Collaborative Writing Using "Many to Many" Technologies

Greg Kessler
Ohio University

Overview of Studies

- ⬜ Wiki Distance-Form (International)

Kessler, G. (2009). Student initiated attention to form in autonomous wiki based collaborative writing. *Language Learning & Technology, 13*(1),79-95.

- ⬜ Wiki Distance-Meaning (International)

Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (in press). Developing collaborative autonomous learning abilities in computer mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning.*

- ⬜ Google Docs Ftf (Domestic-Pre-academic)

Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (in progress). Communities of collaboration: Web based word processing in academic preparation. *Educational Technology & Society.*

Observations

- The ubiquity of individual empowering web 2.0 technology may have forever altered the nature of what writing is (or at least what students think writing ought to be)

- Writing in these environments is different in numerous ways:
    - Less focus on form
    - More experimental & exploratory
    - More varied
    - Multi-functional
    - More tentative
    - Perpetual beta

Observations

———⚙⚙⚙———

- Students appreciate opportunity to use varied environments

- Students are already interacting and collaborating online in ways that are mostly unfamiliar to teachers

- What is lacking is the preparation for teachers to fully harness the potential of these technologies
  - Example
  - Example

Pedagogical Implications

- Preconceptions may be greatest obstacle
    - Reviewer
    - Teacher expectations
    - Teacher planning
    - Students also lack technology skills

- Level of teacher intervention can vary based on task and intent

- Group dynamics in many to many collaboration
    - May reduce bullying
    - May enhance group success
    - Allows for greater accountability

Pedagogical Implications

- Writing teachers & technology

  - The cyclic transfer of technology may overwhelm writing teachers

  - Expertise is not necessary

  - Wikis, blogs and future forms of CMC should be familiar and accessible to L2 teachers to integrate when appropriate

  - A strategic approach to tech integration can alleviate this stress

Pedagogical Implications

Autonomous behavior requires opportunities for autonomous practice

References

Arnold, N., & Ducate, L. (2006). Future foreign language teachers' social and cognitive collaboration in an online environment. *Language Learning & Technology, 10*(1), 42-66. Retrieved March 4, 2008, from http://llt.msu.edu/vol10num1/arnoldducate/default.html.

Belz, J. A. (2003). Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural

competence in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 68-99.

Benson, P. (1997). The philosophy and politics of learner autonomy. In P. Benson, & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 18-34). London: Longman.

Benson, P. (2001). *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning.* London: Longman.

Benson, P. (2002). Rethinking the relationship of self-access and autonomy. Self-Access Language Learning, 5, 3-7. Retrieved September 29, 2008, from http://lc.ust.hk/HASALD/newsletter/newsletterSept02.pdf

Bikowski, D. (2007). Internet relationships: Building learning communities through friendship. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 6*(2), 131-141. Retrieved August 15, 2007, from http://www.ncolr.org/jiol/issues/ showissue.cfm?volID=6&IssueID=20

Bikowski, D. (2008). The discourse of relationship building in an intercultural virtual learning community. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University.

Blake, R. (2000). Computer mediated communication: A window on L2 Spanish interlanguage. *Language Learning & Technology, 4*(1), 120-136. Retrieved May 6, 2001, from http://llt.msu.edu/vol4num1/blake/.

Bruce, B., Peyton, J.K., & Batson, T. (1993). *Network-based classrooms: Promises and realities.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. *ELT Journal, 49*(3), 219-227.

Dörnyei, Z. & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in second language learning. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589-630). Oxford: Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 83–107.

Eliot, T. S. (1948). Notes towards a Definition of Culture. Retrieved September 30, 2008 from http://www.applet-magic.com/cultureliot.htm

Fischer, R. (2007). How do we know what learners are actually doing? Monitoring learners' behavior in CALL. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 20*, 409–442.

Garcia Mayo, M.P. (2002). The effectiveness of two form-focused tasks in advanced EFL pedagogy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(2), 156-175.

Godwin-Jones, R. (2003). Blogs and wikis: Environments for on-line collaboration. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(2), 12-16. Retrieved March 4, 2008 from http://llt.msu.edu/vol7num2/emerging/default.html.

Healey, D. (2007). Theory and research: Autonomy and language learning. In J. Egbert & E. Hanson-Smith (Eds.), *CALL environments: Research, practice and critical issues* (pp. 377-389). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hubbard, P. (2004). Learner training for effective use of CALL. In S. Fotos, & C. Browne (Eds.), *New perspectives on CALL for second language classrooms* (pp. 3-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kessler, G. (2009). Student initiated attention to form in wiki based collaborative writing. *Language Learning & Technology, 13*(1)

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness, 3*(2), 73-93

Kupetz, R., & Zeigenmeyer, B. (2006). Flexible learning activities fostering autonomy in teaching training. *ReCALL, 18*(1), 63-82.

Lee, L. (2002). Synchronous online exchanges: A study of modification devices on non-native discourse. *System, 30*, 275−288.

Leeser, M. (2004). Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(1), 55-81.

Leuf, B., & Cunningham, W. (2001). *The wiki way: Quick collaboration on the web.* Boston: Addison Wesley.

Levy, M., & Stockwell, G. (2006). *CALL dimensions: Options and issues in computer-assisted language learning.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Little, D. (1999). Developing learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom: A social-interactive view of learning and three fundamental pedagogical principles. *Revista Canaria De Estudios Ingleses, 38*, 77-88.

Little, D. (2007). Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 14−29.

Littlewood, W. (1996) Autonomy: An anatomy and a framework. *System, 24*(4), 427- 435.

Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition. Vol. 379* (pp.259-278). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468*).* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M.H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom SLA., (pp. 15-41). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(6), 443-457.

Parks, S., Hamers, D., & Huot-Lemonnier, D. (2003). Crossing boundaries: multimedia technology and pedagogical innovation in a high school class. *Language Learning & Technology, 7*(1), 28–45.

Schwienhorst, K. (2003). Neither here nor there? Learner autonomy and intercultural factors in CALL environments. In D. Palfreyman & R. C. Smith (Eds.), Learner autonomy across cultures: Language education perspectives (pp. 164-180). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sengupta, S. (2001). Exchanging ideas with peers in network-based classrooms: An aid or a pain? *Language Learning & Technology, 5*(1), 103-134. Retrieved November 21, 2008, from http://llt.msu.edu/vol5num1/sengupta/.

Smith, B. (2003). Computer-mediated negotiated interaction: An expanded model. The Modern Language Journal, 87, 38-54.

Sotillo, S. (2002). Constructivist and collaborative learning in a wireless environment. *TESOL Journal, 11*(3), 16-20.

Spratt, M., Humphreys, G., & Chan, V. (2002). Autonomy and motivation: Which comes first? *Language Teaching Research, 6*(3), 245-266.

Storch, N. (1999). Are two heads better than one? Pair work and grammatical accuracy. *System, 27*(3), 363-374.

Storch, N. (2001). Comparing ESL learners' attention to grammar on three different classroom tasks. *RELC Journal, 32(*2), 104-124.

Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 153–173.

Stryker, S. B. (1997). The Mexico experiment at the Foreign Service Institute. In S. B. Stryker, & B. L. Leaver (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods* (pp. 177-202). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Swan, K. (2004). Relationships between interactions and learning in online environments. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from The Sloan Consortium Web site: http://www.sloan-c.org/publications/books/interactions.pdf

Swain, M. (1995) Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(3), 371-391.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 320-337.

Vician, C., & Brown, S. A. (2000). Unraveling the message quilt: A case-study examination of student interaction in computer-based communication assignments, *Computers and Composition 17* (2000), pp. 211–229.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ware, P. D. (2004). Confidence and competition online: ESL student perspectives on web-based discussions in the classroom, *Computers and Composition, 21*(4), 451-468.

Williams, J. (1999). Learner-generated attention to form. *Language Learning, 49*(4), 583-625.

Thanks!