

Item	3 rd Case Study
<p>Introduction</p>	<p>In recent years, the use of wikis in the classroom has become very popular due to their pedagogical benefits as “participatory technologies” (Ajjan & Hartshorne, 2008, p. 71). Most authors agree on the collaborative nature of wikis and their suitability to foster interaction. Thus, a number of studies have emphasised that wikis facilitate reflection and collaboration (Lund, 2008). Other authors have described them as enhancers of peer interaction, group work and collaboration, as opposed to competition (Li, 2012). According to Boulos, Maramba, and Wheeler (2006) they are excellent resources for the learners’ own construction of knowledge and Wheeler, Yeomans, and Wheeler (2008) mention that wikis have the ability to keep learners connected, so that they feel closer to one another and more engaged in the learning task. Wikis are also considered highly democratic by authors such as Lee (2010), since they disperse individual power and all participants have an equal status and the right to contribute or edit entries. They are unique in that they serve as a platform for scaffolding and fostering student-centred learning and allow for the incorporation of multiple perspectives.</p> <p>In contrast to the benefits mentioned above, other studies have reported less encouraging findings. Thus, authors such as Forte and Bruckman (2006) have mentioned how their students did not work consistently in the wiki and tended to post the largest edits close to the assessment deadline, while “smaller contributions like sharing resources and giving evaluations were more consistently spaced out over many days preceding due dates” (p. 184). Along the same lines, authors such as Cole (2009) reported that their students did not contribute to the wiki at all over an entire semester, despite the fact that it was integrated as an activity on their courses. Finally, other authors have mentioned how, even “even when participation is relatively high, much of the work [is down] to a relatively small proportion of contributors (Carr, Morrison, Cox, & Deacon, 2007). These and other findings suggest that wikis [may not be] inherently collaborative” (Judd, Kennedy, & Cropper, 2010, p. 343), and, therefore, more research needs to be carried out on the nature of collaboration in wikis. In order to contribute to current research, we decided to use a wiki as an online tool to train nine in-service teachers from different countries in order to become future telecollaborative teachers. Telecollaboration is a complex activity that requires teachers to work in collaboration with one or more teachers who belong to a different culture and are in distant locations. Therefore, fostering collaboration among participants was of primary concern, and this study attempts to find answers to the following research question: did the teachers who worked online in small groups in a wiki engage (or not) in collaborative behaviours?</p> <p>Although most studies on educational wiki implementations tend to be perception-based, a growing number of studies have drawn on the data generated by wikis to support their research on student participation (Cole, 2009). In order to provide answers for our research question, we decided to follow this trend and analyse participation and interaction as reliable measures of collaborative behaviour by wiki-users (Judd et al., 2010; Trentin, 2009).</p>
<p>Type of institution involved</p>	<p>Higher Education</p>

Title of the methodology used	Identifying collaborative behaviours online: training teachers in wikis
Type of educator	Teachers (Master Students)
Tool/tools used	Wiki / Telecollaboration
Main Challenges, Key Success and Enabling Factors	<p>The findings in this study suggest that an analysis of the pattern, scope and nature of user contributions can signal (in)effective collaborative behaviour by wiki-users as suggested by Judd et al. (2010). In this case, those teachers who engaged in successful collaboration gave priority to fostering social interaction (process) over finishing the task (final product) and collaborative group behaviors were characterised by prompt communication, regular group discussion, timely and relevant contributions, commitment to the task (task organisation, joint responsibility) and consistent participation (Vinagre, 2015).</p> <p>These findings, although encouraging, are not conclusive due to the small sample size. Therefore, further research needs to be undertaken with larger data sets in order to obtain more significant results. Moreover, data analysis has been restricted to participation and interaction as measures of collaborative behaviour. In order for this study to be complete, an in-depth content analysis is necessary to determine the quality of contributions.</p> <p>These findings also suggest that designing activities or using technologies that are collaborative does not guarantee that the participants will be successful at collaboration. Therefore, special attention should be paid to those indicators that allow practitioners to identify and assess collaborative behaviours in group interaction during the learning process.</p>
Lessons Learnt and Recommendations	<p>The research question in this study led us to examine the pattern, scope and nature of contributions of nine teachers as reliable measures of collaborative behaviour by wiki-users (Trentin, 2009). Although, as mentioned by Arnold, Ducate, Lomicka, and Lord (2009), these are only quantitative surface indicators which are “not necessarily indicative of a group’s success, [...] they provide a glimpse into the inner workings of a group and can reflect heterogeneity of participation, roles, social loafing and free riding” (p. 126).</p> <p>Similar to findings in a previous study (Vinagre, 2015), three members in Group 1 showed collaborative behaviours: they worked regularly and constantly over the time allocated to the task, and engaged in discussion most of the time (looking for feedback, input and consensus) whilst also engaging in fair amounts of contributing (content). Members in this group commented often and they spent a lot of time replying to other members’ suggestions, which reflects the participants’ efforts at engaging in group discussion and building consensual knowledge. Members in Group 2 did not display the same effective dynamics. Their contributions were made late in the activity and very close to the deadline, which means that participants would have had limited opportunities to interact with other members of their group. Two teachers in Group 2 did make a serious effort to contribute regularly, extensively and within the deadlines. Unfortunately, lack of (timely) response from the other group members meant that these participants went ahead and made individual decisions in order to finish the task. Comments were few and far between and there was no activity for three weeks. The majority of teachers in this group, as pointed out by Vinagre (2015), “were happy to contribute from time to time in order to meet the task requirements rather than develop a more equitable</p>



	e, consensual and comprehensive group submission that would require more [regular and consistent] collaboration with the other group members" (n.p).
Country	Spain
Name of the Institution/ Education Center	Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain Source: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565812.pdf



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.