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Abstract

Roles-based script is one form of scaffolds commonly used to overcome the difficulties in collaborative writing. However roles that emerge during collaboration often different from the roles specified in the script given. This study examines how the roles emerge in online collaborative writing, and how it impacts the group’s collaboration. This study used a multiple case studies design. Three groups were observed. Each group was analyzed separately and interpretations done on a case-by-case basis. Following this, general results were compared across the cases. The result shows that each group developed unique emerging roles. Although the script enhance group collaboration and ensure that the task given was completed within the framework given; there were two problems observed; first, unequal participation and secondly, quality of group collaboration. Therefore, it is important for the teacher(s) to decide how to support the transition from other- to self-regulation and successively to fade out script given. The teacher(s) might want to motivate students to continue the scripted activities by having the learners mutually control the continued engagement in the specified activities and possibly by rewarding engagement in these activities.
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1. Introduction

Collaborative writing (CW) is a current interest in higher education and in the workplace. The notion of collaborative writing goes beyond the simple idea of groups coming together to produce texts. Couture and Rymer (1989) see collaboration as the oral and written communication pertaining to a document during the process of planning, drafting, and revising it. Lowry, Aaron & Rene (2004) define CW as an iterative and social process that involves a team focused on a common objective that negotiates, coordinates, and communicates during the creation of a common document. Arvaja (2009) say that collaborative work may involve several difficulties. The collaborating partners must have a common interest in solving the problem at hand. Furthermore, they should be mutually dependent on the information, resources, tools and cooperative intention or willingness of the partners to reach their common goals. Under these conditions of mutuality, coordination of task strategy and the constructive activities to achieve a shared understanding of the problem are crucial aspects of collaborative learning. Moreover, the participants also need to come to agreement with respect to task strategies, relevant concepts and relationships. These difficulties indicate that learners may need some kinds of help or guidance. Scaffolding is an instructional support that can be used to help or guide the learner to a higher level of both collaborative processes and individual learning outcomes (Quintana, Reiser, Davis, Krajcik, Fret, Duncan, Kyza, Edelson). A collaborative script is one form of scaffolds commonly used in CW. A collaborative script is a series of instructions prescribing how students should form groups, how they should interact and collaborate, and how they should solve the problem (Dillenbourg, 2002). Such predefined structures are intended to facilitate collaborative learning processes and guide the learners' activities. It is assumed that scripts will this way lead to higher-level cognitive processing and therefore to better learning outcomes. Scripts may concern the way learners are to deal with the task (epistemic scripts) and/or indicate how they should interact with other group members (social scripts) (Weinberger, Fischer, & Mandl, 2007). This means taking into account not only the cognitive aspects of collaborative learning, but also the social dimensions of the student activity. This study examines collaboration scripts as a pedagogical method to facilitate collaborative learning. We explored how the given script-designed to support students’ collaborative processes guided groups’ activities while working in the web-based environment. In addition, the aim was to study what kinds of roles students adopted and what kinds of differences there were between the groups in working through the script.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Script in computer-supported learning environment

Scripts for collaborative learning have been studied extensively in face-to-face (FtF) contexts. Yet recently, scripts have become increasingly important for computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL). In the context of CSCL, scripts can have different characteristics altogether depending on the type of computer application, which mediates the communication of learners (e.g., e-mail, chat, and videoconferencing).

Collaborative learning often uses scripts to facilitate its processes. Such scripts can facilitate the collaborative learning by specifying, sequencing, and possibly assigning activities to collaborative learners ((O’Donnell, 1999). Learners are expected to follow the script and to engage in productive collaborative learning.

There are two important collaborative learning scripts: social and epistemic (Weinberger, Fischer, & Mandl, 2007). Epistemic script facilitates cognitive processes by guiding the attention of learners towards specific aspects of the tasks and towards specific task-oriented activities while collaboratively discussing and constructing knowledge (Fischer & Mandl, 2001). Social scripts facilitate the social processes by specifying and sequencing the interactions of the learners (Weinberger, Fischer, & Mandl, 2007). Weinberger’s study in 2007 suggested that different scripts in a computer-mediated learning environment may produce differentiated effects on the process and outcome convergence of collaborative knowledge construction. The study showed that the implemented epistemic scripts might help co-workers to focus on...
specific aspects, but do not foster internalization of shared knowledge. Social scripts, in contrast, may facilitate learners to contribute divergent knowledge.

Most script approaches are based on instructors that introduce and typically monitor how the script suggestions are meant to be applied. Apart from the fact that the introduction of scripts may take more time than the actual collaboration, teachers introducing and monitoring scripts may compromise the idea of self-guided, collaborative, distant learning and require FtF encounters.

Scripts can be realized with different degrees of freedom within CSCL environments. CSCL interfaces with few degrees of freedom may be designed for specific learning tasks and only allow task-oriented activities. Holly (1997), for example, sequenced the interaction of learners in CSCL environments by alternately prompting two learners to propose modifications to solutions of learning tasks, to explain the modification, and to obtain agreement from the learning partner. Interfaces with more degrees of freedom can guide collaborative learning by providing a selection of prompts. Scardamalia and Bereiter (1996) showed that prompts could encourage students to explore and discuss alternative viewpoints in comparison to unscripted computer-mediated discussions. Thus, it can be said that prompts can have a positive effect on collaborative learning in text-based computer-mediated communication.

In videoconferencing, scripts may be implemented in a shared collaboration space, for example, as a representation shared by the learners. Using application sharing, which can be regarded as a genuine feature of videoconferencing, learners can create and modify the contents of this shared representation. The shared representation can visualize concepts and make them salient. Concepts can also be made salient within the discourse of learners without explicit reference to the concepts if the representation is constructed in a particular way, for example, a table (cf., Dansereau, 1988) or prompts that have to be responded to (e.g., King, 1999).

2.2. Roles

Roles can be defined as explicit functions and/or responsibilities that guide individual behavior and regulate group interaction (Arvaja & Hamalainen, 2009). Roles can promote group cohesion and individual responsibility (O’Donell, 1999), and specify what each group member is accountable for. The degree of cohesion and group members’ individual responsibilities are central to the functioning of any group (Forsyth, 2010). A greater sense of responsibility can increase an individual group member’s commitment to the group’s goal and subsequently, increase group functioning. Individual responsibility and group cohesion correspond with two concepts that are central in collaborative learning: individual accountability and positive interdependence. Individual accountability means the degree to which group members are held individually accountable for jobs, tasks, or duties central to a group’s functioning. In other words, a higher level of individual accountability can enhance group members’ individual responsibilities for the group. Positive interdependence is the degree to which the performance of a single group member depends on the performance of other members. In other words, a higher level of positive interdependence can enhance cohesiveness. Cohesiveness can increase stability, satisfaction, and efficient communication, as well as result in negative effects like social pressure, inter- and intragroup aggression or conflict, and polarization (Forsyth, 2010). Roles strengthen interdependence as contributions from all members are required for the task (Brush, 1998), and can stimulate group members’ awareness of overall group functioning. Two perspectives on roles are apparent in the CSCL literature: scripted and emergent. Emergent roles are roles that emerge spontaneously or are negotiated spontaneously by group members without interference by the teacher or researcher. During collaborative activities, the task and individual orientation towards this task affects how students structure their collaboration, and how they develop a personal participative style (emergent roles) during online learning activities and interplay with fellowgroup members (De Laat, 2006).

De Laat (2007) review roles from three different levels, i.e.: at micro level, at meso level and at macro level. Role at micro level perceived roles as a task where specified activity focused on the collaborative product or process. Roles at meso level focused on multiple tasks on the product, process or a combination; whereas roles at macro level sees role as a stance where an individual’s’ participative pattern based on their attitude towards the task and collaborative learning. Weinberger, Stegmann, and Fischer (2010) provided substantive evidence for a positive effect of scripting activities in CSCL. They
worked with a text-based online environment developed to promote argumentative skills and some specific domain knowledge. In the scripted condition, the learners had additional input windows to formulate their arguments (claim, grounds, and qualifications). Their final messages were sent to a discussion board, where a discussion followed. The collaborative learners in the scripted condition clearly outperformed groups of students who had not received these additional hints for providing substantiated arguments. They were better in argumentation and acquired more domain-specific knowledge. A further interesting observation was that in this setting, individual learning without a script was clearly not inferior to scripted collaborative learning.

Often rotation of roles is proposed as a way to promote learning (Weinberger, Stegman, & Fischer, 2010). An already classical example are the changing roles of recalled (summarizing the major ideas of a passage of a text) and listener (monitoring the explanation: detecting errors, identifying omissions, and asking for clarification in the sense of grounding) from the work of Dansereau (1988). Dansereau (1988) said that it would not be wise to wait for role rotation to emerge, but instead to script the rotation of roles. Sometimes more implicit ways to promote role rotation can be applied. In the studies by Rummel and Spada (2005) and Rummel et al. (2009), a computersupported setting was used in which two learners with complementary knowledge (medicine, psychology) collaborated in processing difficult cases with co-morbidity of mental and physical disorders. As experts in one field and a layperson in the other, they had to take up dynamically changing roles during collaboration. Similarly, by intentionally inducing the need to provide complementary information, it becomes inevitable to change roles from informing the other learner to accepting and processing the information received from the other learner (Rummel & Spada, 2005).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study used a multiple case studies design; each group will represent a single case. Each group was analysed separately and interpretations done on a case-by-case basis. Following this, general results were compared across the cases. Yin (1984) explain that qualitative case study is the most appropriate to answering research questions that focus on what happens in a given context, how the events take place, and why they occur. This kind of focus is different from the yes/no questions underlying quantitative research, which are usually expressed in terms of hypotheses relating to expected differences within and/or between groups and which are usually tested experimentally under controlled conditions. The procedure adopted is to first answer the what questions, then to use some results as a basis for answering the how questions, the higher level of explanation or interpretation. Additional questions may arise as the research progresses, in keeping with the ongoing spiral movement that characterizes case study research (Yin, 1984).

3.2. Participants

Participants were students enrolled in the EDPC 5021–Introduction to the Learning Sciences at the University of Sydney. The EDPC 5021 is a core course for the Graduate Certificate/Graduate Diploma/Master of Learning Sciences and Technology. The students met admission requirements to the Faculty of Education and Social Work. In this research, pseudonyms were used to prevent identification of participants. Information sheets explaining the nature of this study and the importance of students of their role in the completion of this study were given to the students to obtain their agreement to participate. The students were advised that they can withdraw from the study anytime without any consequences. Two instructors taught the class in an online environment, using Adobe Acrobat Connect Pro, Google Doc. The study was applied on the completion of a group-writing assignment in the online mode and on writing an electronic document for six consecutive weeks. Course requirements were standardized across all sections in compliance with department policy.
3.3. Data collection

Data collection occurred during the first semester 2010. All data gathered from the participant resources were collected with explicit permission from the participants and in full compliance with the University of Sydney’s ethics guidelines. The instruments used in this research were chosen and designed to investigate the central research questions further, as well as issues raised by the literature review and to facilitate data analysis.

3.3.1. Group online video observations

The researcher held a record of a video, which includes group meetings in the online class for each group. Each group was asked to maintain a record of the group for each meeting conducted outside the official online classroom. One group member was asked put it online on the group wiki for research purposes. Content analysis of the recorded meeting provided data on how the groups manage their work in a real context.

3.3.2. Interview

A second source of information was collected through in-depth, semi-structured interviews after the students complete the project. Given that the study seeks to carry out an in-depth investigation into the issues embedded in the research questions, semi-structured interviews allowed the interviewer to investigate further when necessary or to amend questions to suit personalities. Data gathering for these sub aims was aided by the guiding questions, which were meant to assess the perspectives of participants with respect to group work in academic writing at the tertiary level. An interview guide with a list of possible interview questions was developed from the guiding questions for me or the interviewer to help her along. The questions were written bearing in mind that at the time of interviewing, the students had completed the task and hence would reflect on the full understanding and responding in retrospect.

3.4. Procedural Details for Implementation of the Study

During the first week of the research, the participants received training session in the FtF mode. The aims of the training session were to introduce the platform for delivering the class and performing the collaborative writing tasks, and to introduce the concept, the benefits, and the purposes of collaborative writing. Students were given an initial script that they should follow in order to complete the collaborative writing task.

![Team Writing Script](image)

**Fig. 1.** The collaborative writing script given
During this period, the students were grouped into 3 groups based on the profession/research interest. Each group consisted of four to six group members. The task was to write a design innovation document, i.e.: finding a new solution to a learning/training problem students consider important for each group. The student innovation tasks were divided into three big parts: problem analysis, pedagogical approach, and ICT elements and innovations. Each part should be completed within 2 weeks. The group can revise the initial document based on the feedback given by their peers (within the same group) or the feedback given by the lecturers (in case they need more explanation or justification of the materials for their CW project). There was no specific number for the revisions made by the groups for the collaborative writing project. Amongst other issues, it was natural that students incrementally refined their documents because it was (of course) the case that their initial conception cannot be considered to be the final word result/words. Students worked collaboratively, which will incorporate synchronous and asynchronous forms. The asynchronous form used for writing and group log files (both wiki pages and Google docs), whereas the group and class discussions were conducted synchronously.

3.5. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using content analysis. Content analysis is defined as: “A systematic research method for analyzing textual information in a standardized way that allows evaluators to make inferences about that information” (Krippendorff, 1980, pp. 21-27): “The central idea in content analysis is that the many words of the text are classified into much fewer content categories”. Forsyth (2010) defined group dynamic as the interactions and relationships that take place among group members, as well as between the group and the rest of society. It includes interdependence of group members, collective problem solving and decision-making, and group conformity. There were three data sources for the description of group dynamics: the online group discussion, chat from online group meeting, and interview. Online group meeting discussion and the interview were transcribed verbatim, partially to indentify the key decisions/key events within the group. The unit of analysis for the data from the synchronous team meeting (for both the chat and online group discussion) would be the thread. A thread is a series of related messages on a topic or a theme in real-time extended through turns. Threads are selected and developed when participants initiate and respond to each other. Each message can be seen as an independent or individual comment, which means that they can express one or more ideas, but they are also strongly or tenuously connected through the underlying meaning/theme. There are four reasons why I chose thread as unit of analysis for the chat. First, thread can solve the problem of thread jump. Jumping refers to the non-sequential, non-linear appearance of messages in a chat, or the phenomenon of disrupted turn adjacency. That is, the intervention of messages belonging to other interleaved threads can disrupt (but not “break”) the succession of one thread.

Second, thread allows us to review the simultaneous development of multiple threads in a certain temporal and spatial frame or threads parallel (Feenberg, 1989). Third, threads resist closure (Herring, 1999). The initiation of a new thread is usually not the result of the ending of a previous thread. Fourth, threads could have multitaskers, which refer to the synchronous chat capacity for participants to be simultaneously engaged in multiple threads (Florio-Ruane, 1987). For the data that come from the interview, the thematic analysis will be used. The reason for choosing thematic analysis is that it provides a means of organizing and summarizing the findings from the interview. The expected events from this dimension will be membership changes, crisis, roles and function, writing strategy, and so on. Organizing chat, online group discussion, and interviews based on underlying meanings/themes will allow me to do more interpretation based on the context of the underlying meanings/themes identified (Dixon-Wood et al., 2005).

4. Results and Discussions

Table 1 displays the roles adopted by each of group members during the collaborative writing process period.
Table 1. Collaborative writing process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Groups name</th>
<th>member’s name</th>
<th>Roles during writing 1\textsuperscript{st} part of project</th>
<th>Roles during writing 2\textsuperscript{nd} part of project</th>
<th>Roles during writing 3\textsuperscript{rd} part of project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td>Brenda</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>N/A (withdrew)</td>
<td>N/A (withdrew)</td>
<td>N/A (withdrew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>N/A (withdrew)</td>
<td>N/A (withdrew)</td>
<td>N/A (withdrew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>Reviewer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 1 it can be seen that each group develop unique emerging roles. Even though each group maintained all of roles describe in the script given, the way the script was interpret within each group was different from what was expected by the lecturers. In Group I, I notice that Michael never became an editor. Whereas in the 1st part of the writing project, there is a clear description on who became the writer and who become the reviewer; these roles seems to blur during the next two part of the collaborative writing project, as everybody became a writer and a reviewer at the same time. This happened as one group member became a ghost, i.e.: the person was there but the contributions were not significant nor appear.

*Sorry guys, I just lost my friend last week. I did not feel well right now. I tried to catch up with you guy in the next week.*

(James, Group I)

Group II, it can be seen that during the 1st part of the writing project, there were two roles that emerged in this group, i.e. data collector and technical manager which was not mentioned in earlier script.

*The notes and data in there are copied from the ADCET site and I think represent the traditional approach to education with basic adaptation for VIPs. I will use it as a point of departure to explore the relevant pedagogy for each of their recommended strategies and where it may fall short.*

(Grace, Group II)
Hi guys, I have solve our problem with Adobe connect. Sorry we lost all of our conversation last week. Now I set up a back up for our work, please click on the following link... (William, Group II)

Group III followed the script given by the lecturers in the first two part of the writing project. However, due to the withdrawal of one group member, during the last part of the writing project, all of the group members share the writing responsibilities of the withdraw member by becoming writer and reviewers at the same time.

Table 2. Variation between the student groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical feature of the group</th>
<th>Activity level of students</th>
<th>Level of collaboration for the actively participating students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Unequal contribution</td>
<td>1=free rider 2=high 2= some 2= over rider 1= some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Practically- oriented</td>
<td>1= over rider 3= high 1= some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>working methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>One group member dominance</td>
<td>1= captain 2= quite active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2, we can infer that unequal participation was evident in Group 1. Despite the unequal participation, the group members were still able to listen to each other. Two group members of this group were actively involved in the task and reached an analytical and reciprocal collaboration process. Besides these two students in the groups, one member was contributing to the work, but not actively or effectively. The fifth group member can be characterized as a free rider, who apparently seeking maximum benefit from the group task with minimum personal input. Within this group, the active members did not blame the non-active one; instead they distribute the job of the free riders to the highly active group members.

Group two was very practically oriented. Two group members organized the work in the beginning and the group then followed the given structure accordingly. One group member displayed some activity during the work, but to a lesser degree than the others. The in depth analysis of the documents showed that the level of the contribution of the group members were good and their shared the similar interest as all of the group members either has interest in the group’s writing topic or has real experiences of the writing topic. Group 2 and 3 both included one dominant member. The influences of the dominating group differed greatly. While group 2 suffered from over rider dominating the group work, Group 3 was lead by the captain, who had strong orientation towards the group and tried to manage and facilitate the CW task. The over rider person in Group 2 tried to dominate the group work during the whole working period by giving orders and right answers to the group, he even outlined the structure of CW project.

Despite the apparently similar instructional support, the quality of collaborative activities in different group varied considerably (Hamailen & Arvaja, 2009). My finding suggests that high activity level is not always an indication of good collaboration. Group 2 experienced suffered from over rider, whereas Group 1 and took over the jobs and responsibilities of the free rider without trying to make the free rider involve effectively in the CW project. It also noted that for Group 2 the brainstorming process and outlining process were merely conducted by particular group members then the rest of the group basically expanded the ideas without trying to fill in the gap of the ideas.

5. Conclusions

In this experimental exercise all participating groups followed a given script called Case. The script was designed to ensure that all groups could complete the task successfully and come up with respective shared plans for the particular case. However, the given script could not guarantee equal and...
level” collaboration within the teams, and there was also considerable variation between the groups in this respect. In addition, the aim was to study what kinds of roles students adopted and what sort of differences there were between the groups in terms of their activities in the scripted environment. As far as the roles were concerned, the main problem for the group work was unequal participation in collaboration, especially free riding, ghosting, and ghost write as recognized both by some active members of the group and by some less active members themselves. Because this study did not include any non-scripted control group, there is no way to estimate how much the low activity of some students might be due to the script itself, or perhaps attributable to e-learning more generally. Despite the apparently similar instructional support, the quality of collaborative activities in different groups varied considerably (Hamalainen, 2008). Collaborative learning is achieved under unique circumstances and its significance is determined ultimately by learners’ interaction and cannot be directly predicted (Arvaja, 2007). According to Sonnenwald (1995) intergroup communication may also explain communication among group members. Within groups, members often adopt specialized roles and this specialization may imply different expectations and approaches, which may make negotiation of shared meanings and mutual knowledge construction more difficult. In the future it may therefore be necessary to increase the role of the teacher during collaboration or to structure collaboration more strictly. This work gives us direction for the next step of our work. The challenge is to design a script that can engage the students equally in collaborative writing. It might be useful to combine the knowledge of students’ self regulation (Rummel & Spada, 2005), on one hand, and of collaborative script on the other hand (Tabak, 2004).
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