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**Abstract**

An increasing number of universities are providing the current generation of students, the so-called ‘digital natives’ (Prensky, 2001) - with more flexible and innovative language learning environments through the use of free Web 2.0 tools, such as wikis, blogs, social networking, Second Life and podcasting. However, still relatively little is known about wikis in the context of teaching English for Academic Purposes. My project aims to fill this research gap. I applied a case study strategy, where three groups of students attending a course *Academic reading and writing for teacher candidates* were examined. This paper demonstrates how the wiki software was employed in the course to encourage teacher candidates to proof-read and edit their own and others’ texts in order to be more accurate in academic writing. The present case study applied several research methods, including analysis of the texts written by students on the wiki and chat-room comments, an interview with the teacher of examined groups and a student questionnaire. The analysis of peer revisions was carefully conducted with a particular focus on: the variations in the way that students corrected each others’ texts, types of revised language issues, and the extent to which the teacher candidates were correcting accurately. My findings show that the students paid close attention to sentence structure (e.g. clauses, punctuation), fixing sentence problems (e.g. parallelism, choppy and stringy sentences), inflection and academic style. It is noteworthy that most of these languages issues were discussed in class. Considerably less attention was given by students to questions like paragraph structure and content. The accuracy of students’ revisions varied depending on the type of corrected language issue. The general impression of employing the wiki in this course was favourable. Many of the teacher candidates admitted that they would like to utilize the wiki tool in their future teaching courses.
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1. Introduction

The web is increasingly present in all aspects of our life, motivating internet inventors to create more and more sophisticated and innovative functions. Their main focus is on facilitating communication and social networking among families, friends, co-workers or classmates. Web 2.0, also known as the ‘social web’, is the second major incarnation of Web 1.0 and has a huge potential to improve, and add new collaborative practices to the classroom environment (Solomon & Schrum, 2007). Many scholars have discussed internet technologies and their impact on the language learning and teaching. For instance, Stevens & Shield (2007/2009) and Newstead (2007) argue that the use of new web technologies offers the students flexibility and autonomy, as well as occasions for self-improvement in studies.

In recent years, there has been a wide interest in Web 2.0 tools, and some studies have been conducted to investigate whether these internet devices can indeed ease and accelerate language learning. According to Anderson (2007), Web 2.0 refers to the set of internet applications that facilitate a social connection, in which everybody can create, edit and share knowledge online. Among teachers and learners, the most common Web 2.0 tools include blogs, social networking (e.g. LiveMocha), Second Life, podcasting and wikis. More and more teachers are using these increasingly familiar tools in their courses to modify the language learning process among second language learners. For instance, Lee (2010) employed blogs as home assignments and her hypothesis was that such a teaching approach would help the students to improve their target language competence. The findings confirm her expectations. Moreover, her results show that peer feedback on the content encouraged further discussion and engagement with the topic among students. Deutschmann (2009) conducted a comparative analysis of two oral proficiency courses that applied the Second Life tool to enhance language proficiency in speaking and listening. Another significant study on employing Web 2.0 tools in the ESL (English as a Second Language) classroom was carried out by O’Brien and Hegelheimer (2007). Researchers describe the efforts of integrating CALL activities in the form of podcasts into ESL course on listening strategies. These two studies on Second Life and podcasts demonstrate how successful these Web 2.0 tools are in the ESL courses. Finally, in their eight case studies, Guth and Helm (2010) employ almost all Web 2.0 tools and show how the successful practices of informal settings can be implemented in formal language learning.

My project will focus merely on the teaching and learning of academic writing supported by the wiki; therefore, it is essential to discuss more findings that are directly related to wikis. A wiki enables the students to collaborate with their peers and learn from observing the process of creation of their common work. In this way, they are not only recipients of the knowledge but also contributors. It has also been shown that through the exposure to other students’ comments they are more cautious with language use, as they feel more responsible for what and how they write (Guth, 2007). According to Kuteeva (2011), using wikis makes the students consider their audience, thereby increasing attention to linguistic accuracy in academic writing. Thus, in her study, the participants reported that writing on the wiki encouraged them to produce more reader-
oriented and grammatically correct texts. However, Kuteeva’s (2011) study does not focus on the process of peer review. Franco (2008) includes students’ revisions in his case study and shows that peer correction through wikis provided Brazilian EFL learners with many benefits in developing their writing and social skills. Nevertheless, relatively little is known about wiki peer revisions in the context of English for Academic Purposes.

In the present study, I have examined the groups of students that attended the course Academic reading and writing for teacher candidates. The aim of this study is to demonstrate how the wiki has been used to facilitate the learning of traditional academic writing skills by proof-reading and editing the students’ own and other texts. A particular focus of this investigation is on the variations and the accuracy in peer correction.

Two types of data have been employed in this thesis: primary and secondary data (Yin, 2009). The primary data include different kinds of material I collected and analysed for the case study. The secondary data for this research include sources, such as books, articles, and internet material, presented below, in the literature review. The literature review section will examine the existing theories and the knowledge on the main subject of this dissertation and will provide a better understanding of what it is that is not known, but needs to be known, to answer the research questions. The introduction to this dissertation has provisionally identified a lack of research on wiki peer revisions in the context of EAP. This gap in the knowledge led me to conduct primary research, which is discussed in the methodology section.

The dissertation is organized as follows: Firstly, the literature pertinent to the research topic is discussed in detail. Secondly, there is a presentation of the background to my study. Section 4 presents and justifies selected methodology and gives the reader an overview of how the study was conducted. In Section 5, the results obtained from the primary research are given. Next, the answers to the research questions are presented in the discussion and conclusion section. Finally, limitations and recommendations for future research are stated in Section 7.
2. Literature review: wiki, EAP, collaborative writing and peer feedback

The purpose of this section is to discuss the essential theories and research studies related to the use of wikis in language classrooms and their contribution towards collaborative language learning. The chapter starts with a definition of the wiki and its distinctive functions. Secondly, significant theories, such as Social Development Theory and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development Theory, will be outlined. Also, the phenomena of collaborative writing and peer feedback will be explained in the context of wiki usage. Finally, there is a presentation of relevant research studies and their relation to my case study research.

2.1 What is a wiki?

The wiki has been defined as “a website or database developed collaboratively by a community of users, allowing any user to add and edit content” (Stevenson, 2010). Undoubtedly, the most well-known and extensive example of the wiki is Wikipedia - the largest on-line encyclopaedia that allows any visitors to insert or edit its entries. Some typical functions that can be found in wikis include browser-based editing, access control, wiki mark-up - web formatting, tracking version history, discussion pages, automated page edit alerts, and locking current page version (Leeds, 2009). Ward Cunningham, co-designer of the first wiki software called WikiWikiWeb, defined it as "the simplest online database that could possibly work.” (Matias, 2003). The name ‘wiki’ derives from the Hawaiian word meaning 'quick'. Indeed, the wiki tool is easy to set up, and it is simple to learn its functions. It is undoubtedly one of the most convenient applications available on social Web 2.0 that can be used by teachers in a number of educational contexts (Wheeler and Wheeler, 2009). In the context of EAP, like other Web 2.0 tools, the wiki allows collaborative knowledge construction and communication with peers and professors outside the classroom.

2.2 Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development Theory, Collaborative Writing and Peer Feedback

Social Development Theory promotes a learning process in which the students play an active role (Booth, 1994). Two main concepts of this theory are the Zone of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1978) and The More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) (Sincero, 2011). Vygotsky's (1978) defined the Zone of Proximal Development Theory as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). Below, in Figure 1, is an additional, illustrative presentation of ZPD.
Social Development Theory suggests that the so-called More Knowledgeable Other (MKO) does not have to be a teacher but anyone with a better knowledge than the learner on a particular topic, for instance a peer. According to Vygotsky (1978), peer collaboration is an effective way to enhance student learning abilities and strategies. His implication is that teachers should employ collaborative learning activities, where less skilful students will improve with the assistance of MKO (peer) within the Zone of Proximal Development. Furthermore, second language acquisition theory also established and emphasized a major role of student-student interactions in language courses (Liu & Hansen, 2002). The above-mentioned theories justify the fact that an increasing number of course instructors introduce Web 2.0 collaborative tools, such as wikis, to improve and facilitate language learning process in their classes.

Another term that appears frequently in this paper is that of collaborative writing. This phenomenon is fairly complex, and there are different definitions of collaborative writing. However, for the purpose of my research, collaborative writing is defined as the process of composing a text by a particular student discourse community. According to Miller et al. (2012), collaborative writing attracted researchers’ interest in the early 1970's when English professor Kenneth Bruffee (1973) showed that students produced better outcome (written assignments) when they worked in groups than alone. He also claimed that they learned considerably more through collaborative group work than by interaction only with the course instructor. Many researchers, such as Bruffee (1973) and LeFevre (1987), support a view of collaborative writing as a more effective learning approach, particularly nowadays, when new technologies offer a plethora of free collaborative tools to current generation of students “digital natives” (Prensky, 2001), (Bruffee 1973 and LeFevre 1987, as discussed by Miller et al., 2012). More and more course instructors of EAP are realizing that wikis are one of the most functional Web 2.0 tools available for collaborative online writing (Richardson, 2006).
Collaborative writing usually involves peer revision. Peer feedback can be found in various forms, such as corrections, opinions, suggestions, ideas to each other (Lin et al., 2001). In a wiki context, peer feedback is defined as a phenomenon where students work collectively, by co-revising their texts through editing and redrafting (Lin & Chien, 2009).

2.3 Previous research on wikis in language teaching and learning

Kuteeva’s (2011) findings reveal that writing on the wiki made students pay close attention to grammatical accuracy and structural coherence. In contrast to Kuteeva’s (2011) results, Kessler’s (2009) study indicates that NNS (Non-Native Speaker), EFL teacher candidates gave considerably more attention to the content when editing the wiki, although they were encouraged to focus on language accuracy while writing and revising their own and others’ texts. It is noteworthy that the students in Kessler’s (2009) study were not correcting grammatical issues that did not impede the meaning, even though they were capable of it. Regarding my case study, the wiki tasks in Academic Reading and Writing course were designed based on Kuteeva’s (2011) findings. Thus, the teacher wanted her students to focus primarily on grammatical accuracy rather than content when editing the wiki. Further detailed explanation of how the wiki was applied in the course is presented in Section 3, Background information.

Similarly to Kuteeva (2011), Wheeler and Wheeler (2009) demonstrate that the examined groups of students considerably raised their skill level in academic writing through their formal collaborative participation in the course wiki. However, in Wheeler and Wheeler’s (2009), as well as Lee’s (2010) case studies, collaborative writing was limited as a result of the reluctance of many participants to correct each others’ texts on the wiki. In the case of Wheeler and Wheeler’s (2009) study, their unwillingness was presumably caused by the fact that this was a teacher training course, and most of the participants were already experienced teachers, so they were afraid to question other teachers’ competence. Lee (2010), on the other hand, claimed that 40% of her participants simply did not feel confident in their own writing; therefore, they were not willing to edit their peers’ texts. In contrast to the above findings, Kessler (2009) demonstrates that the majority of examined students felt comfortable correcting and critiquing one another.

Peer correction is certainly becoming more and more popular among teachers, and this frequent use of peer feedback in language learning courses can be effectively justified by the theories mentioned in the previous section. Furthermore, Coit (2004) claims that, according to collaborative learning theories, peer review plays a crucial role in L1 and L2 writing classrooms. It has been shown that when the students are allowed to correct their classmates’ papers, they feel more confident and motivated during the course. Lin and Chien (2009) have made an invaluable contribution to practical justification of peer feedback in EAP. They examined a group of Chinese students to investigate how effective peer feedback was in the enhancement of the students’ academic writing skills. After an intensive eight-week English course which included writing training and peer correction activities, the students reported that peer feedback assisted them to better understand the concepts of academic writing. However, there is still the need for further
research in the area of peer feedback through the course wiki and the effectiveness of such feedback in the context of EAP. To my knowledge, none of the above-mentioned studies has analyzed and discussed in great detail the variations and the accuracy in peer correction on wiki academic courses. That is why I have decided to focus mainly on these important issues.

3. Background and aims of this study

The present study was conducted at Stockholm University and is based on the material collected from a six-week course called *Academic reading and writing for teacher candidates*. More specifically, I examined three groups of students (about 20 members in each group) enrolled on this module in the Fall Semester 2011. Within the examined groups, the vast majority of the learners were native speakers of Swedish and their ages ranged between 20 and 35, with the majority in their early twenties. Some of them were already experienced teachers.

The course is a required component of a teacher training programme. The aim of this course is to develop the participants’ academic reading and writing skills in order to prepare them for further studies in the English department. The main focus is on writing in an academic register, reformulation, and the acquisition of key academic vocabulary. Throughout the course, students were required to submit three assignments, including an introductory paragraph, a short summary paragraph (pair work posted on the wiki), and a short report based on a piece of original research (about 700 words). The teacher introduced various language topics, such as paragraph structure (topic sentence, supporting ideas and concluding sentence), unity and coherence (e.g. use of transition signals, consistent pronouns), sentence structure (SVO, clauses, punctuation e.g. FANBOYS), fixing sentence problems (parallelism, sentence fragments, choppy sentences, run-on sentences, comma splices and stringy sentences).

Students were assessed with regard to their class participation, including attendance, homework and wiki contributions (20% of the grade), and the final assignment in the form of a mini-research project (80% of the grade). Students could choose their own topic of research or select from the given list.

The course wiki (powered by Mondo/Sakai) was introduced in the second seminar, and the first task was to write a paragraph summary of an assigned section from Nation’s (2001) book and post it on the wiki. The structure and the usage of wiki and chat-rooms were carefully explained by the course teacher. In the third and fourth seminar, students were asked to edit only their own pair-work, with a particular focus on the language issues that had been previously discussed in class. They did not have to consult with their partners before they made any changes to their own texts. In the fifth seminar, the students were allowed to edit the whole wiki texts (fixing any sentence and paragraph problems) and place the paragraphs in an appropriate order. The teacher advised them that they could just edit other texts straightaway on the wiki, or they could use the chat-room to discuss any possible changes with the specific authors of texts. If people were not pleased with the revisions that had been made to their texts, they could negotiate
that in the chat-room. The course instructor left some leeway for each student to decide on the form of their participation on the wiki and chat-rooms. In the last seminar, they had a little discussion on what they had learned from the course wiki.

As mentioned above, the wiki task was employed in addition to some other activities, present in the seminars. This activity was especially designed to give the students opportunity to think through and practice the language issues that were introduced in class, thereby allowing the teacher to monitor their progress through the history function. Moreover, the needs analysis for this course showed that the students in general were not writing accurately. They were writing their work without rereading it again, checking and looking for mistakes. The impression was that as long as the grammatical issues did not impede the meaning, the students were not concerned with the form. Therefore, the teacher was searching for some activity that would encourage the students to proof-read and edit their texts to achieve greater accuracy. The wiki tool seemed to be the best solution. Also, the instructor was interested in introducing something that her learners would have never experienced in any way of learning or collaborating.

The wiki tasks in Academic Reading and Writing course were designed based on Kuteeva’s (2011) findings, where it is stated that writing on the wiki made students pay attention to grammatical accuracy and structural coherence. The teacher did not want her students to focus only on the content as is demonstrated in Kessler’s (2009) findings. Therefore, she chose the specific task for the course wiki, i.e., each pair group was allocated one chapter of Nation’s (2001) book and had to write a short summary paragraph on the wiki. The teacher gave the following reason for applying such a task:

I wanted them to do the summary, because in one of the papers I read, it said the students were worried about the content and kept changing the content and didn’t look at all at form. So I thought if they all got a different piece of the text where they are experts in this little area, they can’t keep complaining about the content so much, because they wouldn’t know about it.

The main purpose of the whole course was to focus on writing accurately in an academic register; that is why the attention to form (while writing on the wiki) was an expected outcome.

The wiki tool was used to supplement the traditional composition exercises in language learning. The access to the wiki was restricted to each particular group of students, the teacher and administrative staff who set up the wiki, which means that only these members were allowed to edit and view the page content. The students were posting and editing their own texts throughout the course, and they were also reviewing each others’ texts over one week. This activity gave them an opportunity to work on a collective writing project; thus raising their individual responsibility and extending peer review and collaboration. Thanks to the wiki history tool, all users could track the constantly changing state of the wiki and negotiate the emerging alterations through the chat room. While there are several aspects of the wiki use that could be examined in this study, my focus will be on the students’ attention to accuracy of certain language issues through constant proof-reading and editing wiki texts. More specifically, my research questions are as follows:
1. What types of language issues were the students correcting?
2. To what extent did they correct them accurately?
3. What variations could be found in the way the students corrected each other’s work?
4. Did writing collaboratively on the wiki encourage students to proof-read and edit their texts to achieve greater accuracy?

4. Methodology

The aim of this section is to validate selected research methodology and present the reader with an overview of how the study has been conducted. This chapter begins with an explanation of the chosen research methods, followed by a description of the data collection process and analysis.

4.1 Research strategy

Yin (1994) presents four main research strategies: experiment, archival analysis, survey and case study. For the purpose of this thesis, a case study was applied. This strategy involves a thorough analysis of a case (participant or group of participants) in order to obtain a deeper understanding of the subject (Yin, 2009). The case study methodology seems to be the most appropriate for this dissertation, since it provides a great quantity of description and detail and a researcher can learn a lot from one case (Yin, 1994). In this research, three groups of students that were further divided into 30 sub-groups for the specific wiki tasks (pair-work) were examined regarding the same phenomenon. This amount of information may result in suggestions for several future research questions to follow up in other studies on the same or similar problems.

One weakness of the case study strategy is that it requires several sources of information, which is indeed time-consuming. However, collection of the data from only one source may be unreliable and cause biased views (Yin, 2009). Consequently, this may influence the findings, as insufficient information can lead to inappropriate results. In order to prevent these risks, a case study with multiple sources of data collection has been employed in this research. The following sections describe them in detail.

4.2 Method

The research method is very significant for the collection of primary data. There are various techniques and sources available to employ in case studies. The most constructive ones are: participant observation, direct observation, questionnaires, interviews, documents, archival records etc. (Yin, 1994). In order to answer the aforementioned research questions, the present research study applied the following methods: the analysis of the texts written by students on the wiki, an interview with the
teacher of examined groups, and a student questionnaire. The following section outlines data collection process and analysis.

4.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The above-mentioned research techniques were the most convenient ways of collecting primary data. The present study relies mostly on the data provided by the wiki itself with support of the teacher interview and student questionnaire. As a researcher, I was given access to Mondo sites of all examined groups in order to view the contributions that students made on the wiki pages and ensuing chat-room discussions. Also, due to Mondo access, it was possible to contact students and consequently to obtain completed questionnaires.

4.3.1 Wiki texts and chat-room comments

The texts produced by all three groups were collected from Mondo sites and scrutinized together. Thorough analysis of the texts posted on the wiki was conducted in close connection to chat-room comments, in which the students were justifying and discussing their own and peer revisions. More specifically, three wiki texts (6496 words) and three chat-rooms (12190 words) were analyzed all together.

Due to the history function, it was feasible to track all contributions made on the wiki. However, the most significant data was accessed through chat-rooms. In order to verify how the students' work progressed, one randomly selected text was analyzed separately.

The error categories that emerged during the analysis of wiki texts and chat-room comments included: paragraph structure, unity and coherence, sentence structure (choppy sentences, stringy sentences, run-on sentences, parallelism), punctuation, academic vocabulary, inflection and spelling. The terminology of the sentence structure errors was derived from the textbook used in the course: Writing Academic English by Oshima & Hogue (2006). These terms will be explained in detail below, in the Results section. Further qualitative data were obtained through the analysis. The results of the text and chat-room analysis are set out in Section 5.1.

4.3.2 Interview

The teacher was interviewed in person at Stockholm University. The interview lasted about an hour, and was recorded and transcribed shortly afterwards. Additional information and clarification were obtained through email correspondence. The interview with the teacher included the questions concerning her personal experience with the wiki: the rationale for applying wiki in the course, fulfilled expectations and limitations of this tool, the accuracy of students' revisions, potential use and improvement of the wiki in future teaching courses (see Appendix A containing all interview questions). Qualitative data from the recorded interview are presented in Section 5.2.
4.3.3 Student questionnaire

As established earlier, the questionnaire provides a very effective way of gathering information for building a case study. What is more, it is one of methods that can be used to collect qualitative or quantitative data. As researcher, I have decided to gather qualitative data (which describe the participants’ opinions, experience, as well as give linguistic facts), that have been essential to obtain additional information on the subject of the research (Nunan, 1992).

The questionnaire was conducted through the Internet since this method is deemed to be the easiest and quickest way to receive results from the participants (Wright, 2005). More specifically, the questionnaire was sent out to all groups via the Mondo site. The students filled it out voluntarily and e-mailed back to me after the completion of the course. Within one month, 9 out of 60 students, fully completed the questionnaire.

The student questionnaire provided an opportunity to ask students about their experience and opinions on the course wiki. The survey contained 10 questions (9 statements and 1 ranking question) concerning the collaborative writing on the wiki and 3 queries regarding general information about the informants, such as gender, age group and mother tongue (see Appendix B containing the questionnaire). A 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) was utilized in the aforementioned 9 questions-statements to determine the students’ views on the wiki.

The student questionnaires were compared with each other in order to find similarities and differences in the answers. The similarities found in the answers developed an overall trend for each question. Since all queries were closed, it was possible to convert the qualitative information into more lucid quantitative data (numerical and percentage data). They are presented in the form of tables and graphs, which makes it easier for the reader to follow the trends.

Qualitative and quantitative data obtained from the interview and questionnaire are compared with each other and provide further evidence to illustrate and support the findings based on the analysis of students’ texts and chat-room comments.

4.3.4 Comparative analysis

After the collection and analysis of the data, pertinent students’ and teacher’s answers are compared with each other. Finally, the findings of the text analysis are contrasted with the students’ and teacher’s responses in order to find similarities and differences between different kinds of results.

In contrast to the questionnaire, which was completed by only 9 participants, all 60 students participated in wiki contributions and 56 participants partook in chat-room discussion. Thus, the wiki texts and chat-room comments seem to be a more reliable source of data collection in this research. The interview, on the other hand, provides us with some significant information on the topic from the teacher’s perspective.
5. Results

The results of the study are displayed in the following order. Firstly, the analysis of wiki texts and chat-room comments is presented in several distinct sections depending on the discussed types of language issues. Successful and unsuccessful revisions as well as overlooked mistakes are also indicated below in separate segments. Secondly, the results of the student questionnaire are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 and thoroughly analysed by the researcher. Finally, selected student responses are compared with the teacher’s answers and both findings are contrasted with the results of text and chat-room analysis.

5.1 Students’ texts

The wiki contributions and chat-room comments show that peer revisions were almost purely grammatical as students were only familiar with the content of the chapter they had to summarize. Subsequent sections illustrate successful and unsuccessful revisions of various language matters. Some students edited wiki texts straightaway, others, however, pointed out supposed mistakes and allowed the authors to correct their own paragraphs. The majority of chat-room comments also include the students’ own brief explanations of their revisions.

After the elaboration of successful and unsuccessful corrections, there is a section with selected examples of overlooked errors. Subsequently, the discussion of ordering paragraphs and analysis of text progression on the wiki are presented. Next, there is a presentation of student clarification and negotiation on revision, which is followed by a discussion of text proof-reading. Finally, some comments on positive and negative attitudes towards writing on the wiki are demonstrated.

Three groups were examined, namely groups 10, 11 and 13 of English I. 56 out of 60 students that took part in chat-room discussions were examined. However, comments and wiki contributions of 38 participants were selected and presented below. Each of 38 students was given an anonymous and unique name that consists of an alphabetical letter: A to K and a number: 10, 11 or 13, depending on which group they belonged to. In the examples of chat-room comments, words such as text, group and paragraph mean the same thing and are used interchangeably by the students. Regarding the wiki contributions, abbreviations $V_p$, $V_c$, $V_f$ stand for previous version, corrected version and final version respectively.

5.1.1 Successful revisions

5.1.1.1 Unity and coherence, paragraph structure, sentence structure

These language issues were introduced by the teacher and discussed in detail throughout the course. When editing the wiki, close attention was paid to sentence structure and unity and coherence, while considerably less consideration was given to paragraph structure.
Unity and coherence

Within all groups, three kinds of aspects of unity and coherence were taken into consideration (while editing the wiki), and mentioned in chat-room discussions: consistency of pronouns, transition signals and avoiding repetition. The following example is a chat-room comment on pronoun consistency in the same sentence. The student indicated what correction was made on the wiki:

Student D10: Group 4, In the sentence "..the learner has an advantage if they know" I changed they to he.

In this revision, the word ‘the learner’ notionally has an indefinite function, covering woman as well as man. The above correction may be seen as a bit controversial since in the second half of the 20th century the pronoun ‘they’ has become increasingly common as an indefinite pronoun, which could refer to just one person (Seely, 2009). Nevertheless, this rule is not completely established in Standard English; therefore, correction made by the fellow student seems to be successful.

The next comment is a slight piece of advice for group 3 to proof-read their own text, and check if they can omit or substitute somewhere in the text a repetitive pronoun ‘we’:

Student G13: Went through the paragraphs looking for pronouns and changed some in my own text. Found a lot of "we" in paragraph number 5, perhaps that is worth looking at...

A considerable number of comments have been found on transition signals. The students noticed a tendency to overuse or apply these language issues inaccurately. The following comments are suggestions from peer students to reread the texts and look for any sign of overusing the transition signals:

Student I11: Text 4, I think this text is over-using the transition signals. The author may read it once more and tell me if you agree or not.

Below, there is one selected instance of several comments that deals with employing the transition signals wrongly, which may make the reader confused:

Student B11: Text 2, felt strange with all the transition signals, conjunctions: consequently, furthermore, hence, therefore.. might just be me though.

Some students also added the transition signals directly on the wiki to make the texts easier to follow:

Student L10: Text 11, I put in some transition signals so that the reader could keep up.

No more than one student out of all groups attempted to obtain some sort of unity throughout wiki texts. He suggested being consistent with referencing style through all paragraphs:

Student G13: And another thing I thought of is that some groups have included page numbers in their citations (Baddley 1990. 57). We should agree on whether all groups should do this so that we can get some unity throughout the wiki.
As is evidenced by the last version of the wiki text, students did not agree on any type of referencing; consequently, some paragraphs included page numbers in their citation, and others did not.

**Paragraph structure**

Only one revision concerning the paragraph structure was found. The author of the following comment considers the first sentence of text 11 to be too straightforward without any kind of introduction to the main topic of the paragraph:

Student A10: Just wondering: nr 11, isn't your starting sentence a little too abrupt? Or maybe it's supposed to sound like that? It totally throws you in without consideration.

Vf: (11) “According to the piece "The value of learning from word cards" direct learning with word cards has 3 values. Firstly, it is efficient, it allows us…”

The final version of the wiki shows that the author of text 11 did not agree with the fellow student or simply he or she made no effort to correct his or her own text.

**Sentence structure**

Some students were editing the structure of the sentences that seemed to be vague for the reader:

Student C10: Hello group 5! I changed some things in your text; for example, “look with at”, I changed to “(look) goes with the word (at)” to make it more clear.

Several comments on parallelism, choppy and stringy sentences were also included in chat-room discussions. All the terms were taken from the student textbook and applied in the course. In short, the above-mentioned language issues are grammatical errors in the form of incomplete or badly constructed sentences. For instance, parallelism errors occur when in a list or comparison, at least one of the items takes different grammatical form than others (Oshima & Hogue, 2006). As is evidenced within the following examples, students understood the phenomenon of parallelism and were paying close attention to this issue:

Student D10: Group 4, I also changed "recognizing" to "to recognize" because of what we learned about parallelism.

Vc/f: It is harder to distinguish individual words than to recognize the word families as a unit.

Student B13: Group 8, I changed the word "use" in this sentence to plural: however they may convey different ideas and uses of the word. If you're talking about plural "ideas", you should also talk about plural "uses".

Student E11: Group 11, sentence number 3 - check parallelism

Indeed, Group 11 proofread their text and corrected the mistakes on wiki pages. It was possible to track their changes thanks to the history tool.
Another successful revision is a direct contribution to the wiki, also available through the history function:

**Group 10, Text 12:**

Vp: “… how it is taught and learned, and **facilitation** of the learning process.”

Vc/f: “… how it is taught and learned, and **facilitated** in the learning process.”

Problems with choppy sentences appear when there are many short and simple sentences in one paragraph. It makes student writing become less academic and sophisticated. Student F11 attempted to find choppy sentences in texts, however, without complete success. The example below shows that the student did not understand precisely the notion of choppy sentences. Nevertheless, it does not change the fact that the final version of this sentence sounds much better than the previous one:

**Student F11:** Text 9, “This can make it both easier to acquire the words and at the same time make it last longer in mind. This is if the word gives a good direction to its meaning.” I think it's both **choppy** and overuses the word “this”.

Vc/f: “This can make it not only easier to acquire the words, but also make them more memorable; that is, if the word gives a good direction to its meaning.”

Stringy sentences are those that contain too many clauses what may be confusing for the reader. Below is an example of stringy sentences in one of the texts that was revised later on by fellow student. As is shown below in Vc/f, despite a close attention that was paid to fixing the sentence structure, the student overlooked a spelling mistake:

**Student C13:** Group 2, I also put a dot in the first sentence after burden, and started a new sentence from “This means...” I think that sentence was too long. **Stringy sentences** I think it is called.

Vc/f: “The time dedicated to learning a new word is commonly referred to as learning **burden. This means** that words **wich** are distantly related to the user's L1 language tend to be harder to assimilate in contrast to familiar-sounding words with similar meanings…”

### 5.1.1.2 Grammar and Spelling

The students paid attention to grammatical issues like inflection of nouns and pronouns, collocations, word choice, repetition, articles and spelling. It is evidenced within the following quotes taken from the chat-rooms and wiki contributions.

**Grammar correction**

Examples below are chat-room comments on: **declension of nouns** to indicate an accurate number (singular or plural), and **declension of pronouns** to specify the case:

**Student B10:** Text 5, First sentence, changed "**mind**" to **minds**, seems to be dealing with several, correct me if I’m wrong.
Vc/f: “Pawley and Syder (1983) states that we learn and speak our first language fluently; therefore, we store many sequence memories in our minds.”

Student A11: Text 3, remember to use the possessive case where it is called for. i.e. "one's", not "ones".

Vc/f: “…between one's first and one's second language,…”

However, in the case of "ones", the author of Text 3 could make just a typo instead of a grammatical mistake.

In the example below, we find a comment that deals both with the inflection of pronouns and word-choice. Subsequent revision makes the sentence sound more coherent:

Student C11: Text 9, 'This can make it both easier to acquire the words and at the same time make it last longer in mind'. I would take away the word 'both'. I would also maybe replace 'longer in mind' with 'memorable'. Oh, you also used 'words' (plural) so the 'it' should be changed to 'them', maybe?

Vc/f: “This can make it not only easier to acquire the words, but also make them more memorable;…”

Students paid attention to proper word choice and collocation. In the example Vp1, the student corrected the sentence successfully, as the expression “ due to that” cannot be followed by a clause. Also, Student C13 corrected a wrong collocation “related from” to “related to”:

Vp1: “The numbers are low due to that word families do not count proper nouns;…”

Vc/f: “The numbers are low due to the fact that word families do not count proper nouns;…”

Student C13 (Anna): Group 2, I made a little change in the text 2. Instead "distantly related from..." I wrote “distantly related to...”.

Students: E13 and F13, however, substituted word “with” for “containing” and “of great importance” for “crucial”, respectively to avoid repetitions:

Student E13: Hello Group 4, changed "with words with similar" to "with words containing similar" to avoid overuse of words.

Student F13: I changed the phrase "of great importance" to crucial in text (9)

Vc/f: ‘The importance of retrieval and how to make it a part of all learning activities is crucial.”
Articles

Three revisions of articles (Students C10, D13) were found among chat-room comments. Student C10 gave two suggestions for correcting a sentence in Text 12: to change the number to plural in the word ‘language’ or to add an article ‘a’. The author of that text chose the first option and edited that sentence:

Student C10: Text 12, I changed some things in your first sentence; for example, ‘teaching language’ must be ‘languages’ or ‘teaching a language’.

Vc/f: “There are a number of important aspects when it comes to teaching languages.”

Below, Student C10 corrected a common article error and gave a detailed explanation. Student D13, however, just omitted the unnecessary article ‘the’.

Student C10: Text 5, I also changed, (an) to (a) before the word “collocation”, because it does not begin with a vowel sound.

Student D13: I removed the word "the" in this sentence in (2) since it seemed redundant: "...and connections between the both languages...

Close attention was given to subject-verb agreement errors. Two (Vp2, Student A11) out of many other examples are presented below:

Vp2: “There are different set of context which can help us expressing a given meaning, situational, topical context and local context.”

Vc/f: “There are different sets of context which can help us expressing a given meaning, situational, topical context and local context.”

Student A11: Text 10 “[...] intentional and incidental learning is (?) not of great importance [...]”----- intentional + incidental = plural.

Spelling correction

Four students of different course groups were registered to correct spelling errors. Examples below prove that majority of them are typos rather than conscious misspellings:

Student J10: Text 2, 4th row ultimately-ultimately; group 9, 1st paragraph 3rd row memorise-memorize, text 10, 1st paragraph 2nd row learning-learning, then 25%-than 25%.

Student B11: fixed typos in text 10.

Student D11: Text 3 and 5, Corrected simple spelling mistakes.

Student B13: Group 6, I fixed a couple spelling mistakes, like changing "acknowledging” to "acknowledging".
5.1.1.3 Punctuation

Of all the above-discussed grammatical issues, students were paying the most attention to punctuation. The majority of students that took part in chat-room discussion commented on the fact that they revised punctuation in their own and others’ texts. This can be justified by the fact that this issue was discussed thoroughly in class; moreover, the students were asked in Seminar 4 to improve their punctuation. The most common comments were like the following one:

   Student E10: Text 2: Some punctuation issues corrected, first sentence. Also removed some semicolons (hyperciton correction ;) and added some commas here and there; Text 6: Changed some punctuation, applied some FANBOYS and semicolons where necessary.

The comment above proves that student paid attention to terminology introduced in the course, for instance, ‘FANBOYS’. This acronym stands for 7 coordinating conjunctions: For-And-Nor-But-Or-Yet-So that join two independent clauses and are preceded by a comma (Oshima & Hogue, 2006).

As shown in the following examples, the students paid considerable attention to semicolons. Some semicolons had to be deleted (Student H13) or corrected (Student A11) as they were used inappropriately. Others, however, were required in some sentences (Student E11):

   Student H13: Group 6, Although I love semicolons I had to take away a few :) One used for "such as" which isn't a conjunctive adverb

   Student A11: Text 2, I have a few comments. The semicolon here "loan word, hence; it can" is incorrect. Move it to the other side of "hence".

   Student E11: Text 1, Try to put in at least one semicolon somewhere.

Also, some students fixed sentence structures while revising punctuation. The example below shows that the sentences were too long in some paragraphs; that is why, some commas or semicolons had to be added:

   Student G13: I also fiddled about with the punctuations in the different groups. Long sentences etc.

Students also gave a detailed explanations of revised punctuation. The excerpt below explains why we put a pair of commas around ‘however’:

   Student C13: Group 7, I added commas before and after however...'This current encounter can, however, reinforce the memory...’I think “however” is some kind of pause in this sentence. So we can use a pair of commas there since it is not essential to the meaning of the sentence. I suppose.

5.1.1.4 Academic writing style

The main focus of the course was on writing in an academic register and the acquisition of key academic vocabulary. Therefore, it was expected that students would pay close
attention to academic writing style. However, no changes and comments on academic style were found in group 11. Many comments and contributions on using proper academic vocabulary were found. Students replaced less formal words or expressions with more academic ones. Below are selected examples of comments from two groups:

**Student G10**: Group 5, You can say **accompany with instead of go with**, to make it more **academic**, in the first paragraph, last sentence.

Vp: “...sometimes function words go with content words,...”

Vc/f: “...sometimes function words accompany with content words,...”

**Student K13**: I did some word changes to text (3): **mechanisms < components, knowing < comprehending**

**Student G13**: I did some changes regarding **academic vocabulary** in the wiki. Changed the word "**shown**" to "**displayed**" and the word "**watch**" to "**observe**" in group 6.

The students also corrected sentences with referencing problems and three examples from two groups were found. In the example below, Student I10 claims that brackets should not be used when the book is an example; however, he does not point out that they ought to be placed around the year instead:

**Student I10**: I didn't change this, but the first sentence in group 1 looks kind of wrong. If the book is an example, the "()" shouldn't be there.

Vf: During current years there **has** been reliable books about ongoing research tests on measuring vocabulary size on native speakers, such as **(Golden, Nation and Read, 1990; Zechmeister, Chronis, Cull, D’Anna and Healy, 1995).**

Also, the author of the comment was not bothered by the error in subject-verb agreement. The subject ‘reliable books’ is plural; that is why, the verb should be ‘have’ instead of ‘has’. As we may notice in Vf, the author of the paragraph did not correct this sentence after an accurate peer suggestion.

Other comments were more successful. Student D13 added the year to citation and Student G13 replaced “according to the source text” with “according to Nation (2001)” to make it more academic:

**Student D13**: I also added a citation to "**Nation's view is that...**”

Vc/f: "**Nation's (2001) view is that...**”

**Student G13**: Group 4, Changed “**according to the source text**” to “according to Nation (2001)”. Sounds better and more academic with a proper citation.
5.1.1.5 Content

Little attention was paid to the content of wiki texts. A total of 3 attempts were made to correct the content of paragraphs and all of them were successful. The students changed the text when the meaning was unclear or added some lacking information in the sentences. Two selected comments are presented below. In the first example, the student attempted to correct some vague and complex sentences. In the second instance, a peer suggested to give a brief definition of the linguistic term: “word cards”. The final versions of wiki demonstrate that both authors of texts agreed with peer suggestions, and successfully corrected their mistakes:

Student A13: Ok I know I’m out way to late with this, but this sentence in the second paragraph seems kinda odd to me: "there is a system in our brain which stores words; also, referred to as the "tip of the tongue" phenomenon. It occurs when we cannot recall a word we actually know." The system in our brain that stores words can't be the tip of the tongue phenomenon, rather the system in our brains that stores words, our vocabulary, play a part in the tip of the tongue phenomena, not sure I can edit it since I don’t have the original text though.

Vc/f: According to Brown and McNeill (1966) there is a system in our brain which stores words, when this system fails to retrieve the phonetical components of a word that can in turn give rise to what is referred to as the "tip of the tongue" phenomenon.

Student F11: I think that text 11 doesn't state what a "word card" means.

Vc/f: Take the case of word cards: educational devices that aim to link words to meanings, a practice that benefits a more deliberate study of vocabulary (N. Ellis 1995).

5.1.2 Successful revisions without approval from fellow students

It is necessary to mention that there were some successful revisions, which, unfortunately, were not acknowledged by the authors of the texts or changed later by other peer students. In groups 10 and 13 five of such revisions were discovered. Three of them were already demonstrated by the comments of Student G13 in Section 5.1.1.1 Unity and coherence, Student A10 in Section 5.1.1.1 Paragraph structure and Student I10 in Section 5.1.1.4 Academic writing style.

In Group 11, as many as 9 successful but not accepted revisions were found in chat-room comments. Four of them are shown below. The high number of such comments can be explained by the fact that many students from this group did not correct other texts directly on the wiki. They simply placed their comments on errors in the chat-room and allowed the authors to decide and edit their own paragraphs. Some students may have failed to realize that peer suggestions were successful; therefore, they did not make any changes in their texts. Others, however, did not trouble themselves to check the chat-room discussion everyday in case somebody commented on their texts.

The revisions concerned various language issues, such as punctuation (Student A11), word choice (Student E11), fixing sentence structure (Student F11) and transition signals (Student H11):
Student A11: Text 10, Fifth sentence: the semicolon is used incorrectly. "Daily interaction and influence with media" is not in itself an independent clause. Remove the semicolon and replace it with a comma…”

Vf: Daily interaction with society and influence of media; for instance, watching television, listening to the radio and being involved in conversations, are great forms of learning.

Student E11: Text #10 ‘Coming Tests’ should probably be changed to ‘upcoming’ exams/tests.

Vf: “…occurs when students are unaware of coming exams.”

Student F11: Text 3, the last sentence needs to be re-structured. It doesn't really make sense.

Vf: “To conclude, by adapting these different strategies increases the proficiency of learning a language.”

Student H11: Text 5. Can you write “; and moreover, “?

Vf: “…;and moreover, the topic it concerns.”

The questioning of Student H11 that something might be wrong with the expression ‘and moreover’ is accurate: ‘and’ is redundant in this case, because 'moreover' includes already the word 'and'.

5.1.3 Unsuccessful revisions

Some of the revisions of groups 10 and 13 were deemed unsuccessful as the result of overworking. Two errors were discovered in spelling. In one of the examples, a peer student changed British to American spelling. It is necessary to mention that in the course both types of spelling were accepted. For example:

Text 10: Vp: “A good learning programme…”

Vc/f: “A good learning program…”

Another revision was found on applying academic vocabulary. Student H10 replaced ‘ease’ with ‘facilitate’ which does not appear to be a more formal utterance:

Student H10: Changed ease to facilitate in text 12, just because of the academic expression.

Two other comments concerned an accurate word choice. Student K10 and Student J10 substituted ‘also’ with ‘in addition’ and ‘simple’ with ‘simpler’ respectively:

Student K10: Text 3, I changed; Also, research shows.....to In addition, research shows.

Vc/f: In addition, research shows that the more difficult a word is to pronounce, the more difficult it is to learn.

Student J10: Group 4, 1st paragraph 2nd row more simple-simpler.
Vf: By paying attention to these parts, the learning process can be made **simpler**.

It is one of these examples where both forms seem to be accurate, with the difference that ‘simpler’ is probably more widely used. Therefore, the above correction was unnecessary.

The example below regards a redundant revision of punctuation with the word ‘however’:

  **Student D13:** Made a minor change to "**Nation (2001), however, argues** that learning from context," in (10). Changed it to "**However, Nation (2001) argues**". Since however is a **conjunctive adverb** and just "Nation (2001)" is not an independent clause, and it needs to be preceded by either a period or a semicolon. I also think it makes the text flow better.

In this case, the transition signal ‘however’ does not function as a conjunctive adverb, but as an element that is inserted into the middle of an independent clause.

### 5.1.4 Unsuccessful revisions without approval from fellow students

The wiki contributions and chat-room comments also include some unsuccessful revisions that fortunately were not approved in the final versions of wiki texts. Three examples were selected and presented below in this section. The sentence of text 2, group 10 was altered twice. The student unsuccessfully edited the grammatically correct form of the word 'have' in subject-verb agreement with 'loan word' as a subject. Soon afterwards, another student changed it back to the proper version of this sentence and that was a final edition:

Vp: “For instance, if word using sounds similar to the first language and follows regular spelling patterns, is a **loan word** that **fits** and almost **has** the same meaning in the grammatical patterns as in the first language and **ultimately** has resembling collocations and constraints,…”

Vc: “ultimately **have** resembling collocations and constraints”

Vf: “ultimately **has** resembling collocations and constraints”

Another unsuccessful revision concerned sentence structure. Student A11 attempted to correct the sentence by replacing the transition signal ‘therefore’ with ‘for example’. If the author of the text had approved that change, the sentence would not make sense. The sentence ‘professors can ease the learning…’ is not one of the mentioned below factors:

  **Student A11:** Text 2, "Some of the factors that help us learn a word quicker are not as obvious as others; therefore, professors can ease the learning burden by, for example, revealing the novel similarities." I'm not sure the part after the semicolon necessarily follows from the part before. "Therefore" has the air of a conclusion to it. I would replace "**therefore**" with "**for example**", and remove the other "for example" that is used later in the sentence.

Vf: Some of the factors that help us learn a word quicker are not as obvious as others; **therefore**, professors can ease the learning burden by, for example, revealing the novel similarities.
As is shown above in final version, none of the fellow students agreed with Student A11 and changed a correctly-structured sentence.

Some unsuccessful introspection on a proper usage of punctuation was also found within the chat-room discussion. Student D13 attempted to correct his own sentence by deleting a comma after the conjunctive adverb ‘however’. As is shown in the example below, Student D13 did not succeed since a previous version of his sentence was accurate:

Student D13: I added a comma after however seeing as it is a conjunctive adverb and that requires a comma after its usage. For instance, the word cement can be incorporated into different sentences; however, they may convey different ideas and uses of the word.

Student D13: That looks weird, should be like this. "For instance, the word cement can be incorporated into different sentences; however they may convey different ideas and uses of the word."

Vf: For instance, the word cement can be incorporated into different sentences; however, they may convey…

Nevertheless, as is seen in Vf example, another student noticed a punctuation error, and added a comma after a conjunctive adverb ‘however’.

5.1.5 Overlooked errors

In spite of many successful revisions made on the wiki, some overlooked mistakes were found in areas such as punctuation, grammar and spelling, sentence structure, academic style, and content. Three representative instances are shown below:

Group 10, sentence structure

In the following example, students overlooked sentence structure problem, the so-called ‘parallelism’:

Text 6: “When learning and acquiring a new language the first thing required is the ability to notice and mark the unfamiliar words, but also try to (change to “to try to”) understand the way of using them.”

Group 13, punctuation

In the example below, the comma before ‘and’ should be deleted, as it is not a case of ‘FANBOYS’ phenomenon:

Text 6: Vf: To encourage learning in general, individuals should pay extra attention to noticing new items, (delete,) and useful language elements.

The examples above show that the issues introduced in the course and understood by most of the students (proved by previous examples) were also sometimes overlooked.

Group 11, Unclear Content:
The sentences below do not present a complete thought; therefore, they need to be rephrased:
Text 11: “Indeed, intentional learning, where the learner actively focuses on a subject, has been shown to be superior to incidental learning as it pertains to the retention of word meaning. Take the case of word cards: educational devices that aim to link words to meanings, a practice that benefits a more deliberate study of vocabulary (N. Ellis 1995).”

Many sentences were unclear in the content and the students sometimes found it hard to understand wiki paragraphs. The quote above is a perfect example of such sentences.

5.1.6 Placing the texts in an appropriate order

All three groups attempted to place their paragraphs in a proper order to obtain one coherent wiki text. However, Group 10 paid considerably less attention to the overall coherence compared to other groups. They arranged their paragraphs merely according to the numbers (1-12), without a careful consideration which texts seemed to be introductory or final etc.:

   Student B10: I tried to achieve some better layout, ordered group 1 first, 2 second and so forth. I don’t say I have read it all, it just looks better in this order.

Groups 11 and 13 were striving to obtain some sort of unity and coherence within collectively written wiki texts. It is demonstrated by the comments below:

   Student A11: One thing that we, as a group, haven't really done is order the paragraphs into one somewhat coherent whole. I thought I'd offer a few general suggestions: Paragraphs 3 and 6 seem to me to belong somewhere in the beginning of the document. Either one could serve as an introduction with some modifications…

As is demonstrated below, students were attempting to avoid repetitions of utterances or phrases, for instance, the introductory transition signal like 'according to' (Student L11) and expression 'when learning vocabulary' (Student M11):

   Student L11: I do not know if this is important but we shouldn't have four groups starting their texts with "According to" after each other?

   Student M11: I have a suggestion, maybe we can rewrite so that the phrase "when learning vocabulary" can be replaced with something like "when learning (a) new word(s)" to avoid repetition of that phrase, since it's very prevalent in the text, does anyone spot more words and/or phrases that are overly used?

Students were negotiating with each other on an accurate order of paragraphs, for instance, which of them should be located at the beginning of the whole wiki text:

   Student H13: Hello folks, I suggest that group 10’s paragraph should represent the introductory phrase. Do you agree? And if not which one would you prefer?

   Student C13: I decided to move the text 3, now it appears as the first. It seems to be some kind of introduction.

   Student H13: I still think that group 10 have the intro. paragraph.
So far, my analysis in the Results section indicates that students were correcting various language issues with different frequency. Close attention was given to the areas, such as punctuation, inflection, academic writing, sentence structure and unity and coherence, while little attention was paid to paragraph structure and content. Two groups 11 and 13, considered carefully how to place the paragraphs in a proper order to obtain coherent wiki texts. The analysis also demonstrates that there are considerably more successful than unsuccessful revisions found on the wiki. An interesting fact is that peers sometimes did not approve successful corrections. On the other hand, they also did not accept some unsuccessful revisions made by fellow students. This situation mainly occurred in group 11, as many students of this group were not editing peers’ texts directly on the wiki. Lastly, according to Section 5.1.5, final wiki texts still include various language errors.

5.1.7 Progression of wiki text

The purpose of this brief analysis is to check the dynamics of peer revisions. Two randomly selected paragraphs from two different groups were analyzed and compared with each other in order to look for any trend in the development of collaboratively written texts. The intention was to find out what language issues were corrected first, second, and so on.

As mentioned in the background to the study, students were allowed to revise each others’ texts during the last week of the course for about one week. Thanks to the history tool, it was possible to track all contributions made to wiki texts. In the whole wiki text of group 13, as many as 65 editions were made by peers within the last week of the course. The analyzed paragraph (Text 6) was edited 14 times. At the beginning, students were correcting grammatical mistakes, such as changing pronouns or contractions. Afterwards, one student fixed some problems with sentence structure such as parallelism (replacing the word ‘noticing’ with ‘notice’), stringy sentences, and so on. Next, students paid attention to spelling (changing "acknowledging" to "acknowledging") and academic vocabulary (changing "shown" to "displayed" and "watch" to "observe"). In the last editions, it was demonstrated that fellow students corrected some minor errors in the sentence structure to make them appear more coherent and clear. Finally, one student moved paragraph 6 to an appropriate place in the whole wiki text.

Another randomly selected paragraph is Text 4 of group 10. In this case, as many as 72 editions were found in whole wiki text, and Text 4 was edited 11 times. Firstly, fellow students were changing some utterances to make them sound more academic. Secondly, they were fixing punctuation and sentence structure. Later on there were some redundant changes made on transitions signals. Soon afterwards one student corrected unsuccessfully some grammatical issues, for instance, editing the word ‘simple’ to ‘simpler’. At the end, the paragraph was moved to an appropriate place in a collaboratively written wiki text.

After a brief analysis of these two texts, we can notice that students were approaching the examined texts differently. Moreover, after scrutiny of several other texts of all examined groups, it became apparent that different students were correcting various
language issues at different wiki stages. It also depended on the accuracy of texts, since some of them were written more successfully than others. That is why they had to be approached differently. To sum up, it was impossible to establish any trend in the dynamics of students’ revisions in this research study.

5.1.8 Student clarification and negotiation on revision

Students were not only correcting each others’ work on the wiki, but also many of them attempted to clarify or negotiate their changes in the chat-room discussion. The majority of them did it successfully. In the example below, Student C10 provided a detailed clarification of ‘why there is a comma before and’:

Student G10: Group 6, Why are you using a comma before and?!

Student C10: You can use a comma before and...If I remember correctly, the rule was, when you using (and) as a (fanboy) and adding a similar or equal idea, then you should use a comma before the and. For example, (I like fish and chips.) Or, (I like fish, and i like chips.).

Student C10 indeed proved his understanding of the linguistic term ‘FANBOYS’ that was introduced and thoroughly discussed in class.

Another clarification concerned the use of a proper linguistic term, i.e. whether to use ‘loan word’ or ‘borrowed word’ in the following sentence:

Student C11: Group 2. I would replace 'loan word' with 'borrowed word'.

Student E11: I have to say that I don't agree. I think that loan word is a better choice. Does anyone else have an opinion?

Student F11: I like loan word. I think that it's more of a "proper" expression than borrowed word.

Student C11: Hi Jasmina, I stand corrected with loanword. There is a difference between 'loanwords' and to loan a word. If the context was about something else then it probably would be better with 'borrow'. I did some googling and had always thought that the term 'loanwords' were when people translated directly from Swedish. Sorry!

The following instance demonstrates how students were negotiating over the sentence structure, and how they reached an agreement:

Student H13: Hello group 10, I suggest that you take away 'however' in your second sentence, and if not consider to use a semicolon.

Student J13: Regarding your comment that group 10 should consider taking away the 'however' in the second sentence I disagree since Nations view is that the processes in language-based and context-based learning should NOT be distinguished. If we would be taken away, this would not be clear. And although I consider myself rather addicted to semicolons (I love them passionately!), I don't see how a semicolon would fit in here.
Student H13: Hello Anette, see your point, but still find the ‘However’ a bit misplaced. **What about putting it in the beginning of the sentence?** “...However, Nation argues…bla, bla”.

Vc/f: “However, Nation (2001) argues that learning from context…..”

The above example shows that in spite of the initial disagreement between students, they came to mutual understanding and conformity through negotiation in the chat-room.

Some unsuccessful clarifications were also found in the wiki chat-room. As is evidenced within the subsequent quotes, one of them regards a proper citation:

**Student M10**: Group 9, the last sentence of your last paragraph mentions what Baddely thinks without stating a source.

**Student N10**: What we mentioned on the last paragraph is what Baddely thinks, its his words, so the source is himself.

### 5.1.9 Proofreading and editing coaching

One of the main aims of this research was to find out if writing collaboratively on the wiki encouraged students to proof-read their texts to achieve greater accuracy. The examples in this section demonstrate some signs of proof-reading their own and others’ texts, with a particular focus on language issues that were previously discussed in class. For instance, the following comment shows how Student M10 attempts to encourage all peer students to look through the transition signals in their own texts:

**Student M10**: I have been reading the texts a couple of times now and I have noticed a tendency of over using the **transition signals**. So, the tip of the day is for all of you to read through your text and think about what I just said.

A comment below is an appealing example of proofreading the texts, with a particular focus on choppy and stringy sentences, and sharing that strategy on chat-room discussion with fellow students:

**Student J11**: Trying to find either a choppy sentence or a stringy sentence....

Both comments of Student J13 were addressed to the specific groups of students to reread their paragraphs and pay particular attention to language issues like punctuation (Group 7) and overall grammar and content (Group 5) etc:

**Student J13**: Group 7, if I were you, I would have an extra look at the semicolons in your text. Didn't Lisa say something about semicolon crazy? I don't think she meant your text, but have a look anyway.

**Text 7**:

Vp: ” Also, repetition is a vital function in learning vocabulary; as many studies have shown.”

Vc/f: "Also, repetition is a vital function in learning vocabulary, as many studies have shown.”
Student J13: Group 5, I think it might be a good idea if you try to make your text a bit clearer with regard to the content, and when you have done that it might also be a good thing to review the grammar as well as the vocabulary.

The following comments by two students revealed that they paid attention to students’ suggestions and proofread their own work:

Student J11: Thanks (for comments) and I will go through my text, and see what I will change.

Student K11: Thank u, the punctuation has been changed!;

I couldn’t agree more. i’ll change it! Thanks

This comment is an example of peer feedback in the form of opinion on peers’ good work which also clearly demonstrates student’s proofreading:

Student J11: Group 11, I liked how you guys used comma and semicolons:) well done:); group 2, Good use of the academic words!

It is necessary to point out that in the previous sections, some chat-room comments also indicated that students were constantly proofreading and editing wiki texts.

5.1.10 Some personal opinions and preferences regarding writing on the wiki

Three students expressed their opinions on the course wiki before making any contributions to the texts. Two of them (Students A11 and B11) were reluctant to edit other students’ summary paragraphs. Student A11 proposed some sort of discussion before making any corrections to others’ texts:

Student A11: I will be very reluctant to correct and change anyone else’s summary paragraph when the free-for-all editing-extravaganza officially commences. I would very much prefer a discussion regarding proposed modifications with the authors of the pertinent paragraph before any changes are made.

Student B11: This wiki-war doesn’t quite work with Swedes I think, nobody has the stomach to just change stuff.

That can explain the fact that as many as 7 people from group 11 were not editing directly on the wiki, but they used the chat-room instead to point out and discuss possible errors.

However, not all students were biased against correcting on the wiki. One out of three students that expressed their opinions in the chat-room had a positive attitude towards peer revisions on the wiki:

Student F11: I think wiki warfare sounds fun though, and I suspect that we will discuss the changes in class or on fabulous mondo.
5.2 Interview and Questionnaire

Several excerpts from the teacher’s interview were already mentioned earlier in this thesis, mainly in Section 3.1 Background and aims of the study. These included, for instance, the teacher’s rationale for employing the wiki in the course and an explanation of wiki and chat-rooms functions. The teacher’s views concerning the expectations and limitations of the course wiki will be presented separately in Section 5.2.1. The remainder of the interview data will be discussed and compared with the students’ answers and the findings based on previous text analysis in Section 5.2.2.

5.2.1 Expectations and limitations of the course wiki

Considering that students only had six lessons to learn Academic English, the teacher expected that the course wiki would give them opportunity to re-read their texts and consolidate the knowledge obtained in class:

I wanted students to collaboratively do the summary and then I wanted them week by week think about what they learned in class, go back to the text and see how they were doing on that aspect. So, for example when we did punctuation, I wanted them to think: right I’ve learned it in the lesson now, look at the wiki, can I do this?...I cant do this, now I’m going to change it. I wanted to give them a regular opportunity to check what they’ve learned in class.

The teacher stated that some of her expectations were fulfilled, as several students took the opportunity to review their work. Moreover, she also obtained outcomes that she did not expect from students, such as applying newly introduced terminology in their revisions in the chat-room:

I really wasn’t expecting them to be as comfortable with linguistic terminology as they were. And just the fact that they were saying things like: your sentence is a choppy, they must have understood the concept of choppy and when we’re using that vocabulary and terminology. I wasn’t expecting them to learn that as quickly or to be able to do that.

However, she also admitted that the course wiki did not fully meet her expectations as final wiki texts were not successful:

I wasn’t satisfied that they had written a coherent, good text. They were told at the beginning they were writing wiki entry to other students about vocabulary learning and I think if new students read that text they wouldn’t be very well informed about vocabulary learning.

According to the teacher, the limitations were caused by the fact that the selected texts were too difficult for many students. Consequently, the outcomes were not good, readable wiki texts since many students did not actually understand Nation’s (2001) original text:

I think I overestimated their reading ability. So, I think the texts were too difficult for them…Lots of the problems came down to not understanding the texts; that’s why, they couldn’t connect their ideas because in some cases they weren’t really clear what the text was about.
5.2.2 Comparative analysis of students’ and teacher’s responses to the results of students’ texts.

The results of the questionnaire are demonstrated below in Table 1, Table 2 and Graph 1 and are continuously compared with the results of the interview section and text analysis. Table 1 depicts mean scores for 9 statements on the Likert scale of 5 (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). These statements deal with various aspects of writing collaboratively on the wiki. Table 2 provides some more detail regarding proportional distribution of students’ responses, also presented on the Likert scale of 5.

Table 1. Mean scores of students’ responses on the use of the wiki.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements of the questionnaire</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Writing collaboratively on the wiki encouraged me to proof-read and edit my own and others’ texts to achieve greater accuracy.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. While writing on the wiki I was paying more attention to issues introduced in the course than some others, non-related to seminar content.</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Correcting others’ texts made me feel convenient.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Others’ revisions of my text made me feel convenient.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I always commented in chat-room on changes I made to others’ texts.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I corrected the texts directly on the wiki without any approval of the authors of particular texts.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I only pointed out the mistakes of particular groups in chat-room and let them correct on their own.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My fellow students were editing accurately.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would like to employ the wiki in my Academic English courses.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Proportional distribution of students’ responses on a Likert scale of 5 (n=9; male = 3, female = 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Statements</th>
<th>1 S.D.</th>
<th>2 D.</th>
<th>3 N.</th>
<th>4 A.</th>
<th>5 S.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest mean scores (4.3) were found for statements: 1,3,4. Therefore, according to the responses to question 1, the majority of students (8) agreed that writing on the wiki encouraged them to proof-read and edit their own and others’ texts to achieve greater accuracy. Also, the teacher’s impression was that the wiki did encouraged them to proofread their texts as that was the main aim of employing this innovative tool in the course. The following quote is an exact teacher’s answer:

I think it did make them realize they should be proof-reading and looking again at their work…

I think it had to encourage them, because every lesson I was saying: remember to proof-read the wiki. So I supposed even if they were not doing it, they had me saying every lesson, check, revisit your text, proof-read.

As we may notice, the questionnaire and interview support text findings on student proof-reading, presented mainly in Section 5.1.9.

According to students’ responses to questions 3 and 4, most participants (8) assured that they felt comfortable with correcting students’ texts as well as being corrected by peers. The findings of chat-room analysis also show that students were not afraid to correct others. Thus, only two comments (Students: A11 and B11) demonstrated in Section 5.1.10 indicate negative attitudes towards peer revisions on the wiki.

A considerably high mean score (3.7) for statement 5 proves that students were actively participating in chat-room discussions. Thus, more than half of the respondents (66%) said that they always left some comments on changes made to peers’ texts. That can be explained by the fact that the teacher advised students to point out any contributions made to the wiki text in the chat-room. However, the course instructor also gave them some leeway to decide on the form of contribution to the wiki texts and chat-rooms. According to self-reports, most of the students (7) agreed that they mainly corrected the texts directly on the wiki without waiting for any approval from the authors of edited texts. At the same time, two students stated that they only indicated the mistakes of pertinent texts in chat-room and allow peers to correct on their own. That might be caused by the fact that some members of group 11 were reluctant to edit other paragraphs (see Section 5.1.10, Students: A11 and B11). Consequently, they were not editing wiki texts, but instead they preferred to discuss proposed modifications with the authors.

The self-reports show that students were barely concerned with language issues introduced in the course when editing the wiki, with the highest proportion of respondents (8) expressing a neutral opinion. Only one student admitted that he or she paid attention to issues discussed in class. According to the previously analyzed statement 1, which has the highest mean score, writing collaboratively on the wiki encouraged them to proofread and edit the texts with the focus on the language issues discussed previously in class. These contradictory findings between two related statements (1 and 2) can be explained only in one way. When completing the questionnaire, the students did not remember or were not sure of what issues were discussed in class. Therefore, there were so many neutral opinions in Statement 2.
Nevertheless, the teacher claimed that most of the revised language issues were introduced in class, although some other corrections were also present:

Some issues that I didn’t cover were corrected. I remember at least one or two instances.

However, my impression was that it was mostly things in the seminar.

Likewise, the analysis of student texts and chat-room comments clearly shows that learners paid more attention to language issues discussed in the course, such as punctuation (e.g. FANBOYS), problems with sentence structure (e.g. parallelism, stringy sentences) etc.

The questionnaire results indicate that more than half of the students were satisfied with the accuracy of other students’ revisions. None of the students disagreed with statement 8, while four of them expressed a neutral opinion. Such findings are not surprising, considering the fact that students represented a similar level of English language proficiency. Even if these 4 respondents thought that peer students could have made errors in revision, they were not certain how to correct them; moreover, they probably did not want to question their fellow students’ language competence. The teacher was not fully pleased with the accuracy of their own revisions; however, she admitted that during the last week of the course, students were commenting considerably well on each others’ texts:

I think some revisions were successful, many weren’t, some were completely unnecessary, like change from ‘however’ to ‘but’. But I think the last week when they were correcting each other, I had the impression that the suggestions they were making were good on the whole.

As was already mentioned, the major disappointment for the teacher was the poor outcome of the whole wiki texts. She stated that even if the students significantly improved in accuracy, when writing on the wiki, it did not help them to make the texts more readable because they had not understood the original text in the first place.

According to the results of text analysis, in general, many revisions were grammatically accurate. However, Sections: 5.1.3-5.1.5 show that several mistaken and unnecessary corrections were also present. As was mentioned by the teacher, the main problem was with the clarity and coherence of whole wiki texts. Also, there were some errors like misspellings that could have been easily corrected by peer students.

It is noteworthy that overall students’ experience with the wiki seems to be positive, as 6 respondents agreed that they would like to employ the wiki in Academic English courses in their future teaching careers. Thus, it appears that writing collaboratively on the wiki had a positive impact on students’ learning development. The course instructor was under the same impression. She said that when the groups had discussion about methodology used in the course, the students reflected that they would use wiki in their teaching courses and explained how they would employ it. The following interview quote presents what the students said to the teacher at the last seminar:

I asked them whether they would use it with their students and lots of them said yes and started to explain how they would adapt it for their students. Saying, oh we could look for if they could write in the past tense…if they could correct each other’s past tense or something like that.
According to the teacher’s response, it seems like the course instructor would like to apply the wiki again in similar courses, although she found some limitations and was not fully satisfied with the final versions of wiki texts:

The experiment I did was unsuccessful to a certain extent, as they were given too difficult texts but I would certainly try it using the wiki again, but I would approach it differently.

The last question of the survey was a ranking question. Students had to rank certain language issues such as content, academic style, spelling etc., considering the frequency of their revisions (1-the least frequent and 8-the most frequent). Responses to this question are presented in Graph 1. It demonstrates the mean scores of all students for different language issues on scale of 8.

Graph 1. Mean scores of students’ responses on the ranking question: What types of language issues were you correcting on the wiki? (Rank 1- the least frequent and 8- the most frequent).

According to this ranking, students paid close attention to inflection when correcting peers’ texts. Thus, this language issue represents the highest mean score (6.4). It can be justified by the fact that this language matter is probably the most common in language learning; that is why, the students were familiar and confident with revising this issue. Moreover, incorrect inflections of noun and pronouns or wrong subject-verb agreement are probably the most obvious errors that course participants (present and future teachers) were used to correcting on a daily basis. However, it is noteworthy that according to self-reports students did not pay much attention to spelling (one of the lowest mean scores, 3.7). The students’ responses support the results of text analysis, as the final versions of wiki texts contain several spelling mistakes. That is indeed surprising, since spelling errors also seem to be the most basic and noticeable grammatical mistakes in any text.
Academic style, punctuation and sentence structure represent the next highest mean scores, 5.9, 5.3 and 5.1 respectively. This is due to the fact that these issues were thoroughly discussed throughout the course. Moreover, writing in an academic register and the acquisition of key academic vocabulary were the main focus of the course. Also, it is essential to mention that students were asked in the fourth seminar to improve the punctuation and structure of their sentences. Therefore, the attention to these language matters was highly probable.

Revisions of unity and coherence and paragraph structure were ranked lower than academic style, punctuation or sentence structure. Despite the fact that all these language problems were scrupulously discussed in class, these two variables represent minor mean scores, 4.1 and 3.1 respectively. The text analysis shows similar findings regarding the revision frequency of the language issues discussed in class. The difference occurred in the accuracy of edited language matters. As is shown in Section 4.1, some issues were corrected more successfully than others.

As was expected by the teacher, students did not pay much attention to the content of their peers’ texts. Hence, the mean score for this issue was the lowest (2.3). Similar findings were demonstrated by the text analysis in Section 5.1.1.5. Those results were the most likely, as each pair group was only familiar with the content of one of the Nation’s (2001) chapters. Finally, the respondents did not mention any other language problems that concerned them while revising wiki texts.

5.3 Further comparative analysis of results obtained from texts and chat-room comments with selected interview and questionnaire responses.

Contrary to Kessler’s (2009) findings, the participants in this study paid considerably more attention to grammatical issues than to content. This claim is supported by both text analysis and questionnaire results. As mentioned above, the students’ attention to form was an expected and desired outcome. It was mainly caused by the fact that each pair group was assigned to summarize one chapter of Nation’s (2001) book; therefore, they were not familiar with other sections. This lack of knowledge of the original text prevented students from making corrections on the content. Consequently, many texts posted on the wiki were hard to understand. The course instructor acknowledged that many students became so obsessed with correcting grammar and punctuation that the content of their final wiki text appeared to be illogical but accurately punctuated, spelled etc.:

I saw some sentences that made no sense at all but had perfect punctuation. But it doesn’t say anything, as this content and meaning completely went out of the window, and all that mattered was if they used transition signals correctly.

Moreover, the teacher mentioned that the students were informed that the audience was other students, and the text was an introduction to vocabulary learning for them. Thus, everyone was supposed to be able to understand it without having read the original text. The terminology, such as the key word method, incidental learning, or word cards should have been explained for other students. Nevertheless, the teacher was pleased
about the fact that students at least were pointing out some texts that they found difficult to understand:

Someone is commenting on the fact that it isn’t clear to the reader, so I was happy to see those and there should have been so many more.

Below are examples of students’ comments regarding problems with understanding the wiki texts:

Student A13: “Royer (1973) conducted an experiment wherein learners of words were shown the translation of the words in English at the same time on the first trial, and then on later trials tried to recall the words and guess. The recalling procedure group scored significantly more right answers than the simultaneous translation group on a test which was taken directly after the learning sessions.” I don’t understand this sentence in the second last paragraph, lacking the paper I don’t feel I can change it : / If someone who has the paper is on perhaps the sentence can be adjusted?

Student A10: Am I the only one who doesn’t get nr 10? Maybe ‘cause I’m tired but I really don't understand it.

Unfortunately, most of the authors did not act on these suggestions about making their texts more comprehensible (except for one instance, see Student F11, Section 5.1.1.5). Nevertheless, it was satisfactory enough that fellow students at least indicated unclear texts.

6. Discussion and conclusion

This case study has demonstrated how the wiki tool can be successfully exploited in teaching academic writing skills, such as reformulation, fixing sentence structure and key academic vocabulary etc., in a collaborative on-line environment.

To begin with, it is necessary to point out that this section will mainly draw on the significant results provided by the text and chat-room analysis. The questionnaire findings may seem somewhat unreliable in this case study, considering the fact that only 15% of respondents completed the survey. The interview responses will be considered, as it will be practical to obtain some information on the topic of the research from the teacher’s point of view.

The first research question concerns the types of language issues that students were correcting during the last week of the course. The results show that students edited many various grammatical issues with different frequency. Close attention was given to language issues introduced in class, such as punctuation, sentence structure and academic writing style, but also to inflection problems, which were not discussed in the course. This finding is also confirmed by the responses to the ranking question since all these issues were ranked the highest. Little attention was given to paragraph structure. As for the matter of unity and coherence, the questionnaire responses show that participants were not concerned much about that issue. However, the wiki text analysis
demonstrates that two out of three groups attempted to gain some sort of unity through whole wiki texts, as shown in detail in Section 5.1.6. Also, regarding unity and coherence, there were many attempts found on editing or adding proper transition signals, but unfortunately many of them were unsuccessful. As was expected by the course instructor, students did not pay much attention to the content as they were not familiar with the original text. Thus, only three successful attempts were found in the whole wiki. To sum up, the general impression is that the students were correcting many various grammatical issues; however, they gave the most attention to language aspects introduced and discussed throughout the course.

The second research question concerns the accuracy of peer revisions. According to the wiki text analysis, my overall impression is that there are considerably more successful than unsuccessful revisions found on the wiki. The results also show that students sometimes did not approve successful corrections; others, however, did not accept unsuccessful revisions. This situation mainly occurred in group 11, as some students of this group were reluctant to edit peers’ texts directly. Most of the failed modifications were found in punctuation, transition signals, inflection and academic vocabulary. The fact is that those language issues were corrected the most; therefore, the highest number of unsuccessful revisions is explicable. The questionnaire responses demonstrate that more than half of the students (56%) were satisfied with the accuracy of peer revisions. The teacher, on the other hand, was not entirely pleased with correctness of the revisions. However, she noticed that chat-room suggestions and negotiations regarding revisions were mostly successful. According to my analysis of the wiki text and chat-room comments as well as the teacher’s opinion, several paragraphs of the final wiki texts were not completely coherent and clear in meaning, although they were perfectly punctuated and spelled. It is noteworthy that students were not so careful with grammar while writing in the chat room. Wheeler & Wheeler (2009) suggest that the informal nature of such discussion pages makes students assume that spelling and grammatical mistakes are acceptable. In sum, it has been shown that students paid close attention to grammatical correctness while revising peer texts. Thus, most of their revisions were accurate in form.

The third research question addresses variations that could be found in the way the students corrected each others’ work. All forms of peer feedback (corrections, opinions, suggestions, ideas to each other) were presented in the chat-room comments. Corrections were possible to track due to the history function as well as the chat-room. Students were advised to edit the wiki directly or they could utilize chat-rooms to negotiate any possible changes with the authors of pertinent texts. They were told, however, that they should have left their comments on any modifications in the chat-room. The results show that the vast majority of students were editing the wiki straightaway. Those students who felt it inconvenient to correct others’ mistakes wrote their suggestions in the chat-room and allowed the authors to correct their own errors. Only two students of the single group expressed their negative attitude towards direct modifications of peers’ paragraphs. In contrast to the findings of Lee (2010) and Wheeler & Wheeler (2009), most of the students in this case study felt comfortable correcting peers’ texts. Thus, they were not afraid of direct editing on the wiki.
The last and most fundamental research question concerns proof-reading and editing texts when writing collaboratively on the wiki. The results of the text analysis reveal that the wiki indeed encouraged students to proof-read and edit their texts to achieve greater accuracy. These findings are also supported by the questionnaire and interview, where both students and teacher agreed that writing collaboratively on the wiki encouraged them to constantly revise their work. The teacher mentioned that every lesson she reminded them to reread their texts with a particular focus on the issues introduced in class, to look for mistakes and to correct them. The course instructor played a very significant role in motivating her students to proof-read their paragraphs. The chat-room comments proved that she definitely succeeded. Evidence that students clearly proofread their work on the wiki is demonstrated mainly in Section 4.1.9, but also in some other parts of the Results chapter, for instance, when the students were clarifying and negotiating their revisions on issues discussed previously in class. In this way, they proofread the texts, revised and consolidated their knowledge together through the chat-room communication on the Mondo site.

7. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This paper has demonstrated how wikis may contribute to collaborative language learning in EAP classrooms. Despite the fact that the findings of this study are noteworthy, the chief disadvantage of any case study is that the results might not be generalizable in other contexts. In other words, the experiences of these three examined groups 10, 11 and 13, comprising 60 students, might not apply in other educational settings. I gathered a great amount of information on the students’ peer revisions on the wiki, but what they reveal might not be true of all students and of all EAP courses.

Another limitation is that the students were given too difficult original texts and many of them produced unclear summaries. Because of this unfamiliarity with the original text, other peers were unable to correct the content to make them appear more comprehensible for the readers. Consequently, some paragraphs of the final wiki texts were not readable. Although the teacher’s aim in designing the wiki task was to make students pay close attention to grammar instead of the content, in future studies it would be worth designing a wiki activity that would encourage students to focus both on grammatical accuracy and content.

Finally, since many students were no longer active on the Mondo site after completion of the course, only a small number of people filled in the questionnaire. Moreover, in this way it was difficult to contact them and arrange a follow-up interview. This reduced the number of completed questionnaires and the lack of interviews with the students prevented me from gaining a better understanding of the subject of this research. It would also be valuable to support the data with follow-up interviews with the students. Further research may contemplate a larger sample of students and a different wiki task design.
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Appendix A – Interview questions

1. Is that your first time you have introduced wiki in your course?
2. What were your rationale for employing wiki in the course?
3. What were your expectations regarding the wiki before starting the course? Did you fulfil them?
4. How did you explain the students the functions/usage of wiki and chat-rooms?
5. Did they find it difficult to understand?
6. Did revisions on the wiki reflect more seminar content or some other language issues?
7. In general, do you think that writing collaboratively on the wiki encouraged students to proof-read and edit their texts to achieve greater accuracy?
8. In your opinion were the students’ revisions accurate?
9. Have you found any limitations of the course wiki?
10. In your opinion what the impact could the course have on the teacher candidates?
11. Would you employ wiki again in such kind of courses?
**Appendix B – Student questionnaire**

*Using wiki on the course Academic reading and writing for teacher candidates*

**Survey questions:**

1. Writing collaboratively on the wiki encouraged me to proof-read and edit my own and others’ texts to achieve greater accuracy.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

2. While writing on the wiki I was paying more attention to issues introduced in the course than some others, non-related to seminar content.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

3. Correcting others’ texts made me feel inconvenient.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

4. Others’ revision of my text made me feel inconvenient.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

5. I always commented in chat-room on changes I made to others’ texts.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

6. I corrected the texts directly on the wiki without any approval of the authors of particular texts.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

7. I only pointed out the mistakes of particular groups in chat-room and let them correct on their own.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |

8. My fellow students were editing accurately.

   | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Strongly agree |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
   |                |         |         |      |               |
9. I would like to employ the wiki in my Academic English courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. What types of language issues were you correcting on the wiki?
Rank them in order of frequency and write 1,2,3…8 next to each item (1- the least frequent and 8- the most frequent)

A. paragraph structure
B. sentence structure
C. unity and coherence
D. inflection of verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs etc.
E. punctuation
F. spelling
G. academic style (referencing, word choice etc.)
H. content
I. other (specify:……………..)

General information about the informant

Gender:
1. Male
2. Female

Age group:
1. 18-24
2. 25-34
3. 35-44
4. 45+

Mother tongue/s:
1. __________