Appendix 1

STUDENT INFORMATION

Please fill out this form about yourself. The information will help me in my observation during the collaborative sessions. Thank you

1. Personal Information

Name	
Course & Year of Study	
Gender	
Race	
English I (XYZ1111) Result	
Date	

2. Collaborative Writing

Do you like collaborative writing? Why/ Why not?	*Yes, because*	*No, because*

Appendix 2

<u>Written Consent from Informant</u>

I have agreed to become an informant in a study entitled "Collaborative Writing Among Diploma Students With Mixed Proficiency: A Case Study" which is conducted by Ms. Lin Siew Fong for the thesis requirement of her doctoral studies (Doctor of Philosophy) at University of Malaya. The purpose of the study is to compare the use of collaborative writing among selected ESL students with different language proficiency at tertiary level. In this study, the use of collaboration is perceived as a mediational tool in the writing process and attempts to discover the conducive and non-conducive contexts for collaborative activities.

For the purpose of this study, I will be observed during the collaborative writing sessions of producing a long report. I am aware that the interactions will be video recorded. In addition, I will be interviewed and I will write diary entries on my experiences during the collaboration with my group members. Furthermore, I will allow the researcher to view my work produced during the collaborative writing.

The researcher will not use my full name but use a pseudonym instead when reporting on the findings of the research. I will be informed of the research findings and be allowed to read them. I will be free to withdraw from the study whenever I wish to.

……………………… ..…………………. …………………
(Signature)   (Name of Student)   (Date)

Appendix 3

<u>Group Writing Task</u>

Write a long report on a topic that you are interested in. Each group has to submit only a written long report. Submit the long report in Week 7.

Appendix 4

Schedule for Writing Long Report

Week	Sub-Task
1	Appointment of Group Leader Selection of Topic Division of Work on Doing Referencing
2	Preparation of questionnaire/interview/observation Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of Information to be Used in Writing
3	Preparation of questionnaire/interview/observation Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of Information to be Used in Writing
4	Analysis of data from questionnaires/interviews/observations Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of Information to be Used in Writing Integrating information into Topic
5	Analysis of data from questionnaires/interviews/observations Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of Information to be Used in Writing Integrating information into Topic
6	Analysis of data from questionnaires/interviews/observations Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of Information to be Used in Writing Integrating information into Topic
7	Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of Information to be Used in Writing Producing a Mind-Map to summarise information Writing, editing and proofreading the first draft of long report based on mind-map
8	Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of New Information to be Used in Writing Writing, editing and proofreading the second draft of long report
9	Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of New Information to be Used in Writing Writing, editing and proofreading the third draft of long report
10	Information-Sharing after Doing Referencing Filtering of New Information to be Used in Writing Writing, editing and proofreading the fourth draft of long report

(Adapted from Kwah, 2005, p. 150)

Appendix 5

How to Write Diary Entries

A. <u>Week 1 to Week 9</u>

1. Reflect on the collaborative writing session you have just had. Use the following sentences as a guide in writing your journals:

    a) In this session, I learned …..

    b) The session was useful due to …

    c) The session was not useful because ….

    d) In this session, the mistake I made is ….

    e) My difficulty in the session is ……..

2. Reflect on your previous experience of writing individually and compare it with collaborative writing. Use the following sentences as a guide in writing your journals:

    a) The experience was similar to working alone because…

    b) The benefits are …

    c) The experience was different from working alone because…

    d) The benefits are …

B. <u>Week 10 only</u>

During the past 10 weeks you have been working in a collaborative group. Give an overall view of how you feel about the whole experience. Has the experience been useful and effective in relation to your own writing process?

(Source: Adapted from Nunan, 1988, p. 134)

Appendix 6

<u>Writing Task</u>
Work in your writing group to produce the assignment below. Each group has to submit only a written long report.

1. <u>Long Report (10 Weeks)</u>

This written assignment is a long report based on a topic of interest. The topic chosen has to receive approval from the lecturer before any work on the project is carried out.

Each group should consist of not more than 6 members. The length of the report is about 2000 words.

You can conduct a simple investigation by using either interviews, questionnaires, diary entries or observations to collect relevant data for the report. In addition, data from sources such as books, magazines, journals or articles from the internet can be used as well. Use Harvard Referencing System for your assignment.

Other Guidelines for Long Report:
- Computer-typed with double spacing
- Font type: Times New Roman
- Font Size: 12
- Printed one sided on A4-sized papers

You have Week 1 to Week 10 of the semester to write the report. Submit your report in Week 11.

Sources of Data and Data Analysis for Research Questions

No.	Research Questions	Sources of Data	Research Design/ Data Analysis	Areas to Look At	Participants
1.	What are the critical incidents that occur during the collaboration of mixed-ability students in the writing process?	Observation (Field Notes, Checklists, Students' Spoken Transcripts) Students' Diary Entries, Interviews	Coding system of episodes Coding system of episodes	Positive and negative contexts Students' opinions on contexts	12 Students
2.	In what way does collaboration impact the students' composing process and text production?	Observation (Field Notes, Checklists, Students' Spoken Transcripts) Students' Written Work (Long Report) Students' Diary Entries, Interviews	Coding system of words, phrases and sentences Grading of work Coding system of students' experiences	Group-focus, task focus, sub-code categories Content, language, format and overall impression Students' opinions on influence of collaboration on writing process and written work	12 Students

No.	Research Question	Source of Data	Research Design/ Data Analysis	Areas to Look At	Participants
3.	What factors enhance and what factors inhibit collaboration in a mixed proficiency group? (causes of the success and failure of collaboration)	Observation (Field Notes, Checklists, Students' Spoken Transcripts)	Coding system of episodes	Positive and negative contexts	12 Students
		Students' Diary Entries, Interviews	Coding system of students' experiences	Students' opinions of barriers and support for collaboration, experiences	

Appendix 8

Checklist for Observation & Analysis of Video Recording

Observer: Teresa/ Norah   Date: …………………………

Group: 1/ 2   Time: …………………………..

Week: 1/ 2/ 3/ 4/ 5/ 6/ 7/ 8/ 9/ 10   Venue: ……………………….

(Week 1 to 6)

Areas Looked At	Yes	No	Comments
1. Interaction at pre-writing stage a. Group-focus b. Task focus c. Sub-code Categories			
2. Interaction regarding: a. Content b. Language c. Format d. Overall Impression			
3. a. Positive Contexts b. Neutral Contexts c. Negative Contexts			

(Week 7 to 10)

Areas Looked At	Yes	No	Comments

1. Interaction at writing stage
 	
  a. Group-focus
 	
  b. Task focus
 	
  c. Sub-code Categories
 	
2. Interaction at editing stages
 	
  a. Group-focus
 	
  b. Task focus
 	
  c. Sub-code Categories			

3. Interaction regarding:
 	
  a. Content
 	
  b. Language
 	
  c. Format
 	
  d. Overall Impression			

4. a. Positive Contexts
 	
  b. Neutral Contexts
 	
  c. Negative Contexts			

Interview Questions

Week 1

1. How has the discussion helped you in selecting the research topic? What are the reasons?

2. How advantageous has it been working with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

3. What problem/s have you encountered with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

4. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve your future collaborative session?

Weeks 2 and 3

1. (a)   How has the discussion helped you in preparing the questionnaire/interview questions? What are the reasons?

    (b)   How has the discussion helped you in sharing information? What are the reasons?

    (c)   How has the discussion helped you in filtering information? What are the reasons?

2. How advantageous has it been working with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

3. What problem/s have you encountered with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

4. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve your future collaborative session?

<u>Weeks 4, 5 and 6</u>

1. (a)   How has the discussion helped you in analysing your questionnaire/ interview questions? What are the reasons?

   (b)   How has the discussion helped you in sharing information? What are the reasons?

   (c)   How has the discussion helped you in filtering information? What are the reasons?

   (d)   How has the discussion helped you in integrating information into the topic? What are the reasons?

2. How advantageous has it been working with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

3. What problem/s have you encountered with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

4. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve your future collaborative session?

<u>Weeks 7</u>

1. (a)   How has the discussion helped you in sharing information? What are the reasons?

(b)   How has the discussion helped you in filtering information? What are the reasons?

(c)   How has the discussion helped you in integrating information into the topic? What are the reasons?

(d)   How has the discussion helped you in producing a mind map? What are the reasons?

(e)   How has the discussion helped you in writing? What are the reasons?

(f)   How has the discussion helped you in editing? What are the reasons?

(g)   How has the discussion helped you in proofreading? What are the reasons?

2. How advantageous has it been working with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

3. What problem/s have you encountered with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

4. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve your future collaborative session?

Weeks 8, 9 and 10

1. (a)   How has the discussion helped you in sharing information? What are the reasons?

(b)   How has the discussion helped you in filtering information to be used in writing? What are the reasons?

(c)   How has the discussion helped you in writing? What are the reasons?

(d)   How has the discussion helped you in editing? What are the reasons?

(e)   How has the discussion helped you in proofreading? What are the reasons?

2. How advantageous has it been working with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

3. What problem/s have you encountered with friends who have low/medium/high proficiency?

4. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve your future collaborative session?

Appendix 10

<u>Amended Checklist for Observation & Analysis of Video Recording</u>

Observer: Teresa/ Norah   Date: …………………………

Group: 1/ 2   Time: ………………..……..

Week: 1/ 2/ 3/ 4/ 5/ 6/ 7/ 8/ 9/ 10   Venue: ……………………….

<u>(Week 1 to 6)</u>

Areas Looked At	Yes	No	Comments
1. Interaction at pre-writing stage a. Group-focus b. Task focus c. Sub-code Categories			
2. Interaction regarding: a. Content b. Language c. Format			
3. a. Positive Contexts b. Negative Contexts			

(Week 7 to 10)

Areas Looked At	Yes	No	Comments
1. Interaction at writing stage a. Group-focus b. Task focus c. Sub-code Categories 2. Interaction at editing stages a. Group-focus b. Task focus c. Sub-code Categories			
3. Interaction regarding: a. Content b. Language c. Format			
4. a. Positive Contexts b. Negative Contexts			

Appendix 11

Scoring Rubric for Long Report

Criteria	Marks		
	0-1	*2-3*	*4-5*
Format & Organisation (5 marks)	• *Major mistakes in format* • *Loosely organised important ideas* • *Develops some ideas from general to specific* • *Slight coherence achieved through language structures and cohesive devices*	• *Minor mistakes in format* • *Generally well organised important ideas* • *Develops most ideas from general to specific* • *Some coherence achieved through language structures and cohesive devices*	• *Use of correct format* • *Logically organised around major ideas* • *Develops ideas from general to specific* • *Coherence achieved through the use of appropriate cohesive devices*
	0-7	*8-15*	*16-20*
Content (20 marks)	• *Demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of topic but shows gaps in knowledge* • *Includes some important ideas but limited understanding of them* • *Develops ideas adequately and includes some supporting facts or examples* • *Vague, repetitive and not well developed*	• *Demonstrates good understanding of topic* • *Includes most important ideas and shows good understanding of them* • *Demonstrates good development of ideas and includes adequate supporting facts or examples* • *Contains some irrelevant information*	• *Complete, accurate and thorough input* • *Includes all important ideas and demonstrates understanding of them* • *Fully developed ideas with specific facts or examples* • *Contains no irrelevant information*
	0-8	*9-18*	*19-25*
Language (25 marks)	• *Generally clearly written with few errors that interfere with comprehension* • *Demonstrates occasional problems with word choice* • *Includes some inaccurate word forms and verb tenses* • *Uses simple sentences with occasional errors and attempts to use complex sentences* • *Demonstrates some reliance on source text language and not always integrated with student-generated language*	• *Clearly written with few errors that do not interfere with comprehension* • *Uses generally accurate academic vocabulary* • *May include inaccurate word forms and verb tenses* • *Uses simple sentences accurately and attempts to use complex sentences* • *Contains source text language that is adequately integrated with student-generated language*	• *Clearly written with few errors that do not interfere with comprehension* • *Includes academic language that is rarely inaccurate or repetitive* • *Includes generally accurate word forms and verb tenses* • *Uses a variety of sentence types accurately* • *Contains source text that is well integrated with student-generated language*

Adapted from Scoring Rubric Developed for use in Intensive English Programme at Georgia State University (Weigle, 2002, p. 190-191)

Appendix 12

Key Findings of Mutual Interaction and Sharing of Expertise in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Spontaneous Interaction and Elicitation of Information (Week 1)	*Brainstorming of topics– 12 topics while Group 1 only had 6 topics (Week 1)*
Loh used open approach - asked questions as forms of verification and gate-keeping (Weeks 1 and 4)	*Corrine used questions to correct and refine information to increase understanding – similar with Loh (Week 1)*
Discussed new information (Weeks 3 and 5)	*Discussed new information (Weeks 2 and 3), Group 2's interaction more dynamic than Group 1 (Week 2)*
Loh used closed approach – questions not asked, reduced exploration of issue, influenced by collectivist culture (Weeks 3 and 5)	*None*
Opinions: *a. Positive* *Week 1 - received ideas, productive, increased knowledge, co-constructed knowledge* *Week 4 - increased knowledge, Soong did not talk at all but still learned from others, scaffolding occurred* *Week 5 – good participation due to preparedness including Soong, made decisions collectively* *b. Negative* *Week 3 – lack of questions asked* *Week 4 – Soong did not talk at all because she did not read articles*	*Opinions:* *a. Positive* *Week 1 – generated interesting topics, created awareness* *Week 2 - more topics, learn teamwork, increase motivation, awareness of dominating* *b. Negative* *Week 1 – insufficient information, too many topics causing disagreement, lack of preparation, James' unhappiness over rejection of topic* *Week 2 – little contribution, dominating, confusion over too much information* *Week 3 – rejection of topic without rationale (collectivist culture), information not emphasised*

Appendix 13

Key Findings of Negotiation in Group 1

Group 1	Week
Confirmation checks – repeating, elaborating and simplifying	*2 and 3*
Elaborating	*2*
Cumulative talk	*2*
Simplifying and repeating	*3*
Opinions: a. *Positive* *Understand and evaluate information, lacked understanding*	*2*
Increased understanding, active participation, improved speaking skills, corrected mistakes	*3*
b. *Negative* *Lacked understanding*	*2*

Appendix 14

Key Findings of Power Struggle in Group 2

Group 2	Week
High-power and low-power members, power struggle	*1, 2, 3, 6, and 8*
Unequal distribution of power	*1, 3*
Corrine dominated discussion - contributed expertise but enforced power by correcting group members constantly	*1*
Corrine influenced group through lengthy repetition of explanations	*1*
Improvement in power distribution	*2*
Corrine's lines shorter than in Week 1	*2*
Group depended on Corrine to guide discussion	*2*
Corrine forced group to use interviews and questionnaire	*3*
James was tardy – group angry that they could not progress with work, Corrine suggested ignoring him (influenced by collectivist culture), Corrine chided James over tardiness	*6*
Group ignored James	*6 and 8*
Diffusion of power struggle	*8*

(continued) Key Findings of Power Struggle in Group 2

Group 2	Week
James confronted Corrine but group sided with Corrine	*8*
Group side-tracked from discussion, James joined in to try re-establish sense of belonging to group	*8*
Group stopped ignoring James during division of work in writing – emphasis on group solidarity (influenced by collectivist culture)	*8*
Opinions: a. *Positive* *Group performed task together, Corrine's contribution important, exchange and share information through arguments*	*8*
b. *Negative* *Too much time spent on generation of topics, dissatisfied with Corrine but did not confront her due to collectivist culture, Corrine realised she dominated*	*1*
Dominating behaviour, insufficient contribution, confusion over information	*2*
Confused over use of interviews and questionnaire, did not confront Corrine due to collectivist culture, Corrine aware that she dominated	*3*
Negative opinions – James wasted time, complained of James being unclear over work, difficulty in placing points in mind-map	*6*

Appendix 15

Key Findings of Leadership Styles in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Loh's democratic leadership – invited and prompted members to talk, members self volunteered in choosing sub-topics to read about (Week 1)	*Soh's democratic leadership (easy-going and sociable in nature); Loh - mixture of democratic and autocratic behaviour (organised and serious person)*
Egalitarian approach allowed free contribution, increased interest and motivation in task (Week 1)	*Democratic approach allowed group to talk freely (Week 1)*
Mixed democratic and autocratic behaviour in leadership, democratic to encourage generating of interview questions and to allow brainstorming, autocratic by rejecting Wai's question, claimed question similar as another question but not true, group did not correct her being influenced by collectivist culture (Week 3)	*Soh relinquished leadership to Corrine due to her good command of English, group co-operated well with Corrine (Week 8)*
Opinions: *a. Positive* *Week 1 - co-operation enabled performance of task, work scrutinised, delegation of work* *Week 3 - learned and increased understanding, reduced time for task, corrected mistakes*	*Opinions:* *b. Positive* *Week 1 - Created interest, group co-operated and involved in decision-making, fair share of work* *Week 8 - Corrine was a good leader, group learned English from her, outline prepared by her, she provided scaffold in language and writing* *c. Negative* *Week 1 - Irresponsible group members*

Key Findings of Topic Selection and Brainstorming in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Different levels of involvement	*Different levels of involvement*
Loh elicited information, Loh, Ooi, Tang and Wai responded consistently, Soong and Phua quiet (low proficiency, shy and self-conscious)	*Corrine dominated, Soh contributed regularly, James, Kok, Fun and Yin did not contribute regularly (low proficiency)*
Loh most active – being group leader, good command of English	*Corrine most active – good command of English*
Group's active contribution - forming questions for questionnaire and interview, analysing data, Soong and Phua active (not much language skills needed and familiarity with task)	*Soh as group leader active but lines shorter than Corrine's, overshadowed by Corrine (strong personality and good command of English), power struggle due to unequal distribution of power*
Group enthusiastic in drawing mind-map but Soong and Phua quiet (poor language)	*Prepared mind-map then analysed data unlike Group 1 which analysed data first, Corrine did not dominate during analysing data, group active including Yin and Kok (not much language skills needed)*
Opinions: a. *Positive* *Learning from each other, having many topics, easy to work with each other, increased understanding on information regarding topic* b. *Negative* *Unable to contribute due to poor language, giving short answers to questions.*	*Opinions:* a. *Positive* *Many topics, worked as team* b. *Negative* *No preparation, self-conscious, topic rejected, boring sessions*

Key Findings of Format and Organisation in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Not much discussion on format and organisation, sought researcher's help (labelling information - use of relevant statistics, real estate and ways to overcome financial problem), followed researcher's advice on writing (two paragraphs on important statistics in Conclusion, three paragraphs on real estate in Conclusion, four paragraphs on ways to overcome financial problem in Recommendations)	*Did not seek researcher's help unlike Group 1*
Loh made final decision on points to include in long report (left out Wai's point on purpose) – being leader and has good command of English	*Group unsure of how to start discussion on writing so Soh directed discussion to Corrine who decided to write outline despite Soh's protest, Group 2 used an outline but not Group 1, Corrine wrote outline with minimal help from group (scaffolding in guiding group in writing), Corrine offered to help group (lacked confidence in writing according to preferred length)*
Marks awarded for format and organisation: three out of five marks	*Marks awarded for format and organisation: two out of five marks*
Opinions: *a. Positive* *Correct format with appropriate headings, correct sequence of headings, suitable sub-headings to categorise information* *b. Negative* *Disjointed writing (content with headings and sub-headings), irrelevant information in Findings and Recommendations (all information discussed used in writing so difficult to organise), absence of a bibliography (task of preparing bibliography overlooked in discussions)*	*Opinions:* *a. Negative* *Only had Introduction and Recommendations headings but not Findings and Conclusions headings (format and organisation not discussed but concentrated on content)*

Appendix 18

Key Findings of Drafting in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Draft was based on mind-map	*Draft was based on mind-map*
Co-operative and maintained group solidarity (collectivist culture) - Phua, Tang and Soong started discussing first when Loh, Wai and Ooi informed them of their lateness, Phua passed unfinished written work to Loh when she arrived - Loh as group leader with good command of English, Loh continued guiding group in writing Introduction, Conclusion, provided language assistance when group could not express themselves	*Corrine played prominent role like Loh, group members inactive and depended on Corrine, outline not used because Kok was late, Corrine continued task of providing another outline, James ignored, Kok was late and forgot outline but group did not confront her – maintained group harmony (collectivist), side-tracked from discussion (mid-term test, Christmas holidays, time Fun went to sleep, assignment), James included in discussion, Group 2 had less discussions than Group 1*
Loh made final decision on points to be included in final writing during editing and proofreading (as leader and with good command of English)	*Similar with Loh, Corrine made final decision on points to be included in final writing during editing and proofreading (good command of English)*
Information discussed and used in writing final draft of long report – points on how they spend money, investment portfolio ,common mistakes used, types of insurance (clearly explained), types of investments (not presented with suitable sub-headings), mutual funds (wrongly categorised as a section), types of financial planning	*Division of work for individual writing based on Corrine's outline but some points left out* *Information discussed and used in writing final draft of long report – use of the word "prevent" in Recommendations, point on misleading information, Harvard Referencing System in Bibliography (unlike Group 1 which did not discuss referencing)*

(Continued) Key Findings of Drafting in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Information discussed but not used in writing final draft of long report - how the concept was grown, top investment, real estate, financial report, the sentence "The purpose of the study is to know more about financial planning" in Introduction, convenience and opinions, questionnaire findings (not detailed), the sentence "This report covers some problems in financial planning, questionnaire findings", tables not used to present information	*Information discussed but not used in writing final draft of long report - Introduction heading missing, information on little knowledge in Introduction, suggested length of writing not followed (2880 instead of 2000 words)*
Marks awarded for content - 13 out of 20 marks; language - 8 out of 25 marks	*Marks awarded for content - 11 out of 20 marks, language - 13 out of 25 marks*
Opinions: *a. Positive* *Impressive amount of information (diligence and commitment of group, motivated by each other), good development of ideas (mutual interactions and negotiations increased understanding)* *b. Negative* *Irrelevant information in Findings and Recommendations (too detailed), informal style of language (lack of discussion on tone), tense and sentence errors (lack of discussion on language), plagiarised writing (overlooked task of re-phrasing sentences), no proper citations and absence of a bibliography (no discussion on bibliography)*	*Opinions:* *a. Positive* *Positive feedback - good organisation (cohesion and coherence in different sections) and related information (better than Group 1), less plagiarised work and good development of ideas* *b. Negative* *Negative feedback – detailed survey findings in Introduction (should be in Findings), lengthy explanation of sex crime in Conclusion (should be summarised), language errors such as tense and sentence errors (more than Group 1 due to independent writing)*

Appendix 19

Key Findings of Editing and Proofreading in Groups 1 and 2

Group 1	Group 2
Did not perform editing and proofreading as group but Loh carried out alone (volunteered because of command of language and as responsible leader)	*Did not perform editing and proofreading as group but Corrine carried it out on her own (volunteered because of command of language)*
Findings from this group supported views from: *Ede and Lunsford (1990) - acceptable for an individual performing a task alone called "hierarchical co-authoring" in collaborative writing* *Ede and Lunsford (1990) - planning and writing carried out by team but revision by only one group member* *Locker (2006), too, explains that editing and proofreading can be performed by having a person to check for correctness in grammar, mechanics and spelling and consistency in format elements, names and numbers; using a spell checker*	*Similar with Group 1, findings from this group supported views from:* *Ede and Lunsford (1990) - acceptable for an individual performing a task alone called "hierarchical co-authoring" in collaborative writing* *Ede and Lunsford (1990) - planning and writing carried out by team but revision by only one group member* *Locker (2006), too, explains that editing and proofreading can be performed by having a person to check for correctness in grammar, mechanics and spelling and consistency in format elements, names and numbers; using a spell checker*

Appendix 20

Key Findings of Factors which Enhance Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2
(Leadership Styles, Collectivist Culture and Participants' Proficiency)

Group 1	Group 2
Leadership Styles *Loh practised mixed democratic and autocratic behaviour* *Democratic approach: members brainstormed and provided opinions freely, increased interest and motivation, mutual interactions and negotiations* *But Loh autocratic when rejecting Wai's question claiming similarity with another question despite slight protest from others, Loh not confronted - good command in English and collectivist culture (emphasis on respect towards leader and group solidarity)* *Positive views on leadership style - learned from information presented, increased understanding on input they initially could not comprehend (scaffold in understanding knowledge)*	*Leadership Style* *Soh maintained democratic leadership style while Group 1 had mixture of autocratic and democratic leadership* *Conducive atmosphere for participation - twelve topics to choose from as final topic, mutual interactions and sharing of expertise* *Soh relinquished leadership to Corrine in Week 8 (priority on group's interest - Corrine guided group better due to good command of English), group successfully produced long report with Corrine's language and writing assistance* *Positive views on leadership style - grateful to Corrine (leadership, explanation of task, scaffold in language and writing)*
Collectivist Culture *Group members' behaviour:* a. *Co-operative* b. *Agreeable* c. *Respectful towards Loh (collectivist culture emphasise on respect towards leader and group solidarity)* d. *Prioritised group harmony over disagreements - ten weeks of successful collaborative writing sessions* *Positive views - learned from information presented, increased understanding on input, spent less time in designing questionnaire and mistakes corrected by others*	*Collectivist Culture* *Group members' behaviour:* a. *Priority on group harmony and solidarity (Corrine's dominating tolerated by group)* b. *Importance on group's achievement than individuals' goal (Corrine's guidance despite unhappiness over dependence on her)* c. *Handled misbehaving group member successfully (James ignored for being late, re-established sense of belonging by behaving – group's task more important than his own needs)* *Mixed views – unhappy with Corrine and James but grateful for Corrine's help in writing*

(Continued) Key Findings of Factors which Enhance Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2 (Leadership Styles, Collectivist Culture and Participants' Proficiency)

Group 1	Group 2
Participants' Proficiency *Members with mixed proficiency pooled knowledge and abilities to produce long report*	*Participants' Proficiency* *Members with mixed proficiency pooled knowledge and abilities to produce long report, but depended on Corrine's language and writing abilities during writing*
All searched for information but weak members could not understand so Loh elicited information through probing questions - increased understanding of points, weak members intimidated by questions and kept quiet so frequency of questions reduced (consideration towards weak members)	*All collaborated in searching for information, Corrine refined ideas by adding information and correcting them - increased understanding*
Loh's language and writing abilities (forms of scaffold) - helped group understand articles, guided group in writing, edited and proofread long report	*Corrine's language and writing abilities (forms of scaffold) - guided group in writing, produced outline for group to follow in writing, edited and proofread long report*

Key Findings of Factors which Enhance Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2
(Humour and National Language)

Group 1	Group 2
Humour *Positive group-related exhibitions of humour identified through:* a. *Wai's humourous explanation on how people misuse credit cards by overspending and buying of shares - to create group dynamics but group did not respond (group serious in nature and very task-focussed)* b. *Ooi and researcher lightened up situation by interjecting on where one could obtain money when one had overspent and expanded idea when Loh and Wai argued over interview question - to reduce tension, group laughed and argument ended*	*Humour* *Positive group-related exhibitions of humour identified through:* a. *James jokingly asked what to do if girl asked what would be given for participating in interview - to create cohesiveness because they would interview friends together, group laughed* b. *Corrine checked with James his comments on pictures passed around by boys in co-educational schools, he refused to comment by jokingly demonstrating self-censorship on his speech and said he was a good boy - to create cohesiveness in group by respecting female group members in not passing negative remarks, group laughed* c. *Soh informed group that topic chosen was sex education but jokingly expressed her surprise over it due to sensitivity towards it - to reduce discomfort over topic, group laughed* d. *Researcher asked group where Kok was because she was late, Yin said Kok was on bus, Corrine asked where outline was because she wanted to refer to it, Soh jestingly said it was with Kok on the bus – to reduce the seriousness of situation (Kok's lateness and missing outline), group laughed*

(Continued) Key Findings of Factors which Enhance Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2 (Humour and National Language)

Group 1	Group 2
Use of National Language *Not used in group's discussions*	*Use of National Language* *The use of national language - Bahasa Malaysia (Malay) evident in Group 2 but not in Group 1* *Used during selection of topic - James presented topic on **Mat Rempit** (illegal motorcycle racers), common in the country, all Malays, Corrine corrected him by saying that a majority of Malays were **Mat Rempit**, Yin and Fun stated decision in choosing **Mat Rempit** topic, **Mat Rempit** was used by group because they did not know the English term for it and everyone could understand the meaning of it*

Key Findings of Factors which Inhibit Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2
(Collectivist Culture, Participants' Proficiency, Different Levels of Expectations
and Lack of Time Management Skills)

Group 1	Group 2
Collectivist Culture	*Collectivist Culture*
Group 1: co-operative, agreeable and respectful towards each other, priority on group harmony and conformity	*Group 2 avoided confrontation, maintained group harmony, placed importance on group's goals over their own goal*
Collaboration negatively affected:	*Collaboration adversely affected:*
a. Emphasis on conformity of behaviour in group - Loh stopped asking probing questions because group uncomfortable and none followed her example - reduced exploration of issue, content consisted of a large amount of information which lacked connection and organisation due to inability to understand it	*a. Focused on group solidarity and group's decision – failure to confront Corrine over dominating ways despite unhappiness*
	b. Emphasises group harmony - no open communication, chose to remain silent over unhappiness with James and Corrine
b. Focused on creating harmonious atmosphere - avoided argument by not challenging Loh despite disagreement on interview question – a good interview question left out	*c. Ostracise members who do not behave like the rest in group - James ignored by group so he lost interest, friction created and useful ideas from him rejected*
Participants' Proficiency	*Participants' Proficiency*
Loh confident, Soong, Wai and Phua did not talk much due to shyness, lack of confidence and difficulty in explaining information, Tang could not understand information, Loh frustrated with inactive members assuming they did not prepare well for the discussions	*Corrine active, Soh and James contributed despite weak command of English because they were confident, only Fun, Kok and Yin were shy and lacked confidence, Corrine just like Loh was unhappy with lack of preparation, forced her to talk more*

(Continued) Key Findings of Factors which Inhibit Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2 (Collectivist Culture, Participants' Proficiency, Different Levels of Expectations and Lack of Time Management Skills)

Group 1	Group 2
Different Levels of Expectations	*Different Levels of Expectations*
Interviews and diary entries revealed different levels of expectations - negative perceptions of collaboration:	*Like Group 1, interviews and diary entries revealed members' different levels of expectations - dissatisfactions with collaboration:*
a. *Loh, the group leader, disappointed with group not contributing effectively - failed to answer questions well, gave short answers*	a. *Corrine felt sessions unproductive - members not prepared well (no new information shared), unfair to others who had prepared, Corrine, similar with Loh from Group 1 did not realise members' problems*
b. *Soong uncertain on how to contribute in discussions - some members gave detailed explanations which made sessions boring, some only read out sub-headings of information*	b. *Kok unhappy with James coming late - a delay in work*
c. *Loh and Ooi felt lack of preparation caused group unable to answer questions, Tang and Soong confirmed they did not contribute due to lack of preparation, Soong could not understand information, Loh did not understand their struggles*	c. *Group dependent on Corrine because of problems - Fun misunderstood topic, Yin and Soh could not assist in analysing data because of inability to calculate well*
Lack of Time Management Skills	*Lack of Time Management Skills*
Wasting too much time on certain tasks (Loh and Soong unhappy with too much time spent on certain sub-tasks, Loh confessed she did not plan their time as leader for drawing mind-map and drafting - so more than one session needed)	*Sub-tasks could not be completed in a short time (Corrine and Fun dissatisfied with time spent on drawing of mind-map and deciding on topic)*

Appendix 23

Key Findings of Factors which Inhibit Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2 (Leadership Style and Lack of Punctuality)

Group 1	Group 2
Leadership Style *Did not inhibit collaboration*	*Leadership Style* *Soh the leader - democratic behaviour but Group 1 had mixture of autocratic and democratic leadership* *Soh's style created conducive atmosphere for participation but less efforts from group, not placing importance on discussions, Group 2 only had eight sessions in comparison with Group 1 who had ten productive sessions* *Leadership style had negative results:* *a. Failed to prepare well – searched for information and reported on it for three sessions while Group 1 performed them for five sessions, Group 2's long report had less in-depth information than Group 1's work, Soh, as leader did not emphasise on importance of preparation* *b. Soh allowed Corrine to dominate – group exasperated through constant corrections and forced decisions, Soh neither invited others to talk regularly nor advise Corrine* *c. Soh did not remind group to be punctual - James not punctual in Weeks 5 and 6 while Kok late in Week 8, delayed work, disappointed and angered group, Corrine instead of Soh reprimanded James* *d. Soh allowed side-tracking: James excusing himself from room, Soh and Kok discussing how to fill out study loan application form, Group 1 concentrated more on sub-task so produced detailed long report*

(Continued) Key Findings of Factors which Inhibit Collaboration in Groups 1 and 2 (Leadership Style and Lack of Punctuality)

Group 1	Group 2
Lack of Punctuality *Did not inhibit collaboration*	*Lack of Punctuality* *Group 2 lacked punctuality while Group 1 attempted to be punctual for discussions* *Two members who were late created problems:* *a. James unhappy with rejection of his topics and Corrine's dominating behaviour, came late for discussions, group unable to continue work because they needed his share of information, group was frustrated* *b. Kok overslept and late for discussion, forgot to bring outline, missing information from writing because group could not remember contents allotted for different sections in outline, did not check writing with outline after that*