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ABSTRACT

The primary goal of this thesis is to investigate the way in which learners interact when asked to work together to write and revise a composition in an online environment. Specifically, the first research question explores the working styles of learners in the context of a wiki. It seeks to determine whether the various dyads work collaboratively or cooperatively to write and revise a composition in Spanish. The second research question deals with the type and degree of politeness that students express towards each other when working together to write and revise their composition. Specifically, it investigates the nature of politeness displayed by the dyads who worked collaboratively when compared to those who worked cooperatively. The interactions/written discourse displayed in the chat logs of each dyad is analyzed to understand how varying degrees of politeness characterized each dyad’s working style. The third research question explored how students interpreted and incorporated instructor feedback that was given to them in the wiki on their first draft of the composition. The scores that each composition received were used to determine which type of group work improved more. Chat logs and interview transcripts were analyzed to answer this question.

The results of the study indicate that the majority of students/dyads in this study tended to work collaboratively, meaning they truly worked together to write and revise all parts of their composition to achieve the goal of the project vs. those groups who divided the writing and revision tasks and worked on the compositions in a more individualized manner. It was found that collaborative groups improved more in their compositions. The politeness strategies that collaborative groups used more were those of Strategy 1.
(attending to the addressee) and Strategy 10 (offering) as described in Brown and Levinson (1987).
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The field of foreign language education is an area that often witnesses firsthand the ever-changing landscape of second language (L2) teaching and learning. One of the more recent ways in which instructors improve the experience that students have in the classroom is to look for ways in which students can learn languages using the technological applications/tools that they use in their everyday lives. This thesis reports on the findings of a study that aims to understand the ways in which a specific kind of technology—called a wiki—can help improve students’ foreign language writing abilities. In this preliminary chapter, a brief introduction to the thesis is provided in order to outline the various components that make up this small-scale project.

1.1 Second Language Teaching and Learning

When considering the acquisition of a L2, many questions about this complex process have yet to be fully answered such as how one defines whether a learner has successfully acquired the language, how different kinds of teaching methodologies result in learners acquiring the L2 faster or better, how students interpret and ultimately use corrective feedback, among other issues. An L2 classroom is a good starting point when attempting to investigate the answers to these questions because in this environment, more formal measures are taken to teach the language. These measures are described as being more formal in nature because they are in a classroom where a teacher is present and where all students are receiving the same information and resources. In an effort to better understand these processes and the process of learning an L2 as a whole, many factors need to be considered including the instructor teaching the L2, the cognitive,
social, and academic backgrounds of the students learning the L2, the ways in which students develop various skills in the language (e.g., writing, reading, listening, and speaking) and the teaching methodologies used to teach the material.

Some of the more important technical elements that form the learning experience of an L2 are grammar, orthography, vocabulary, and culture. When these elements are present in a language classroom, students can begin to form meaning in the L2 because they are in possession of the tools that are required to produce the language correctly. Sometimes, however, possessing these elements all at the same time can be a difficult task for L2 learners. In language classrooms, students often feel overwhelmed with new grammar rules, a number of vocabulary word lists, along with unique cultural aspects related to the people and places where the L2 is spoken. This is the reason why instructors must be diligent in creating tasks for students that not only enhance their grammatical, lexical, and cultural knowledge of the language, but also motivate students to continue working hard to successfully acquire the language.

1.2 Motivation and Second Language Learning

Instructors must also consider the way in which students live their everyday lives to make sure that language-learning activities are meaningful to the students, thereby motivating and helping them to acquire the L2. Dörnyei and Ottó (1998) explain that students may at times feel as though by completing assignments, they are merely complying with what the teacher is asking. They suggest that having students do activities that are mechanical in nature and do not allow them to collaboratively work to achieve a language goal can decrease students’ motivation which can also negatively affect the quality of the product that they produce (Dörnyei & Ottó, p. 44). Therefore,
they propose that teachers follow their suggested model for motivation, implying that when the model is followed, intrinsic motivation will be achieved. The model consists of a pre-actional phase where goals are set and defined based on the intended outcome of the task, an Actional Phase where students are completing a task based on the goals that are set and defined, and a Post-actional Phase where the task at hand is evaluated and whether or not the goal was achieved is determined.

Dörnyei (1997) also suggests that simply using computer-mediated communication in the L2 classroom will increase motivation in students. Creating more activities online and delivering content electronically are increasingly becoming more common techniques to teach an L2. Authors and researchers such as Kissau (2010) conclude that technology has become an important part of students’ academic, social, and personal lives. As such, teaching an L2 can be just as challenging as learning one for instructors who are not familiar with various kinds of technological applications (Dörnyei 1997, pg. 483).

1.3 L2 Writing and Wikis

One important skill in an L2, as well as in one’s native language, is the ability to use its grammar correctly in a written format. Having the ability to successfully write a cohesive and coherent essay or paragraph in an L2 is something that can facilitate the development of other linguistic abilities in the language. Once a student can produce a well-written piece of work, that student can feel more confident in his/her knowledge of L2 grammar and in the ability to communicate ideas in a manner that is acceptable in the academic world. However, according to Warschauer (2010) and Kessler (2009), developing the ability to write in the L2 can be a very difficult task. In addition, for many
students the process of writing can be frustrating and can deter the student from enjoying the language or prevent her from wanting to continue to learn. Warschauer (2010) also states that writing encourages students to create a mental picture of what is being learned of the L2. This can be problematic for students because for many of them it is a more advanced skill for them to develop. Furthermore, one of the most common ways to assess students’ writing ability in a formal classroom setting is to have students work on their own to complete a timed writing task. While this kind of assessment is standard in many L2 classrooms, this type of writing task has been found by some (e.g., Ferris, 2004) to cause students to become nervous, thereby not allowing them to complete the task nor fully demonstrate their actual writing ability in the L2. The question then arises of how to alleviate the stress that students feel when working on a L2 writing task and create an environment where writing can be a more useful and productive experience and not something to be feared by the learner.

Since allowing students an unlimited amount of time to finish a writing task inside the classroom is not feasible, one remedy to the problem of nerves and pressure-filled situations that has recently been adopted and used by L2 instructors is having students write their compositions online at home, thereby giving them an extended period of time in which to complete their writing assignments. A useful tool that instructors are using to successfully assign projects of this nature is called a wiki.

Leslie (2010) defines a wiki as “a series of collaborative web pages which can be edited by all those with a password, or by all those who visit it, and which becomes a ‘repository of knowledge, with the knowledge base growing over time’” (p. 55). Wikis, therefore allow students to enter their own webpage and create a composition at their own
pace. Since students are able to freely edit their writing in the wiki, this allows them time to think about their composing process(es) and affords them the ability to compose a well-written composition. The process of writing via a wiki has been shown to facilitate learners’ L2 writing development (Martinez-Carrillo & Pentikousis, 2008). In addition, the asynchronous nature of writing in a wiki is also a testament to their ease of use. By asynchronous, it is understood that what is being written in a wiki is something that can be saved by the person writing in the wiki and continued at a future moment in time. As such, the writing task does not have to be immediately carried out in one sitting. Additionally, wikis allow students to work outside of the physical classroom, thereby having an extended period of time to finish the writing task. Students can therefore be free to consult dictionaries and other resources that may not be readily accessible to them when carrying out a timed composition in a formal classroom setting.

Another unique feature of wikis is that they also allow the possibility that more than one student may participate in the composing process. Specifically, wikis can promote student interaction and collaboration since they are an online tool that can be easily accessed by one or more students. Elola and Oskoz (2010) add that the collaboration that wikis foster “promotes reflective thinking” (p. 209) on the part of the student. According to the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996), acquisition is best attained through interaction with other people who also speak or know the language. Specifically, Long (1996) argues that input alone (e.g., that which is solely provided by an instructor), is not sufficient to acquire an L2. Long goes on to suggest that input needs to be comprehensible or meaningful to students before they are able to use it. Students, when writing in a wiki, are working together to produce language and are therefore creating
input for each other in this virtual environment. Others (Arnold, 2007) have found that interaction is present via collaboration in the context of a wiki. Specifically, Arnold (2007) indicates that a wiki provides a low-stakes and non-threatening environment where students can feel confident in themselves to produce a well-written composition. Although Long’s (1996) hypothesis presupposes that learning happens via the interaction between a native speaker (NS) and a non-native speaker (NNS), communication between two NNS students can also be beneficial, as it promotes interaction (Swain & Lapkin, 1998).

1.4 Social Aspects of Wikis

A unique characteristic of the way in which collaboration unfolds between students is the underlying social dynamic that evolves between members of a dyad or group. A question to be asked is how individual students, when given the task to work with another student on a language activity, contribute to the effort. Part of this question is whether the effort is collaborative (i.e., where each student truly works together to create the finished product) or cooperative (i.e., where each student has a designated task to complete individually). Once this information is determined, the issue is then raised of how composing in a wiki affects the outcome of what is being written and how it affects how students work together (or not) to create a composition. Remaining to be seen is whether the fact that a composition is carried out online and/or written outside of the classroom changes the way students go about writing and working together versus working in pairs in a classroom setting. These are just some of the questions that have yet to be answered in the research literature on wikis and L2 learning.
Additionally, the way in which the groups and group members are selected to work on an activity, such as a written composition, is also an important factor to consider when investigating if or how the social dynamic of a group affects the writing process and product. Some questions related to this issue are the following: how groups should be arranged; what factors instructors should consider when assigning groups; how the proficiency level of each student affects how the students cooperate with each other in the group; whether being seen and given advice by a peer who is on the same level academically has any impact on the way the group functions (in other words, how do students view being corrected by another student). These kinds of questions motivated the researcher to carry out the current study.

1.5 Corrective Feedback

Another feature of a composition assignment like the one that is being analyzed in this thesis is instructor correction of student errors. It is evident that many factors are taken into account when instructors first begin to look at and correct a student’s written work. Some features of students’ writing that instructors might look at include content errors such as whether the student gets his/her meaning across in a clear and efficient manner. Other errors deal with the language itself such as spelling, and lexical or grammatical errors. When assigning a writing activity in a wiki, instructors should be selective as to how many and what types of errors to correct to allow students to fully understand the meaning of what they are correcting. In addition, an instructor needs to be sure that his/her indicated errors are comprehensible to students. Once these items are taken into consideration, it then becomes relevant to study the students’ reactions to these errors and the way in which they correct the errors.
The question of how the error correction process works for both instructor and student in a wiki environment will also be explored in this thesis. Finally, this research project will draw on the theory of situated learning presented by Lave and Wenger (1991) that describes learning in terms of a community of practice. In this theory, it is argued that Vygotsky’s (1978) proposed socio-cultural theory, which indicates that learning is defined by the internalization of information, does not fully account for learning because learning inevitably draws on experience and practice in a community where members can teach each other.

1.6 Research Questions

This research project attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. Do wikis promote collaborative or cooperative interactions when students write a descriptive essay?

2. How does the social dynamic of each dyad affect how students compose and revise in a wiki environment?

3. How do students incorporate/treat instructor feedback in a wiki environment?

In sum, the value and practicality of online tools in the fields of L2 acquisition and education are many. The purpose of the present study is to gain insight into the use of new teaching methods (specifically wikis) for foreign language classrooms as well as explore possible limitations of these new methods. With this study, knowledge will be attained as far as the importance and effects of pairing learners when carrying out a linguistic task in a dyad or group in a wiki. The study also aims to understand how students view collaboration in a wiki when given a writing task (i.e., focusing on error correction in this medium). The ultimate goal of this study, however, is to determine what
benefits (if any) are provided by wikis and to determine the most beneficial ways to utilize them in a foreign language classroom. With these goals, it is hoped that the results of this study will provide useful knowledge to the field of foreign language education.

Taking the aforementioned information into account, the second chapter of this thesis will provide a review of the research literature related to wikis and their purpose in a language-learning environment. In addition, I will provide a summary of the research related to instructor feedback and student error correction in an L2 learning context. Third, a review of the literature regarding how group work—specifically the social dynamic(s) within a dyad or group—can affect each learner and the overall learning process/task will be explored. Finally, I will provide a review of the theoretical framework being used in this study.

The third chapter of this thesis will deal with the methodology used in the study. Discussed in chapter 3 will be an explanation of the data collection and analysis measures/procedures such as a description of how participants were selected and the writing task used in the study. The fourth chapter contains the results of the study and discusses their importance. The fifth chapter contains the conclusions drawn from the results of the project along with an explanation of the limitations of the study and future avenues for research in this area.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will provide an in-depth look at various facets of research that are necessary to consider for this thesis project. The sections will include a theoretical background that examines the theory of situated learning proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991) to better understand why collaboration and social activity is important for learners when acquiring an L2 in a classroom context. The politeness theory put forth by Brown and Levinson (1987) will be used as well to understand the collaborative/cooperative dichotomy that evolved out of the interactions of the various dyads in the study. In addition, a number of studies will be highlighted that deal with the use of wikis and their importance in the classroom. A section dealing with teacher corrective feedback will be included to understand how instructors correct compositions and what types of errors they correct. Lastly, a section that looks at peer interaction in wiki environments is presented to address the nature of social dynamic(s) and how this can affect how students work together to revise and create their final written products in an L2 context.

2.1 Interaction and its Role in Language Acquisition

Common among scholars in the field of L2 acquisition is the notion that to achieve the ultimate goal of attainment of a language, there must exist an element of interaction among two or more people. To better explain the importance of interaction and collaboration between two or more learners of the language, this thesis will adopt as its theoretical framework the constructs that make up the theory of situated learning proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991). In this theory, it is argued that learning is not merely the internalization of information as defined by Vygotsky (1978). Rather, it is a much more social practice. The notion of situated learning is explained by first establishing that there needs to exist the element of “legitimate peripheral participation”
(Lave & Wenger 1991, p. 35) in order for learning of any kind to occur. Legitimate peripheral participation is defined as a type of participation in which there is no power between members of a community; each person—as a member of the community—has access to all parts of the community and the privileges afforded by the community. Legitimate peripheral participation in learning, as opposed to internalization of information as learning, also takes into account motivation and goals of learning as significant factors that influence what one learns. Motivation and goals are described as integral components to learning because they affect how much students participate, how often they participate, and to what extent they interact with each other. In this way, knowledge is described by Lave and Wenger as “open-ended” because “understanding and experience are in constant interaction with each other” (p. 52).

Also central to the theory of situated learning is that it is not the individual who is at the center of learning. Rather, each member (i.e., as an individual) is considered as a member of a community of practice, meaning that members have a common goal of learning something. As such, individual needs are not neglected, but neither is the role of the community in learning. Learning, according to this theory, involves the members of the communities being in tune with the activity at hand and to be in harmony with the community at the same time. Once again, knowledge here is open-ended. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), “learning is not a condition of membership but is itself an evolving form of membership” (p. 53). This means that the focus here is taken off of the sheer fact of learning and focusing on learning as it correlates with being a part of a community. Once membership into this community is attained, the learning process has already begun by default because the new member has learned enough to become a full
member of the community who enjoys the benefits of what the participants have to share. Lave and Wenger are also quick to state that the only way to truly gain membership and peripheral participant status is to participate actively in the group. In other words, without contributing to the goals of the community and becoming a peripheral participant, learning as it is defined cannot happen.

If it is required that one be a member of a community of practice to obtain the highest goal of learning something, then motivation must exist on the part of the member to be a member and to participate. Lave and Wenger (1991) make this point and then go on to explain motivation and how it pertains to the notion of a community of practice. They state that motivation must first be intrinsic. In other words, it must come from inside the member and not be forced upon him. One way that they suggest to gain intrinsic motivation is by stating that communities of practice must provide access to their communities. This is to say that anyone who wishes to become a member must have a chance to become a member of the community. With this opportunity to share learning with others, motivation is fostered because learning does not seem unattainable. Students feel a larger desire to contribute once they feel they are of worth in the community and that they have already contributed to the group’s goals.

In a similar vein, Chapelle (2004) analyzes computer-assisted language learning (CALL) from an interactionist perspective. She uses Long’s (1996) Interaction Hypothesis as her theoretical base. One part of Long’s (1996) theory deals with the fact that students cannot thrive on input from another speaker alone. Chapelle suggests that while Long’s (1996) interaction hypothesis primarily dealt with face-to-face interaction, many of the same principles can be easily applied to computer-assisted language learning
contexts (Chapelle, 2004). Among these principles is the fact that using text (synchronous) online chat with another person is a productive way to achieve interaction between speakers (2004, p. 5). Another interactional feature of computers mentioned is the fact that computers can also provide video-based chats where learners can speak with others face-to-face on the computer (Chapelle, 2004, p. 5). Blake (2000) also finds in his study that certain activities that would normally be done in a classroom work setting can be adapted for a virtual environment. In Blake’s (2000) study, he makes use of jigsaw tasks. A jigsaw task is when two students are each given half of a picture and they must work in pairs to complete it. When carrying out this specific task in a virtual (i.e., computer) environment, he concludes that:

“Learners heighten their vocabulary development and where they still need to go in order to gain more target-like lexical control. Doing tasks in a [computer-mediated communication] environment then generates apperceived input, which can subsequently be used to modify and improve their vocabulary” (Blake, 2000, p. 133).

2.1.1 Collaborative vs. Cooperative Learning

While interaction may appear to be a straightforward concept, research has investigated the various ways in which students carry out pair or group work. Oxford (1997) analyzes the roles of collaboration and cooperation and their differences when dealing with group work in an educational setting. In her study, she defines collaborative learning as when “people act upon each other” (p. 444). By this she means that students are interacting with each other and consulting with one another to create a final product (e.g., a composition). In this way, students are becoming members of a community of
practice, such as the one defined by Lave and Wenger (1991), because they are encouraged to utilize each other’s’ knowledge. On the contrary, Oxford states that a trait of cooperative learning is that students are more accountable and there is more of a role for the individual student’s contribution within the group at hand (p. 445). Each student here works to contribute his or her own part of the project and little interaction between students is involved during the process. The nature of group projects is that students must make a decision as to how they will go about completing the assignment at hand. This allows the participation shared by the students to be classified as either collaborative or cooperative and in order to assess and analyze the way in which groups work together, it is important to determine into which category the project falls.

Holliman and Scanion (2006) affirm the definitions of cooperative and collaborative learning mentioned by Oxford (1997) by stating that cooperative learning involves students learning the language vicariously and passively. By using the terms “vicariously” and “passively”, the authors are stating that students are not interacting with each other to achieve learning the way they are when they work collaboratively. Rather, they are learning through the activity itself, or passively. Hathorne and Ingram (2002) add to Oxford’s (1997) definition of the terms by stating that collaboration fosters interdependence (i.e., where members of the group depend on each other) to complete tasks. Dillenbourg (1999) also agrees that collaboration involves members of a group using each other to verify ideas and to get affirmation of what is being produced. Slavin (1991) continues to help distinguish between the two terms as he states that cooperative learning involves more independence on the part of the student, much like what Oxford (1997) states. To sum up the definitions given by this previous research regarding
collaborative work versus cooperative work, collaboration occurs when students contribute to each and every part of the assignment and consult with one another by working together to achieve the goal. Cooperation occurs when work is done more individually and parts of the project are put together to make a whole project once each member has completed his own part. This explanation of cooperative and collaborative learning serves to help explain different ways in which students can interact. This distinction is important to underscore here before addressing group dynamics further below in this chapter.

2.2 The Uses and Functions of Wikis in Relation to Language Learning

The role/use of technology in L2 classrooms has, as of late, become a heavily investigated topic among researchers aiming to discover the effects of these new methods on L2 teaching and learning. Current L2 teaching methodologies (Lee & VanPatten, 2003) promote interactional and technological approaches to teaching and learning languages as these techniques tend to reflect the daily lives of the students who are investing their time in learning an L2. A principal concern is the way in which technological applications, such as wikis, have become useful tools that easily allow students to collaborate when carrying out language learning tasks both in and outside of the classroom. Interaction therefore evolves from collaboration that, in turn, fosters acquisition of the L2.

Researchers such as Chinnery (2008) write about the need to incorporate new teaching methods—specifically technological methods—into L2 classrooms. Chinnery also speaks of the lack of the use of technology in the classroom as a problem with current teaching methodologies. Wikis are one of many tools that can be easily
incorporated into any classroom. A wiki is a recently popularized medium that exists on the internet that has of late been found to have multiple benefits in the field of foreign language education. Minocha and Roberts (2008) define a wiki as “an asynchronous collaborative authoring environment – a readable and writeable website in which potentially all the visitors to the site can create new pages or modify existing ones, with optional access control to set limits on authorship” (2008, p. 274). Wagner (2004) adds that wikis “[support] ‘conversational’ knowledge creation and sharing” (p. 265). Wikis are not only excellent sites for collaboration that are fairly easy to use, but they are also areas where people feel safe entering and publishing information (Wagner, 2004).

Prichard (2008) goes on to say that wikis provide a “meaningful” (p. 38) site for students to publish work that will allow them to feel like their work is being published legitimately. Wikis, therefore, are not just any website that can be created on the internet; they often serve a specific purpose. Lund (2008) states that wikis’ collaborative nature can also help students with their “ability to solve complex problems that are typical of the knowledge society but beyond the capacity of the individual” (p. 36). Amidst the obvious collaborative nature of wikis, the majority of wiki sites offer chat features where students can converse with one another live while composing the work that is being done. Martinez-Carrillo and Pentikousis (2008) state that wikis are also very effective in easing the shift from individual to collaborative work for students which makes them enjoyable and an excellent learning tool (p. 39). This allows for even more interaction between students and opens the door to further acquisition and knowledge of the language.

In addition to the benefits of using wikis in the classroom, there are drawbacks as well. There are some reasons for students to feel apprehension or hesitation when writing
in a foreign language in a wiki. Warschauer and Grimes (2007) address the vulnerability that students may feel about composing online by pointing out that the idea of authorship is somewhat dying since wikis can easily be entered and changed (p. 11). Godwin-Jones (2010) rejects this notion by reminding that wikis are easily privacy-protected so that only a limited audience may view the written content. Kissau et al. (2010) reiterate that students will feel less anxious communicating online not only for the aforementioned privacy reason but also because today’s students are accustomed to various forms of technology such as the internet. As such, the virtual world can actually become a comfort zone for them, which, in turn, can decrease the amount of anxiety that they feel when they are composing in their L2 (p. 286).

One concern that instructors often have regarding written assignments is the quantity of language that students produce. In his study, Warschauer (2010) posits that wikis may promote increased language output due to the fact that the compositions are done at home and without such a narrow time limit under which to work (p. 5). Warschauer (1997) also suggests that wikis, being asynchronous, can foster a positive attitude towards writing in the L2 because the element of pressure (time and affective filter) is eliminated. Warschauer’s (1997) study found that when positive attitudes are present, students will be inclined to write more and produce more language. Since the ultimate goal of an L2 class is to allow students to produce language, the more language that is produced the more assessment of the language the teacher can carry out. Bower et al. (2006) hypothesize that since wikis are able to be used at home and are so closely related to other social networking sites that students use daily, students will adapt and they will become powerful teaching tools.
Warschauer (2010) speculates that wikis also provide for instructors the ease of being able to see who in the group contributes what part of the composition since each person has his own username and account. Being able to do this also allows the instructor the ability to make a better assessment of the group’s dynamic and how the students are working together to arrive at a well-written composition. With this, Warschauer (2010) also alludes to the fact that along with providing instructors the opportunity to see who has written what within the wiki, the nature of a wiki also allows instructors to view a timestamp that expresses the exact moment in which a composition was written or edited. This fact can prove to be favorable because it is yet another method to ensure that both members of the pair are contributing equally and one member is not simply doing the whole task for the pair (p. 5). One other benefit that wikis provide to education, according to Murray and Hourigan (2006), is that they are tools that students can use for free and are easy to access online. This is particularly a benefit for students and for schools that choose to use wiki technology because there are no financial hindrances that prevent their use. Because of their ease of use, students can focus more attention on the goal of the project that they are carrying out rather than on using the technology itself, and this should lead to a better and well thought-out linguistic task/product (Leslie, 2010, p. 52).

An important aspect of wiki use to consider when using them in a classroom setting is students’ attitudes toward the wikis themselves. If students do not like wikis or if they find their use difficult or time-consuming, they will be less likely to have a positive attitude towards the project that they are being asked to complete. Looking to investigate this very question, Lee (2010) conducted a study in which she had students write on various topics in a wiki. She first analyzed the improvement and progress in the
way that the students were writing and then had them fill out a survey. In this survey, she used a five-point Likert scale where the students rated wikis in general. She discovered through the results of this survey that “more than 50% of the students expressed their preferences for creating a wiki to traditional writing with a word processor” (p. 165). With a percentage such as the one above of students who preferred using the wiki, it is seen that wikis have at least made an impact in the way that students view learning (otherwise it would have been lower). It can be argued that a wiki is a tool that students enjoy using and find beneficial to their own learning endeavors, which is always a benefit in a learning environment.

Similarly, Kissau (2010) concurs with Lee (2010) by arguing that in his study students felt more comfortable communicating online than traditionally with a word processor. In his (2010) study, he administered a pre- and post-test to L2 students in which they ranked their ability in the language and followed up with interviews. It was through the interviews that he discovered that students felt more comfortable composing and communicating in the online realm than on a word processor or via face-to-face interaction. This result proves significant when arguing for the use of wikis as a tool for composing and collaborating.

2.3 Teacher Feedback, Peer Feedback, and Group Dynamics in Wikis

2.3.1 Teacher Feedback in L2 Writing

An important aspect of writing projects in general—whether they are online or any other type of assignment—is the linguistic- and content-related feedback that students receive both from their instructor and from each other. Lyster and Ranta (1997), Ferris (1997), Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1996), Ferris (1995), Ng and Tsui (2000), and Oskoz
and Liskin-Gasparro (2001), among others, have studied the types of corrections that instructors and students working in group formats provide and their effects on students’ attitudes towards the activity. Not only have they studied the effects on attitudes, but they have also extensively studied the effects on the product itself (i.e., the quality of what is produced). Lyster and Ranta (1997) study the different types of feedback and their relation to the uptake experienced by students. Contrary to Long et al. (1998), who conducted pre- and post-tests and found that recasts provided the most successful improvement rates, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that recasts, which are defined as a “reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error” (p. 46), are the forms of error correction that are least beneficial to learners. Ironically, recasts were seen in their (1997) study and in Oskoz and Liskin-Gasparro’s (2002) study to be the most frequent form of error correction employed by instructors. It is said, however, that

“the feedback uptake sequence engages students more actively when there is negotiation of form, that is, when the correct form is not provided to the students—as it is in recasts and explicit correction—and when signals are provided to the learner that assist in the reformulation of the erroneous utterance” (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 58).

Therefore, since recasts are found in this study to be the least beneficial form of error correction for students, teachers should find ways to point out errors to students that show them that they have made an error while still forcing students to arrive at the correct answer on their own. Although Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) study deals with verbal feedback in the language classroom, it can also be applied to the written assignment as well. This can be done because instructors, while correcting written compositions, can
still have varying levels of specificity and length of their corrections that students must interpret. For example, if an instructor chooses not to have students partake in a second draft or correction phase of a composition, this can be considered analogous to a recast because students are not benefitting from any uptake since they don’t know where they made their errors. Similarly, if a teacher simply chooses to return an essay to students without any errors marked and only denotes a grade earned, students do not understand their mistakes and do not learn.

Ferris (1995) raises some important issues about instructor corrective feedback by arguing that the way students perceive instructor feedback will vary depending on the assignment. She states that in a multiple-draft assignment, students, unsurprisingly, will feel more of a sense of urgency to pay better attention to the corrections being made than if it were a single-draft composition (p. 36). Ferris (1997) also brings up the point that the specific location where instructors physically write comments (i.e., in the margins or at the end of the document) will affect how students view them. She states that comments written in the margins of compositions are “short” (p. 323) in nature and much more specific (i.e., grammatical) in nature. Comments written at the end of compositions tend to be “long” (p. 323) and more summative (holistic and content-based) in nature. Her point is that depending on what type of errors and corrections teachers want their students to focus on, they need to be careful where they write their comments.

Since the writing that occurs in wikis is corrected mainly by deletion or complete replacement of material, it is important then for instructors to be careful about how they insert their comments or feedback into the wikis so that students are easily able to see them and apply them in future drafts. Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) agree with this
notion by mentioning that the “corrective habits” (p. 299) of instructors (i.e., whether correcting more form or content, or whether correcting holistically or error by error) can influence what students value as important in their second drafts as well.

Truscott found in his (1996) study that when teachers focused on grammar issues and point out grammatical error after grammatical error, that it was detrimental to students’ attainment and counter-productive in its nature. Since students feel so overwhelmed, he finds, they are less likely to get anything out of the assignment that they are doing. He urges teachers and instructors to focus on a more holistic approach when correcting essays and compositions in the language rather than correcting a myriad of grammatical errors. Goring Kepner (1991) concurs, adding that “in this study, error-corrections and rule-reminders seemed to serve neither for significantly improving students' level of written accuracy in L2 surface skills nor for enhancing the ideational quality of L2 students' writing” (p. 310). Frantzen (1995) adds that simply being in an intermediate-level Spanish course will allow students to significantly improve their grammar in the language, and that more content and general writing issues should be focused on when correcting a second language composition.

Hyland (2003) agrees with Truscott (1996) in that instructors should aim not to overwhelm students with the quantity of errors that they are signaling in a composition. However, she encounters in her study (in which students’ perceptions of teacher feedback was the focus) that students did in fact appreciate their grammar being corrected to some extent. She posits that it is virtually the only way in which language skills can be ascertained to the degree required to pass a language course. She makes a point, however, in stating that the amount to which students reported valuing or using the feedback
provided by a teacher varied by the case study itself (2003, p. 228). Goring Kepner (1991) proposes using a “message-related comments model” (p. 307). This term implies that instructors would write a message to the student in Spanish at the end of the composition that spoke to the student (used his or her name) and spoke to the piece itself. These messages suggested ways to improve the journal entries, which was the particular type of composition that was investigated in her study. She found that for college-level or higher education students, this was an especially effective way to correct a composition to which the students responded well.

One other way that instructors heavily influence the pace of the group project is by picking a theme on which the students will focus their compositions. Montero-Fleta et al. (2008) conducted a study in which they compared compositions written on a variety of themes that included political topics, cultural ideas, and themes such as “fútbol” (soccer) (p. 775). They noted in their results that students paid much more attention to error correction in compositions written about themes that they enjoyed or that interested them more rather than in compositions written about something that was of no personal interest. This is an indication that instructors must choose topics carefully and that they must also pay close attention to how they select groups if topics will be controversial in nature. It is also an indication that controversial topics should probably be avoided unless there is a particular goal in mind that involves those topics. Pérez-Sotelo and González-Bueno (2003) speculate, however, that the sheer fact of writing in a wiki (and the fact that the instructor has assigned a project of this nature) will contribute to students’ interest in the assignment and the results will be more to the instructor’s liking. Perhaps this is due to the fact that wikis provide a real-world context in which the students may continue to
communicate after the class has ended, thus making the assignment itself more meaningful for the students and increase students’ level of interest in the writing activity.

2.3.2 Peer Feedback/Group Dynamic in a Wiki Environment

Just as instructors play a large role in the shaping of collaborative assignments and how they are corrected, students too have a role in the effectiveness of the project and acquisition of the language. Kessler (2010, 2009) argues that autonomy and independence from an instructor or expert on the students’ part during collaborative assignments should be investigated just as much as the instructor’s role. Kessler (2010) claims that collaboration in a wiki environment affords students an opportunity to teach themselves (p. 43) and that it makes students feel more accountable for their own contribution to the assignment, thereby encouraging them to learn more on their own before the time to collaborate arrives (p. 49). The author also finds that these factors contribute to the students’ willingness to work within their own groups. He goes on to state that this attribute is a very important part of group dynamics and what it entails.

Kessler (2009) conducted a study in a wiki environment where there was to be solely peer feedback given within the group and zero instructor intervention. The results indicated that complete autonomy from the instructor was something to be desired and was good in theory. However, it instilled within some of the participants a sense of discouragement and discord with other group members at times. Discouragement was felt primarily because students at times had trouble arriving at conclusions on their own and amongst themselves as a group, and with no teacher interacting with them, there was no guidance to allow students to arrive at these conclusions. This occurred even though students in this study were attempting to do everything they could on their own.
Therefore, the idea of student autonomy is still valid. However, the instructor’s role in the process of writing in a wiki must be much more carefully constructed so as to have both roles of student and instructor be well balanced.

An obvious benefit to peer feedback or peer correction, according to Tsui and Ng (2000), is that peer correction is more targeted and pitched towards the level of ability of the learner that is being corrected (p. 148). The results of their (2000) study indicate that even though having peers correct compositions was a positive element of the process, students still incorporated more of the instructor’s feedback. The reasons that this occurs could possibly include the fact that students simply trust the response that instructors give more than the responses or corrections that their fellow classmates give to them. Another reason is that the instructors ultimately assign the grades to the students. Lund and Smørdal (2006) offer a suggestion of how to fix this problem in reminding their readers that wikis themselves do not offer special privileges to administrators so instructors are at the same level as the students as far as what they are allowed to do, correct, and manipulate within a wiki (p. 39). They go on to comment that the only real power an administrator has within a wiki that normal users do not possess is that administrators can choose which users see which wiki (2000, p. 39). As such, students can get more of a sense that their corrections of their own work and suggestions offered to their peers are more on the level of the instructor and of what the instructor can do which would ideally improve relations between group members, but obviously this is not always the case. Elola and Oskoz (2010) also add that the collaboration between students and the interactions they have with each other in a correction process is beneficial because it focuses students more on the “grammatical accuracy, lexis, and discourse, and
encourages a pooling of knowledge about language” (p. 209). They argue that this does not always occur when the instructor is the one making the corrections.

Lund and Smørdal (2006), Grant (2009), Tharp et al. (2000), and Crook (2008), among others, address the issue of tension and discord within small collaborative groups working together in a wiki environment. Lund and Smørdal (2006) gave students questionnaires that asked students to write about their experiences working in pairs and being corrected by their peers. Results included comments such as “Someone can change what you have written, even when you know what you have written is correct” (p. 41), and “My texts got deleted” (p. 41). However, comments were also received such as “I like this because it is a win/win situation. To help others and get help back is nice. Co-operating is very important in our daily lives and future jobs!” (p. 40). As such, Lund and Smørdal (2006) suggest that instructors continue to do what wikis allow them to which is monitor and mediate the group dynamic to combat this potential shift in harmony among the members.

Crook (2008) finds that using social types of software in a classroom or educational setting, while beneficial to the learner, also creates an environment where students felt vulnerable and uneasy with publishing work that would be viewed and corrected. His study found that students, feeling vulnerable themselves, were hesitant to correct others’ work. Grant (2009) also had members of her study work together to edit one another’s compositions. Similar to what was found in the study of Crook (2008), Grant (2009) found that “very few edited material on others’ pages” (p. 109) and that “[there was only one] example of a student trying to substantively contribute to the work of others, and [it] was met with hostility by the rest of the group” (p. 109). Her suggestion
for this particular study (2009) to help instructors avoid similar fates was to pair students according to proficiency level (i.e., pairing students together who are at the same level of proficiency) in order to form more unity and equality among students. To conclude, pairing students according to ability level is beneficial for various reasons. It allows them to learn from each other as well as from the assignment, and it promotes interaction between the two students at the same time because they are more heavily reliant on each other to accomplish the goals of the assignment.

2.4 Politeness Theory and Wikis

One way in which social dynamic in wikis can be measured is by applying the politeness model of Brown and Levinson (1987). These authors put forth a notion that gives value to the nature of the planning of social interaction, and also state that analyzing the forethought that is put into message construction is the proper way to analyze strategic language use (p. 56). The notion of politeness has become an important concept in the field of linguistics because the way in which people communicate with each other and the linguistic choices that they make can dictate the social relationship that will be had between those two people (Brown and Levinson 1987, p. 55). The concept of politeness that these authors propose is applicable to both spoken and written communication (including genres such as letters and online communication), and is therefore easily applicable to the use of communication in wikis as well. This is due to the fact that communication in wikis is online and asynchronous (i.e., not instantaneous).

There are two main components of this construct, positive and negative politeness. The authors argue that positive politeness is the want to take the addressee’s (i.e. the receiver of the message) wants and desires into account when constructing a
message. The strategies that people put to use to formulate messages that employ positive politeness include taking the other person’s wants into account, including both the addressee and the speaker in the statement by making it obvious that there is mutual effort to achieve a goal (i.e., using the word “we”) (p.127), and offering to do something for the addressee. To quote the authors, positive politeness demonstrates “interest and approval of each other’s personality, presuppositions indicating shared wants and shared knowledge, implicit claims to reciprocity of and shared knowledge, implicit claims to reciprocity of obligations or to reflexivity of wants, etc., are routinely exchanged” (p. 101). Also part of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory is the concept of negative politeness, or the addressee’s “want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded” (p. 129). In these interactions, the idea is to avoid imposition to the other member of the conversation. Both types of politeness are useful in understanding the way in which people go about deciding how to formulate an utterance, word a sentence, ask a question, or any other kind of speech act that can be contrived.

According to Kissau (2010) and Lee (2010), one feature of wikis is that they are also used for a variety of purposes and by a number of different types of people, and they are not always used collaboratively. Therefore, there are many ways in which people interact in this online environment and both components of politeness theory could be employed. However, in a language learning context where students are asked to work together to compose, it is interesting to analyze the lengths to which these students go in order to appeal to the recipient of the message (if they in fact do make this attempt). An aspect of linguistics that has not been explored much in the past is the determination of whether or not people actually make an attempt to care about the message recipient
himself and maintain a certain harmony in an online environment. For this reason, positive politeness is an area that merits further investigation and it will be the primary focus of the second research question.

One way in which to apply this theory to the wiki chat logs of students who are working together is to code these chat logs to see which politeness strategies they have used in their discussions. Specifically, in determining which strategies students use in their wiki interactions, one can easily see which types of group work employ more of the positive politeness strategies, and which strategies are used more by each type of group. In doing so, connections can be made between this notion of politeness and the two types of pair work, cooperative and collaborative, that have not been studied previously.

2.5 Goals of the Study

The primary goal of this study is to examine the nature of collaborative L2 writing in a wiki. Specifically, the study attempts to better understand the social dynamics of a number of student dyads who have been assigned to work together to create a written essay via an online writing tool (i.e., a wiki). In addition to analyzing the social dynamic(s) of the various dyads when they are composing in their L2 in a virtual context, linguistic analyses will also be carried out on students’ compositions to better understand how wikis facilitate or inhibit students’ ability to improve their writing via their instructor’s feedback when jointly working on the composition.

New teaching methods and tools that can be used in and outside of the classroom are increasingly being used by L2 instructors. These new methods are primarily sought because the field of education must keep abreast of new technological developments since many students have grown up using a number of technologies in both personal and
academic contexts. According to Warschauer (2010), technology is becoming a part of students’ everyday lives whether they consciously seek to use it or not. Therefore, it is in the students’ best interest for instructors to attempt to find ways to incorporate it into their lessons. Through these new technologies, students are also provided with online tools that will give them skills that will aid them in their academic endeavors. Wikis have recently been investigated to discover the effects of using them in a L2 language class (Godwin-Jones, 2003; Lund, 2008; Warschauer & Grimes, 2007; Warschauer, 2010).

According to Auger et al. (2004), wikis are “fully editable websites. Users can visit, read, re-organise and update the structure and content (text and pictures) of a wiki as they see fit” (p. 95). However, a number of questions remain regarding how wikis are used by instructors in upper-level, content-based L2 courses along with how students react and use wikis when presented with a writing task in these contexts. Therefore, the following research questions were carefully chosen based on this information. Finally, the study looks at how students react to and incorporate teacher feedback in their writing in a wiki environment. The research questions being posed are:

1. Do wikis promote collaborative or cooperative interactions when students work together to write a descriptive essay?

2. How does the social dynamic of each dyad affect how students compose and revise written work in a wiki environment?

3. How do students incorporate/treat instructor feedback in a wiki environment?

An explanation for the rationale behind exploring each of the research questions is provided below.
1. Do wikis promote collaborative or cooperative interactions when students work together to write a descriptive essay?

This research question looks to past studies to make initial judgments about which type of group work each group engaged in (whether collaborative or cooperative). When working together or doing pair work in an academic setting, decisions must be made with regards to how students go about dividing work and ultimately accomplishing the goal of the assignment that they are being asked to do. For this reason, it is important to analyze the steps that students take when going about composing the essay that will be used to inform the results of this study. According to Oxford (2007), there are two main types of interactions that take place when students go about working in pairs. These are collaboration and cooperation. Certain factors including the assignment, the timeline of the assignment, and the personality traits of students themselves go into deciding which route students will take when composing their essay. Hathorne and Ingram (2002), in agreement with Oxford (2007), state that students who choose to work collaboratively choose to work interdependently. Specifically, they depend on each other to get the work done and to accomplish the goal of the assignment at hand. Each person takes part in each part of the assignment and assumes ownership of the entire composition. In contrast, Slavin (1991) states that those who choose to work cooperatively choose to work more independently. These groups consist of members who each contribute their own part, without having worked on any other part of the project but their own. Thus, each member claims ownership of only the part that he contributed to the assignment.

Both aspects of group work are important and neither collaborative work nor cooperative work holds less merit in the overall scope of the project. This study aims to
conclude which path is more common for students to take on a project of this nature. As stated before, according to Dillenbourg (1999), factors such as the amount of time students have and the project itself heavily influence which path students choose to take. For example, if the students are not given much time to complete a task, they might choose which form of group work (collaborative or cooperative) seems simplest to get the job done. Also, if the project itself calls for certain things to be done, students may find it easier to go one way or the other as well. Regardless, this will form an integral part of the study at hand and will provide interesting information when considering group work in the L2.

2. How does the social dynamic of each dyad affect how students compose and revise written work in a wiki environment?

This research question seeks to analyze and further the judgments put forth in the first research question specifically by not only categorizing the students into two groups but also by linguistically defining the interactions that take place in the wikis. Due to the collaborative nature of wikis, researchers such as Grant (2009) and Kessler (2009, 2010) among others state that it is important to explore the ways in which students work together to produce their written composition. In addition, one area of research that merits further investigation is how students communicate and interact via the wiki to talk about and ultimately compose their essays and correct their errors.

To answer this research question, the researcher looks to apply a specific theory to the information gained from the chat logs in order to further determine how the interactions between students are being carried out. Specifically, interactions carried out via the text-based chat functions in the wiki will be analyzed based on Brown and
Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory. In Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory, the authors put forth a construct that measures how people go about making the linguistic decisions that go into shaping a conversation. These decisions consist of whether the speaker or sender of the message will employ positive politeness, which appeals to the message recipient’s sense of worth (p. 101), or negative politeness, which attempts not to infringe upon the message recipient (p. 129). For this reason, this a good theory to apply to the interactions found in wikis if one’s aim is to analyze and understand the social aspects of the members of dyads. Because of the design of the study, it is expected that many more examples of positive politeness strategies will be found in the data. In addition, due to the nature of the interactions involved in this study (students working together to come up with a well-written essay), positive politeness is of more interest than negative politeness due to its specific realizations.

In the constructs of positive politeness, Brown and Levinson (1987) state that there are fifteen strategies that people use when exhibiting positive politeness. During the study, the researcher and an outside rater will code each of the chat logs for the specific politeness strategies in order to determine which group type (collaborative or cooperative) uses which type of strategies. This is carried out in an effort to better understand the nature of each of the types of interactions in order to relate it to the final product put forth in the wiki itself.

3. How do students incorporate/treat instructor feedback in a wiki environment?

The area of teacher feedback and how students use/incorporate it in the various drafts when composing is something that cannot be ignored when investigating the nature of how students write in their L2. The main goal of any writing composition that includes
multiple drafts, according to studies such as Ferris (1997, 1995), and Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1996), is for the writers and learners to improve in both grammar and content areas. Since wikis are collaborative in nature, it is important to examine how students work together to address their errors in order to produce a well-written composition. While examining how students correct errors, it then becomes important to pose the question of why they are making specific errors in an effort to learn more about how students go about writing their first drafts of the composition. In other words, it is important to understand why students commit these errors so that the instructor can understand what to emphasize in subsequent class meetings.

To analyze how students collaboratively compose and correct their errors when writing in the L2, several of the functions in the wiki, such as highlighting and data from the chat logs, will be examined. The instructor will use a correction guide (see Appendix A) that will indicate a rating system to assign points to the compositions. The instructor will be asked to correct three content-based errors and seven language errors per composition to ensure that students correct a variety of errors. Scores and ratings provided by the instructor and raters will be used to evaluate whether or not the students have improved in their writing. Specifically, the instructor will use the same rubric used in the first draft to put a grade or rating on the second draft. This grade will be final and will be the grade that the students see. The raters will use the same correction guide that the teacher uses to rate the composition to establish inter-rater reliability.

In summary, this chapter has addressed some of the research literature on interaction in L2 learning, the use of technological tools such as wikis, collaborative and cooperative learning styles, and corrective feedback. The first section provided insight
about Lave and Wenger’s (1991) situated learning model that can be applied when analyzing the way in which collaboration manifests itself in wiki environments. The next section dealt with wikis and their definitions and implications for learning a second language. I then addressed the issue of teacher corrective feedback/corrections and described the more common approaches used by teachers to correct student compositions in an L2 setting. Correction methods were explained here as well as the implications that these corrections had on what the students proceeded to do with them. The last section dealt with social aspects of wikis and peer work. Discussed here were some of the benefits and drawbacks of having students be allowed to have input on something that another student was writing and the vulnerability that students may possibly feel when allowing a fellow student to view and critique his or her work.

In the next chapter, methodological procedures will be highlighted to provide information about how the study will be conducted. Every important aspect of the study will be given here to give more information about how the study will answer the research questions given below.
3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed description of the research methodologies used in this study to investigate the various issues highlighted in the previous chapter. The chapter provides descriptions of the technology used in the study along with information about the research participants and a description of the way in which data was collected and analyzed. Finally, a timeline of data collection activities is also provided.

3.1 Participants of the Study

The informants invited to participate in this study are university students who are enrolled in a Spanish composition class at a major university in the southern part of the United States. Seventeen students were invited to participate. There were seven groups of two and one group of three who worked together. This is an ideal number of informants because it allowed the researcher the ability to ascertain more qualitative information about the participants and their experiences of working with another student in the wiki environment. Prior to collecting data from the students from their wikis, all students were given a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B). Information collected via the questionnaire includes students’ majors and/or minors, their language learning background or experience with Spanish, their experiences with technology and wikis in general, and their thoughts on working with a partner in an educational setting.

The instructor teaching the course has taught this particular course for five semesters. She has taught in general, however, for more than ten years. She is a native speaker of Spanish from Buenos Aires, Argentina. She designed her course specifically for the level of students who take it. However, she also challenges the students creatively by including an array of topics on which the students will write compositions. She has
stated that she has not previously used wikis, however she plans on using them in future classes because she sees their educational potential and possibilities. The writing assignment used in this study is something that she has agreed to use in relation to the study, but also to further the aims and pedagogical goals of her course.

3.2 Class Context

The context in which this study took place is an advanced grammar and composition course that is primarily taken by Spanish majors and minors generally in their fifth semester of study at the university where the study was carried out. The course therefore does not solely focus on teaching students about the linguistic aspects of Spanish. Rather, it also focuses on developing students’ writing abilities in Spanish. With that said, the course was chosen over a more advanced-level (e.g., an Introduction to Literature course) because the majority of students who enroll in the course are still developing their linguistic skills in Spanish along with their writing abilities. As such, they are appropriate candidates to participate in this study because while most students in the course have taken Spanish language classes before, they are at a point where they still have much to learn about the language. It is believed that students at this level are receptive to others’ criticism yet are proficient enough to provide help to fellow students when needed. It is also fitting that a class that focuses on developing students’ writing skills be chosen as the context for this study. For the duration of the semester in this particular class, students will focus their efforts on improving their L2 writing ability. It is also fitting that many different writing genres are explored in the course used in this study as it will allow the researcher the ability to select one of the genres to use and analyze as a secondary variable in the study.
3.3 Wiki Used in the Study

*Wikispaces* was chosen as the wiki to be used in this study for several reasons. First, neither the students nor the instructor needed to pay any fees to use *Wikispaces*. Secondly, *Wikispaces*, when compared to other, free wikis, is very user-friendly. As such, students will not have difficulty accessing the wiki and contributing to their assigned writing tasks.

**Figure 1. Screenshot of Wikispaces**

As seen in the above screenshot of the main screen of *Wikispaces*, there are many functions and actions available using this screen alone. Students can simply begin to type their material where it indicates to do so. They can then edit the material at any point in time (and multiple times) thereafter. One of the useful features of wikis is that most of them allow the user to track any changes that are/have been made to any piece of writing composed in the wiki. Students, as seen in Figure 1 above, are able to change fonts,
colors, and can also add links to the material that they are entering on the page. All of these changes can enhance what they post on their wiki page and allow them to personalize what they are posting if they desire to do so. Students save their material and preview it on this screen as well. In essence, a wiki is a personal webpage.

Figure 2. History Screen of Wikispaces

When students access the History screen in Wikispaces, it shows them the wikis that have been created and who modified them and at what time. The timestamp that this page provides is helpful to instructors because they can tell exactly when students are entering data and how much time they are putting into a project. In addition, this history screen allows the viewers of the wiki to see its original author (in this case, the person who first modified the wiki). Students may also make comments that can be seen from this screen under the section called Comment. To the extreme right of the screen, users of the wiki are allowed to see all of the different wikis that are available to them. For
privacy protection, students participating in this study were only allowed to view their own production (i.e., what they and their assigned partner write) and not other students’ writing in the class. However, the instructor by necessity had access to the wikis of all dyads.

![Figure 3. Discussion Screen of Wikispaces](image)

One other feature of wikis that make them unique educational tools is their asynchronous chat and discussion functions. Asynchronous is defined as having chats that are allowed to occur irrespective of time and space. Their asynchronous nature is especially beneficial to this particular study because students can comment according to their own schedules and the comments can be saved more easily than on a synchronous chat. Students are able to participate in a text-based conversation within this area of the wiki which allows them to interact and collaborate better when compared to other online
environments. Students choose which forum they wish to comment on or discuss and they can also reply to their partner’s comments. Their post is recorded and time-stamped as well and this is a way of keeping track of what students are saying to each other while carrying out the task in the wiki. As such, this feature will allow the researcher to gain a better understanding of the nature of the social dynamic of each dyad. More regarding the social aspects of the study is provided below. Finally, topics (i.e., discussions) can be edited and modified at any time during the process of chatting and this provides the students with an opportunity to feel safe with what they are saying to each other throughout the various parts of the writing process.

Overall, wikis are useful collaborative tools for a plethora of reasons, not the least of which is their versatility. Wikis were chosen specifically because they directly relate to a part of students’ lives that is becoming more important every day: web 2.0 technology. With the majority of students being familiar with a number of web 2.0 tools (e.g., social networking websites, podcasts, video content sites like YouTube, among other applications), wikis should be easy to navigate and understand for the students participating in this study. Being able to understand wikis and use them with ease will give students a sense of comfort that they may not obtain in a classroom writing setting. They will therefore be able to complete their project and composition without having to worry about using the technology itself.

3.4 Methodological Procedures

3.4.1 Primary Instrument of Investigation

The written compositions that students created in their wiki pages were one of the main sources of data for this thesis. Students who were working in pairs are asked to
write the composition in the wiki while concurrently using its discussion feature and interacting with each other exclusively online to arrive at a more sound, cohesive, and grammatically accurate written product. Students were instructed that the length of the composition would be the same as that of a normal composition in the course: approximately 1,250 words. This was done to simulate a traditional pen and paper composition that the students would be doing in class in an effort to not provide them with a task that is foreign to what they would normally be doing in the course.

Students were allowed one week to compose their first draft of the composition. The instructor of the class was then asked to correct the composition in each dyad’s wiki page over the next four days (following Elola and Oskoz, 2010) so that students were able to incorporate the feedback. In this way, the composition was rated using a correction guide (See Appendix A) that involves the instructor signaling three content-based errors and seven language errors. This was done to provide a wide range of error types and to ensure that the students are focusing on both language- and content-related errors. While the instructor corrected the compositions, two unbiased, third-party raters were asked to individually rate the compositions using the same rubric as the instructor. Using raters in this way helped to triangulate the data of the study and to establish inter-rater reliability. The raters were one native speaker and one non-native speaker of Spanish. The students were then given until the next class period to correct their essays, at which point the instructor evaluated each dyad’s final draft. To do so, the instructor and the raters used the same rubric each time so as to provide reliability not only between raters but also between the drafts themselves.

The ratings that students received on the final drafts of their compositions were to
be used for an extra credit grade in the composition class so as to eliminate any kind of additional strain that students may have felt by being asked to complete this assignment apart from their regular coursework. The bonus points were awarded on a rolling scale which means that students had a possibility of receiving a maximum of ten bonus points based on their participation and contribution to the wiki. Those who contributed less to the effort received fewer points. Once the process was completed, a stimulated recall session and interview was carried out with three of the dyads. A stimulated recall session is a type of interview session where the wiki itself will be shown during the interview to “stimulate” memories and recollections of what went on during the writing process. This stimulated-recall session was conducted to provide additional information about the writing process in the wikis (this will be discussed further below). Three of the dyads were invited to participate in this process. During the interview process, each student participated in a short interview by him or herself since some of the questions are sensitive regarding social dynamic issues that occurred between the members. After the individual interviews, the researcher asked them both to be present while several more questions were asked that required both students’ participation at the same time. The researcher selected the dyads that participated in the interviews and stimulated recalls based upon results of the compositions and findings in the writings of the students. A strict timeline for the study (see Table 1 below) was to be followed to ensure that both the instructor and students would have ample time to complete every portion of the study.
Table 1. Timeline of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>Visit class to explain project initially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td>Visit class to train on wikis and assign dyads/composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>First draft due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>Teacher Interview Questions Answered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19</td>
<td>First corrections due by teacher/raters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23</td>
<td>Student corrections due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>Second draft corrections due by teacher/raters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28</td>
<td>Stimulated-Recall Interviews held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.2 Selection of Dyads

Careful attention was paid to how groups and dyads are selected to participate in this study. According to Grant (2009), to obtain optimal results, dyads should be selected based upon proficiency in the language. Specifically, she chose students with distinct levels of proficiency to work with one another. This means that students were paired with varying levels of proficiency (e.g., students who are more proficient were paired with less proficient students). To pair students by proficiency level, the instructor of the class was asked for her input/recommendations since she had spent three and one half weeks with the students before data collection began. The reason why proficiency is important is that it provides students with an opportunity to learn from one another. It also allows students to feel more at ease with one another because they are learning from a peer (Grant 2009). The one drawback to pairing students based on proficiency, however, is that it might promote the more proficient student to contribute more material to the composition than
the less proficient student. This could be remedied, however, by monitoring interaction in the wiki and making sure that each student is indeed contributing what is a necessary and a fair amount.

3.4.3 Topic for Composition

In their study, Montero-Fleta et al. (2008) discover that the topic of the composition can be just as important to its outcome as the students who are selected to write it. Their study suggests that writing something basic and of similar interest to both members of the dyad is one way to help foster collaboration between members of the group. However, in the present study, a different approach will be taken. Specifically, the genre that was chosen was description. A descriptive essay was chosen because it would allow for a more ample pool of vocabulary from which to choose and gives the students more material to work with. The specific topic of the composition asked students to describe what occurred during the Gulf of Mexico Oil Spill of April 2010 (see Appendix C). This topic was chosen because it is one on which each individual has his or her own views and is one that is meaningful to students in the state where this study takes place. One reason for choosing a topic where students must form and use their own opinion is that it forces students to think at a more advanced level in the L2. This is to say that students are not simply creating sentences but are being asked to think critically about what they are writing. The second reason for choosing a somewhat opinion-oriented topic is that most people have some kind of opinion regarding current events. In addition, it was hoped that a topic on which each student has his or her own opinion would result in students producing the language while also expressing several different points of view. It was expected that students would have little difficulty forming opinions and this would
provide them with much material about which to write. The political nature of the topic also served to push students to collaborate and negotiate their opinion(s) as well. In sum, the topic of the composition, coupled with pairing students together who have distinct proficiency levels in Spanish, should foster group work.

### 3.5 Stimulated Recall Sessions/Interviews

The last component of the study was an interview after the students had completed their portion of work in the wiki. Three dyads were chosen to go into a lab and record their answers to questions that the researcher asked them about their experience working on this project. The dyads were chosen based on the results of the composition itself. For example, the researcher chose to interview the dyad that had the most interaction in the chat feature of the wiki or the dyad with the most varied opinions shown in the essay. Questions asked range from very broad such as “How was the experience of composing in an L2 with a partner overall?” to more specific questions such as “How did you work together to correct your composition?” (see Appendix D for the interview guide). First, students were interviewed individually to answer questions that they might have had trouble answering with their partners present. Once this was done, they participated in an interview where they are both present to answer questions about how they worked together. During the interview, the researcher showed the dyad’s wiki page on a computer in front of them in order for the group members to see what they wrote in the wiki. Discussion board postings were also of interest because they showed where students had communicated about the composition and revision processes.

The purpose of the interviews was to allow for a more in-depth study of each dyad’s interactions and the way in which underlying social dynamic(s) of each dyad
possibly affected the collaborative writing process in a wiki environment. Previous research that has focused on interaction in wiki environments has neglected this aspect of L2 learning. Students were informed that participating in the interview would be voluntary and that those who volunteer to participate will be given a chance to have their names put in a lottery drawing for a drawing for small prize.

In addition, the instructor of the course used in this study was also interviewed at the beginning of the study. The purpose of the interview (see appendix E for the interview guideline) is to get input from the instructor as to her opinions of technology such as wikis in the classroom prior to using them in her own classroom. At this point she will also be allowed to give information on her background with teaching and her own education. She gave details about the types of classes she usually teaches and the classes she has taught in the past to show how diverse her background is and how those classes relate to the one in question.

3.5.1 Coding of Interviews and Chat Logs

To efficiently determine whether or not a group had partaken in collaborative or cooperative interactions, a strict coding scheme (see Appendix F) was applied to all interaction that went on between the two members in the wiki. This included the coding of the interviews that was held after the writing process takes place as well as the coding of the chat logs where the students communicated with each other during the process. The coding serves the purpose of providing an objective way to determine whether groups collaborated or cooperated to achieve the goals of the project. This would in turn be used to inform the answer to the first research question which deals with this very issue. The coding scheme was drawn from research done by Oxford (1997) and Slavin
(1991) to provide definitions and distinctions between the two types of interactions in which they partake when working together. The interviews and chat logs were rated by the researcher and a second rater who is a native speaker of English to ensure that there is inter-rater reliability in the results of the coding. Instances of collaborative or cooperative interactions were coded and the number of each type of interaction was counted. Whatever interaction type appears most is what was to be ultimately coded in the logs.

Once the chat logs and interviews were coded for this information, the researcher looked to assist these outcomes by further providing definitions of the type of group work that went on in the dyads. In an effort to enhance these ratings, chat logs were also coded by the researcher and second rater according to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) model of positive politeness. The second rater was used to ensure reliability in determining which strategies were used and how many instances of each occurred. They were coded first for the strategies that were found in the dialogue. Then the data were analyzed to see which strategies were found in the different types of groups to better understand the nature of the groups and the interactions that were held between members.

To summarize, this chapter has provided an in-depth look into how data was collected and analyzed. The first section explained the research questions. Next, the various parts of the study were described in detail such as the participants of the study, the class that was chosen to participate in the study, the topic of the study, and a timeline that indicated when each part of the study was carried out. Also, the wiki that was used, Wikispaces, was shown in detail. In the next chapter, Chapter 4, the results of the study will be discussed to provide a more in-depth analysis of the research questions being investigated in this study.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the present study are presented. Details such as the demographic information of the students and instructor, and information ascertained in the stimulated recall interview sessions are discussed. The demographic information outlined in this chapter provides insight into each participant’s background which will, in turn, inform and help to provide an answer to the research questions mentioned in the previous chapter. Also discussed in this chapter are the results of the compositions from the instructor. This information will help to provide insight into how students use the feedback that they are given by outside raters. Results of the interviews conducted with the students and instructor, as well as the aforementioned items, will serve to answer the research questions investigated in this study.

4.1 Demographic Information

4.1.1 Students

Students who participated in this study responded to a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B) that was used to help the researcher gain insight into students’ habits inside and outside of the classroom regarding computer use and their contact with Spanish in general. The seventeen participants ranged from 19 to 24 years of age. Nine out of the seventeen were in their third year of college, five indicated that they were in their fourth year, and three indicated that they were in their second year. Each participant had studied at least one year of Spanish in high school. Due to placement exams and high school credit, students indicated that they were in between their second and seventh semester of college Spanish. Eight students indicated that they had never previously traveled to a Spanish-speaking country, while seven indicated that they had experienced a
Spanish-speaking country. Two students who had previously traveled to a Spanish-speaking country indicated that they had studied Spanish while there. Fourteen of the participants indicated that they had contact with Spanish outside of classroom learning. The majority of this contact was reported as having Spanish-speaking friends and co-workers, while others reported watching Spanish-language television programs.

Regarding their education, eight of the participants reported planning to minor in Spanish while six reported that they intend to pursue a major in Spanish. This last piece of information is noteworthy because it shows that the students in the class who participated in this study are serious about their Spanish studies.

When answering questions about online/collaborative habits, only five students indicated having ever used wikis, and each of the five students indicated that they had used the wiki called Wikipedia. This indicates that students have either not been informed about wikis or that they simply have no interest in this form of online communication. Sixteen participants indicated using social networking websites such as Facebook and checking email daily. This is also noteworthy as it is an indicator that the students’ computing abilities are well established and that they understand how to manipulate programs that are similar to wikis. This makes using the wiki an easier task for them.

When asked about whether students enjoyed working in groups, the majority of students responded that they did and provided various reasons why group work was a positive experience for them. Several indicated that they felt that working in groups helped them to get to know other people and that it also helped to get another student’s input/point of view on the project. However, some students indicated a more tepid reaction to working with a partner. One student indicated that it ultimately depends on
who the other person is and that group work can be constructive only if all members of the group contribute to the project. Still, there were 4 students who expressed a dislike for group work. One of those students indicated that group projects are rarely structured enough to facilitate learning. This comment about structuring group projects is interesting and it is something that will be explored further in the stimulated-recall interview data.

To more easily analyze how the pair work manifested itself, every dyad was given a specific number. In addition, each member of the dyads used in this study was also given a pseudonym. Both the dyad numbers and pseudonyms were used to protect the participants’ identity. Each dyad and its members will be referenced by their assigned number and pseudonyms throughout the rest of this thesis.

4.1.1.1 Students from dyad 4

In this section, more specific demographic details are provided about the three groups that participated in the interview sessions at the end of the project. In the demographic questionnaire, Suzie from Dyad 4 indicated that she has close friends from Peru with whom she speaks frequently. She also said that she has never used wikis before but does frequently use other social-networking sites. She also indicated that she checks her email several times a day. She studied Spanish formally for three years in high school and for five semesters in college. She indicates that she normally does not like to do group projects because she does not like to have to depend on other people for her grade. Jacqueline from Dyad 4 indicated that she gets her main Spanish input from watching movies in Spanish. She studied Spanish for seven years in high school and for five semesters in college. She says that she has never used wikis before but does use other
internet communication a applications daily. She states that she likes group work, but it depends on the dependability of the other group member(s).

4.1.1.2 Students from dyad 7

Samantha in Dyad 7 indicated that she studied Spanish for three years in high school and for three semesters in college. She says that she rarely speaks or hears Spanish outside of class. The only familiarity she has with wikis is using Wikipedia. However, she has only ever read it and has not yet edited it. She also indicated that she has a Facebook account that she does not use. Aside from that, she does not frequently use internet applications. As far as group work goes, she indicated that a lot of it depends on the assignment and the partner; those two factors can affect her attitude about whether she enjoys or does not enjoy working with others in a group.

Samantha’s partner in dyad 7 is Charlie. He indicated that he studied Spanish for two years in high school and for five semesters in college. He studied in Spain for five months so he feels comfortable with his linguistic abilities in Spanish. He indicates that he has never used wikis before but is familiar with other social-networking sites which he uses frequently. He feels that group work helps him to meet new people and he sees no downside to it.

4.1.1.3 Students from dyad 5

Mackensie from dyad 5 indicates that she has studied Spanish extensively in both high school and college and that she speaks it with her friends outside of class. She admits to no prior knowledge of wikis but says that she frequents other social-networking sites so she feels comfortable with using computers. Her point of view on group work is that she feels it is helpful to have someone to help who has ideas to share.
Mackensie’s partner, Jessica, indicates that she has studied Spanish in both high school and college and says that this is her main avenue of Spanish skills. She claims to have no knowledge of wikis before doing this project, but, like many other students, she is familiar with other social-networking sites and she also checks her email several times a day. She enjoys working with a partner because she has someone to talk to about the group project and help her when she needs it.

4.1.2 Instructor

The instructor of the class that was used in this study also completed a demographic questionnaire/interview that gave insight into how she has taught this particular class before. In addition, she also provided information about her educational background. The instructor received her M.A. from the a major research institution on the East Coast and her Ph.D. in literature at the same university. She noted that she has been teaching at the university where this study was carried out for more than ten years and has taught a variety of courses. Some courses that she teaches are at the junior level while others have been introduction to literature courses. She generally teaches courses about literature and Spanish-American film at the senior level. She also teaches seminars dedicated to Literature and Cultural Studies at the graduate level.

Another part of the interview questionnaire asked the instructor about her use of technology in the classroom in general. It then asked her to detail her knowledge of wikis. She stated, “I see education as a cooperative process carried out by both professors and students since this relationship is a dynamic one and since the development of individuals can only occur in mutuality with others” (italics in original statement). Given this view about education itself, it seems fitting that wikis would be something that would
be used in her classroom. This is because of not only their collaborative nature but also the way in which they allow an instructor to be part of the writing process through his or her commentaries that are added to the wiki. Although her primary technological applications in her courses include the use of YouTube, Moodle, and PowerPoint, she had never used wikis before her participation in this study.

To summarize, the students who participated in this study had varying levels of Spanish experience and education. They told the researcher at what point they were in the university in general and also at what point they were in their Spanish studies at the university. They explained how often and in what way(s) they use Spanish outside of the classroom, which was important to gauge the way they perceive their Spanish abilities. They also indicated whether or not they had ever used wikis before, and how often they use the computer every day. They also were given the opportunity to indicate whether they enjoyed working with a partner in school and explain why they feel the way they do about this particular issue.

4.2 Results of Study

The following section of this chapter is dedicated to answering the research questions proposed in the previous chapters. The research questions investigated in the study are the following:

1. Do wikis promote collaborative or cooperative interactions when students work together to write a descriptive essay?

2. How does the social dynamic of each dyad affect how students compose and revise written work in a wiki environment?

3. How do students incorporate/treat instructor feedback in a wiki environment?
Through the duration of this chapter, these research questions will be answered based on the data that was obtained from the study and these answers will be explained in further detail in the next chapter.

4.2.1 Collaborative Versus Cooperative Interactions

Research Question 1. Do wikis promote collaborative or cooperative interactions when students work together to write a descriptive essay?

This research question deals with determining whether students participated collaboratively or cooperatively in the wiki environment itself. The answer to this question deals with initial judgments made based on past studies such as Oxford (1997), Slavin (1991), and the others mentioned above in the literature review. To measure the nature of the interactions between students, the discussion logs were taken from Wikispaces for each of the eight dyads that participated in the study. Data from the asynchronous chats were extracted from conversations (see Appendix G) that took place both regarding the first draft and the second draft of the compositions that the students wrote. In addition, data obtained from the stimulated-recall interview sessions (see Appendix H) that took place with three of the eight dyads were also used to help answer research question 1.

A coding guide (see Appendix F) was applied to each of the aforementioned interactions based on definitions of collaboration and cooperation taken from Oxford (1997) and Slavin (1991). Each of the three interviews and the conversations in the chat logs were coded to be either Collaborative or Cooperative. While many of the conversations and interviews exhibited some qualities of both types of interactions, the coding scheme was used to determine which type of interaction was dominant among the
students. Based on the results of the coding carried out by the researcher and a second rater, the data indicate that three of the dyads exhibited cooperative working styles while the other five dyads displayed more collaborative behavior when working together to write the descriptive essay (continued on next page).

Table 2. Collaborative or Cooperative Interaction observed in Chats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>Coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>Coll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>Coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>Coll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coop</td>
<td>Coop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>Coll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>Coll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coll</td>
<td>Coll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ratings in Table 2 show the results of the coding that was carried out and eventually agreed upon by the researcher and the rater. To code the chat logs, each interaction between learners in each dyad was coded and a total for each type of interaction was calculated for each dyad. Whichever type of interaction appeared more frequently was the rating that the interaction received. Initially, there was a discrepancy between the researcher and the rater about how to rate dyad 5. The researcher rated this dyad as cooperative while the outside rater originally had rated the dyad as collaborative.
However, this was resolved by reevaluating the coding scheme and reassessing the chat logs for dyad 5. It was deemed that this particular group’s work was in fact cooperative in nature. At this point, 100% inter-rater reliability was obtained. Based on these results, which come from the data obtained through coding the interactions on the chat function, the researcher and rater determined that 3 of the dyads or 37.5% exhibited more cooperative interactions while 5 of the dyads or 62.5% exhibited more collaborative interactions. Based on these results, it can be determined that the majority of dyads in this study interacted collaboratively to work on their wiki assignment.

The interviews that were conducted provided a more in-depth look into how the students worked together. To back up the information found in the coding process, it was found that Charlie from Dyad 7 indicated that during the correction phase “I corrected those few sentences and then there was one sentence that I left exactly how [Samantha] wrote it so [Samantha] corrected the mistake.” (Appendix G) This type of interaction, according to the coding scheme, would be considered Collaborative. During this same interview, it was also stated by Charlie that “[Samantha] gave all the ideas but then when I started I just like, I really get into it so I added a lot of stuff.” This can also be considered collaborative in nature because once one of the students contributed his/her point of view s/he each expounded upon those and provided more information to the researcher during the interview. Similarly, Suzie of dyad 4 said that “being nice, [Jaqueline] went in and re-corrected my corrections” (Appendix H) which was determined to indicate collaborative work. Another interaction was found in the chat log from dyad 8 with signs of collaborative work in the first draft via the comment “i just posted my part. i tried to edit some of yours (Appendix G). For the second draft of the
essay for this same group, the following interaction was observed indicating its collaborative nature:

Roberto: ok so i finished up the corrections. double check the corrections i made on your part to see if they agree with what you wanted to say

Mariah: ok i think it looks pretty good.

Another collaborative interaction was discussed in an interview. The statement was made by Jacqueline from dyad 4: “when I was done we both looked at it together all as one to see if it flowed and so we edited it together. It wasn’t like we just threw each other’s parts together” (Appendix H). Spoken and written interaction between the two members of the dyad is happening here to achieve the goal of the project, and this is the clear definition of collaborative effort.

Dyad 5 was rated as being more cooperative in nature and an example of their interactions was the following statement from one member of the dyad: “We did [correct] whatever we wrote. We corrected our own parts.” (See Appendix H). The fact that these students focused more on what parts they had individually written is a clear indicator of cooperative interactions as defined by Slavin (1991). This same group, however, admitted that there was no lack of communication however because “we didn’t want to like repeat ourselves” (Appendix H). This was a common concern expressed in interviews and chat logs of those dyads that were determined to illustrate cooperative interactions. However, most groups still managed to avoid this problem of repetition by deciding ahead of time what their individual part would be. In the chat log, the following interaction that was determined to be cooperative took place between members of dyad 3:

Shawn: Do you want to just put your ideas and we combine mine and yours later?
Natalie: Yes, we can do that!

Via analyzing the patterns that evolved in the data, it can be concluded that wikis promote more of a collaborative type of interaction between students versus a cooperative one. Judging from the results of the coding of the chat logs, it can be seen that the students who participated in this project tended to exhibit more collaborative behavior when interacting in the wiki. This could be for a variety of reasons, and those will be discussed further in the following chapter, which analyzes the results given in this chapter.

4.2.2 Social Dynamics & Wikis

The second research question investigated in this study asks:

2. How does the social dynamic of each dyad affect how students compose and revise written work in a wiki environment?

This research question has the intent of bolstering the judgments made in the previous research question about how students chose to work together and treated each other in the group work process. While lending additional weight to the judgments set forth in the discussion of research question one, Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory will also be used to analyze the question of social dynamics that exist among the members of the dyads who participated in this study. The researcher and an additional outside rater evaluated each transcript from the chat logs and coded the transcripts according to which of the strategies from this model were used by each of the types of groups (see Appendix J). The data indicate that the following occurred in the chat logs from the wiki:
Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Collaborative Groups</th>
<th>Cooperative Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Attend to Hearer’s (H) Wants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Exaggerate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Intensify Interest to H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – In-group identity markers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Seek Agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Avoid Disagreement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Assert Common Ground</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Joke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Presupposes Speaker’s (S) Concern for H’s Wants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Offer, Promise</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – Be optimistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – Include both S and H in the group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – Give (ask for) reasons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 – Assume or assert reciprocity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – Give gifts to H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two strategies that were found the most frequently in the collaborative groups were Strategy 1 (Brown & Levinson 1987, p. 103) and Strategy 10 (Brown & Levinson 1987, p. 125).
Strategy 1 (Attend to Hearer’s Wants) deals with appealing to the other person and letting him or her know that you acknowledge his or her needs as a member of the group. The speaker is attempting to make a connection with the hearer in this type of interaction. Strategy 10 (Offering) of this model involves offering to contribute to the group in some way. In the case of this study, since students are working more closely with each other to accomplish the goals of the assignment, it is not unexpected that they would offer to do more work or that they would be more interested in the wants and needs of the other person in their group. Some examples of these types of requests that came from the chat logs of collaborative groups were the following:

Example of Strategy 1 (Attend to hearer’s wants) (Dyad 4):

Wow, You did a great job! I looked for errors and couldn’t find a single on. I feel like our composition was pretty thorough... good job! (Appendix G)

Here the student is complementing her partner and is approving of the work she has done. This is a clear indicator of positive politeness.

Example of Strategy 10 (Offer, Promise) (Dyad 2): I can help with whatever you need just message me here and send a copy of whatever you send to my email as well to be sure that I get it on time. (Appendix G)

In this case, the student is offering to help the other students in her group on the project. This would be another indicator of positive politeness used by collaborative groups. It appears as though the reason for seeing more positive politeness in the collaborative groups is due to the fact that the students are communicating more with each other throughout the process. Also, since this is an online environment, students are not forced to see each other when they are interacting and therefore might be more apt to be more
polite and save their own positive face in this environment.

One other feature of the interactions that were collaborative is that they showed more use of strategy 12 (Include both S and H in the activity), which deals with including both the hearer and the speaker (or in this case, the person typing the message and person reading the message) in the utterance. The use of this strategy, according to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 127) indicates that both the hearer and the speaker of the utterance not only have a common goal but acknowledge that the other person is part of the group and is equally responsible for what is being stated. For example:

Example of strategy 12 (Include both S and H in the group)(dyad 2): When do we need to post them by so we can correct each other’s? (Appendix G)

This speaker acknowledges that the other members will have a part in submitting the draft of the composition and speaks collectively. The other strategies that were seen in the chat logs from collaborative groups are strategies that involve seeking to come to an agreement with each other about something and seeking to avoid disagreement with each other. One example of avoiding disagreement with each other is the following:

Example of strategy 6 (Avoid disagreement)(dyad 2): I recommended a few corrections in [her] sections, however i did not want to completely change them in the event that she/you didn’t mean to say that. (Appendix G)

This person is not making corrections that she sees because she is trying to avoid starting a potential argument with the person that wrote the original. She is also attempting to keep the person’s main interests in tact as well, which is also a feature of these collaborative groups mentioned earlier.

The strategy used most in the cooperative groups was Strategy 14 (assume or
assert reciprocity). The construct of positive politeness states that this strategy involves one person offering to complete some task in order for the other person to in turn complete some other task (p. 129). This was to be anticipated because in cooperative group work, students seek to simply divide work and assign roles within the group. This was also interesting because in the collaborative groups there were no cases of this particular strategy found in the chat logs. Instances of reciprocity in the cooperative groups were the following:

Example of Strategy 14 (Assert Reciprocity) (dyad 1): I can correct the errors in my part, and you can correct the ones in your part. Sound good? (Appendix G)

Example of Strategy 14 (Assert Reciprocity) (dyad 5): I just did 5 of the corrections. Could you do the other 5 for tomorrow? (Appendix G)

In these cases, the students working together are simply trying to seek agreement on who will write what part. They are also attempting to establish that each member of the group will indeed contribute, which is important to this model: One person will be in charge of one task and the other will be in charge of another. This is the definition of cooperative work.

Another strategy used frequently among groups who worked cooperatively was Strategy 7, assume or assert common ground (Brown & Levinson, p. 117). In this strategy, students are trying to claim common ground with each other by engaging in a number of behaviors such as use of small talk and gossip in the interaction. An example of this strategy is the following:

Example of Strategy 7 (Assert Common Ground) (dyad 1): This sort of came at a bad time because I’ve been in Nashville since Friday, and I’m not coming back
till Monday. I’ll make it work though. (Appendix G)

This particular student did not need to include information about her personal life in this particular case, however in an effort to make small talk or perhaps relate to her partner better, she did. Small talk was a feature common to cooperative groups, and surely more commonly employed in these groups than in collaborative groups.

Other strategies that were found in cooperative groups included those of seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement, offering, and asserting common ground. However, one other strategy used in cooperative groups more than in collaborative groups was in-group identity markers. This strategy deals with using jargon, slang, or other language that helps to assert common ground or identify with the other group members (p. 111). An example found in the chat logs of cooperative groups is the following:

Example of strategy 4 (in group identity markers) (dyad 1): I’m starting on the first section \textit{ahora mismo} (right now). (Appendix G)

Example of strategy 4 (In group identity markers)(dyad 5): Thanks! :)

The first example is that of someone trying to relate to the other person by using what they have in common, the ability to speak Spanish. The second example deals with something that is interesting because it deals specifically with written (online or via text message) conversation. Icons such as these are common among text-based conversations and can be considered a form of jargon or slang since this is the only environment in which they can be used. Therefore, according to this model they fit into the strategy of positive politeness.

To summarize, this research question dealt with the social dynamic that evolved out of the online interactions between members of each dyad in the study. Brown and
Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory was applied to the chat logs to determine which groups used which positive politeness strategies in their communication that took place in the wiki. Specifically, the judgments made in the first research question were bolstered by using this construct to gain more insight into how positive politeness works in groups that work collaboratively and groups that work cooperatively. Through analyzing the data, it was concluded that students who worked collaboratively tended to care about appealing to the message recipients more (i.e. complimenting them and remarking on their achievements) and that they also tended to offer to help complete tasks more. Also found from students working in collaborative groups was that they tended to include the group itself in the interactions and not just speak about themselves and what they would do or had done. In cooperative groups, the students spoke reciprocally. This means that they tended to state what they had contributed and then ask for an equal contribution to match theirs.

4.2.3 Teacher Feedback in Wiki Environments

The last aspect of writing in a wiki environment analyzed in this study is the way in which students incorporated teacher feedback in this particular environment. Research question 3 asked:

3. How do students incorporate/treat instructor feedback in a wiki environment?

To assess how students incorporated teacher feedback, several things were considered. To begin, the first and second drafts of each of the essays were given a rating based on a content and grammar correction guide (see Appendix A) by the instructor of the course and by two outside raters. The instructor marked ten errors—seven grammar and three content—in each of the eight compositions. Both the instructor and the outside
raters were asked to select the ten errors considered to be most grave in order to get a more accurate reading of the quality of the composition. Based on the point value of the error, points were deducted accordingly and a score was given out of 100. The scores that were given by the instructor are given below. For the scores of the outside raters, please see Appendix I.

Table 4. Ratings of First and Second Drafts of the Essay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 6</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 3, each dyad improved from the first draft to the second draft while working together in the wiki. This shows that each group in some way incorporated the comments and feedback that was given by the instructor. It can be seen that dyads 1, 3, and 8 showed the most improvement between the two drafts (11 points, 12 points, and 12.5 points respectively). What is interesting to note is that dyads 1 and 3 were both ranked as cooperative dyads. This could indicate that cooperative interaction, while not high in communication, can still yield positive results when it comes to
working together. Dyads 2, 5, and 7 improved the least between the two drafts, showing only a 6 point, 3.5 point, and 7.5 point increase respectively. As can be seen in Table 3 above and in Appendix I (i.e., the appendix that contains the outside raters’ scores for both drafts), dyad 5 was the dyad that showed the biggest gap in ratings between the instructor’s rating and the outsider raters’ ratings. This held true for both drafts of the composition. The discrepancy was most likely caused by the fact that two outside raters were used to rating the compositions and therefore the results for those ratings vary more than they would vary with just one rater rating them. Nonetheless, this dyad (5) still managed to improve from draft one to draft two in the opinions of both the instructor and the raters.

In the correction phase, the most common errors that remained even after the students utilized the instructor’s corrections were content-related errors. These were signaled as MI for Más Información (more information), FL for Fluidez (fluidity), and O for Organización (organization). This issue was the most commonly brought up issue in the stimulated recall interviews when asked about difficulties had while correcting. It is also the only topic that was really discussed to be an issue in the chat logs during the chats for the second draft. It is to be expected that these errors would be the hardest ones for the students to correct because they are the ones that involve more detail in the corrections. This was suggested by the results that were obtained from the essays themselves as well as the interviews and chat logs. Several students also indicated in the interviews and chat logs that a reason they failed to successfully correct these errors was because these were the three error types that were new to them and they were not fully
aware of how to handle these errors since they required more effort, collaboration and communication among group members to correct them.

During the interview sessions, students were asked about this process and how they decided to go about correcting the errors that they had made. Charlie from dyad 7 commented that there was “not a lot to be corrected” (Appendix H) and that he “knew what was wrong” (Appendix H) without having to go to the correction guide for help. Jessica from dyad 5 claimed that “we didn’t have to ask each other” (Appendix H) about the corrections because they were not anything “too major” (Appendix H). Comments such as these about the ease of fulfilling the correction phase of this project were common both in the chat logs and the interview sessions. As can be seen in Table 4.2 in section 4.2.1 of this chapter, however, most dyads still took a collaborative approach to working on their corrections in that they each participated in going over the corrections that the other member had made.

Dyads 1, 3, and 5, took a more cooperative approach to the correction phase and showed similarities in that the students in these three dyads each corrected their own parts individually. Some chose to have one member of the dyad correct all of the errors on his or her own. This, in turn, was a clear demonstration of cooperative work. The dyads that worked this way, however, still tended to communicate to advise the other member of the dyad that the work had been done and that the corrections had been successfully made.

To conclude, this chapter presented and discussed the results of the study. The research questions that were proposed were answered to the extent that they could be based on the results of the study and demographic information about the student participants and the instructor of their class was given to better inform the results. In the
next chapter, a more thorough discussion and conclusion about the results will be presented. Also, limitations and future avenues for research in this area will be offered.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this fifth and final chapter, the results obtained from the study will be further explained and conclusions will be drawn. Also to be addressed in this chapter will be the limitations of the study along with ideas for future research in the areas explored in this thesis. The primary conclusions presented in this chapter will focus on how the data presented in Chapter 4 are interpreted via the theoretical model of situated learning put forth by Lave and Wenger (1991). The comments and interactions carried out by each member of each dyad during the course of this study will be discussed in this chapter in order to assess how they fit into Lave and Wenger’s (1991) model. Once this is determined, the researcher will explore whether students tend to work collaboratively or cooperatively more in a wiki environment and how this affects the outcome of the product. This will, in turn, answer the question of the wiki’s benefit in an L2 learning environment. To do this, the comments of each dyad that was interviewed will be examined along with the scores that they achieved in the final versions of their essays to draw any theoretical and pedagogical conclusions.

5.1 Wikis and Situated Learning

Lave and Wenger (1991) propose the idea of the situated learning model that details aspects of group work and how each time students work together, a community of practice is formed. A community of practice is formed whenever people with a common goal come together to learn and teach each other. This model is of particular interest to this study because students formed micro communities while working in their dyads and it is important to analyze how each dyad and each member of each dyad interacted to
achieve a common goal. It was found that all three of the dyads that were interviewed fit into Lave and Wenger’s (1991) model, detailed below.

To summarize Lave and Wenger’s (1991) model of situated learning, it must first be noted that situated learning, in their definition, deals with, but is not limited to “learning by doing” (p. 31). In their model of situated learning, people who are members of the community of practice should aspire to be, and should ultimately be “legitimate peripheral participants” (p. 29). What is meant by this term is that these legitimate peripheral participants “participate in communities of practitioners and that the mastery of knowledge and skill requires newcomers to move toward full participation in the socio-cultural practices of a community” (p. 29). Therefore, these communities exist to pull together people with a common goal of learning something specific, and their members must be legitimate peripheral participants. Legitimate peripheral participation would, then, indicate that learning is not only a condition for membership into the community but it is also a reward achieved by said membership. Legitimate peripheral participation also indicates, then, that all members who truly fall into this category have access to the whole community and everything that is produced and shared in this community.

One other main point of Lave and Wenger’s (1991) situated learning model is that learning is something that is not simply information that is internalized. When a community of practice is formed, according Lave and Wenger (1991), the possibility of learning is multiplied because socialization occurs and the members of the community are able to share their wisdom with each other, providing new insight and new ideas to all members. It is mentioned that for learning to occur there must exist an element of
motivation on the part of the learner—or legitimate peripheral participant. It is suggested that once socialization is added to the learning, more motivation can be obtained and as a result, more learning can occur. It is also highlighted that in order for there to be motivation, the members of the community must have a relationship not only with the activity itself—in this case the composition—but also with the other members of the community. This involves communicating and sharing abilities and experiences in order to come about a well-made product. In this case, the product is the composition and the communities are the dyads that composed them.

The members of dyad 4 explained how each person participated in the project to collectively write their essay in the wiki. As was discussed in Chapter 4, dyad 4 was coded as having exhibited a cooperative approach to writing and revising their essay. The first way in which they fit into the model is that they communicated extensively throughout the process of writing the wiki. Jacqueline made the comment that “we exhausted the chat function” (Appendix H), and Suzie backed this comment up by noting that “Fifteen messages [were sent] back and forth at least” (Appendix H). These two members of this dyad were clearly in contact with each other and learned from each other. They were not merely replicating something that the other member did. Rather, they each contributed a part and had a discussion about it to ensure that the product turned out to be a well-written composition.

Another aspect of situated learning is the idea of peripheral participation in which every member is an equal member of the community and there is no one person who takes control of the group or the effort. In dyad 4, this characteristic was prevalent. Neither of the members of this group admitted to feeling that the other member took
control of the project or contributed more or less to the composition. In fact, Jacqueline entered four times and Suzie entered six times through the duration of the process of writing and revising the composition. The members of this dyad stated that they each wrote a portion of the essay and then went in and fit it in with the other member’s portion that was written. In order to do this, they had to take into consideration and communicate about what the other person had written so that they would be able to write what was required of them. Neither member of this dyad felt that there was any tension with the other person at any point in the project, which indicates equal contribution on both of their parts. As is required in the model of situated learning, the members’ relationship to the activity was there, but their relationship to each other was also there, making this fit into Lave and Wenger’s (1991) model with ease.

Each member of dyad 4 also had interesting things to say about her participation throughout the process of completing this assignment. Jacqueline told the researcher that since Suzie had already written part of the essay when she went in to write hers, she was forced to read Suzie’s contribution in order to not repeat what was already written in the wiki. She had become a legitimate peripheral participant of this dyad because she was building upon a foundation that had already been laid by her partner. However, Jacqueline still communicated with Suzie while writing and revising their composition. Together, both students constructed their composition. Suzie stated that by being a peripheral group member and contributing to the writing of the composition, she was able to form a friendship with a classmate who could potentially help her with her Spanish which is the area where she feels she needs improvement. This is an example of a community where the members are learning from each other and building upon each
other’s knowledge. Knowledge here—as described in the situated learning model—is not merely internalized but is gained from this type of partnership and community.

Dyad 5 fits into Lave and Wenger’s (1991) model of situated learning as well. While they were rated as being cooperative in nature, the members of this dyad still exhibited peripheral participation. This is true even though Jessica entered into the wiki to write her portion of the essay and correct her portion of the essay thirteen times while Mackensie entered only five times to make her contributions to the essay. In the interviews, neither one of the members of this dyad acknowledged any tension with the other member. Even though they did not communicate as much as some of the other groups regarding the setup and the proceeding of the project—part of the reason they were coded as working cooperatively—they still claimed that to compose a well-written composition there had to be teamwork because they had to at least read what the other person wrote to avoid repetition or redundancy. In this way, as within situated learning, these students were learning from each other and using each other to get opinions and feedback on their Spanish. This would not have happened without being members of a community as it is defined in this theory (e.g., members who are working together to share knowledge about a given topic). The notion of community of practice here was fulfilled because each member of the dyad did contribute something to the effort of writing and revising the composition and each member of the dyad socialized with the other in order to do so.

Within dyad 5, Mackensie said in her individual interview that without having the help of her partner Jessica, her Spanish would have suffered more and the product would not have come out as well as it did in the end. She said her contribution was more of the
“opinion part about it” (Appendix H). While Jessica’s was more the “knowledge part about it” (Appendix H). Since both were necessary for this project in their own ways, this particular kind of cooperation had to be present to successfully complete the goals of the project. In this way, she was a legitimate peripheral participant of the group throughout the process of writing. In her individual interview, Jessica spoke about using what Mackensie wrote to fuel what she had written since she was more familiar with the topic at hand. When she would notice a gap or a place that was lacking something, she expounded upon it to make a more well-rounded essay in the end. In this way, she built upon what was written and the contribution that the other member of the community had done. Therefore, she was also a good example of a legitimate peripheral participant of this particular community of practice.

The last dyad that was interviewed—dyad 7—also fit the model that Lave and Wenger (1991) present. Once again, in the interviews neither of the members expressed any feelings of unequal participation or unfair domination of the project by one member or the other. Even though Charlie entered the wiki twelve times during the project and Samantha only entered seven, this group is still an example of situated learning because both members were given and gave the other equal opportunities to participate and share his or her knowledge on the topic at hand. Each member contributed to the learning process of the other member. Also similar to the other groups, Samantha in this group indicated that it was beneficial to her to have Charlie there to help her with her Spanish skills which she felt were lacking. Charlie indicated that this did not bother him because he speaks Spanish “as well as English” (Appendix H). Even though he was dominant in
his Spanish skills, he was not a dominating member of the community and his skills were put to use to make the end product a better one.

During the phase in which the students had to correct the mistakes that were indicated by the instructor, Charlie said that he understood one of Samantha’s errors and knew how to fix it but left it alone to allow her the opportunity to address the error. Here, Charlie gave Samantha an opportunity to be heard and to be a legitimate peripheral participant of their small community of practice. Charlie also stated that it was nice to work with a partner because he was able to make a new friend who had great ideas that he could expound upon in the writing process. This type of work is clearly indicative of situated learning because the members of this dyad are using each other as knowledge generators and soundboards for ideas and not simply internalizing knowledge given to them.

As we have seen so far in this chapter, wikis allow students to participate in the types of communities of learning that Lave and Wenger (1991) define. Once again, these communities involve people coming together to learn something specific (in this case writing in Spanish) and they each contribute to each others’ learning in some way. They allow students an opportunity to work together and provide activities for students to complete where they can generate knowledge with one another and not just themselves. Since each person must contribute in some way, they are excellent in making each member accountable peripheral participants. In the case of this study, there were no clear cases of “illegitimate” peripheral participants (1991, p. 29) where one student dominated the other and completely took over the entire project or, on the contrary, did not participate at all.
Due to the short-term nature of this project, the participants had little time to fully develop into either being legitimate or illegitimate peripheral participants. While students did show characteristics of each type of participation, what remains to be seen is how these roles within the dyads would evolve over a longer period of time. Therefore, to more accurately define whether or not the participants fit exactly into the Lave and Wenger (1991) model, this project would have to be carried out over a full semester or perhaps even longer and with more than one writing assignment. With a longitudinal project, it is expected that the students would have the opportunity to assume a variety of roles and develop into community members such as those described in the situated learning model.

This section of this chapter has shown how different people working together can exemplify the participatory roles that were defined earlier in this chapter by the model of situated learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991). It was found that, in this small-scale study, each member who participated in the interview fit into the category of legitimate peripheral participant since all of the interviewed members did participate and relate to the activity that they were completing. However, more information and a longer study would be needed to allow the students to assume their own roles in their small communities.

5.2 Wikis and Their Classroom Benefits

The main focus of this thesis is to correlate types of interactions that students have in a wiki environment to their success (or lack thereof) in composing a well-written essay in Spanish. To do this, careful scrutiny of how the work style of the groups were coded—either collaborative or cooperative—was compared to the the amount of improvement
determined by the raters of the compositions themselves. Since every group that participated in this project did improve from the first to the second draft, the amount that each group improved will be of utmost importance in determining the significance of each type of interaction. For this project, three of the eight dyads were coded as interacting in a more cooperative fashion during the writing and correction phases of the writing assignment that was carried out in a wiki. Dyads 1, 3, and 5 exhibited a working style that was more cooperative in nature. The other five dyads (2, 4, 6, 7, and 8) were coded as working collaboratively.

To determine which form of group work yielded better results on the compositions, an average was taken of the amount of improvement from the first draft to the second draft. All eight of the groups were considered when taking this average. What was deduced was that there was a 9.1 point average improvement for those dyads that were coded as working collaboratively and an 8.8 point average increase for those dyads that were coded as working cooperatively. Therefore, it is shown that collaborative groups improved more than cooperative groups from draft one to draft two in this particular study. Also to be noted is that since the collaborative groups were the ones who ultimately received higher marks on the composition, it can be hypothesized in this particular study the specific politeness strategies that collaborative groups used frequently (the strategies of appealing to the message recipient and offering to complete a task for the message recipient) yielded better results. Those working in cooperative groups were not as successful, and the politeness strategy that they used most often was that of asserting reciprocity. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that since they focused mainly on the exchange of tasks and duties, they were not focusing on complimenting the work that
the other had done, or on attending to the hearer and this is what ultimately led them to be less successful in their drafts of the composition and the corrections. However, considering the small-scale nature of this study, the relatively similar results of final draft scores of both types of groups and the subjective results of the grading of the compositions, these findings cannot be generalized.

It can be said that both types of cooperation have their benefits in an educational setting. When students work collaboratively they communicate more and share more, but when they work cooperatively, according to the definition, they are still contributing an equal amount and depending on the students this work can still be of great quality. It can also be argued, from these conclusions, that wikis themselves are what allows either type of interaction to benefit the student equally because regardless of the amount of communication, students are still at least able to see what the other person has contributed even if they do not edit it themselves. By being able to see someone else’s contribution, learning can still occur and it is still beneficial to the student even though there is not much (if any) real communication about the way that the project will be done.

To conclude, this fifth and final chapter highlights the results of the study again and goes into depth explaining why the results were the way they are. Detailed information about each of the interviewed dyads was provided to further explain how (and if) they fit into Lave and Wenger’s (1991) model of situated learning. Once it was determined how the groups fit into the model, information was detailed about which type of pair work yielded the best results on the composition itself. It has been suggested throughout these five chapters that wikis do indeed hold merit in the educational realm and that the possibilities for using them in the foreign language classroom are many.
Group work carried out via internet utilizes facets of students’ every day lives and takes advantage of the power of students teaching other students.

5.3 Limitations of Wikis

Even though wikis have been proven to be a successful tool in the classroom for foreign language learning, there are limitations to their use. The first limitation is the fact that when students are using wikis at home and doing their projects outside of the classroom with a teacher monitoring, the potential for plagiarism and copying from other websites is prominent. Plagiarism can also be an issue with students who are writing at home with pen and paper methods, and therefore wikis are in this way no more dangerous than pen and paper methods when used at home. With the amount of material available on the internet, students might find it easier to simply copy material and put it in their wiki as their own. In fact, other wikis—which anyone can edit—have as of late been a tool that students sometimes use to research topics that they are studying. Of course, since anyone can enter and edit the information that appears on sites such as Wikipedia, students should never use these wikis as a source of information to use or cite in an academic paper. The one thing that teachers can rely on is their ability to spot wiki entries that seem above and beyond the normal level of proficiency for their students, because many teachers know their students’ writing well enough to do so. If a teacher catches a student simply copying or pasting, he or she can handle the situation at that moment. Teachers can also require students to cite any website that they use to get information, thereby having a security net to be able to verify whether students simply copied the information or if they produced something original.
Another limitation to the use of wikis is that some students do not have access to a computer outside of school. Even with today’s increased access to computers, some students still do not have a computer to work with at home, and for some students going to the library or using a computer at school is not the most convenient route to take. For this reason, assigning a mandatory task that has to be done on a computer might prove to be difficult for these students. Also worthy of note is the fact that some high school-level computers restrict access to websites where any type of communication is allowed, thereby making access to wikis at school virtually impossible. Therefore, if a teacher at this level wishes to use wikis in class, this might prove to be a near impossible task.

5.4 Limitations of Study

One limitation of this study is that it included a small number of students (17). These students came from the same university, so there is only one learning context here as well. Also, within the same university these students were from the same class, and only one class was used to conduct this research. Of the seventeen students who participated in this study, only six of these students—forming three dyads—participated in the stimulated recall interview where more in-depth information was obtained. This more specific information was not ascertained from the other five dyads due to those students not wanting to volunteer their time via a stimulated recall interview. Obviously, more participants would have helped to corroborate the conclusions presented in this chapter. Another limitation of this study is that since Lave and Wenger (1991) set their definitions for legitimate peripheral participation, a study would have to be conducted on a larger scale and for a longer duration of time. This is so that students would have the time to fully assume roles and duties within the dyads, as they were not able to do in this
case. Finally, the scores given on the compositions themselves were very subjective, therefore making these results not able to be generalized.

5.5 Future Areas of Research

There are many other ways that wikis can be used in the second language classroom to foster learning and collaboration. Specifically, longer-term projects can be done where students use wikis for a more substantial amount of time. Some students in this project mentioned in the interviews that they would have liked to be able to have more time to compose their compositions, saying that this would have helped them to produce a better project. Also, another potential research project that could be done would be to have students post their compositions on wikis and have students from other countries work with them as their partners. This would provide students with the opportunity to work with native speakers in a meaningful way which, in turn, could facilitate students’ L2 acquisition.

In conducting this study, it is hoped that contributions have been made to the field of second language learning. Using technology is something that is useful for students as it provides them with opportunities to explore ways to express themselves both individually and with other people. Wiki technology—and the collaboration that often accompanies it—offers students the opportunity to broaden their linguistic and social horizons by interacting/communicating with classmates outside of the physical classroom. It is hoped that more studies will be carried out that expand upon the findings of this study so that wikis can be incorporated and used more in L2 classrooms in the future.
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# APPENDIX A

## ERROR CORRECTION KEY FOR IN-CLASS WRITING COMPOSITION

| C = -1 | concordancia | Hay un problema de concordancia. |
| C = -1 | concordancia | Posibles tipos de problemas: |
| C = -1 | concordancia | • femenino / masculino → el mujer (la mujer) |
| C = -1 | concordancia | • singular / plural → las mujer (la mujer) |
| C = -1 | concordancia | • sujeto / verbo → las mujeres es (las mujeres son) |
| C = -1 | concordancia | • adjetivo / sustantivo → la mujer bajo (la mujer baja) |

| Ing = -1.5 | traducción directa del inglés | Hay que usar una expresión o construcción en español. Ejemplos: |
| Ing = -1.5 | traducción directa del inglés | • Yo tuve un buen tiempo. (Lo pasé bien.) |
| Ing = -1.5 | traducción directa del inglés | • Mi hermana’s casa (La casa de mi hermana) |

| Ort = -.5 | Ortografía | Problemas con la ortografía. Ejemplos: |
| Ort = -.5 | Ortografía | • vigente (veinte) |
| Ort = -.5 | Ortografía | • deciembre (diciembre) |

| T = -1 | Tiempo | El tiempo del verbo no es correcto o el verbo está mal formado. Ejemplos: |
| T = -1 | Tiempo | • Ayer me levantaba a las ocho. (Ayer me levanté a las ocho.) |
| T = -1 | Tiempo | • Siempre me levantía temprano. (Siempre me levantaba temprano.) |

| Voc = -1 | Vocabulario | Hay una palabra incorrecta o hay una mejor. Ejemplos: |
| Voc = -1 | Vocabulario | • Usualmente regreso tarde. (Por lo general / Frecuentemente regreso tarde.) |
| Voc = -1 | Vocabulario | • Mi hijo es dos años. (Mi hijo tiene dos años.) |

| V = -1 | Verbo | Se necesita un verbo diferente/otro verbo. Ejemplo: |
| V = -1 | Verbo | • Baton Rouge es en el estado de Louisiana. (B.R. está en el estado de Louisiana.) |

<p>| ∧ = -1.5 | hace falta algo | Ejemplo: |
| ∧ = -1.5 | hace falta algo | • Él dijo ∧ ella era alta. (Él dijo que ella era alta.) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O = -5</th>
<th>Organización</th>
<th>Hay un problema con la organización de una oración/idea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI = -3</td>
<td>Más Información</td>
<td>Hay algo que se puede desarrollar más o algo que falta textualmente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL = -2.5</td>
<td>Fluidez</td>
<td>Algo es incoherente o incomprensible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B

## Demographic Questionnaire
*(Please Print/Write Legibly)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>___ female ___ male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in school (e.g., junior)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your email</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you been learning Spanish?</th>
<th>_____ Years in high school</th>
<th>_____ Semesters in college/university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever been to/traveled in a Spanish-speaking country? If yes, please specify.</td>
<td>_____ Yes</td>
<td>_____ Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____ No</td>
<td>_____ Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever studied Spanish in a Spanish-speaking country? If yes, please specify.</td>
<td>_____ Yes</td>
<td>_____ Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____ No</td>
<td>_____ Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have (or have you had in the past) any contact with Spanish that is not related to Spanish courses in school? (e.g., Spanish-speaking friends/family, watching movies in Spanish, reading Spanish-language newspapers, magazines, or websites)</td>
<td>_____ Yes</td>
<td>_____ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How often?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are your goals in studying Spanish?</th>
<th>Check all that apply:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_____ I intend to minor in Spanish.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ______ I intend to major in Spanish. | ______ Undecided. Please explain: ____________
| | ____________________________________________________________________________
| | ____________________________________________________________________________
| | ____________________________________________________________________________

| Have you used wikis before? If so, please explain briefly your experience with wikis/frequency of use. |
| Do you regularly use programs such as Facebook, Myspace, Online Chats, or wikis? If so, how frequently? |
| Do you enjoy working in groups in the classroom? Why or why not? |
APPENDIX C

Topic for the Composition in the Wiki

*El derrame de petróleo en Luisiana*

Con tu compañero/a, describe el derrame de petróleo que se produjo en el golfo de México en abril pasado. Incluye una descripción de sus efectos en nuestro estado de Louisiana (la vida diaria, las compañías, la costa del golfo, etc...). Además, describe quién/quiénes son responsable(s) por el derrame y la limpieza y lo que puede(n) hacer para mejorar la situación. Deben escribir por lo menos 1,250 palabras.

REMINDER: Recuerda que tú y tu compañero/a necesitan hacer todo el trabajo vinculado con esta composición (planear el contenido, escribir la composición, revisarla, etc.) en el wiki y no cara a cara.
APPENDIX D

Interview Guide for Student Interviews

1. What are your first reactions to using wikis and technology?
   a. Have you used wikis before?
   b. Do/did you enjoy using wikis?
2. What are some benefits and/or challenges of using wikis from a students’ perspective?
3. What are some benefits and challenges of working together with a partner in the wiki?
4. Do you think you and your partner equally contributed to the effort or was it more one-sided?
   a. Why do you feel this way?
   b. If one-sided, what prevented you/your partner from contributing more?
5. Do you feel that your partner ever took over the project? If so, could you specify what part he/she took over?
6. Was there any tension between you and your partner when you collaborated to write the first draft?
   a. When you collaborated to write the second draft (after taking into consideration the instructor’s comments/feedback?)
7. How did you decide who would do what part of the assignment?
   a. Was this an easy or difficult task?
8. Describe how you worked together to achieve the goals of the project?
9. Do you prefer wikis to a pen and paper method of writing compositions in Spanish?
   a. Why or why not?

1. How did you go about the correction phase of the project?
   a. Did you understand everything your instructor indicated to you?
   b. How did you resolve any problems with your partner like the ones mentioned above?
   c. What could have made the corrections/assignment clearer?
2. Do you have any other comments/anything to add regarding this project?

Thank you for your time!
APPENDIX E

Interview Guide for First Instructor Interview

1. What is your name?

2. Where are you from?

I am from Buenos Aires, Argentina.

3. When did you come to the United States?

The very first time I came to USA was in the late 80s to pursue my M.A. and Ph.D. After a couple of years, I went back to Argentina and stayed there for a certain period of time (actually, it was a back-and-forth process that lasted several years). Then, I came back to the States to defend my dissertation (1996).

4. When did you begin teaching?

I began teaching SSL in Argentina when I was very young. At that time, I was about to finish my degree on “Castellano, Literatura y Latin.” [Spanish language/Spanish and Spanish American literature/Latin and ancient Greek]

5. Briefly describe your educational background (e.g., degrees and institutions and any area(s) of specialization).

I received my:


b) M.A. from University of Maryland at College Park [Contemporary Latin American Literature/Spanish Literature]

c) Ph.D. from U of Md at CP [Contemporary Latin American Lit./Film Studies]

6. How many years have you taught at this university?

I have taught at this university for more than ten years.

7. What are the kinds of courses that you normally teach?

I normally teach junior-level courses (introduction to literary terms/Latin American literature/culture), senior-level courses (contemporary Latin American literature), and graduate-level courses (seminars on literary theory/cultural studies theory; seminars on biopolitics and Latin American literature/culture; seminars on fiction and politics (including the relationship between human rights activism and cultural productions, cultural memory, etc.), etc.
8. How many semesters have you taught this course at this university? (including this current semester)?

I believe I have taught this course for five semesters.

9a. Describe the primary components that make up your philosophy of teaching.

I see education as a cooperative process carried out by both professors and students since this relationship is a dynamic one and since the development of individuals can only occur in mutuality with others. I view education as a forum open to the imaginings and free exercise of decision-making by learners, teachers, and the community. This process is understandable as a dialogical one affirming the mutual and coequal roles of professors and students. I try to point out in all of my classes that my interest is based on the practice of dialogue, on rejecting passivity, and on receptivity to the new without rejecting the old that could be considered good enough as well. I think that, in doing so, I am focusing on developing critical consciousness to challenge the “givenness” of the world. Also, I believe that education must encourage competition (but not simply affirming the rule of the fittest), while maintaining cooperation (but no social conformism). Summarizing, I understand teaching as an exchange between “teachers” and “learners” rather than an imposition of my knowledge on my students’ minds. They are not mere recipients of my ideas and points of view. The whole teaching-learning process is based on intellectual training.

In order to get my pedagogical goals accomplished I incorporate language, literature, art history, and culture through a variety of combined techniques, which include Power Point presentations, art prints, DVDs (fiction films as well as documentaries), and music --CDs, video clips, YouTube, etc. Since I am very interested in Latin American urban cultures, my courses use a trans-disciplinary approach that includes literature, films, popular culture (rock & roll bands, etc.), architecture and urban life studies, etc. This approach aims to break stereotypes and to show the broad diversity of the so-called “Latin” American societies/cultures/region.

9b. What is your approach to teaching undergraduate students how to write in Spanish? Specifically, what do you want students to learn most about writing upon completion of your course?

My intention, throughout the semester, is to provide them with strategies to write and develop their ideas while they are still learning about writing in a foreign language. Based on my constant feedback, they re-do their compositions carefully following my corrections and learn from their own mistakes.

10. How often do you use technology inside and outside of class?

I use technology on a regular basis. I use our university communication system (Moodle) to be in constant contact with my students. Also, I email them every other day. Not only do I remind them about homework, but I forward them articles, links to academic sites, to YouTube, etc.
I prepare my classes using Power point presentations, *YouTube*, and numerous and diverse academic sites.

For my own class preparation, I even read and seek information in Portuguese, Italian, British sites (museums, libraries, etc.)

11. In what ways do you think technology can serve as a useful tool in a foreign language writing class?

I believe feedback is an essential factor for encouraging/consolidating learning and it is crucial in the writing context. Nowadays, computer-mediated feedback has become an indispensable way to foster the language learning process.

I usually use asynchronous writing, i.e. my students communicate with me in a delayed way (via e-mail, Moodle, etc.) In doing so, I help them correct their errors (grammar errors, organizational problems of their compositions, etc.).

I’ve been thinking about implementing *computer conferencing*, so as to give students the chance to communicate with each other or myself in real time.

12. Do you think there are any drawbacks/negative aspects of using technology in a foreign language writing class? If so, please explain.

There are none. On the contrary, using technology facilitates the students’ success and enhances their learning.

13. Have you ever used a wiki before this semester?

No, I have not, but I’m impressed with the new possibilities (i.e., interaction among students and between professor and students) offered by wiki. It’s my intention to use it in a near future.

14. In your opinion, why is corrective feedback important for students in a foreign language writing class?

See answers 9b and 11.

15. Describe how you have traditionally provided corrective feedback to students prior to this semester.

See answer 11.

16. When providing corrective feedback to students prior to this semester, explain how you considered content- vs. linguistic-based errors. For example, did you primarily grade for linguistic accuracy, content, or a mixture of the two? Explain the rationale for your approach.

I grade for a mixture of the two, because I evaluate writing as a whole.

17. Is there anything else that you feel is important for me to know about you, your approach to teaching/foreign language writing, or your use of technology?
APPENDIX F

Coding Key for Interviews/Conversations in the Wiki

Collaborative – COLL
- Interaction between both members of dyad to compose
- Working TOGETHER to compose the composition
- ALL parts of the composition edited by ALL members of the dyad
- Each member contributes to EVERY part of the assignment
- Socialization (speaking/dialogue) between members of the dyad
  - Knowledge generation
  - Group accountability
  - Interdependence
  - Common Inquiry
  - One goal/ One agenda
  - Mutual Investment

Cooperative – COOP
- More individual/independent in nature
- Both contributions simply put together to come up with composition
- Each person owns/edits only HIS OR HER part
- No or very minimal socialization/communication involved about putting together project
  - Knowledge transmission
  - Individual accountability
  - Delegation of tasks
  - Independence
APPENDIX G
Chat Logs Taken from Wikispaces
Dyad 1 Chat Log (while writing first draft):

**Kelly**: Sep 9, 2010 10:35 pm
How do you want to split up the assignment? What do you think our main points should be?

**Ryan**: Sep 11, 2010 12:40 am
I think our main points should be (1) a description of the actual event, what lead up to it, and its aftermath, (2) a description of the effects it has had on the environment, the economy, etc., and (3) efforts made to combat the effects, including things done to stop the flow of the oil and cleanup efforts. As far as splitting it up -- I'm not sure. Is there any part you would prefer to write?

**K**: Sep 12, 2010 10:20 am
Sounds good. I don't really know a whole lot about what led up to it, so I could take that second part about the effects. We could split up the last section. I'll try to work on something tonight. This sort of came at a bad time because I've been in Nashville since Friday, and I'm not coming back til Monday. I'll make it work though.

**R**: Sep 13, 2010 5:13 pm
The total word count is supposed to be 1250, which comes out to be 625 words apiece. I'm starting on the first section ahora mismo, but I have work from 6:30 to midnight, so there'll be a gap then... I'll post what I have before I leave for work.

**R**: Sep 13, 2010 6:28 pm
I posted what I have so far for the first section. I'll be back later to finish some more.

**K**: Sep 14, 2010 10:39 am
Ok I added to mine a little bit. It's still only 287 words though. 625 words is a lot to write about this for me even in English.

**R**: Sep 14, 2010 11:32 am
Agreed. I added some to my section, but I think we'll just have to submit it as-is.

Second Draft:

K: I can correct the errors in my part, and you can correct the ones in your part. Sound good?

K: Sep 21, 2010 11:50 am
Ok, well I did 4 of them, but I don't know what FL or MI mean. Those abbreviations weren't on the correction sheet she gave us in class. Maybe that just means they're completely wrong? Who knows.
Dyad 2 Chat Log (while writing first draft):

**Alison**: Sep 9, 2010 4:41 pm
Hey do you ladies want to designate who does what topic?

Lisa: Sep 9, 2010 4:47 pm
well, there are 3 topics necessary to talk about in our description. we each need approximately 417 words to meet the word count. the topics are 1) the effects on louisiana, who is responsible for the oil spill, and 3) what can be done to make the situation better.

**Theresa** Sep 9, 2010 4:47 pm
I will write about the effects on louisiana

**Alison** Sep 9, 2010 4:48 pm
I will write about who is responsible the spill and the cleaning!

Lisa: Sep 9, 2010 4:49 pm
I will write about what can be done to make the situation better.

**re: Question**
Theresa: Sep 9, 2010 4:50 pm
When do we need to post them by so we can correct each others?

**re: Question**
Alison: Sep 9, 2010 4:50 pm
I may need help with my grammar and putting together sentences but I will write it out first!

**re: Question**
Lisa: Sep 9, 2010 4:51 pm
well, we should have everything ready and posted by sunday night and monday night we can make any and all corrections

**re: Question**
Lisa: Sep 9, 2010 4:52 pm
Andrea i can help with whatever you need just message me here and send a copy of whatever you send to my email (meagan.jada@gmail.com) as well to be sure that i get it in time
re: Question
Alison: Sep 9, 2010 4:52 pm
Any questions you have for me wiki them, or text, call, or email, @
drea.go87@yahoo.com!!!

re: Question
Alison: Sep 9, 2010 4:52 pm
Oh and ok Thanks Meg!!

re: Question
Theresa Sep 9, 2010 5:01 pm
I read a helpful article on NYTImes.com if you need some resources. Just
search oil spill on the nytimes website and click on the first link.

Second Draft
Theresa: In the sentence that says "es necesario y muy importante que BP impulsar" I
think it would be "impulsa" because it comes after "que".

Lisa: thanks I changed it however im not sure if it would require the sub. also i looked at
the other corrections. one of them in the first section required a que after the tener form of
the verb. Some of the correction marks i dont understand such as FL. Please let me know
what this means so that i can understand what exactly needs work.

Lisa: I recommended a few corrections in [her] sections, however i did not want to
completely change them in the event that she/you didn’t mean to say that. Let me know
something about that FL please.
Dyad 3 Chat Log (While writing first draft):

**Shawn:** Sep 8, 2010 4:38 pm
so we have until tuesday to do this project. Do you want to just put your ideas and we combine mine and yours later? Im from New Orleans so I have plenty that I can say about the oil spill because it was a big deal for the people down there. We can also talk about it tomorrow in class if you want.

**Natalie:** Sep 8, 2010 5:13 pm
Hey! Yes, we can do that, I'm just worried that if we don't kind of divide up the topic, we could both end up saying the same things. But yeah, we can definitely talk about it a little in class. I plan to start writing this sometime tomorrow, but we'll see.

Second Draft

NOTE: This particular group did not carry out a chat while doing the second draft.
Dyad 4 Chat Log (While writing first draft):

Suzie: Sep 11, 2010 12:07 pm
Just letting you know that I've just posted my portion of the essay. It's about 687 words, so you have a little over 560 to write... not bad. Good luck!

Jacqueline: Hi im made some grammar corrections to the first part of ur essay, im not done yet but ive done the first few paragraphs. Tell me if u have any problems or suggestions!

Suzie: Thanks for the corrections! I'll be happy to look at yours when you're through. I think you're better at Spanish than I am though, haha. Yeah I totally understand about not having a computer... I just have a couple of other papers due Tuesday so I wanted to get it out of the way as soon as possible. Let me know if you need anything!

Suzie: Wow, you did a great job! I looked for errors and literally couldn't find a single one. I feel like our composition was pretty thorough... good job! Glad to have that out of the way haha.

Second Draft:

Jacqueline: hey, i finished the corrections that the instructor posted so we should be good now, lol i hope :P
Dyad 5 Chat Log (While writing first draft):

Mackensie: Hey, what are some of the things you are going to write about just so we don't repeat ourselves?

Jessica: Sep 8, 2010 4:29 pm
I just started writing my part of the description under what you have written, its not completed yet though. We can combine what we have written when everything is done!

Mackensie Sep 10, 2010 11:20 am
Hey, I finished my half of the description... there are probably a lot of errors in it and a lot of it may not make sense but I have 651 words written! Let me know what you want to do next whenever!

Jessica: Sep 11, 2010 1:51 pm
okay, i finished. i focused more on exactly what happend and what we are able to do to help out.
i took a glance at both of ours and we def didn't write the same thing so that's great.
i'm thinking monday we should meet up for a bit to put it all together. let me know what you think.
thanks :)

Jessica: Sep 13, 2010 8:48 am
we can get together and finish it today, I get out of class today at 1:30

Second Draft

NOTE: This group did not use the chat function while revising the second draft.
Dyad 6 Chat Log (While writing first draft):

Elizabeth: No estoy segura, pero pienso que "costosa" podría ser una palabra más apropiada en oración 4 (instead of "cara").

Jared: Ok, Thanks

Second Draft:

Jared: I did 5 of the corrections. Could you do the other 5 for tomorrow?
Samantha: Sept 8, 2010 7:10 am
i know that the history function will already color the changes made but If you don't mind could we come up with some sort of system to explain why we made the changes that we did, particularly in the grammar department. I was thinking maybe type them in parenthesis in the text but highlight them in some color. Chances are how ever that it will take more time to explain the corrections than to make them. This is something that I feel would be nice for me to learn something from this. If you don't want to then that is ok.

Charlie: Sep 8, 2010 10:21 pm
I totally agree!

Charlie: I have to let you know that I feel really bad, because I have had to change a lot, I don't like to do that because your ideas were good, but sometimes I couldn't understand. I'm currently writing a short description of the event, and then I'll try to develop some ideas to help clean the beaches and else...

Second Draft:

Charlie: Look, I left one sentence uncorrected that came from your first sketch
maybe you should correct and see why it is wrong

Samantha: does this look right to you? I feel like one of the fuerons should be something else.
Lastimaron , también, los animales migratorios. Toda sus comedas normales fueron muertos porque fueron cubiertos en aceite

Charlie: I'd probably say something like, "diezmaron, también, las aves migratorias (migratory birds) porque su comida estaba cubierta en aceite

Samantha: diezmaron, también, las aves migratorias (migratory birds) porque su comida estaba "cubierta" en aceite
Mariah: Sep 11, 2010 5:45 pm
hey i just posted my section. For some reason when I submitted it all my paragraph indentations went away but I think that's probably fine. It would probably make the most sense to just put your part second. I tried to make a tiny little introduction to your part so it would flow better. See you tuesday.

Roberto: looks good, i'll post mine later tonight, or tomorrow. greaux tigers!

Second Draft:

Mariah: just re-read the topic for our composition. I think that it can be divided up into two sections pretty easily. The first section could be made up of effects that the oil leak had on Louisiana and the surrounding areas. This would include how it affected businesses, individuals, and nature. The second part would talk about who is responsible and what can be done to fix the situation.
I think that if it was divided up like this it would be pretty equal but if you think otherwise just let me know what you think would be better. Both parts would probably require about the same amount of research. Personally I think I would like to do the first part, but it doesn’t really matter.
I have a political science take home exam to work on this week so I probably won’t post my part until Friday or Saturday if that’s okay with you. I’ll make sure to do my best so there won’t be a ton of stuff to correct. See in class on Thursday!

Roberto: sounds great. i'll write about how BP was responsible and what has been done to address the problem.

I also think that I'll be able to post either friday or saturday afternoon so no pressure.

Roberto: i just sent you a request or something to add me to the wiki bec i realized that i can't to anything to it besides viewing it and commenting here. see what you can do.

Roberto: Sep 13, 2010 1:43 am
rachel, i just posted my part. i tried to edit some of yours and i'm having trouble understanding what you're trying to say in the sentence "Localidades que se habian ocupado y lleno de pescadores . . ." can you explain what you mean to say for that and i can go ahead and fix it. i made it bold so you can easily find it. thanks

Mariah: Sep 13, 2010 9:09 pm
This is kind of what I meant in english. I'm pretty sure that second sentence was meant for the next paragraph, maybe it got messed up when I copied it over or something. "Towns that were once busy and crowded with fishermen and tourists were suddenly quiet and people at home wondered how they would support their families. Because the oil leak has finally stopped, people are beginning to be hopeful. Slowly, tourism has increased and fishermen are returning to their boats"
Roberto: Sep 19, 2010 10:32 pm
so it doesn't seem like we have much to fix. i'll go ahead and fix the errors tomorrow (monday) and you can go over it after to double check. it shouldn't take long.

Mariah: Sep 20, 2010 1:07 pm
Yeah, I think most of the stuff on my part is underlined because it doesn't flow well or sounds bad. I'm going to look at it again when I get home and see if I can fix some stuff too. See you tomorrow.

Roberto: Sep 20, 2010 1:47 pm
ok so i finished up the corrections. double check the corrections i made on your part to see if the agree with what you wanted to say. almost done!

Mariah: Sep 22, 2010 9:23 pm
ok i think it looks pretty good. Was it just me or was the edit page really confusing? When I went in to change stuff in the edit page all of the paragraphs were divided up in a weird way so I didn't do too much because I was afraid of messing something up. Anyway, I went back over my part and it looks good to me.
APPENDIX H

Interview Transcriptions

Jacqueline Interview – Dyad 4

M: Ok, what are your first reactions to using technology and wikis?

J: Well, it was I guess and easier way to do a group project cause you could just leave a comment and your partner would respond, so I liked it. And it wasn’t difficult to learn either because I’m familiar with like Facebook and Twitter so I’m used to using stuff like that I guess.

M: Ok, and using all these programs such as Facebook made it easier?

J: Right.

M: OK, uhm have you used a wiki before?

J: No, never.

M: Never, OK. Did you enjoy using them?

J: Yea, I did but it was different cause I guess I’m used to meeting up with my partner if I have something to discuss but I guess this was less time-consuming and I could easily just check if she wrote something back, so.

M: What are some benefits of using a wiki from a student’s perspective?

J: I guess, ok some of the benefits are the fact that you don’t have to meet in person so I could do other work while waiting on her response. I don’t have to be at a certain place I just have to have a computer ready to see if she replied so I think it’s easier because you don’t have to meet up. And you can communicate more I think than what you’d get if you met up once or twice because it’s constant communication.

M: Ok, and are there any challenges or difficulties using the wikis for a student?

J: No, I actually found none, it was very easy.

M: OK, and how about are there any benefits or what are the benefits to working with a partner in a wiki?

J: Uhm, because of the discussion part of it. Wait, what do you mean the benefits of working with a partner?

M: Well, what are some things you found maybe that were helpful about having a partner there to work with you versus writing an essay in class?

J: Like an essay by myself in class?
M: Right, yea.

J: Uhm because the partner got to share some of the work, that was the best part of it.

M: Do you think your partner and yourself equally contributed?


M: OK, and so you don’t feel like it was one-sided either way?

J: No, not at all.

M: Do you feel that your partner ever kind of took over any part of the project?

J: Uhm no I think it was an equal contribution and we both gave our points regarding certain issues so I think it was equal, I don’t think anyone took over.

M: Ok, was there any tension between you and your partner during writing the first draft?

J: No, nope no tension whatsoever we got along pretty well.

M: Ok, and do you think the fact that it was on the wiki maybe helped there to be no tension because you didn’t have to say something to her face?

J: True, I guess it probably could because if you had a problem the way you would address it would have been more friendly by just typing it and asking her if she would prefer this way or that way instead of doing it in person and it looks like you just don’t like the way she did it. So yea, I think it was a way that created less tension.

M: Ok, and how about for the second draft whenever the instructor went in and fixed some things and you corrected it, was there any tension at that point?

J: No there wasn’t.

M: OK. How did you guys decide who would do what?

J: Well, at first she had some other work to do so she told me she would just get ahead with doing the first part. So that’s how we did it. I don’t think any of us had a problem with which part we’d do, but she had a bunch of other essays due that same week so she decided to just start and then I did the second half.

M: Ok, so was it easy to, I guess that means it was kind of easy to decide who was going to do which part?

J: Right, it was easy.

M: Ok, uhm and describe how you two worked together to do this project.

J: Uhm you mean if we got along?
M: Or just how did you work together? Like for example did you each do your own part and then just say “OK, now we’re just going to throw it all together”? Or did you each work on the whole thing? Did you edit each other’s parts?

J: Well, ok since I did the second part I had to read what she did first and then obviously continue on her points and then when I was done we both looked at it together all as one to see if it flowed and uhm so we edited it together it wasn’t like we just threw each other’s parts together

M: Ok, well that’s good. Do you prefer wikis to pen and paper just sitting down and writing?

J: Uhm, I think they’re easier but for me even if I’m writing, like if I have an essay to do I would write it in rough first, like pen and paper because I realize that I think better using pen and paper. Like just thinking and then typing immediately doesn’t work for me so even if I use the wiki I still have to write it out first and then type it after. So that’s how I am with writing too. I don’t just write one draft. I write it and then gather my thoughts first and then rewrite it so no matter which method I use I still have to write a draft first.

M: Ok, so then maybe the pen and paper is just your go to kind of ...

J: Uhm, it’s not really. To present it I’d rather use a wiki because it’s, I guess it’s neater and it’s typed. But I just use writing as a way of thinking better so I gather my thoughts better when I write with pen and paper but still yet if I’m writing an essay in class or something I don’t just write. I’m saying that I still have to think about it while I’m writing. So I do a first draft while writing an essay and then rewrite it and then when I type I do a first draft and then retype it so it’s not that I really prefer writing it’s just that that’s my way of thinking.

M: Ok, no that’s excellent. Do you have anything else you want to add? Suggestions? Just things in general?

J: Because the wiki shows when it’s edited, right? Yes I remember that. And at first I was wondering if it would show when it’s edited and it did so I was glad that it showed that and uhm, actually no. I think everything was straightforward. Like the messages, who wrote which message and the number of times it was viewed. All of those things were helpful. So I liked it, it was a good experience.

M: Good! Well I’m glad! Thank you very much!
Suzie Interview – Dyad 4

M: Ok so what are your first reactions, what were your first reactions to using wikis and technology when you started doing this?

S: Uhmm I think you know the day that you came in the class there were some technological issues with the computers and that kind of made me be like “Oh God, what is this going to take, it’s reliant on the internet connection” and everything but I thought that the actual setup of the wiki was very clear, very easy to use you know and I just, I liked that about it.

M: Ok, have you used wikis before?

S: No, I have not.

M: Ok, so did you enjoy them? Do you enjoy them?

S: I do, you know like I said the fact that you can go in and have your final presentation be very neat. And I do, I’m not an, I’m an English major so I do type a lot of papers on the computer, I don’t really write them out, and I appreciated, like I said being able to go in and look at what I’ve edited and having everything that I changed be very clear to me. Like, I really appreciated that.

M: Ok, so I guess you’ve sort of kind of given some thought to this already and answered this already but what are some benefits of using wikis from a student’s perspective?

S: Uhmm I think just, as I said, being able to have everything in one place and you know as far as doing it with a partner you know having the discussion feature and not having to worry about “are they going to check their email?” you know “are they going to get this?” “Could it just get lost in cyber space?” you know apparently sometimes that happens. I just liked having everything in one place, everything was neat, it was easy to use and that made the process much better, much more efficient. It went by really quickly, it was easy to use.

M: Ok, and do you see any challenges using wikis or difficulties using wikis?

S: Uhmm, I guess on the other half, I guess this just kind of deals with the partner work and I mean this didn’t happen to me but you know I guess you’re kind of reliant on your partner to check the wiki space you know which that kind of happened. Apparently she didn’t have access to a computer for a couple of days and I had a lot going on and I was like “I really need to get started on this” and you know she’s not answering me and I’m just like “Well, I’m just going to get started, if you have any questions email me”. So I guess that’s kind of a disadvantage you know you have to rely on your partner to check it. I guess if you’re doing the project individually I really wouldn’t see any disadvantages to it at all.
M: OK, and what are some of the benefits and challenges or difficulties, obviously you’ve kind of just stated one the fact that you’re relying on someone to kind of do her part but of working with a partner. What are the benefits of having another person there?

S: Well she’s much better at Spanish than I am you know, and I didn’t even realize we were going to do this or needed to, and I don’t really think we needed to she was just being nice but when I first submitted my essay she was like “Oh you know I looked at it and proofread it a little bit, changed some things”. So I guess having a partner there, especially one that’s better than you at speaking Spanish, you know she was able to better my essay before the instructor actually even had to look at it. And uhm as I said really the only disadvantage that I see was the fact of relying on your partner to check it.

M: OK, and do you think your and your partner contributed equally to this effort?

S: Yes

M: OK so you don’t feel that it was one-sided then?

S: I mean if anything it was me being like “Look, I’ve got to get started on this, OK? I’m going to write about this and you’re going to write about this.”

M: Ok, do you feel your partner ever took over the project?

S: No

M: Ok and was there any tension between you guys, do you think?

S: No actually we’ve become like good friends now it’s kind of like before I didn’t even know who she was so no, not at all. No tension.

M: Ok so maybe that’s another benefit of working with a partner you’re meeting someone else.

S: Yea, exactly

M: But so in either of the drafts you didn’t find that there was any tension, then?

S: No

M: Ok that’s good. Uhm, and how did you go about deciding who would do what part of the assignment?

S: Uhm I guess we just tried to split it up based on what aspect of it we were more interested in. Like I was more interested in the technicality like what did the oil spill damage and you know what were the effects. And she was more interested in who’s to blame for this and kind of like I guess more the political aspect of it. I guess we just split it along our interests I guess.

M: Ok so was the a kind of easy thing then to decide “OK, we’re just going to...”
S: Yes, yea

M: Ok, and describe how you worked together. Like for instance did one person, did you just write your part, she wrote her part you smashed them together? Did you each work on all of it? How did you go about...

S: We each, we decided which topics we were going to write on, we each wrote two different essays and yea just kind of sandwiched them together and you know like I said we kind of proofread each other’s work initially and you know she helped me out with my corrections

M: Ok, and do you prefer wikis to writing with a pen and paper for a Spanish composition?

S: I do, it’s much easier to, you know I hate having to scratch out when I make a mistake which you know when you’re writing in a foreign language, unless you’re very fluent, chances are you’re going to make mistakes. You know, so I like being able to backspace neatly just try it again. So yes, I would definitely prefer it, I think it’s much neater you know. And you can also you know kind of start a paragraph here and your mind kind of drifts somewhere else you just jot some little notes, you can go back and erase them it’s just a lot easier to just kind of let your thoughts progress in a document in my opinion.

M: Ok, anything else you want to add, anything I didn’t mention yet? Suggestions maybe, something that you thought...? What about the time limit? Did you think that was enough time to write this or would you have liked more time?

S: Uhm, I think with the requirement for the words I think it was fine. You know that particular week I did have a few things going on but if it were just a normal week for me, I think, I think the time constraint was fine it wasn’t an issue at all.

M: Ok, well thank you very much for your time!
Interview With Dyad 4 Together

Researcher = R

R: So my question is how did you guys go about the correction phase of this project whenever the instructor actually told you what to correct, after that. How did you divide up the work or how did you go about doing that?

S: It was actually kind of funny because you know we kind of just intended to go in and do it individually I guess we didn’t really talk too much about it and I went in and did my corrections in blue to show that they had been done and she thought—we didn’t communicate—and she thought that the blue was what needed to be corrected and being nice she went in and re-corrected my corrections. So I guess we kind of had a little bit of a communication gap there.

R: Ok so and speaking of communication was that something that you felt was a good part about the wikis? The chat feature, the discussion feature, did you use that?

J: Yea we did

R: I thought it was a lot more helpful than just cause I mean if someone’s going to have to—it’s all in your email you have to like go back and forth, find what the person said type it and search it. To have it all in one place I guess altogether was helpful to me.

J: Yea, it was

R: Ok and did you understand everything that the instructor had corrected like when you went in?

J: Yes

S: Mhmm

J: Well when I saw [Ashley’s] corrections there were some that I thought were right so I didn’t understand why...

S: My corrections

J: So that’s why it was confusing because I just didn’t know what color the instructor was going to use and [Suzie’s] was underlined and it was blue so I didn’t know if... I wasn’t sure but we communicated well. We communicated well with everything basically. We basically exhausted the discussion part

S: I think there were what? Like 15?

J: Yea

S: 15 messages back and forth at least
R: And did the—the letter that the instructor used, you understood those? Or did you use those? Or did you just go “Oh, yea she marked that word wrong and I know why it’s wrong”?

J: I knew why they were wrong before

S: I used the, I used her notations

R: Ok, and if you came across any problems that you had such as the—you thought she still needed to be corrected—how did you resolve those? Did you resolve it with her or did you just go in and...

J: I actually went in and corrected what I thought was wrong

S: Mhmm

J: ...and then rephrased what I thought was right and then I wrote her a message saying that I did the corrections

S: And I hadn’t checked it and then when we got to class we kind of realized what had happened

R: Ok, so what could have been done to make this project, this experience better, easier... is there anything you would suggest? Anything you maybe had difficulties with about any part of this project?

J: Uhm, I actually didn’t have any difficulties

S: I didn’t either, it was pretty clear

J: Yea, it was straightforward, easy to understand and so were the wikis so I didn’t find it hard at all.

S: Yea I think the only difficulty was the communication gap between us which was you know kind of our issue I guess

R: Ok, now while I have both of you here right now do you have anything as a group to kind of add to this or any comments you want to make. Something that I haven’t asked you yet that you just want to say maybe about this experience?

[silence]

R: Do you think a wiki is something you could maybe use in the future?

S: Yea I mean I like being able to go back and look at what I’ve edited all along. You know I like being able to look back and see you know “What did I do wrong the first time?” or “What did I do wrong the second time?” and just be able to compare all of that and it’s clear it’s all you know labeled clearly with the color differentiation and that sort of thing. That’s what I liked about it.
J: Yea I thought it was easy and straightforward but as I told you before like if I made errors on the wiki I usually use pen and paper to correct it anyways. So that’s just my way of thinking. I can’t just think of a topic and just type it, it doesn’t work for me. My thoughts are scattered so writing it just my way of doing it but to present it I’d use a wiki because it’s neater than just writing. That’s just regarding like penmanship issues. But other than that I had no problem with it

R: Ok, well thank you girls very much for your time!
R: Just a couple of questions, what were your first reactions to using wikis?

M: Well I never used them before so I kind of had no ideas about it. I thought it was cool though. To be able to change everything....

R: Ok, so you liked the way that just anyone could go in and edit it and it showed you everything you had done?

M: Yea I thought that was cool but I don’t know if you change something like someone could just delete what you wrote, right? So I don’t know if that’s a good thing, but...

R: And I mean we had, in this case we had it kind of set to where you and your partner were the only ones that could kind of go in so. But you’re exactly right I mean someone could just go in delete it and that might be a drawback. OK my next question was going to be have you ever used wikis before, but you said “no”... ok did you enjoy using the wiki?

M: Yea I thought it was cool just because I could do it on my own time kind of and we can talk through the site so it kind of just resolved a lot of conflicts so if we wanted to do it together we could just get on the site.

R: Ok, and also you sort of already answered this too but what are some benefits and or challenges with using wikis from a student’s perspective?

M: Uh, I guess challenges would be just kind of sorting it out with the schedule for students because sometimes you might not be able to check things as regularly as your partner wants you to or getting your parts done so you know where to lead off from there. Maybe the discussion part, some discussion was like off a few days or something.

R: Ok, and what are some benefits and challenges of having the partner there?

M: Uh she was able to like tell me what she wanted me to do, kind of help me. Because I’m not really a good Spanish speaker which I know she is so she could help me out. Uh, yea.

R: Ok so it was just good to have that other person?

M: Yea

R: And she said you guys already knew each other so it wasn’t like you were getting to know her thought working with her but... because I know some people said that “Oh, it was cool we got to meet someone new”. Ok do you think you and your partner equally contributed to your composition?
M: Yea I think so because we both split it up into half and half so we wrote our 625 words.

R: Ok so I guess you kind of just explained it to me... Do you feel like she ever took over the project?

M: No, no

R: Ok, uh and was there any tension between you guys when you were writing for the first time when you actually went in to write the thing?

M: Uhm I think we didn’t really know how to do about it at first so it was kind of confusing but we figured out we would just write our own parts and see if there was anything that mixed together we could probably put it together or we could just leave whatever we wrote the way we wrote it.

R: Ok and how about whenever the instructor went in and corrected it and you guys had to fix that was there any tension at that point?

M: Not it was easy from there!

R: Ok! Alright and how did you decide who was going to do what whenever you started writing this?

M: Uhm we didn’t really decide we kind of just saw that we were going in different directions and we were like “alright, well let’s just stay that way”. I kind of went in my own opinion she kind of... she knew a lot about it beforehand so she wrote about her knowledge on it and I kind of wrote an opinion part about it.

R: Ok, and uhm describe to me how you worked together like did you just each write something and just put it there? Did you each work on the whole thing? How did you...

M: We kind of just she wrote her part and I wrote mine. I think the only way that we could have made it more intertwined would be seeing how each part mixed like if we... we didn’t want to like repeat ourselves, that was like our main thing, so.

R: And that’s where the communication had to come in. OK and did you find you communicated well through this?

M: Yea, yea

R: Alright, uhm do you prefer using wikis to a pen and paper when writing in Spanish?

M: Yea I think it’s a lot easier on the computer because when I’m writing I won’t usually go back and read what I wrote but when it’s on the computer it’s kind of just like in your face so for me it’s easier except the accent marks

R: Oh yea, well on some computers there’s little shortcuts and things you can do but ea. Ok well do you have anything else that you want to add? Maybe something
that you didn’t talk about? Something that you just thought of that jus came to mind?

M: Not really

R: Ok thank you very much for your time!
Jessica Interview – Dyad 5

R = Researcher

R: Ok, so what are your first reactions to using wikis and technology?

J: Uhm, it was interesting, it was cool it did remind me of Facebook a lot. It was automatic, it was quick. Uhm, I liked how you could have a discussion on there. That was like really cool you could just like not even talk. Cause like when you talk on the phone or like text it you’d probably get off topic or whatever but this is easier it’s like automatic exactly what you need to know. Uhm and it was cool how we both had our separate, like you know I thought it would bring it all together like our separate, I don’t know how to say it, like what I wrote and what she wrote. So that was cool how it was separated.

R: Ok, and have you ever used wikis before?

J: No

R: Alright, so did you enjoy using it?

J: Uhm yea I thought it was much easier than Microsoft Word, like much easier. Because it was just like put it together open a new file and everything was already on there it was very easy to use and more convenient I think than any other manner of doing it.

R: Ok, you kind of already mentioned some but what are some benefits and or challenges of using wikis from the student’s point of view?

J: Uhm a benefit is that it’s very easy to use, straightforward. And like the discussion thing is really good and just how you can, as I said before, you have your own separate and then if you want you could copy and paste it. And then a challenge? I don’t think there was any challenge. It was really easy to use, nothing bad about it at all.

R: Ok, what are some benefits and or challenges of working together with a partner doing this project, using the wiki?

J: One thing that was hard was making sure that we didn’t say the same stuff. Like we did talk about that but let’s say we didn’t talk about that then that would be really hard. Because we’d probably repeat the same stuff since it was like the same essay.

R: Ok, uhm do you think you and your partner equally contributed to your project?

J: Yea, definitely.

R: Ok, so it wasn’t really one-sided then?
J: No, not at all.

R: Ok, and explain why you feel that you equally contributed

J: Cause I looked at some of the stuff that she wrote and it was equally, I don’t know how to say it but like it’s not like it was very vague like she went into detail, as much detail as I did and then the word count was like, she said that she wrote the same amount as I did so...

R: OK, do you feel that your partner ever took over the project?

J: No, we both did equal

R: OK, alright so was there any tension when you did the first part, when you were first composing it was there any tension between you two?

J: No, we’re both like really chill laid back about it because well, we’ve been in classes before together

R: Ok, so you knew each other?

J: Yea we knew each other before so I think we both knew how each other, we both, I knew she would contribute like a good bit and I would too so it would be equal

R: Ok and how about the second part when you guys went in and corrected what the instructor told you to was there any tension then?

J: No, it was just like, no tension between us but I had to like figure out what “O” meant like organización cause I wasn’t sure what that meant and things like that because like the thing was it’s not like we different paragraphs, we both did just one section and then one section. And then mine was at the top so mine was like all corrected and she only had two or three so I had most of the corrections.

R: Ok and how did you decide who would do what part?

J: Uhm actually we just went with it like I had done like a paragraph like a paragraph or two first and then I think she read it and she went from there. And then I added stuff that she hadn’t mentioned. So it was pretty much I wrote stuff and then she added on and I added to what she added

R: Ok so then I guess it was a pretty easy task to figure out who was going to do what?

J: Yea.

R: Ok,

J: And we have the same major so I think we work well together. We both study advertising so yea.
R: Oh! That’s interesting. So describe, you kind of already did this, but describe how you worked together to achieve the goals of the project. Such as, did you each just write your own part and sandwich it together? Or did you each work on all of it? How did you go about doing that?

J: We both hit on different topics but we didn’t like plan that. Like as I said before she just added on to what I added on to and then I though like “Oh wait, we should talk about this” and then I added that so it was both, an equal effort by adding different stuff.

R: OK, and do you prefer wikis to a pen and paper method of writing compositions in Spanish?

J: Oh yea, it was much easier. Like pen and paper it would be a lot of scratching out but this is like easier obviously because you’re using technology and then since I’m using the internet I can just copy and paste a word or whatever that I’m not sure or look something up. It’s much easier.

R: Ok, uhm is there anything else you want to add that you haven’t talk about yet about the project maybe like a suggestion you might have?

J: Uhm, they should probably like on the wikis they should probably have an instant translate or something. I don’t know if they could have that but that would be easier cause I know on like Microsoft Word they have translate a word. That would be even more beneficial to Microsoft—it would be even better than Microsoft because like this, as I said before, you can have like two separate things you know like how Mary had one part of the page and I had the other? And it was uniform it was really easy to use, much easier than Microsoft Word. So if it had a translate I think it would be perfect.

R: Ok excellent thank you!
Interview with Dyad 5 Together

R = Researcher

R: Ok so how did you two go about doing the correction phase when the instructor told you what to correct how did you divide up the work?

M: Uhm, we did whatever we wrote. We corrected our own parts.

J: Yea, it was simple. Like, I mean I don’t even think we like talked about it.

M: Yea, because it wasn’t going anything like too major so we didn’t have to ask each other how to do this, how to do that.

R: Ok, did you understand everything she indicated to you to correct?

M: For me, yea

J: I didn’t. Like the “O”s, the abbreviations she used I had to ask her cause I had no idea. Even though it makes sense now like the “O” for organization

R: Ok, so you asked her about it then?

J: Oh yea, definitely. I definitely asked her.

M: Ok, cause my next question was going to be how did you resolve any of those issues if you did have kind of an issue with “I don’t understand this”, but OK. So you asked the instructor and she explained it to you?

J: Yea, yea, yea. She was really nice about it.

M: Ok, and what do you think could have been done to make the corrections even more clear? Like for instance, you had a problem with that. What could have been done so that you wouldn’t have had to go ask the instructor maybe?

J: Well, write out the whole word.

M: Or, like give a list, like she gave a list.

J: Like a key

M: ...with a key to show her abbreviations

J: Cause I didn’t know. One of them was like “O” and I don’t remember what the other one was that was confusing, oh “F” for fluidez I didn’t know that one
R: Ok and what could have made the entire project any clearer? Or what do you think could have made it improve in any way? Don’t be afraid to say it.

M: I thought it was pretty clear about what we were supposed to do so

J: I still think they should add a translate button that way I don’t even have to get on the internet or whatever on another site. It would just be automatic.

M: Or like an accent mark thing like automatic accent marks cause I kept copying and pasting all the accent marks so I don’t really know how to use them so.

R: Ok, so as a kind of pair is there anything that we haven’t talked about yet that you’d like to maybe mention about the wiki assignment? Anything else that you can think of?

M: No, I like how you were able to go in and put in some input and the teacher could do that too. It didn’t have to be like you didn’t have to go to their office to sort it out.

J: Or like you could send us messages through there or the instuctor could too. I didn’t have to go to my email to check if it was automatically on there.

M: That was cool

R: Alright well thank you girls!
R: Ok, what are your first reactions to using wikis and technology?

S: Uh, first it’s kind of confusing, but then it was like “this is really cool and I had to go talk to my parents and be like “Hey look! I have a wiki!” Uhm but yea I can’t really say it has anything really cool on it or anything but the fact that I have one is kind of like “YAY” I’m kind of like proud of it a little bit.

R: Ok! So have you used wikis before?

S: No. I’ve read Wikipedia if that counts but that’s it.

R: Alright, and did you enjoy using wikis? Do you enjoy using wikis?

S: I think it would be an interesting concept but I feel like it would work better if it was a long term project.

R: Ok Long term as in not just this one composition that was over...

S: I mean like if it was something, one activity that was like for maybe a month or two because I realize that I did most of mine during one time and he did a lot of his all at once because he apparently wasn’t doing anything school related over the weekend or something so it wasn’t that much opportunity for like back and forth sort of thing, it was more...

R: Because of the length of time that you were given to do it?

S: Right.

R: Ok, I understand. What are some benefits and or challenges of using wikis from a student’s perspective?

S: Uh, the fact that you can change it whenever you are... you don’t have to like print it out. You don’t use a lot of paper which costs money. You don’t use a lot of ink. You can basically have it up there so whenever you get a chance to do it you can just work on it.

R: Ok, and what are some benefits and or challenges of working with a partner in the wiki?

S: Uh, your partner is not always there at the same time as you are or anywhere near the same time as you are so like I said I did mine mostly in the beginning and then he didn’t really do anything until later.
R: Ok so this would be a challenge then?

S: Yes.

R: Ok but are there any benefits?

S: Benefits, yes uh because then you have someone else to like review your work and you can review theirs and I think it’s a great concept just as long as it works like it ought to.

R: Ok, and the having someone to review your work you found was helpful?

S: Yes, because my Spanish is horrible!

R: Oh! Do you think you and your partner equally contributed to the effort or was it more one-sided?

M: Ok, I don’t really know because I wrote a whole bunch but I also realize that mine was truly horrid so I really am not sure who contributed more or the more usable information.

R: Ok, because

S: I know I came in more often but it was probably more beneficial each time he came in.

R: Oh ok, yea that makes sense. What do you think might have prevented your partner from contributing more than you did? If you feel like maybe you did not contribute enough or he didn’t, what is the reason for that.

S: Time, time, just plain time!

R: Ok, so you think one week was maybe not enough to write an essay of this length

S: Uhm, I think that maybe it might have been but it also depends on what you were doing during the week for other classes?

R: Ok, no that’s perfect. Do you think your partner ever took over the project?

S: I don’t think so. Or if it was, it wasn’t unnecessary.

R: Ok, was there any tension between you and your partner when you collaborated to write the first draft?

S: No, no, uhm really no.
R: Ok, that’s perfect. And how about when you looked at the teacher’s feedback, if you did, was there any tension at that point?

S: If anything it was very tension-less because you did not see the other person ever. Do there was no heated debate it was more like “Yea, ok, I’ll write this.”

R: Ok, so the nature of the wiki then, being that you don’t do this face-to-face actually relieved some of the tension a little then maybe?

S: Yes, there’s no tension really except for hoping tht the other person shows up because they’re not there so you can’t make sure they are there.

R: Ok, also maybe contributing to this is the fact that sometimes you feel more comfortable telling people things in typing than you would...

S: No, actually not because I did see a study that a lot of people feel more comfortable with the internet because people don’t see them, but honestly I’m a very careful person when it comes to typing things because once it’s in type someone else can read it. It can be found again on your computer even if you erase it. But unless someone is recording what you’re saying, you can always take it back even though it might be misunderstood or twisted or something but it’s not permanently etched somewhere so that some person can find it.

R: At least you and that other person would be the only two that know. Ok how did you decide who would do what part of the wiki? Of the original..

S: I don’t think we did. We didn’t. I just started writing and hoped he would show up. I don’t really think we did a whole lot of deciding.

R: Ok, so there was no process really? It was just an “OK I’m going to write my part and he’s going to write his?”

S: Yea, I just wrote and it was pretty bad.

R: Ok describe how you worked together to achieve the goals of this project? How did you work together?

S: Uhm, I wrote my half and basically he corrected a whole bunch and I’m sorry for that.

R: Ok, so you wrote your half and he corrected it and it’s kind of just...

S: That’s just what happened.

M: Ok thank you for your time!
Interview with Charlie from Dyad 7

R = Researcher

R: Ok, so what are your first reactions to using wikis and technology?

C: Well, I still like face-to-face conversations. It’s easier to make, easier to clear things, you know?

R: Ok, to resolve conflicts, to talk about your part...

C: Yea

R: Ok, have you used wikis before?

C: Never, never. Well, except Wikipedia but I don’t really...it’s just for information.

R: Ok so do or did you enjoy using wikis?

C: Yea, that was fun. I mean I liked the fact that we could see what was changed and stuff so I knew what I did.

R: Ok, what are some benefits of using wikis from a student’s perspective? Just in general, what do you think could be some benefits?

C: Well, as we said before it’s nice because we can stay at home and do it. Like I can do my part whenever I feel like doing my part and she does hers whenever she feels like doing hers and we don’t have to be at the same place at the same time.

R: And what are some challenges of using wikis from a student’s perspective?

C: Well it was no big deal. I mean, I’ve always been used to using computers so it kind of was just like getting used to the patterns and stuff, so...

R: What are some benefits of working with a partner in the wiki?

C: Well, we all know different stuff, we a have different ideas so we can share it, like a little bit of everything, we think and we write so. Like she had good ideas so sometimes I just rewrote the sentences but kept her ideas

R: Ok, what are some challenges to working with a partner in the wiki?

C: Well, her Spanish is, it’s like she says her Spanish is not excellent so I had to correct like maybe a lot of mistakes she made, so that is probably it.
R: Ok, do you think you and your partner equally contributed to the composition or was it more one-sided?

C: I probably a little bit more I guess

R: Ok, and I have this right here [points to computer]. It’s evident you entered in quite a bit more than she did. Now, I don’t know, maybe she changed more when she did enter but there you go, the proof is right there. And why do you think that might have been? Why do you think you might have contributed a little more than she did?

C: Well, I don’t like take credit for it but...

R: Oh no...

C: I basically speak Spanish better than I speak English, so I just knew more. I spent some time in Spain too so I can write in Spanish as I write in English or pretty much like I write in French, so it’s just easier.

R: Ok, so maybe it was her difficulties with the language that caused her to...

C: Yea

R: Ok. That’s perfectly...

C: I’m more comfortable dealing with the language than she is so...

R: Ok. No that’s good. Do you feel that your partner ever took over the project?

C: Not really. I probably...she started it...she totally started it and then I implemented my ideas and changed the sentences but we were like, I guess she didn’t take over.

R: Ok, was there any tension between you and your partner when you wrote the first part of the composition?

C: No, I don’t think so.

R: Ok and how about for the second one when the instructor had gone in and you had to change some things?

C: No, no tension just she asked me how she should correct the sentence and that was it. No tension.

R: Ok, how did you decide who would do what part? Or like how did you go
about...

C: Well, she started it, she started to write about the history. Well, I’m not sure if she wrote the history but I mean one us did. So we didn’t really talk about “You do that”, “I’ll do that” just she started it and I completed it basically. I just put my ideas in what was left, what was left to be talked about.

R: Ok, so then knowing what you kind of had to do once she started it was that easy, difficult to decide what you were going to do?

C: At first I was pretty much like “What do I have to do”, you know she gave all the ideas but then when I started I just like, I really get into it so I added a lot of stuff, I just find random stuff, so that’s how I did it.

R: Ok, and now describe how you worked together to kind of do this project.

C: Well, as I said, she gave a lot of ideas and I just turned it into the more Spanish way of saying it, you know what I mean?

R: Ok, so then you would kind of say that you dealt more with the language of it...

C: Yea, and she gave a lot ideas.

R: Ok, no that’s perfectly fine, ok the last question. Do you prefer wikis to a pen and paper method of writing compositions in Spanish?

C: I like to write on the computer but it depends on what you mean when you say paper

R: Or just like, writing on the computer, on the internet versus sitting in class writing an in-class composition.

C: Well, it gives more time lie that [points to wiki] and I can listen to music which I mean, I don’t do that obviously when I am taking a test, but yea I mean I can do it at home in my couch like with my desk. It’s more comfortable.

R: No that’s great! Now, do you have any last things to say, any last comments to make about the project as a whole.

C: Maybe, like, to be able to choose the partner because I didn’t know [Samantha] at all. I just came here and like I met this guy in the Spanish class and I thought I could do it with him so that was the idea and when you gave us the name it was like “Oh, ok, well I’ll do it anyway”, but...
R: Ok, so that would be a suggestion then, maybe to choose your partner and that would have helped? So do you think, then, that if you would have gotten to choose your partner it would have been easier to do this maybe?

C: Not easier, but it helps to get to know the other person too, but I met Samantha at the same time. Actually it was good too because I met another person, someone else than those I usually talk to.

R: So then maybe that’s another benefit of using a wiki is working with other people!

C: Yes!

R: Ok, well thank you very much for your time you’ve been great!
Interview with Dyad 7 Together

R = Researcher

R: Ok how did you two go about the correction phase of this project? For instance when the instructor had gone in and made some corrections, how did you proceed from there?

S: He did most of it, and then you left me one and then I typed in like “Yea, I think this looks right!” and then that wasn’t right.

C: There was not a lot to be corrected it was like a few sentences, a few words that, I don’t know, I messed up a little bit so then yea. I corrected those few sentences and then there was one sentence that I left exactly how she wrote it so she corrected the mistake.

R: OK, but you both kind of took part in the correction phase...

S: Yea

C: Yea yea sure sure

R: Ok did you understand everything that the instructor indicated to you?

C: Well it was just like underlined so it was kind of obvious I mean there was something wrong there.

R: Ok the letters and the correction guide that she used did you understand those?

C: Uh, actually not really but I knew what was wrong so I just...for the things I changed I knew what was wrong like I made some mistakes like typo stuff knew it was wrong so I just corrected it cause I felt like it was supposed to be like that, you know?

R: Ok no that’s fine. So uhm how did you, if for instance we kind of already answered this but if you had nay problems in the correction phase or if you didn’t understand something how did you go about resolving that? How did you resolve that?

S: I just kind of posted it and then [Charlie] responded it and then that’s it. It wasn’t very difficult

C: There was no like big problem

S: Just my horrible Spanish, that’s it, that was the only problem
R: And what could have made the corrections, that part correcting what she told you to correct—what could have made that easier? Or was it already easy? Or what do you think?

C: Well it wasn’t, I mean it wasn’t that hard. Most of the stuff was just like “Yea”. Some of it was, some was wrong because it’s like an expression, a phrase in Spanish, things like that you know?

R: Ok, and what could have made this entire process, using the wiki, the assignment, the prompt that you got, easier? What do you think that could have been done to make it easier, clearer?

S: More time

C: Yea, maybe more time, more time to spend on it like we had some other tests and quizzes and stuff

S: And it’s like if you didn’t have anything else to do that’s probably extra time

C: NO problem

S: But because of all the other things

C: It was like right the week we had Spanish test, my German test, my Mass Comm test it was like all at the same time

S: Yea to be honest I’m always busy so there is no great week to have anything to do it’s just more of an “OK, if you put it up there for a month I’ll get to it”

C: At some point, in the weekend

R: But you guys did do great getting it done on time and I thank you for that. Uhm, Well do you have any other comments or anything to add regarding this project? Any suggestions? Besides obviously more time. But any suggestions or comments about using wikis? Anything like that?

C: Well, I’m not a big fan of using wikis, I’d rather have a discussion. Maybe it’s good we had time to, we wrote our parts by ourselves and then post it and then correct it and then whatever. But I feel better talking about the mistakes or stuff like that from like face-to-face.

S: If it was some way you can highlight “this is the individual thing that you changed”, “this is the thing that I changed” and maybe each change be a different color as opposed to “oh whatever was changed last was this color” no matter whose it was.
C: Yea like it should be a different color for each person just to know what was changed by who you know?

S: And each change so you can go “OK, this is blue it’s a different color blue because it was changed more recently or something of that nature so there’s a complete history in different colors or some other method. Colors wouldn’t have to be it but maybe something else. Font? I don’t know

R: Ok well thank you very much for your time!!
APPENDIX I

Average of the Scores Given to Compositions by Outside Raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 1</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 2</td>
<td>85.75</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 3</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 4</td>
<td>86.75</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 5</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 6</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 7</td>
<td>82.75</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 8</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Coding Scheme for Politeness Model (from Brown and Levinson, 1987)

Strategy 1: Attend to hearer (interests, wants, needs, goods)
Strategy 2: Exaggerate
Strategy 3: Intensify interest to H
Strategy 4: Use in-group identity markers
Strategy 5: Seek agreement
Strategy 6: Avoid disagreement
Strategy 7: Presuppose/raise/assert common ground
Strategy 8: Joke
Strategy 9: Assert or presuppose S’s knowledge of and concern for H’s wants
Strategy 10: Offer, promise
Strategy 11: be optimistic
Strategy 12: include both S and H in the activity
Strategy 13: Give (or ask for) reasons
Strategy 14: Assume or assert reciprocity

Strategy 15: Give gifts to H
APPENDIX K

Consent form Given to Students

1. Study Title: Collaboration via wikis: Investigating the social dynamics of L2 writing and revising in an online environment

2. Performance Site: Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

3. Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study
   Dr. Joshua Thoms (225)578-7398; jthoms3@lsu.edu
   Madeline Boudreaux (337)962-1252; mboud44@tigers.lsu.edu

4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this study is the analyze and gain insight into how students use teacher feedback in a Wiki environment online on a second language composition and what role group dynamic plays in the acquisition of the language.

5. Subject Inclusion: Students enrolled in [class] for [semester]

6. Number of subjects: 18

7. Study Procedures: Participants will form pairs and collaborate to write a composition in a wiki in Spanish. Their first draft will be corrected by the teacher. They will then make corrections accordingly and submit a second draft which will then be scored for the final grade on the assignment. There will then be a voluntary interview with at least one of the dyads to attain more insight into what went on in the groups during the process.

8. Benefits: Subjects who agree to participate will receive bonus points towards their final grade in the course (amount to be determined).

9. Risks: The only risk that could possibly be contrived from this study would be vulnerability gained from posting work online. However, measures of confidentiality are taken by locking accounts and granting access to the compositions only to the researcher and members of the dyad.

10. Right to Refuse: Subjects may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of any benefit to which they might otherwise be entitled.

11. Privacy: Results of the study may be published, but no names or identifying information will be included in the publication. Subject identity will remain confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

12. Signatures:

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigators. If I have

137
questions about subjects’ rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board,(225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the investigator's obligation to provide me with a signed copy of this consent form.

Subject Signature:________________________________
Date:____________________

Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.6792
irb@lsu.edu | lsu.edu/irb
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