

Students' Perceptions of the Use of Collaborative Writing and Peer Reviewing in Wiki Lab Reports

Selvapandian Prescilla Premila

INTI International College Subang, 47500 Subang Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia.

*Corresponding author. Email: prescilla.pselva@newinti.edu.my

Article Info:

Received: 29 Dec 2021; Revised: 21 Sept 2022; Accepted: 18 Dec 2022; Available Online: 20 Dec 2022

Abstract

Laboratory reports are synonymous with laboratory sessions in undergraduate chemistry courses. This research restructures the format of lab reports, to avoid repetitive churning of lab reports that accompany weekly experiments that do not create avenues for proper appreciation of the scientific essence of the experiment. This research explores the dual use of wikis and peer-reviewing techniques that rely on students' collaborative efforts to improve scientific literacy. Student perceptions are captured upon implementation and valuable findings are shared. Collaborativeness among students surfaced in the interview findings and aspects of having more reflectiveness, critical-thinking and research skills were present as values for the peer-reviewing activities. While the research explores the presentation of lab reports in chemistry, the peer-reviewing techniques can be extended to courses that involves the assessment of student writing. The research findings showed how constructive alignment between the task, assessment and learning outcomes is necessary to ensure that learning gains from peer-reviewing are achieved. Also noticeable was that proper technological and pedagogical considerations are necessary in the planning of tasks.

Keywords: *collaboration, laboratory reporting, peer-review techniques, scientific writing, student perceptions, Wikis,*

1. Introduction

Learning in the laboratory forms a very important aspect of learning in most science courses. Core chemistry courses, such as general chemistry, organic chemistry, and higher-level chemistry, usually incorporate laboratory work that emphasises hands-on skills. Within the laboratory environment, students actively learn through inquiry-based experiments while also gaining experiences and skills that are related to scientific practices (Auchincloss et al., 2014; Evans et al., 2016; Hunter et al., 2007; Szteinberg & Weaver, 2013; Yore et al., 2008) such as specific technical techniques, critical thinking, scientific literacy, and data analysis methods (Dood et al., 2018). Given the vast array of skills students can acquire from laboratory sessions, various assessments can be developed to assess students' learning from these sessions. Two ways of assessing students are by evaluating psychomotor abilities and by evaluating cognitive abilities. Psychomotor assessments involve assessment of specific in-situ technical skills and the relevant competencies required as outlined under the procedures of the experiments, while an assessment of cognitive ability involves assessing how students reason and demonstrate understanding of the results obtained. Such presentation of results adopts scientific reporting formats.

A long-standing practice in assessing students' cognitive abilities is through lab reports. Lab reports communicate observations, organise data and workflow, allow visualising of patterns and relationships, and clarify thought processes (Green et al., 2017). The goals of preparing a lab report are to demonstrate thinking scientifically (Deiner et al., 2012) and to prepare students to act, think, and reason as authentically as possible in comparison to the practices of real-world scientists (Lerner, 2007; Russell, 2002). Notably, writing is a complex skill and requires sustained, reiterative support rather than a single one-off experience (Brownell et al., 2014) and is most significantly impactful when there is knowledge “transfer” in ways that students can connect the dots between ideas and benefit from divergent learning experiences (Donovon et al., 1999).

Typically, expository (traditional) approaches are used in the teaching lab with recipe-style protocols where students follow a predetermined set of procedures for data analysis. While this method allows learners with opportunities to develop practical skills such as using the apparatus, mixing solutions, setting up experiments, and even meeting the required objectives of the lab session, this teacher-centred approach leaves very little room for thought or reflection of the concepts that underpin the experiment (Quattrucci, 2018). O' Dennell (2014) points out that students can even complete a lab report fairly well without a strong grasp of the theories behind the experiment. As a result, the work submitted may not be a true reflection of the students' ability and understanding of the knowledge that is reported. Another point to note is that individually composing lab reports results in a voluminous amount of lab reports every week. As such, a shift of the centre of gravity to one that progressively improves scientific literacy and at the same time manages grading workload will be beneficial to students and instructors. To address issues that come with traditional lab report writing, the present research aims to explore the following research questions:

- i. What were the students' experiences in lab work reporting?
- ii. What were the challenges in writing lab wikis?
- iii. What did the students think of the peer-reviewing elements?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Wiki as a Tool for Scientific Reporting

Wiki, a Web 2.0 software, allows users to create and edit Web pages. Content can be changed, removed, edited, and added and this task can be shared between several users. Closest to the present research is the studies by researchers who have used Electronic Laboratory Notebooks (ELN) (Lawrie, 2016; Bromfield Lee, 2018) and CHEM-wiki (Elliot & Fraiman, 2010), where students collaboratively prepare lab reports using the wiki software. Aspects highlighted in this research is the collaborative nature of preparing lab reports otherwise absent in traditional lab reports. Presenting lab reports in an electronic format has enabled students' sharing of ideas and the flexibility to link external references (Elliot & Fraiman, 2010); it is a more environmentally friendly method and students can share images and discuss how to accomplish certain tasks (Bromfield, 2018). Moreover, it encourages student ownership and appraisal of good or bad data because data is being presented for a wider audience rather than for individual submissions of reports (Lawrie, 2016).

2.2 Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is an approach aimed at involving students in the assessment of learning by offering opinions, suggestions, and comments on the work of other students. Through the process of critically evaluating good and poor-quality work, students learn to take ownership of their own work. When peers read and evaluate content created by others in the class, this would mean that the work created has to be of an acceptable quality since critical reading and writing are involved. Pedagogically speaking, these functions extend insights into students' cognitive processes and this allows the instructor to identify specific areas that require further support among students (Lawrie, 2016). Thus, in addition to using the wiki to recreate lab reports, peer-reviewing techniques have also been incorporated to involve students in the assessment of work quality.

Students' metacognitive skills benefit when peer-reviewing tasks are incorporated. Notable benefits of peer-reviewing in scientific writing are improved ability of students to select literature relevant to the matter under study, thoroughly understanding the specific requirements of the components of a scientific paper, improved ability to critique a scientific paper (Rangachari & Mierson, 1995; Seals & Tanaka, 2000; Subramaniam, 2010; Yankulov & Couto, 2012), alongside minimization of common writing errors and inaccurate reporting (Colthorpe et al., 2014). Besides, students acquire improved confidence, motivation, and independence in writing (Romula et al., 2018). Dominating the discussions of peer reviewing is the inclusion of formative assessments that have contributed to greater student learning. Formative assessments have countered limitations of the usual summative feedback given by instructors (Sims, 1989) which often result in a grade deduction before students are allowed to remedy mistakes.

While there is general consensus that peer-reviewing techniques are beneficial to student learning, some researchers have highlighted otherwise. Ge (2012) surveyed engineering students and found that students preferred to use a word processing software to present their work rather than Wikis. Issues that were reported were difficulties deciphering work posted by their peers, wikis were a less organized option, and creating wikis was time-consuming. In two separate studies, Coyle (2007) and Leung et al. (2009) raised the question of whether wikis are truly suitable for measuring collaboration among students. Unless required, students will not voluntarily edit their peers' work (Coyle, 2007). This defeats the aim of prompting collaboration among students. Similarly, Leung et al. (2009) analysed quantitative and qualitative results from a Media wiki project and found that very limited collaboration occurred between group members in the Wiki learning environment. Such findings point to the need for assessment criteria when using the wiki and raise questions about whether it is possible to assess collaboration in the wiki writing process. Kaufmann and Schunn (2010) found that students had concerns about the fairness and accuracy of peer assessment (i.e., unqualified peer reviewers) especially in cases where instructors do not moderate the marks provided by peer reviewers. Strategies that have been recommended to improve the quality of peer feedback can be summarized as increasing students' peer assessment experience (Sluijsmans et al., 2001; Wen & Tsai 2006); specifying the criteria for peer assessments (Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000; Smith, Cooper, & Lancaster, 2002); and supporting students with proper training and practice in peer assessments (Cheng & Warren, 1997; Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000).

2.3 Research Novelty

The conflicting findings and suggestions to improve the implementation of peer-reviewing indicate a need for further research. The novelty of the present research is in addressing previously reported shortcomings via the research design. Therefore, several new pedagogical approaches were incorporated. The present research is angled to firstly, specify students' role in contributing and reviewing the lab wiki (thus addressing the issue of voluntarily participation and no participation); and secondly, involve instructor assessment of comments from peer-reviewers based on the same rubric provided to the students (this is to address unqualified, sporadic and the inaccurate peer-review comments). Also included were several rounds of practice to ensure students were familiar with the workarounds of the wiki and requirements of reviewing comments. As these new aspects were added into the peer-reviewing and collaborative aspects to the lab report writing, the present research is aimed at capturing students' experiences in the context of a chemistry course.

3. Module Design

3.1. Design Overview

Traditionally lab reports were written individually and students would submit their lab reports online or through hard copy. In this module, two alterations were made. First, students work in groups to create a lab report. Second, the use of word-processing documents to produce lab reports was replaced with a collaborative tool called "Wiki" available in the students' learning management system called Blackboard. Students were divided into groups at the beginning of the semester by the instructor. For each group of four students, two of the students would create the lab report and the other two would review the lab wiki. The students who created the lab wiki were designated as "contributors" and students who reviewed

the lab wiki were called “reviewers”. The lab wiki followed the usual format of title, aims, results and questions, conclusion, and discussion. The tasks of the two contributors were divided into two: one student prepared the aim, results, and conclusion and the other would prepare the title and discussion. The contributors were given 48 hours to create the lab report upon completion of their lab practical. After 48 hours, the group of students in charge of reviewing the lab report would then evaluate their peers' work, with 48 hours to complete their reviews. The contributors would post their work using black font and the reviewers would post their work using the blue font.

Student roles were rotated in two ways: 1) between contributing (to the lab wiki) and reviewing (the lab wiki) different components of the experiment and 2) between their roles as contributors and reviewers. Regarding the first rotation, the rationale behind assigning one student to complete the aim, results, and conclusion and the other to complete the title and discussion is because these components require different reporting skills as such, rotating the roles allows students to learn the different skill sets pivotal to each component. For example, when completing the “results” component, students learn to create graphs, work out calculations and analyse data using various tools so that a conclusion can be drawn from the raw data obtained from the laboratory. Comparatively, to complete the “discussion” portion of the lab wiki, students are required to reason and link the data obtained from the “results” section to theoretical concepts in chemistry. To do this, students are required to research and select relevant concepts, analyse these concepts for their appropriateness and then reword these concepts to tie them into the context of the experiment. To ensure fairness of workload among students in proportion to the assigned assessment for each lab report (each lab report contributes 1% of their overall score), students are only expected to only contribute or review an assigned component of the lab report. This is to upkeep student motivation, by ensuring that students' efforts are commensurate to the scores assigned (which is only 1% for each lab wiki). Moreover, by contributing a portion of the lab wiki, students are encouraged to prioritize the quality of their contribution. Another element in maintaining the integrity of the task, is to ensure students of a group are not allowed to view lab wikis of students from other groups. This prevents students from copying the content from other groups.

For the second rotation, the reasons for swapping between contributing and reviewing are explained. After the “contributors” have completed their work, the “reviewers” reviewed the lab wiki, adding their comments using a different colour font. The “reviewers” reviewed the “contributors” work and assessed the consistency, accuracy, and correctness of the information posted, guided by a common rubric. Should the “contributors” fail to provide sufficient information or miss portion(s) or post incorrect answers in the lab wiki, the “reviewers” should complete or correct these sections. The reviewers would have had the same lab experiences as the contributors so there is common ground for the reviewers to fully understand the context of the lab wiki. For “discussions” where the “contributors” had already elaborated on the concepts, the reviewer can either choose to deepen the contributor's work by adding new information, reflecting on aspects that were written, or extend on how the discussion points can relate to real-life applications. It was imperative to ensure that the reviewers were aware of their duties to ensure that a critical review was posted, rather than merely agreeing with the “contributors” work. In such instances, it was made clear that no marks would be awarded if the “reviewer” merely paraphrased what the “contributors” had written. A good show of reflectiveness, critical thinking, and extension of knowledge would earn them a higher score on the point scale. This point was emphasized during the introductory presentation for student and captured in the rubric shared with students.

3.2. Preparations

During the first week of the semester, students were informed of 1) their roles as “contributors” and “reviewers” (See Table 1), 2) location of the relevant documents on their learning management system (in this case Blackboard), 3) pertinent due dates for “contributors” and “reviewers”, 4) requirements of a good write up for each lab component (i.e., aim, results, discussion, and conclusion), 5) good and poor examples of past student work, and 6) a rubric outlining categories and mark distribution. The above information was presented in a 60-minute session and the instructors clarified all questions that the students had. To reassure students that allowances would be given for the learning curve ahead when preparing the lab wikis, leeway was provided for the first two experiments. Instead of starting with

summative assessments, formative feedback was provided to all students to understand how to properly contribute and review lab wikis. Summative assessment started for lab wikis for the third experiment.

3.3. Instructor Assessment of Lab Wikis

The grading of lab wikis was done by the instructor after the reviewers had completed their reviews. The instructor assessed the contribution of each group member. This general method of assessment was to ensure students had contributed personally to the wiki and that their classmates were not commenting on their behalf. Wikis from the Learning Management System allow very accurate tracking of number of words and edits made (see Figure 1) and thus was selected as a tool for this activity as opposed to other platforms. Integrated into the learning management system are Course Analytics, Course Reports, and Turnitin plagiarism detections and instructor grading was done using a set rubric that allowed direct grade calculations of the portions that was evaluated. Instructor feedback was given by inserting direct comments on the lab wiki page. The instructor's feedback was inserted under each section of the lab wikis (i.e., aim, results). The instructor commented in red to contrast against the contributors' black font and reviewers blue font in the lab wikis (See Figure 2 and Figure 3). Grades were awarded based on the rubrics that were shared with students; these grades and rubrics were visible to students throughout the semester.




Figure 1. A screenshot of student participation summary

Table 1. An Example of Lab Wiki Task Distribution

	Ng						
Contributors for Aim/Results/Calculation/Questions/Conclusion	7, 10	9	8	2	7, 10	9	8
Reviewers for Title/Discussion	2	7, 10	9	8	2	7, 10	9
Contributors for Title/Discussion	8	2	7, 10	9	8	2	7, 10
Reviewer for Aim/Results/Calculation/Questions/Conclusion	9	8	2	7, 10	9	8	2

Note: The number(s) in the boxes correspond to the lab experiments: i.e., 9 = Experiment 9.



Figure 2. A screenshot of a contributor posting (in black) and a reviewer posting (in blue) for the “Results and Calculation” portion of a lab wiki.




Figure 3. A screenshot of a contributor posting (in black) and a reviewer posting (in blue) for the “Discussion” portion of a lab wiki.

4. Research Design

The study employed a qualitative research design. The participants were interviewed using open-ended questions. A semi-structured interview approach was adopted. The interviews were conducted face-to-face. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and translated for analysis. The participants signed a consent form and were assured of privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity.

Out of the eight students enrolled in Section A of a General Chemistry course, seven volunteered for the online interviews which were recorded and transcribed for thematic analysis. General Chemistry, coded CHM151, is a first-year chemistry course offered in an American Degree Transfer Programme taught at a private higher education institution in the Klang Valley, Malaysia. Students require a pre-requisite chemistry course before enrolling into CHM151. Relevant information of participants is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Participant information

Participants	Gender	Abbreviation	Semester
Student 1	Female	StuF	3
Student 2	Male	StuA	2
Student 3	Male	StuY	3
Student 4	Female	StuJ	4
Student 5	Male	StuS	5
Student 6	Male	StuYS	4
Student 7	Female	StuZ	2

5. Findings

5.1. Findings for the First Research Question

In relation to the first research question of “What were the students’ experiences in lab work reporting?” three themes emerged. The themes are 1) Prior Experiences; 2) Mixed Initial Reactions to Lab Wikis and 3) Division and Management of Tasks.

5.1.1. Prior Experiences

StuS mentioned that he had to hand in hard copies for his previous lab reports and he described printing his lab reports as a “hassle”, having to always visit the printing shop. All the other students also revealed that they submitted hard copies of their lab reports. StuZ mentioned that she takes about thirty minutes

to an hour to complete her lab report to which, upon submission, her instructor will discuss the results with everyone. StuA wrote his lab results in a lab manual, which was then submitted for grading. StuY explained that in his secondary school the teacher would guide them on how to write the lab results and provide examples. He described his current experience of having to write reports from scratch as “very hard, because it’s new”. It was revealed the students had never worked collaboratively to prepare a lab report in their previous chemistry classes.

5.1.2. Mixed Initial Reactions to Lab Wikis

From the seven students that were interviewed, it was noticed the students had mixed reactions to the prospect of using wikis in presenting their lab work. StuYS described his initial reaction as “a lot easier as there is division of work”, and StuS added what came to his mind was that there was no need to print and described working on wikis as a “go green” initiative. StuZ mentioned that it “feels new because never tried writing a lab report online with a deadline of two days” while what struck StuJ first was that she thought it would be “confusing as reviewing could create conflict” as she needed to “correct other students’ work”. StuA was “a bit puzzled”, because he had never experienced such a format before, while StuY described it as “not quite hard” while StuF welcomed the change as there was no more printing required. Generally, the seven students reported a range of initial reactions, and it was found that only StuZ was familiar with using Wikis as she had used it in a previous course. The remaining students expressed that collaborative writing and using the wiki was new to them.

5.1.3. Division and Management of Tasks

It was revealed that the students approached their assigned duties differently. Some of them explained that they created WhatsApp groups among themselves to divide tasks and communicated through WhatsApp messages (i.e., StuYS, StuS, StuA, and StuZ) while some directly contributed to the wiki page without prior discussion and explained that “it depends on who did it first, the first person does their part followed by the next ...it is more like first come first serve basis” (StuJ). Similarly, StuF mentioned that work was done on a “voluntary basis” with the last person picking up what was left and completing it. StuZ mentioned that among her group of students, the WhatsApp group was used to exchange opinions, especially when her classmates made mistakes, and to “discuss what is wrong”. She shared on one occasion she received a WhatsApp message the informed her that her posting of the unit of Molarity was incorrect – “it should be mol/litre but I wrote mol/militre” which she corrected.

5.2. Findings for the Second Research Question

In relation to the second research question of “What were the challenges in writing lab wikis?”, one theme emerged – Technical Difficulties.

5.2.1. Technical Difficulties

The wiki tool that was used in this module did not permit simultaneous editing by students. As such, almost all students raised this as a challenge. When there was concurrent usage of the wiki page, their work would be lost. This created challenges for students as they experienced their work not being saved. YS expressed frustration and shared that when it first occurred, he was discouraged and subsequently (as a measure to safeguard his work) created his work on an MS Word document before posting it on to the wiki page. YS added that a “read-only” version of the wiki page indicated that another student was posting their work. StuZ mentioned the “fail to edit wiki page” notification means all “your hard work is gone and had to restart everything again”. She too resorted to backing up her work in MS Word. She elaborated that writing chemical formulas was challenging as the use of subscript required her to repeatedly scroll up to the function bar. She wished that there was a hotkey function for the wiki page for the subscript function. The same difficulty was echoed by StuF, StuY and StuA, mentioning that after knowing only one person can edit at any one time, they had to start early because typically heavy usage of the wiki is common during the hours before the deadline. StuA explained that he primed his work on MS Word and MS Excel (for graphs and tables) before using the “insert image” function to post his graphs on to the wiki page.

5.3. Findings for the Third Research Question

Regarding the third research question of “What are the students’ perspectives of the peer-reviewing element?” two themes emerged. They are 1) Being a Contributor vs Being a Reviewer and 2) Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer Reviewing.

5.3.1. *Being a Contributor Vs Being a Reviewer*

The students explained how their perceptions of the roles of contributing to and reviewing text on the wiki page differed. For the contributor’s role, the students mentioned that:

- StuS – “...being a contributor is easier than being a reviewer”
- StuZ – “I think both roles are equal but the reviewers’ scope will depend if the contributor did a good job”
- StuJ – “I had a fun time doing it... but I was also very scared that I might do a mistake which will be corrected by the reviewer. That forced me to do better... check my work”
- StuA – “...being a contributor is difficult because when I’m the contributor sometimes I don’t have any idea on how to do it... how to start... and will normally discuss with my friend or refer to other groups for ideas”.

For the reviewer’s role, the students mentioned that:

- StuS – “When you say you look at contributors’ work you got to figure out why ... had to research a lot a lot a lot... make sure you know your stuff. As a reviewer, you must be right, there’s no chance for you to be wrong. The review part especially, makes me think actually. I’ve written both types, paper and wiki. The paper requires less thinking other than the calculation and discussion part. Whatever results you have you just paste it in Microsoft Word but in wiki, when you review there are better connections with the lab experiment.”
- StuF – “Harder for reviewer, I think. Because we need to explain...they (contributors) already give a point...if their point is valid, then you have to find another point to support that point... compared to contributors, who already give the point which sometimes is accurate and sometimes not that accurate... so we (reviewers) need to justify.”
- StuA – “I think reviewing is easier because...let’s say we are reviewing the calculations... if I’m the contributor, I think I won’t have idea on how to do it... but if I’m reviewing it, I can look ,I know I can look at his procedures and then maybe I can find the errors inside...at least I have an idea.”
- StuY – “For me I think reviewing is harder because ...we need to explain what is written by the Contributors...if not we will not get marks.”
- StuYS – “When you’re reviewing, you should write it in a correct way. And then compliment them if they do something right.”

Various perceptions of being a contributor and reviewer came to light. It can be said that the students were more conscious when they posted in the wikis as they were aware that their postings were being read by their peers. This awareness made them more conscientious in their postings. To ensure the correctness of the information, the students revealed that they had to do more than usual research as getting their facts right was imperative. Between the role of being a contributor or reviewers, both roles seem to measure up in levels of difficulty. However, what was distinctly mentioned about reviewing is that having to reason what was written by the contributors made the task more challenging as more figuring-out was required and here, the students cited the requirement stated in the assessment rubric, of having to reason what was written by the contributor.

5.3.2. Advantages and Disadvantages of Peer Reviewing

When asked about the advantages and disadvantages of writing on lab wikis and the elements of peer reviewing, the students shed light on multiple aspects. The students had varied ideas and comments about what struck them as being advantageous and disadvantageous. Several subthemes emerged from the students' responses.

5.3.2.1. Utilizing The Reviews Provided

Three students (StuS, StuA and StuF) brought up the positive aspects of the feedback extended by the reviewers on the wiki page. StuS mentioned that the feedback made him “learn from this mistakes”. StuA brought up how he learnt the importance of the subscript function in writing chemical formulas and how to report using correct significant figures. StuA also mentioned he learned how to properly conclude an experiment and mentioned that “I realized that the conclusion is based on the aim of the experiment after reading feedback from my reviewer”. StuF highlighted that when she was unsure of how to contribute to parts of the wiki page, she would refer to previous wikis where the “good work” feedback was inserted by the instructor and positive reviews were mentioned and replicate the same approach for other lab wikis.

5.3.2.2. Task Distribution

To the aspect of dividing the lab wiki into several parts to be completed by students, both advantages and disadvantages were noticed. The advantages were highlighted by StuZ. She mentioned that by “reading the contributors portion, that clarified the lecture concepts further...it helped me figure out some missing parts... and when you do the entire lab reporting on your own, it creates a lot of pressure but when doing small portions, I understand it better”. StuY favoured distributing the workload to make it manageable and mentioned that “either we learn the calculation through completing the results portion or we write about the concepts in the discussion, smaller tasks make it more manageable.” On the contrary, StuYS disagreed and mentioned that by dividing the lab report among students he only focuses on the part that is assigned to him and he may be missing out on learning how to perform or complete calculations that is commonly done in the ‘results and calculation’ portion.

5.3.2.3. Online format

Regarding switching to online submission for lab wikis, StuS mentioned that completing reporting online is in tune with all other conversions of going paperless. StuS added that with the wiki being online, he is able to access it anywhere when he is logged into Blackboard. However, StuZ pointed out that writing the chemical formulas by hand is “faster” than having to scroll up and down to access the subscript button. To her, that was time consuming. A comment was made by StuJ that she wished the wiki would have a notification reminder to remind her and her group mates of the due dates. She mentioned that the onus of reminding her classmates to meet the due dates had to be taken up by some classmates to make the writing process smooth and quipped “we are constantly chasing the procrastinators”.

5.3.2.4. Favourite Component of the Lab Wiki

StuS mentioned that he looked forward to manipulating the data obtained in the lab and presenting it in the “results and calculation” section as this ultimately is where the satisfaction lies. Whereas the reviewer role makes him think and he adds “I can't copy stuff from the lab manual because I have to have the knowledge and rephrase it to make it relevant”. StuZ mentioned that the writing and reviewing “discussions” are beneficial to link the theory to numbers while writing and reviewing “results and calculations” are beneficial to her to do well in her assessments. StuYS provided an example and mentioned that the discussion is “the flow of the experiment...like for example, Hess's Law...why it happens, how it happens, I can make a connection to what I study in class when I write about it in the discussions”.

6. Discussion

The present research noticed good student participation in the writing and reviewing of the lab wiki reports. Especially noteworthy is student engagement in the peer-reviewing process, which was not left to voluntary student participation but was pre-set by the instructor. This eliminated student absences in reviewing and editing their peers' work, which would have hindered the learning gains that accompany the peer-reviewing activities. The present research learns from Coyle (2007), who mentioned unless required, students will not volunteer to engage in peer-review. The present research also revealed that the in completing the peer-reviewing activity, students were required to explain why and reflect on their peers' wiki postings. Illana-Mahiques (2021) mentioned that there is an impact of audience awareness on a students' own writing and this element was seen when StuJ mentioned that she had to "check my work" before posting to avoid her work being corrected by the reviewer. StuS mentioned that he "learned from his mistakes" and StuA mentioned that he learned how to properly compose the aim of an experiment "after reading feedback from my reviewer". Cho and MacArthur (2010) termed this aspect as the learning-by-reviewing hypothesis, which explains that students' own writing skills may improve because of engaging in peer review. Another aspect that was demonstrated by the students (e.g., StuS, StuA and StuF) is that the reviews were beneficial to them. This addressed concerns of the value of the reviews in terms of accuracy and fairness that was previously highlighted by Kaufmann and Schunn (2010). Student responses implied that the quality of contribution (either by contributor or reviewer) was meaningful to them, thus eliminating concerns of comments being sporadic, inaccurate and not meaningful.

In the case of the present research, the role of reviewing was most times described as challenging and requiring extended research. StuS mentioned the need to have to "figure out why" and "had to research a lot"; this was echoed by StuF, who mentioned that reviewing requires the need to support or justify what is already posted. The evidence that emerged in the present research is consistent with the assertion by Illana-Mahiques (2021) that reviewing develops critical evaluation skills, identifies gaps in argument and detects inconsistencies in structure.

However, on the aspect of collaboration, the present research found that the collaboration was uneven throughout the writing process. While only a handful of students shared that they were collaborating with their classmates throughout the writing process, substantial evidence points that collaborative work was apparent in the early stages and also present were findings that indicate some students were willing to commence work on the lab wikis without informing their peers, consequently leaving their classmates to patch up what had not been done. Perhaps the task design limited interaction opportunities among students. Aydin and Yildiz (2014) highlighted that the type of task does lend a role in affecting learner interaction in wiki-based writing studies. Compounding this notion are findings from other researchers (Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993; Robinson, 2001; Skehan, 1996a), who concur that type of task affects collaboration even in non-technology supported collaborative writing. Similar detection of partial and early collaborative efforts was also reported by Hsu and Lo (2018), where beyond the outlining stage of the wiki-mediated writing activity, student collaboration was not evident. This opens up worthy areas for future research in the creation of new pedagogic strategies that can encourage non-assessable collaborative behaviours.

Up until this study, it was found that the students interviewed were new to using wikis to prepare lab reports. The students, however, had a good understanding of what a lab report is and did not bring up issues with having to learn how to write a lab report. This could be attributed to the students possessing prior knowledge of writing lab reports. However, the wiki tool used in this study was considered not user-friendly as it crashed when students were simultaneously editing the wiki and is not suited for technical writing (i.e., having to write chemical formulas or creating graphs). A study by Berthoud and Gliddon (2018), which used wikis for engineering students' Capstone projects, reported similar negative experiences of the wiki being unsuitable for uploading images and spreadsheets. In contrast, a positive experience was reported for an English Composition course, whereby the researchers did not encounter issues when wiki-mediated collaborative writing was used in an English composition course (Hsu & Lo, 2018). This points to a weakness in the present study, where the wiki tool may be beneficial for collaborative work but not if simultaneous editing and collaborative work are required. While the wiki has shown strength in supporting, tracking, and even displaying analytics of student participation when

writing collaboratively (Berhtoud & Gliddon, 2018), the use of the wiki in the present research hit a stumbling block as it required students to concurrently edit the wiki. The students were resourceful in devising alternative avenues to overcome technical issues; however, future work that requires collaboration and concurrent editing for a technical course should aim to use a different medium.

7. Conclusion

It is absolutely pivotal that students can create, communicate, collaborate, and critically appraise not only their own technical writing but what they read too. Creating habits like mindful writing and reading other students' work can bring benefits to students' own writing and cognitive abilities in thinking scientifically. The redesigning of the common chemistry lab report by incorporating elements of peer-reviewing improved students' consciousness when writing, otherwise, taken for granted when only assessed by the instructor. The findings indicate that the peer-reviewing elements, with careful design and communication to students, and when paired with proper assessment methods have tremendous potential in inculcating critical, reflective thinking and scientific literacy. Collaborativeness, while apparent, was not inherently present among all students. It is recommended when designing tasks for students, technological pedagogical matters, such as choosing the right technological medium, be given equal attention to support the constructive alignment of learning outcomes, tasks and assessments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is appreciative to all participants in this study and the invaluable comments from the reviewers and the editors.

References

- Auchincloss, L. C., Laursen, S. L., Branchaw, J. L., Eagan, K., Graham, M., Hanauer, D. I., ... & Dolan, E. L. (2014). Assessment of course-based undergraduate research experiences: a meeting report.
- Aydin, Z., & Yildiz, S. (2014). Using wikis to promote collaborative EFL writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 18(1), 160–180.
- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher education*, 32(3), 347-364.
- Bromfield Lee, D. (2018). Implementation and student perceptions on Google Docs as an electronic laboratory Notebook in organic chemistry. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 95(7), 1102-1111.
- Brownell, S. E., Price, J. V., & Steinman, L. (2013). A writing-intensive course improves biology undergraduates' perception and confidence of their abilities to read scientific literature and communicate science. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 37(1), 70-79.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (1997). Having second thoughts: Student perceptions before and after a peer assessment exercise. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22(2), 233-239.
- Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and instruction*, 20(4), 328-338.
- Cole, M. (2009). Using Wiki technology to support student engagement: Lessons from the trenches. *Computers & education*, 52(1), 141-146.
- Colthorpe, K., Chen, X., & Zimbardi, K. (2014). Peer feedback enhances a " Journal Club" for undergraduate science students that develops oral communication and critical evaluation skills. *Journal of Learning Design*, 7(2), 105-119.
- Coyle Jr, J. E. (2007). *Wikis in the College Classroom: A Comparative Study of Online and Face-to-Face Group Collaboration at a Private Liberal Arts University* (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University).

- Deiner, J. L., Newsome, D., & Samaroo, D. (2012, October 24). Directed self-inquiry: A scaffold for teaching laboratory report writing. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 89, 1511–1514.
- Dood, A. J., Johnson, L. M., & Shorb, J. M. (2018). Electronic laboratory notebooks allow for modifications in a general, organic, and biochemistry chemistry laboratory to increase authenticity of the student experience. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 95(11), 1922-1928.
- Elliott III, E. W., & Fraiman, A. (2010). Using Chem-Wiki to increase student collaboration through online lab reporting. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 87(1), 54-56.
- Evans, H. G., Heyl, D. L., & Liggitt, P. (2016). Team-based learning, faculty research, and grant writing bring significant learning experiences to an undergraduate biochemistry laboratory course. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 93(6), 1027-1033.
- Falchikov, N., & Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student peer assessment in higher education: A meta-analysis comparing peer and teacher marks. *Review of educational research*, 70(3), 287-322.
- Ge, C. (2012). Application of Wikis with Scaffolding Structure in Laboratory Reporting. *American Journal of Engineering Education*, 3(2), 89-104.
- Green, S., Keremidchieva, Z., Zimmerman, H., Rice, A., Witus, L., Rodwogin, M., & Pardini, R. (2017). Developing students' multi-modal and transferable writing skills in introductory general chemistry. *The WAC Journal*, 28(1), 106-22.
- Hesselbach, R. A., Petering, D. H., Berg, C. A., Tomasiewicz, H., & Weber, D. (2012). A guide to writing a scientific paper: A focus on high school through graduate level student research. *Zephyrus*, 9(4), 246-249.
- Hsu, H. C., & Lo, Y. F. (2018). Using wiki-mediated collaboration to foster L2 writing performance. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(3), 103-123.
- Hunter, A. B., Laursen, S. L., & Seymour, E. (2007). Becoming a scientist: The role of undergraduate research in students' cognitive, personal, and professional development. *Science education*, 91(1), 36-74.
- Illana-Mahiques, E. (2021). Re-thinking peer reviewing in the virtual context: The roles of giving and receiving online feedback in L2 Spanish classrooms. *Languages*, 6(3), 151.
- Kaufman, J. H., & Schunn, C. D. (2010). Students' perceptions about peer assessment for writing: Their origin and impact on revision work. *Instructional Science*, 39(3), 387-406.
- Lawrie, G. A., Grøndahl, L., Boman, S., & Andrews, T. (2016). Wiki laboratory notebooks: Supporting student learning in collaborative inquiry-based laboratory experiments. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 25(3), 394-409.
- Lerner, N. (2007). Laboratory lessons for writing and science. *Written Communication*, 24(3), 191–222.
- Leung, K., & Chu, S. K. W. (2009, December). Using wikis for collaborative learning: A case study of an undergraduate students' group project in Hong Kong. In *The International Conference on Knowledge Management* (pp. 1-14).
- Luckner, N., & Purgathofer, P. (2021, November). Insights from peer reviewing in large university courses. In *Proceedings of the 10th Computer Science Education Research Conference* (pp. 86-93).
- O'Donnell, M. (2014). Science writing, wikis, and collaborative learning. In J. Dougherty & T. O'Donnell (Eds.), *Web Writing: Why and How for Liberal Arts Teaching and Learning*. University of Michigan Press/Trinity College ePress.
- Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction. *Multilingual Matters*, 9-9.
- Ramsden, P. (1997). The context of learning in academic departments. *The experience of learning*, 2, 198-216.

- Rangachari, P. K., & Mierson, S. (1995). A checklist to help students analyze published articles in basic medical sciences. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 268(6), S21.
- Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied linguistics*, 22(1), 27-57.
- Romulo, C. L., Raoufi, A., Largen, K., & Reid Schwebach, J. (2018). Using Peer Review to Improve Lab Report Assignments. *The American Biology Teacher*, 80(4), 301-304.
- Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Southern Illinois University Press.
- Seals, D. R., & Tanaka, H. (2000). Manuscript peer review: A helpful checklist for students and novice referees. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 23(1), S52-58.
- Sims, G. K. (1989). Student peer review in the classroom: A teaching and grading tool. *Journal of Agronomic Education*, 18(2), 105-108.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62.
- Sluijsmans, D. M., Moerkerke, G., Van Merriënboer, J. J., & Dochy, F. J. (2001). Peer assessment in problem based learning. *Studies in educational evaluation*, 27(2), 153-173.
- Smith, H., Cooper, A., & Lancaster, L. (2002). Improving the quality of undergraduate peer assessment: A case for student and staff development. *Innovations in education and teaching international*, 39(1), 71-81.
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 153-173.
- Subramaniam, K. (2010). Integrating writing frames into inquiry-based instruction. *Science Educator*, 19(2), 31-34.
- Szteinberg, G. A., & Weaver, G. C. (2013). Participants' reflections two and three years after an introductory chemistry course-embedded research experience. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 14(1), 23-35.
- Quattrucci, J. G. (2018). Problem-based approach to teaching advanced chemistry laboratories and developing students' critical thinking skills. *Journal of Chemical Education*, 95(2), 259-266.
- Wen, M. L., & Tsai, C. C. (2006). University students' perceptions of and attitudes toward (online) peer assessment. *Higher Education*, 51(1), 27-44.
- Willmott, C. J., Clark, R. P., & Harrison, T. M. (2003). Introducing undergraduate students to scientific reports. *Bioscience Education*, 1(1), 1-8.
- Yankulov, K., & Couto, R. (2012). Peer review in class: Metrics and variations in a senior course. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education*, 40(3), 161-168.
- Yore, L. D., Florence, M. K., Pearson, T. W., & Weaver, A. J. (2006). Written discourse in scientific communities: A conversation with two scientists about their views of science, use of language, role of writing in doing science, and compatibility between their epistemic views and language. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28(2-3), 109-141.