction focuses on practical communication tasks, such as completing sentences and composing letters, emails, or messages in appropriate formats. Students are also guided to identify key components of a paragraph - introduction, body, and conclusion - to support coherent and purposeful writing in real-world contexts.

### **2.4. Linoit as an educational tool**

Linoit is a tool that allows you to create and share visual boards. It can be

used to arrange thoughts, tasks, and notes in a way that makes them easy to understand. Linoit is a great way to brainstorm and work with people as it allows you to add links, photos and glue notes. Users can create, place, and exchange digital notes on virtual boards with the help of the web-based Sticky Note Tool Linoit.com.

Linoit was originally developed for project management and personal task organizations, but schools use it more frequently now. This is due to the fact that it is user-friendly, accessible, and facilitates collaboration. Students can brainstorm, notes, and collaborate to create at least cards, or create impact circumference on the Linoit board. According to Aarar (2022), students who used Linoit in classical arguments were able to construct excellent arguments, particularly regarding the structure of their claims and rebuttals. According to Arsyad and Nur (2024), Linoit improved students' motivations and language skills. They emphasized that Linoit can help students improve their writing skills by being involved in interactive activities in which students exchange ideas. Triyono and Syafei (2016) highlighted how Linoit is promoted in the English learning environment and that its users are friendly. Therefore, Linoit has been recognized as a useful tool for technology-based language lessons. The results show that Linoit inspires students, enables group ideas and improves writing performance, though currently, no research has been conducted on Linoit in Vietnam.

From the above reviews, it is clear:

1. Writing is a challenging skill for Vietnamese EFL students, and traditional methods are often inadequate.

2. Technology-enhanced approaches can significantly improve learner engagement and writing outcomes.

3. Linoit has shown promise in supporting brainstorming and collaboration, but empirical research in the Vietnamese context - especially with first-year students - is still scarce.

Therefore, this study seeks to fill this gap by examining the effect of Linoit on teaching writing in the General English courses at Hai Phong University. In particular, we examine how this tool affects commitment, writing performance, and perceptions of learning process.

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1. Research Design**

The research employed a mixed-methods approach, combining both quantitative and qualitative methods to comprehensively examine the effectiveness of Linoit in writing lessons for first-year students at Hai Phong University. The qualitative component explored student perspectives and teacher observations regarding the use of the tool, while the quantitative component assessed changes in students' writing performance before and after the intervention. This approach is considered effective in educational research, as it values both experiential insights and measurable outcomes

(Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). By triangulating the findings, the researcher was able to integrate quantitative data with qualitative insights to gain a more in-depth understanding of Linoit's functionality in the classroom.

#### **3.2. Participants**

The participants in this study were 60 first-year students enrolled in the General English course at Hai Phong University during the 2024-2025 academic year. Students were selected from classes in two semesters, each consisting of 30 students. All participants studied English in secondary and high school for at least seven years, but reported limited experiences with writing extended texts in English.

Ethical guidelines have been strictly followed. Participants were informed of the study's purpose and ensured that their participation was voluntary. A declaration of consent was obtained by all students and pseudonyms were used to protect their identity. Data were stored securely and used for research purposes only. Students were divided into two groups.

- Experimental group (n = 30): received writing instruction supported by Linoit.

- Control group (n = 30): received traditional writing instruction without technology integration.

Additionally, two English lecturers participated in the study as trainers and observers. Both had over five years of

experience teaching English writing at the tertiary level.

### 3.3. Research Instruments

To collect data, four instruments were employed:

#### 1. Pre-test and Post-test in Writing

- Students completed two writing tasks (before and after the intervention), each task in 20 minutes.

- Each task required a 150–200-word letter on familiar topics.

Pre-test:

This is part of the letter you have just received from Tom, your English-speaking friend.

I'm so excited that you're coming to stay next month. Would you like to go to the beach or would you prefer to stay in town and go sightseeing? And are you still a vegetarian? Is there anything else you want to know?

Write a letter of about 150-200 words in reply to him. Your letter should begin with "Dear Tom," and end with "Yours, Phuong", but should not include your name in it.

Post-test:

This is part of the letter you have just received from Tom, your English-speaking friend.

We're doing a school project on famous tourist attractions around the world in our geography class, so I wanted to write about a place in your

country. Can you tell me about a special place in your country? It can be a building, or a place of natural beauty. What would you choose and why? How often do you go to that place?

Write a letter of about 150-200 words in reply to him. Your letter should begin with "Dear Tom," and end with "Yours, Phuong", but should not include your name in it.

Students will get full marks (2.0 points) for this writing task if the letter meets the following requirements:

- All contents are relevant to the task. The target reader is fully informed.

- The writer uses the conventions of the communicative task to hold the target reader's attention and communicate straightforward ideas.

- The letter is generally well-organized and coherent, using a variety of linking words and cohesive devices.

- The writer uses a range of everyday vocabulary appropriately.

- The writer uses a range of simple and some complex grammatical forms with a good degree of control.

- The letter meets specified length requirement.

- Letters were assessed using an analytic rubric adapted from Jacobs et al. (1981), covering content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

#### 2. Questionnaire

- ❖ The questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group

immediately after the eight-week intervention to collect students' perceptions of using Linoit in writing lessons.

- ❖ It consisted of 20 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale, designed to measure students' perceptions of Linoit in terms of usefulness, engagement, collaboration, and challenges.

- ❖ Participants were given 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire anonymously, and responses were collected digitally via Google Forms to ensure accuracy and convenience.

### 3. Semi-structured Interviews

- Semi-structured interviews were conducted in the week following the completion of the post-test with 10 randomly selected students from the experimental group.

- Each interview lasted approximately 15-20 minutes and was carried out in English in a quiet classroom setting.

- Questions focused on their experiences using Linoit, perceived benefits, and difficulties.

- Interviews were recorded and transcribed for thematic analysis.

### 4. Classroom Observations

- The researcher observed eight writing lessons throughout the eight-week teaching period (four in each group).

- Each observation lasted 50 minutes and followed a structured observation checklist focusing on student

engagement, collaboration, and teacher-student interaction.

- Field notes were taken immediately after each class to capture authentic classroom behavior and contextual details.

### 3.4. Procedure

The study was conducted over an eight-week period with the following stages:

#### ➤ Week 1: Orientation and Pre-test

- Both groups took a pre-test to measure baseline writing ability.

- The experimental group received an introduction to Linoit, including login, creating notes, organizing ideas, and sharing boards.

#### ➤ Weeks 2-7: Writing Instruction

- Control group: followed the regular writing syllabus, including brainstorming, drafting, peer review, and final submission, all done on paper or through classroom discussion.

- Experimental group: completed the same syllabus, but brainstorming and idea organization were conducted using Linoit. For example:

- Brainstorming session: students posted sticky notes with ideas on a shared Linoit board.

- Grouping stage: students organized notes into categories (introduction, body, conclusion).

- Drafting: students used the structured board to develop letters.

- Both groups received teacher feedback on drafts.
- Week 8: Post-test and Feedback
- Both groups completed the post-test letters.
- The experimental group filled out the questionnaire and participated in interviews.

### 3.5. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative techniques:

#### ➤ Quantitative Analysis:

- Pre-test and post-test scores were compared within and between groups using paired and independent-sample t-tests.

- Questionnaire responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency).

#### ➤ Qualitative Analysis:

- Interview transcripts and observation notes were analyzed thematically.

- Recurring themes (e.g., engagement, collaboration, technical challenges) were coded and categorized.

- Qualitative findings were then compared with quantitative results to provide a deeper interpretation.

## 4. Findings

### 4.1. Writing Test Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of Linoit in improving students' writing performance, pre-test and post-test scores

of both groups were compared. The analytic rubric assessed five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

*Table 1. Mean Scores of Writing Tests (out of 100)*

Group	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Gain Score
Experimental (n=30)	62.3	74.8	+12.5
Control (n=30)	61.9	67.1	+5.2

The results indicate that both groups improved after eight weeks of instruction. However, the experimental group used by Linoit showed significantly greater improvement (+12.5 points) than the control group (+5.2 points).

A paired-sample t-test revealed that the difference between pre- and post-test scores was statistically significant for the experimental group ( $p < 0.01$ ), while the improvement in the control group was smaller but still significant ( $p < 0.05$ ). An independent-sample t-test further confirmed that the post-test difference between the two groups was statistically significant ( $p < 0.01$ ).

These results suggest that the integration of Linoit contributed measurable benefits to students' writing abilities, particularly with regard to content development and organization.

### 4.2. Component Analysis of Writing

A closer examination of the rubric scores showed the following:

- **Content:** Students in the experimental group produced essays with more developed ideas and relevant details, likely as a result of collaborative brainstorming on Linoit boards.

- **Organization:** Test group capabilities saw significant improvements to construct introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusions. The visual arrangement of notes in Linoit helped students plan their essays more effectively.

- **Vocabulary and language use:** Both groups improved conservatively, but the differences were less noticeable. Linoit supported the generation of ideas, but did not directly improve grammar or vocabulary acquisition.

- **Mechanic:** There were no significant differences between the groups in terms of punctuation and spelling, although minor improvements were observed. This analysis indicates that Linoit has the greatest impact on idea generation and essay organization - two areas that are often considered the most challenging for first-year EFL students.

### 4.3. Questionnaire Results

After intervention, a questionnaire was conducted in the experimental group (n = 30) to gather students' perceptions of Linoit. The results are summarized below.

*Table 2. Student Perceptions of Linoit.com (5-point Likert Scale)*

Item (simplified)	Mean	SD
Linoit helped me brainstorm more effectively.	4.5	0.6
Linoit made writing lessons more engaging.	4.4	0.7
Collaborating on Linoit improved my writing ideas.	4.6	0.5
Using Linoit was easy and convenient.	4.2	0.8
I want to use Linoit in future writing classes.	4.3	0.7
Technical problems interfered with the activity.	2.9	1.0

Students expressed a highly positive attitude toward Linoit. The most highly rated aspects were its effectiveness in supporting brainstorming and collaboration. Students reported that the platform enabled them to engage with others' ideas in real time, which helped them structure their essays more clearly. In contrast, the lowest ratings were associated with technical issues, including difficulties with internet connectivity and account registration.

### 4.4. Interview Findings

Semi-structured interviews with 10 students provided deeper insights:

- **Improved commitment:** Students described the Linoit session as "fun", "interactive", "different from regular

classes". Some said they felt more motivated when ideas were visually shared.

- Cooperation and Peer Learning: Many respondents highlighted the advantage that classmates can see contributions. One student said, *"When I saw a friend's note, I found some points I had forgotten, which helped to enlarge my writing."*

- Improved Organization: Students appreciated their ability to draw and reorganize notes. They reported that this made it easier to construct essays compared to traditional brainstorming on paper.

- Challenges: Some students had technical issues, including slow internet and difficulty accessing Linoit on mobile devices. Others felt shy about sharing their ideas publicly, but most of them overcame this after repeated use.

#### **4.5. Classroom Observations**

Classroom observations confirmed the results of the survey and interviews. In the experimental group classes, students appeared more active during the brainstorming phase, with almost all students giving at least one note to the Linoit board. The discussion about grouping ideas was lively and light peer feedback students.

In contrast, brainstorming was often based on loot led by teachers during

control group lessons, resulting in fewer students volunteering. Group discussions tended to be shorter and less interactive. Observers also found that Linoit allowed teachers to monitor participation more transparently. Each memo was marked with the student's name, allowing teachers to identify less active students and encourage them to contribute.

#### **4.6. Summary of Results**

The results of this study can be summarized as follows:

1. Writing performance improved significantly in both groups, but gains were larger in the experimental group using Linoit.com.

2. Content and organization are the most positive areas, indicating that Linoit effectively supports brainstorming and letter planning.

3. Students expressed strong satisfaction with Linoit, particularly in terms of cooperation and commitment, though technical issues were occasionally involved.

4. Qualitative evidence from interviews and observations highlighted increased motivation, more interactive lessons, and more systematic essay planning.

Taken together, these results show that Linoit has undue potential as a tool to improve writing lessons in the EFL

context in Vietnam, especially for first-year students.

## **5. Discussion**

### **5.1. Interpretation of Findings**

The findings of this study show that the digital integration of Linoit noticeably improved first-year students' writing performance at Hai Phong University. In particular, students in the experimental group demonstrated considerable improvements in both content and organization compared to those in the control group. This suggests that Linoit's collaborative brainstorming and visual organization features effectively address two of the most common challenges in EFL writing: generating ideas and structuring essays. These positive results align with the process-based writing approach (Tribble, 2012; Hyland, 2019). By using Linoit boards to brainstorm and categorize ideas, students enhanced the consistency and richness of their essays, especially during the initial stages of writing.

### **5.2. Comparison with Previous Studies**

The findings align with previous studies on digital tools for writing instruction. For example, Elola and Okoz (2010) found that collaborative platforms increase learner interactions, leading to higher quality texts. Similarly, Arsyad and Nur (2024) found that students using

Linoit produced more well-structured essays than paper brainstorming essays. This study contributes to this evidence by confirming the positive effects of Linoit in the Vietnamese university context.

At the same time, the results expand the research by emphasizing that the greatest influence of Linoit is the generation and organization instead of vocabulary and grammar. This shade is important as it indicates the extent to which digital brainstorming tools are achieved. While it can improve the planning and collaboration aspects of writing, it cannot replace explicit lessons of language accuracy.

### **5.3. Student Engagement and Motivation**

Another notable finding is the increased student-reported engagement. The findings and interview data showed that Linoit-users became more comfortable and interactive. This reflects the motivational benefits identified by Rahman and Suparman (2020), and found that digital sticky notes promoted student participation and reduced fear. In the Vietnamese context where students often hesitate to comment in class, it is possible that Linoit's anonymity and visual appeal have created a supportive environment for sharing ideas.

Also, classroom observations show that almost all students contributed to

reducing volunteering during traditional brainstorming sessions during Linoit's activities. It supports Warsaw and Kern (2000) that digital tools help democratizing participation by giving all learners the potential to contribute.

#### **5.4. Challenges and Limitations of Linoit Use**

Despite the positive results, several challenges were also identified in this study. Technical issues, particularly the unstable Internet connection, have sometimes disrupted activities. Some students comment on the publication of ideas, reflecting cultural trends regarding humility in Vietnamese classrooms (Nguyen, 2021). Although most of this hesitation has been overcome over time, teachers may need to encourage and promote a supportive atmosphere to ensure full participation.

Linoit improved students' brainstorming and organizational skills; however, it did not directly enhance their grammar or vocabulary, as evidenced by smaller gains in these rubric categories. This suggests that Linoit should be considered a supplementary tool rather than a replacement for traditional instruction in language accuracy. To maximize its effectiveness, teachers should coordinate technology integration with targeted grammar instruction and vocabulary practice.

#### **5.5. Implications for Teaching**

The results of this study have several important influences on writing at the University of Vietnam.

1. Integrating technology into instructional design: Teachers should incorporate digital tools such as Linoit into the brainstorming process, including activities like phase overviews, to enhance idea generation and essay planning. This approach fosters a more interactive and collaborative writing environment for students.

2. Teacher Training: Instructors must be trained not only in the technical aspects of Linoit, but also in designing effective activities that go beyond the simple memo manipulation of structured essay development.

3. Student Support: Some students may lack digital confidence, so orientation meetings and ongoing support are essential for participation.

4. Mixed Approach: Linoit supports collaboration, however, to achieve comprehensive improvement in writing, it must be combined with explicit vocabulary and grammar lessons.

5. Learning Beyond Classroom: Asynchronous access to the Linoit Board allows students to continue brainstorming and revising ideas outside of class hours.

Teachers should promote this extended use to maximize benefits.

### **5.6. Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

While this study offers valuable insights, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample size was restricted to two university classes, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the intervention lasted only eight weeks; therefore, extended research is necessary to assess the long-term impact on writing development. Third, the study relied in part on self-reported data, which may reflect subjective perceptions rather than objective outcomes. Future research should address these limitations by involving larger and more diverse participant groups across multiple institutions, extending the duration of the intervention, and employing more robust measures of writing performance. Additionally, researchers may explore how Linoit can be integrated with other digital platforms such as Google Docs and learning management systems to create a more comprehensive and technologically enriched writing environment.

### **6. Conclusion**

This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of Linoit in teaching writing to first-year students at Hai Phong University. Using a mixed-methods design, it explored both quantitative

improvements in writing performance and qualitative insights into student engagement and perceptions. Results showed that students using Linoit performed significantly better than those in the control group, particularly in content generation and organizational skills. The platform's visual and collaborative features encouraged students to participate actively during brainstorming and helped them develop more coherent essays. Most participants expressed positive views about Linoit, highlighting increased enthusiasm, creativity, and interaction.

However, some challenges were noted. Classroom activities were occasionally disrupted by technical issues, including unstable internet connectivity. Additionally, while Linoit supported idea development and structure, it did not directly address vocabulary growth or grammatical accuracy.

This study contributes to the growing body of research on technology-enhanced language learning (TELL) by providing empirical evidence of Linoit's effectiveness in the Vietnamese EFL context. It demonstrates that even simple digital platforms can offer meaningful educational value when thoughtfully integrated into instruction. The findings also underscore the importance of combining process-oriented writing pedagogy with digital tools to create

models that can be applied in similar institutional settings. Ultimately, this study provides strong support for using Linoit.com as a supplementary tool in EFL writing instruction. By enhancing pre-writing activities and promoting collaborative learning, Linoit offers a practical, engaging, and cost-effective solution to enrich English writing lessons in universities across Vietnam and beyond.

### REFERENCES

1. Aarar, M. (2022), The effect of classroom debate discussion on students' argumentation writing skills via Linoit app, *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 57(6), 415-428, DOI: 10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.35.
2. Arsyad, N. A., & Nur, R. (2024), Linoit: An effective tool for teaching English, *Channing: Journal of English Language Education and Literature*, 9(1), 51-60, DOI: 10.30598/channing.v9i1.2087.
3. Chapelle, C. A. (2001), *Computer applications in second language acquisition: Foundations for teaching, testing, and research*, Cambridge University Press.
4. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018), *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.), SAGE.
5. Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010), Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development, *Language Learning & Technology*, 14 (3), 51-71.
6. Hyland, K. (2019), *Second language writing* (2nd ed.), Cambridge University Press.
7. Jacobs, H. L., Zingraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981), *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*, Newbury House.
8. Nguyen, T. T. L. (2021), Learning EFL writing in Vietnam: Voices from an upper secondary school's students, *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(4), 1195-1210, DOI:10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.4.8.1195.
9. Nguyen, T. T. H. & Nguyen, N. B. (2023), Product and process approaches of teaching English writing skills, *International Journal of All Research Writings*, 4(11), 650-662.
10. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2018), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, Cambridge University Press.
11. Stockwell, G. (2017), Technology and motivation in English language teaching and learning, In M. Carrier, R. M. Damerow, & K. M. Bailey (Eds.), *Digital language learning and teaching* (pp. 47-65), Routledge.
12. Sun, Y.-C., & Chang, Y.-J. (2012), Blogging to learn: Becoming EFL

- academic writers through collaborative dialogues, *Language Learning & Technology*, 16(1), 43-61.
13. Tong, T.T.N (2024), Difficulties in learning writing skills among English major students at University of Phan Thiet, *Journal of Industry and Trade*, 16 (7), 2024.
14. Tribble, C. (2012), *Writing*, Oxford University Press.
15. Triyono, B., Fauzia, A., & Syafei, R. (2016), Using Linoit application in teaching English, *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(1), <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt>.
16. Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (2000), *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*, Cambridge University Press.
17. Rahman, M. A & Suparman, Y. H (2020), Design of Teaching Material for Problem-Based Learning to Improve Creative Thinking Skills, *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 559 - 565, DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2020.080227.