International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education
IASCE

IASCE Newsletter Volume 31 Number 1 April 2012

Table of Contents

Dear Colleagues,

IASCE is pleased to bring you the first member newsletter of 2012.

I would like to begin by announcing our plans for the next IASCE conference. The conference, *The Transformative Power of Co-operation in Education*, will be held in Scarborough England on July 4-6, 2013. This event will mark the 35th anniversary of IASCE, and will be IASCE's 18th international conference. The conference will be hosted by the University of Hull, Faculty of Education. Wendy Joliffe, IASCE member and Head of Scarborough School of Education at the University of Hull, is the local coordinator, with help from CLADA (Co-operative Learning and Development Associates). CLADA is a UK based group that we first met at our 2002 Manchester conference; many of us first met Wendy at the 2008 conference in Torino, Italy.

The UK is experiencing rapid growth in co-operative schools and this conference should provide us with a stimulating opportunity to learn more about how these schools reflect cooperation at all levels. We will profile research and practice from around the world and celebrate excellence in the field through the IASCE Awards. We are confident that the conference will be dynamic and stimulating for researchers, practitioners, and those just wanting to know more.

For those of us who like to plan a bit of sightseeing into our travel schedules, Scarborough is a seaside resort in North Yorkshire. It is well connected by train (3 hours to London, 2 to Manchester) and bus; it is close to the ancient city of York, the evocative Yorkshire Moors, the spectacular Georgian architecture of Whitby, and the charming village of Robin Hood's Bay.

Conference details, a Request for Proposals, and information about how to nominate individuals or groups for an IASCE Award, will follow soon on the IASCE website. Please, mark your calendars.

I would like to thank Lalita Agashe and the team of board members, especially Yael Sharan, Celeste Brody, and George Jacobs, who contributed to this issue of the IASCE newsletter. As we have come to anticipate, it is an interesting compilation of news, reviews, retrospectives, and abstracts. George Jacobs provides us with a thought-provoking review of Pasi Sahlberg's book *Finnish Lessons*. In addition to learning about educational change in Finland, we are reminded that developing high-performance educational systems is a complex process embedded in context. For some reason, as I was reading, I kept picturing a layer cake. It is possible to build a good cake with just two layers of cake and something to hold them together—often icing or jam. However, lots of layers, with a variety of ingredients connecting the layers, creates a far more satisfying and memorable result. So it is with the Finnish story. The ingredients in their student layer include heterogeneous grouping, early intervention to ensure success, low anxiety and high confidence, and time for activities outside of school.

How to Subscribe to the CL List

Want to dialogue with others about your use of CL? Then, you might wish to join the CL List, an internet discussion group about cooperative learning.

Well-known CL experts as well as "just folks" belong. Currently, the CL List isn't a busy group, but when discussions do take place, they are often enlightening.

Furthermore, you can receive updates on CL related events.

To subscribe, send an email to CL_Listsubscribe@yahoogroups.com. You should very quickly receive an email reply with simple instructions.
If that fails, just send an email to george@vegetariansociety.org, and he'll do the necessary.

Talk to you soon!

Their teacher layer is characterized by high levels of professional development, teacher empowerment, and job satisfaction. Their administrative/government layers support teachers and students and are well connected with non-government agencies so that the NGOs serve as an additional, supporting layer. Connecting the layers—and providing flavor, character, and a unified whole--are the common values and deep commitment to equity, access, respect, collegiality, and cooperation.

Yael Sharan's retrospective of newsletter abstracts from the past 11 years also examines the varieties of layers, icings, and jams that have held particular interest for practitioners and researchers. Additionally, Lalita Agashe reports on a chemistry conference in India and the use of cooperation to revitalize the teaching of chemistry. The session abstracts suggest to me that cooperation is being explored and utilized as "the jam" that links students and ties things together.

Journal abstracts describe the use of collaboration to mitigate gender inequalities in science and to build confidence in the use of English as a second language; again we hear the Finnish themes of equity and confidence. The subtleties of group composition are the topic of three abstracts in this issue, and skill level, learning styles, and content experiences are each investigated as appropriate considerations for optimal grouping. Technology related abstracts include investigations of multimedia to teach both academic and interpersonal skills, the use of technical devices in large group instruction, and an interaction analysis of online learning. Teaching interactional skills is the topic of multiple abstracts, as is peer feedback. While attention to interactional skills, feedback, and reflection have long been basic tenets in multiple models of cooperative learning, determining the "how" in different contexts continues to be a useful area of investigation. As always, I've marked a few abstracts for further investigation as I depend on the IASCE newsletter to stimulate my own thinking and practice and to give me glimpses into the rich and multilayered work that is collectively known as the study of cooperation in education.

Finally, my hope is that you, our members and readers, find the IASCE newsletter useful and are able to share and apply ideas you glean throughout the layers of your own organizations. As always, thank you for your support.

Cooperatively yours,

Writing for This Newsletter

There are so many things happening world-wide related to cooperative learning! Help others find out about them by writing articles or short news items for inclusion in this newsletter, and by submitting abstracts of published work for inclusion in the *From the Journals* section of the newsletter. Short pieces (1000 words or less) are preferred.

The newsletter appears three times a year. Please email submissions or questions about them to the editor of the IASCE Newsletter, Lalita Agashe, at lalitaagashe@gmail.com. Put "IASCE Newsletter" on the Subject line of the email, please.

Thank you for your submissions.

Lynda Baloche

IASCE Co-President *Interviewed by Celeste M. Brody*

Lynda Baloche is Professor of Education at West Chester University, Pennsylvania, USA where she teaches both undergraduate and graduate courses in group processes in the classroom, cooperative learning, creativity, arts integration, and reflective practices. The author of numerous articles in scholarly journals and the text, *The Cooperative Classroom: Empowering Learning* (1998, Prentice Hall), she enjoys working with faculty, teachers and administrators who are committed to developing collaborative classroom communities. In 2008 she received the West Chester University' Council of Trustees Achievement Award for her unique contributions to the area of cooperation in education.

What initially attracted you to cooperative learning?

I first became interested in cooperative learning in the mid 1970's when I was a young, elementary-level music teacher. I didn't know I was interested in cooperative learning; what I knew was that the children found each other a lot more interesting than they found me and the lessons I was trying to teach. I worked with about 600 children—ages 6 to 12. I had lots of opportunity—and need—to learn. Every 30-40 minutes, I pushed a piano and a cart of music supplies into a different classroom; every 30-40 minutes I saw how different children responded and how different seating patterns and teacher expectations impacted what I was trying to do. After two years, I got a room of my own. The school didn't have enough kid furniture for the room and I asked them not to get any. Instead I got a pile of carpet samples and, pretty soon, it was me and the children on the floor. We danced, we sang, I tried to figure things out. I enrolled in a graduate course in dance therapy. I loved it. I asked the professor about ideas for study in graduate school. She was very perceptive and helped me realize that it was the group processes that interested me. Soon I enrolled in a class at Temple University in group processes and soon I was surrounded by professors who had studied with Herbert Thelen and Ned Flanders; professors who referenced Kurt Lewin, Morton Deutsch, and Ron Lippitt in everyday conversation. Ah, I thought, now I can really figure out what's going on in my own classroom!

Did you do other training in cooperative learning during this time that helped you answer your pragmatic questions of how to actually *implement* CL?

My classroom wasn't "normal." I had 10 year olds working in groups of 4 to write librettos and "score" their own music for operas based on *The Brementown Musicians*. We collected junk and transformed an entire classroom into a series of found instruments and then created maps (scores) to "play" the room. I kept reading group theory and trying to figure out my classroom. One day I read an article by David and Roger Johnson of the University of Minnesota. I realized that people already knew what I've been trying to figure out. Soon, I enrolled in a five-day workshop with David and Roger. That week opened up a new world to me. Subsequently I went to Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore for three days to work with Robert Slavin's trainers.

You have done considerable writing and teaching on the connections between cooperative learning and creativity. How did that nexus occur for you?

Somewhere during my formative period as a teacher, I read an article by the creativity researcher Paul Torrance. I wrote him to ask him to expand on a comment he made about group processes, quality circles, and creativity. He told me it had really been just a comment. This led me to think that there wasn't a lot of literature exploring the intersection of creativity and cooperation. (This was before Teresa Amabile published *The Social Psychology of Creativity* in 1983). So I kept going, and focused my thinking on both cooperative learning and creativity. I wrote a dissertation on this topic. Then, West Chester University, where I am now, was looking for someone to teach courses in creativity to pre-service and in-service teachers. That was the perfect opportunity.

How did you become acquainted with IASCE?

In 1990, I went to a conference in California sponsored by The Child Development Project. It was fabulous. It was the first time I saw presenters working as integrated cooperative teams. I presented my ideas about creativity and cooperation. My presentation was scheduled for the final hour of the last day. I thought no one would come.

Much to my amazement people did come and I got kind and good feedback about the connections I was making; this feedback was critical to my development. I met Nan and Ted Graves, the editors of IASCE's *Cooperative Learning Magazine.* They told me about the summer IASCE conference in Baltimore USA (1990). I went; it was huge. I spent a great day in a workshop with Yael Sharan, co-author of *Group Investigation in the Classroom*. Soon I traveled to a one-day event with Spencer Kagan sponsored by MAACIE (Mid-Atlantic Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education). I experienced how Spencer created a highly-organized interactive workshop for 400 teachers. Regional conferences (especially GLACIE [Great Lakes Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education]) and IASCE conferences became great opportunities to learn more, to get helpful feedback on my own work, and to meet wonderful colleagues.

You wrote the internationally recognized book, *The Cooperative Classroom.* What motivated you to write this book?

As I worked with preservice and inservice teachers, both in the university and in their classroom settings, my lens changed and sharpened and I *saw* classrooms and learning as interactional possibilities. Even when children were sitting quietly and reading, I was able to see how individual reading was transformed (or not) by what came before or after. The teachers were very giving of their time and ideas, and several of the articles I wrote at that time were directly linked with their work. As I became more comfortable, I was able to listen more deeply to the questions teachers and children asked and began to consider what frameworks might help them answer these questions. I looked around at what "initiatives" were taking hold in schools that were supporting teachers or competing for their precious time. I wanted a resource that would pull together several views of cooperative learning—and would do so in a way that was a bit academic, which meant, in my mind, acknowledging the antecedent thinkers and teachers. I think we all need to be reminded that good ideas come from somewhere and build on something—they aren't magic.

I found that the Johnsons' conceptual model provided a solid foundation for teachers' thinking and development. James Banks' model for multicultural education was just as important. Group development and community building were fundamental and I thought Will Schutz's model (inclusion, control, affection) would be helpful and accessible. As I listened to teachers, I realized that many of their questions could be framed in terms of lesson design. (I have found Spencer Kagan's work in "domain of usefulness," in relation to structures, to be helpful work in this area.) Therefore, I knew I needed to build a design frame into my own work. So, there I had it: an eclectic view of cooperative learning that was situated within a five component model, with overlapping frames of multicultural education, group development theory, and lesson design. The actual writing took two years. It was another great learning opportunity related to cooperative learning—and also about creative processes as I monitored and developed my own writing habits.

What holds promise for your future work in cooperative learning?

The world of cooperative learning has expanded so much in the past decade. Electronic communication has facilitated a truly international view. For instance, exciting work is being done examining context, cultural variations, and the subtleties of dialogue. I depend on the IASCE Newsletter to help me keep up with trends. Teacher education has been another fruitful area of study. In addition to IASCE's own book (2004: *Teaching Cooperative Learning: The Challenges of Teacher Education*), a recent ERIC (Education Resource Information Center) search yielded 240 articles, written in English between 2000-2011, related to cooperative learning and teacher education.

Even as our work deepens and expands, many of us feel the threats of government mandates, shrinking budgets, and initiatives that could move us away from cooperation. In my professional life, I have spent significant time serving on curricular bodies, developing assessment plans, and writing reports for regional and national accreditation boards. Sometimes I ask myself why, but I know why. The university where I work prepares the largest number of teachers in the region. This work has been an opportunity for me to help ensure that the language of cooperation and creativity remain in our curricula and instruction and remain evidenced in our data and reporting processes. Every situation can be an opportunity to learn, to teach, and to work with others, and I continue to seek new opportunities and perspectives.

Finland: Cooperation Beyond the Small Group in the Classroom

George Jacobs reviews Pasi Sahlberg's Book

Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

This book documents changes in Finland over the past 40 years, changes which are credited with enabling Finnish students, since 2000, to achieve top scores in international comparison tests, such as PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) - http://www.pisa.oecd.org.

The book says little about cooperative learning, other than to state on page 34 that Finland adopted CL relatively early and that many teachers there use it. So, why review the book for the IASCE Newsletter? The book fully deserves a place in this newsletter, because it looks at cooperation beyond small groups of students working together in classrooms. It examines cooperation among students in a broader realm, as well as cooperation among teachers, between teachers and administrators, between people with school age children and those without, and between different socio-economic groups in society.

Before looking at the various types of cooperation in Finnish society, the book's author should be introduced. Pasi Salhberg - www.pasisahlberg.com - Director General of the Centre for International Mobility and Cooperation at the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture, and the son of Finnish school teachers, a former Finnish school teacher himself, and a former staff member at the World Bank and European Commission, is uniquely positioned to explain the Finnish phenomenon to the outside world, as he possesses both an insider's knowledge of Finnish education and the experience of explaining and debating Finnish education with many thousands of curious outsiders, both those who have visited Finland to see education in action there and those who have attended the 250+ talks Pasi has given abroad or who have read, seen, or listened to the 100+ interviews he has done. Last but not least, Pasi is a long serving member of the IASCE board.

Types of cooperation in Finnish society

Let us look at the various forms of cooperation in Finnish society, starting with cooperation among students. In addition to the use of CL, Finland encourages student-student cooperation in several other ways. One, a wide network exists of youth associations and sports clubs with links to the school curriculum. Students have time to participate in these because Finnish schools give little homework (about 30 minutes or less a day) and after school classes, either at school or elsewhere, are not common. Two, competition among students is lessened by the fact that only one high stakes exam takes place, the university entrance exam.

Three, as during the first nine years of schooling, students in Finland are not tracked, a.k.a., streamed, students are not segregated from one another based on past achievement levels. No doubt, CL plays an important role in helping unstreamed classes succeed for the low, middle, and high achievers. Four, early intervention programmes assist students who face difficulties with the school curriculum. Perhaps, due to this intervention, in the first nine years of school, only about 2% of students need to repeat grades. The grade repetition rate is much higher in many other countries, e.g., 25% in Germany and Switzerland.

After reading the evidence about student life in Finnish schools presented in the two preceding paragraphs, readers will not be surprised to learn that students in Finland appear to experience relatively low anxiety levels, e.g., 7% feel anxious on mathematics tasks. In contrast, students in many other countries report much more anxiety, e.g., 53% of French students feel anxious on similar mathematics tasks. Finnish students' lower anxiety might promote an atmosphere conducive to student-student cooperation.

Cooperation among teachers also receives encouragement in Finland. First of all, teachers have more time to cooperate with their peers, because they teach about 600 hours per year, far fewer hours than their counterparts in many other countries. For example, lower secondary school teachers in the U.S. log about 1080 teaching hours annually. Furthermore, Finnish teachers are not ranked and do not compete against each other for merit pay or other forms of competitive rewards. Thus, the emphasis lies on teacher collegiality and professionalism, not on individual teacher excellence and teacher accountability.

Finland also strives for cooperation between teachers, on one hand, and administrators and other government officials, on the other hand. This cooperation begins by attracting top students into teaching and then giving them all free university education (indeed, in Finland, university education is free to all, regardless of what is studied) through to graduate school education programmes which highlight research. In fact, all Finnish teachers, from kindergarten to university, have at least a master's degree. This attraction to teaching among top secondary school students is possible not because Finnish teachers are especially well paid, but because of the high status they enjoy in Finnish society.

Once Finnish teachers begin their careers, they seem to enjoy their work, as indicated by the low attrition rate among teachers, a stark contrast to high teacher attrition rates in other countries. Among the factors leading to most teachers remaining in the profession long term is that teachers are trusted to do their work without close supervision. Also, teachers are encouraged to exercise their professional judgement to design curriculum in cooperation with peers. This cooperation among teachers and between teachers and administrators sets a good example for students and for society as a whole.

Education in Finland is seen as a social good. Thus, it enjoys broad support among the public, not just among those with school age children. As a result, all schooling is public and free of charge from kindergarten through university, including graduate school. Furthermore, many links exist between schools and NGOs, indicative of a high level of public participation in education.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the Finnish story lies in the country's effort to grow a democratic, egalitarian society, with public education acting as a key driver. While many countries have jumped aboard the Private Education bandwagon, Finland continues to thrive with public education. One of the most surprising statistics in the book concerned between-school variance in PISA scores. In the 2009 PISA study of student reading levels, Finland recorded 7% between-school variance, whereas the average variance in OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) - http://www.oecd.org – countries was 42% (OECD countries tend to be the world's more economically developed countries).

On page 6 of his book, Pasi highlights Finland's success via public education as the key "Finnish Lesson" (the book's title): "[W]e should listen to the story of Finland because it gives hope to those who are losing their faith in public education and whether it can be changed. This book reveals that the transformation of educational systems is possible, but that it takes time, patience, and determination."

Conclusion

This is the part of a book review in which reviewers often make constructive criticisms. Here are two. First, Pasi recounts that during a visit to Finland, Howard Gardner, the developer of Multiple Intelligences theory, questioned whether the current system of international comparison exams, exams on which Finland ranks so highly, neglects too many important educational outcomes. For instance, these exams do not measure students' level of empathy, their physical abilities or their level of action on behalf of the environment and non human animals. Gardner's point seems valid, but it does not diminish Finland's accomplishment; it only limits it, while calling on the international education community to develop and deploy measures of a wider range of valued outcome variables.

Second, in the book, Pasi describes not only Finland's successes in education but also in economics, i.e., how Finland transformed itself from a largely agrarian society, ravaged by World War II, into a modern Information Age economy. Indeed, the book's penultimate chapter is titled "The Finnish Way: Competitive Welfare State." The chapter reminds me of cooperative learning techniques which utilize within group cooperation and between group competition. Thus, it seems that people in Finland cooperate with one another so that Finland can succeed internationally, e.g., so that Nokia can sell more phones at a higher profit margin than can Samsung or Sony Ericsson.

This competition between economies brings to mind one of the nine ways to promote positive interdependence explained by David and Roger Johnson. The Johnsons call it External Challenge Positive Interdependence, i.e., people cooperate to overcome a challenge from outside their group, whether it be a sports team trying to defeat

another team or a team of scientists cooperating with one another to find a way to deal with bird flu. Please note that this external challenge need not involve defeating other people or countries and it could involve everyone working together to overcome another type of challenge, such as raising PISA scores internationally or lowering meat consumption worldwide.

Perhaps Pasi did not have space in his excellent book to delve into all the ways that Finnish students and other Finns work together with people in other countries to promote the general welfare. And, certainly by promoting the Finnish alternative for education, Finland and Pasi are doing the world a great service. The many visits to Finland by educators from around the world and the many articles in praise of Pasi's book, e.g., http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2012/mar/08/schools-we-can-envy, attest to the fact that many educators seek to put into practice the Finnish Lessons taught in the book. At the end of his book, Pasi confidently concludes, "As a countervailing force against the global education-reform movement driving school systems around the world, the Finnish Way reveals that creative curricula, autonomous teachers, courageous leadership and high performance go together. … The evidence is clear and so should be the road ahead" (pp. 144-145).

CL Makes its Presence Felt at a National Chemistry Conference in India

By Lalita Agashe

23rd through 25th February were three busy days for the staff and the students of the chemistry department of Progressive Education Society's Modern College, Pune, India. They were engaged in organizing the national conference on 'Perspectives in Chemical Sciences'. India is attempting vigorously to revitalize its science education, especially in the higher education sector and the organizers' enthusiasm spoke of their sincere efforts in this direction. 140 participants, with 100 students, participated in this collaborative endeavour.

A remarkable aspect of the conference was the wide spectrum of topics covered, that included innovative methods of chemistry education, industry-related dimensions of chemistry and research frontiers in chemistry. On all three days the large number of students and teachers enjoyed the opportunity to listen to and communicate with the eminent speakers from the fields of education, research and industry and present their own research papers and posters.

Dr. Natu of the Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Pune, elaborated on various aspects of student centric, experiential teaching-learning approaches. Dr. S. Ladage of Homi Bhabha Centre for Science Education suggested cooperative learning as one important method, among various exploratory and participatory methods to be incorporated in chemistry classrooms.

Conference organizing secretary Dr. Mrs. Sushama Joag, Dr. Lalita Agashe, IASCE Board Member and Dr. Manisha Bora gave oral presentations. Coincidentally, all the three oral presentations cited the classroom use of cooperative learning in different contexts of higher education. Here are the abstracts of the three presentations.

Enhancing Student Participation in Undergraduate Chemistry Classes through Co-operative Learning

By Joag S.D, Associate Professor, Department of Chemistry, P. E. S.'s Modern College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Pune

The process of education in undergraduate science classes faces many problems including lack of motivation and interest on the part of the students. An experiment using a new pedagogic method, "Co-operative Learning" was carried out in the S.Y B.Sc. and T.Y B.Sc. chemistry classes within the framework of a rigid syllabus and time constraints. These experiments gave positive results regarding student's interest in learning the subject matter, attendance of the students in the class, concept clarity, student -teacher rapport and initiative of student's in self

study. In this experiment a set of multiple choice questions, based on a chapter already discussed in the class, was given to students as a home assignment. It included carefully designed questions at different difficulty levels (25% easy, 50% moderate, 25% difficult). The assessment was done in the class using Cooperative Learning where students' participation was important. Common problems such as low attendance and passivity associated with students' responses to home assignment were found to be totally missing in this experiment. On the other hand, the main purpose of education, i.e. clarification of concepts, was fulfilled, as the students enthusiastically participated in discussing the reasons behind the right and wrong responses for each question. The success of the experiment was also assessed by doing the usual result analysis.

Reaching Out to Every Student in the Higher Education Classroom through Cooperative Learning

Abstract of the invited talk on teaching methodology by Lalita Agashe

Reaching out to every student in the classroom is the primary goal of a teacher. Using a teaching-learning methodology based on sound pedagogical principles increases the chances of effective communication between teacher and students. Yet the opportunity is rarely available for educators in higher education in India, as formal teacher training is not required for teachers in most of the disciplines of higher education, including chemistry education. This presentation aims to provide a glimpse of one of the most researched (Barkley, Cross & Major, 2005) and promising pedagogical approach known as Cooperative Learning. Every teacher in higher education can easily implement it to supplement the traditional lecture method, and experience its benefits for the students and oneself, through active engagement in learning. The presentation also includes the dimensions of the necessary shift in the teacher's beliefs (Brody, 1998) that facilitate successful implementation of cooperative learning. Touching upon some parallel challenges, I present a case study illustrating effective use of the cooperative approach for teaching research methodology in chemistry at the post graduate level (Agashe and Deshpande, 2011). The case study also highlights the role of 'cooperation within' an individual, supported by the ancient Indian science of Yoga (Krishnamurti, 2010; Vinod 2004; Vivekananda 1957), in managing the cooperative classroom. Further research in the use of cooperative learning in specific contexts can throw more light on its effectiveness in higher education in India.

Cooperative Games: An innovative way of teaching and learning

By Manisha Bora, Dept. of Chemistry, Bhartiya Jain Sanghtna's Arts, Science and Commerce College, Wagholi

It is essential that the present young generation be aware of core values in order to make choices, judgments and decisions more intelligently and meaningfully. Through cooperative games and play students learn to share, empathize with others' feelings, and get along better; they fear losing and are more confident and relaxed while learning cooperatively. This has a further positive effect on learning. Students who have become bored by traditional methods of learning may become interested in learning once again. The student-teacher relationship can improve because the student is more successful. For complex topics where many heads are better than one or two, you may want to have students work in groups of three or more. As the term "cooperative learning" suggests, students working in groups will help each other learn and avoid the embarrassment of students who have not yet mastered all of the skills required for answering or asking questions. I introduced some games in chemistry classes which are based on cooperative learning. It was found that with these games students were interested in the subject and in the activities performed, they were alert and worked in teams to solve the queries in the games. This also improved their self confidence and team mates motivated each other.

Compiled by George Jacobs and Lalita Agashe

Annamma, S., Eppolito, A., Klingner, J., Boele, A., Boardman, A., &. Stillman-Spisak, S. J. (2011). Collaborative strategic reading: Fostering success for all. *Voices from the Middle, 19*(2), 27-32.

The authors interviewed 17 middle school reading and language arts teachers as part of a larger study on an evidence-based intervention called Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). CSR is a multi-component reading instructional model combined with cooperative grouping and peer discussion. We show from the teacher interviews that CSR has benefits for all middle school students, especially those historically at risk for school failure, including English Language Learners, struggling learners, and students designated with a special education label. The teachers' perceived benefits for these students included additional oral language exposure for ELLs through interaction with peers, access to different levels of text for students in special education, and explicit strategy instruction for struggling learners. The teachers also commented on CSR's positive impact on their classroom communities: CSR fostered cooperation, built students' confidence and self-esteem, and facilitated increased student engagement.

Arrigo M., Kukulska-Humne A., Arnedilli-Sanchez I, and Kismihok G. (2012). Meta-analysis from a collaborative project in mobile lifelong learning. *British Educational Research Journal*. iFirst article, 1-26. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01411926.2011.652068 doi: 10.1080/01411926.2011.652068

This paper focuses on the use of mobile technologies in relation to the aims of the European Union's Lifelong Learning programme. First, we explain the background to the notion of mobile lifelong learning. We then present a methodological framework to analyse and identify good practices in mobile lifelong learning, based on the outcomes of the MOTILL project ('Mobile Technologies in Lifelong Learning: Best Practices'). In particular, we give an account of the methodology adopted to carry out meta-analyses of published literature and accounts of mobile learning experiences. Furthermore, we present the results of an implementation of our Evaluation Grid and the implications arising from it in terms of management, pedagogy, policies and ethical issues. Finally, we discuss lessons learnt and future work.

Chan C.K.K. (2012). Co-regulation of learning in computer-supported collaborative learning environments: A discussion. *Metacognition And Learning.* Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/y8q527282254r143 doi: 10.1007/s11409-012-9086-z

This discussion paper for this special issue examines co-regulation of learning in computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) environments extending research on self-regulated learning in computer based environments. The discussion employs a socio-cognitive perspective focusing on social and collective views of learning to examine how students co-regulate and collaborate in computer-supported inquiry. Following the review of the articles, theoretical, methodological and instructional implications are discussed: Future research directions include examining the theoretical nature of collective regulation and social metacognition in building models of co-regulated learning; expanding methodological approaches using trace data and multiple measures for convergence and construct validity; and conducting instructional experiments to test and to foster the development of co-regulated learning in computer-supported collaborative inquiry.

Esiobu, G. O. (2011). Achieving gender equity in science class: Shift from competition to cooperative learning. *Multicultural Education & Technology Journal, 5*(4), 244-257.

This study aims to verify the impact of cooperative learning as an intervention strategy towards the achievement of peace, equality and equity in the science classroom as part of the democratic process necessary for sustainable development. The study sample comprised 56 SSS 2 students in one public co-educational secondary school in Lagos State. Using a students' gender equity and peace questionnaire, results indicate that cooperative learning is effective in achieving a good measure of equity and peace between sexes in the biology classroom.

Furthermore, cooperative learning was observed not to have differential impact on students of different ability levels with respect to their achievement of gender equity in the biology classroom. The study concludes that cooperative learning mode is a gender friendly interaction pattern for all and should be encouraged at the secondary school level in order to empower all students to begin early to imbibe democratic values and behaviors necessary for peaceful coexistence and sustainable development. The study provides a unique insight into cooperative learning and gender equity in Lagos, Nigeria.

Fushino, K. (2011). Students' reactions to a group project in a university English-as-a-foreign-language class for cultural understanding. *Intercultural Education, 22*(4), 301–316.

This paper introduces and analyzes a cooperative learning (CL) group survey project implemented in a freshman university English-as-a-foreign-language class focused on intercultural communication and taught at a co-ed university in the Tokyo metropolitan area in the spring semester, 2008. The project consisted of three phases, with students working in heterogeneously formed groups for an entire semester. In Phase 1, the students learned basic discussion and CL skills. In Phase 2, each group conducted a class survey on a group-selected topic in the field of intercultural communication, analyzed the results and presented their findings. Similar procedures were repeated in Phase 3, except that this time students interviewed foreigners outside the university and were required to work on more demanding tasks. At the end of the semester, the students filled out a reflective questionnaire and their responses were quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. Interviewing classmates and foreigners helped the students develop confidence in their English ability and broaden their cultural perspectives. In addition, they showed cooperative behavior and analytical ability. English had become a real means of communication. This hands-on experience helped them begin to shift from knowledge consumers to knowledge producers. They also experienced the power of true cooperation.

Jackson, D. O. (2011). Convergent and divergent computer-mediated communication tasks in an English for Academic Purposes course. *TESL-EJ, 15*(3), 1-18.

This article describes the implementation of technology-mediated tasks in an English for academic purposes (EAP) curriculum at a Japanese university. The course addressed the needs of English majors at the school by enabling more efficient completion of academic work, including essay writing. One way that technology supported this goal was through tasks conducted via a chat module integrated into the Moodle course management system (http://moodle.org/). A classroom-based study was designed to evaluate the potential of convergent and divergent tasks to promote the development of second language competence through computer -mediated communication (CMC). During class, dyads completed two tasks via chat. Building on past research in face-to-face settings, quantitative and qualitative analyses of the discourse were conducted. Results are discussed in terms of the similarities and differences between these findings in CMC situations and those of the aforementioned research carried out in face-to-face settings. Implications for second language pedagogy, as well as methodological limitations, are discussed in the conclusion.

Kyprianidou, M., Demetriadis, S., Tsiatsos, T., & Pombortsis, A. (2012). Group formation based on learning styles: Can it improve students' teamwork? *Educational Technology Research and Development,* 83-110. doi:10.1007/s11423-011-9215-4

This work explores the impact of teacher-led heterogeneous group formation on students' teamwork, based on students' learning styles. Fifty senior university students participated in a project-based course with two key organizational features: first, a web system (PEGASUS) was developed to help students identify their learning styles and distribute them to heterogeneous groups. Second, group facilitation meetings were introduced as a technique to help students reflect on their weak/strong traits and employ appropriate roles in their group. The study research questions focused mainly on students' attitudes regarding the learning style-based group formation approach. By applying qualitative research method students' views were recorded about the impact of styles awareness and group heterogeneity on group collaboration and possible benefits and drawbacks related to the style-based grouping approach. Evaluation data revealed that students gradually overcame their initial

reservations for the innovative group formation method and were highly benefited since styles heterogeneity within the group emphasized complementarities and pluralism in students' ways of thinking. Overall, this work provides evidence that the adoption of learning styles theories in practice can be facilitated by systems for automated group formation and supportive group facilitation meetings that help avoiding the trivial and discouraging approach of using learning styles to simply label students.

Kuester, D. A., & Zental, S. S. (2011). Social interaction rules in cooperative learning groups for students at risk for ADHD. *Learning, Instruction, and Cognition, 80*(1), 69-95.

This study assessed the effects of providing social participation rules on the performance and social behavior of a school-based sample of 10–14-year-old students at risk for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (n = 34) who worked cooperatively in same-gender triads with typical peers (n = 92). The design was primarily a 2 (population group) × 2 (gender) × 2 (type of triads: with or without a group member at risk) × 2 (task condition: with or without the social rules of turn-taking, response justification). The authors found that social interactive rules reduced negative verbal and off-task behavior, which was attributable to students at risk for attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and improved the percentage of problems solved for all children, which was attributable to boys and to middle school students. The intervention was discussed in terms of its practicality and educational importance.

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., Logan, M., & Cheung, A. (2011). Effects of cooperative writing with embedded multimedia: A randomized experiment. *Effective Education, 3*(1), 1-9.

The present study represented an effort to improve on the outcomes of the Puma (2006) study by creating a writing process program that provided students with compelling video models of effective writing practices in small writing teams. In this method, called Writing Wings with Media (WWM), students worked in 4-member, heterogeneous writing groups to help one another plan, draft, revise, edit, and publish compositions, as in the earlier Writing Wings program. However, in WWM, students were shown a series of humorous, professionally designed puppet skits in which a four-member writing team learns to use writing process elements in a variety of genres. The idea was to communicate directly to the students themselves (as well as to teachers) a vision of how to work in writing teams, in hopes that this would help teachers implement the program with greater fidelity and build enthusiasm and strategic insights among students. The theory of action for the embedded multimedia aspect of Writing Wings with Media focused on the problem of transfer from workshop to classroom (see Joyce, Calhoun, & Hopkins, 1999; Joyce & Showers, 2002). The idea was that instead of teaching teachers to use writing process methods and then hope that they could communicate them to children, the videos would go directly to teachers and students at the same time, demonstrating key behaviors and ideas for effective writing. The study took place in 22 high-poverty schools located in 11 states (Florida, Hawaii, Texas, Louisiana, Illinois, Mississippi, New Mexico, Washington, Wisconsin, Ohio, and Oregon). The findings of this randomized evaluation of Writing Wings with Media indicate small positive effects on ratings of students' compositions at posttest, controlling for pretest measures. The magnitude of the gains in effect sizes are modest, ranging from +0.07 to +0.18, but it is interesting to note that the mean gain from third to fourth grade in the control group was only +0.13 for Style, +0.22 for Ideas and Organization, and +0.29 for Mechanics. From a practical perspective, the findings of the study of Writing Wings with Media suggest that schools can improve writing outcomes for children in the upper-elementary grades using a writing process approach that emphasizes cooperative learning and adds regular video demonstrations of the writing process as played out in various genres.

Moreno J., Ovalle D.A. and Vicari R.M. (2012). A genetic algorithm approach for group formation in collaborative learning considering multiple student characteristics. *Computers and Education, 58* (1), 560-569. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131511002284http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360131511002284

Considering that group formation is one of the key processes in collaborative learning, the aim of this paper is to propose a method based on a genetic algorithm approach for achieving inter-homogeneous and intra-heterogeneous groups. The main feature of such a method is that it allows for the consideration of as many student characteristics as may be desired, translating the grouping problem into one of multi-objective

considering three characteristics: an estimate of student knowledge levels, an estimate of student communicative skills, and an estimate of student leadership skills. Results of such an experiment allowed for the validation, not only from the computational point of view by measuring the algorithmic performance, but also from the pedagogical point of view by measuring student outcomes, and comparing them with two traditional group formation strategies: random and self-organized.

Mulcahy, R. S. (2012). The effects of experience grouping on achievement, satisfaction, and problem-solving discourse in professional technical training. *Educational Technology, Research and Development, 60,* 15-29. *doi*: 10.1007/s11423-011-9203-8

When a course designed around cooperative, problem-centered instruction attracts learners with a wide range of experience in the topic, should learners be grouped heterogeneously or homogeneously in terms of their relative expertise? In this study, learners were randomly distributed between the two types of groups; learning gains, satisfaction, and problem-solving discourse were compared. Overall, no significant differences were found between heterogeneous and homogeneous groups. However, groups solving relatively ill-structured problems exchanged significantly more elaborated explanations than groups solving relatively well-structured problems.

O'Brien, C., & Wood, C. L. (2011). Video modelling of cooperative discussion group behaviors with students with learning disabilities in a secondary content-area classroom. *Journal of Special Education Technology, 26*(4), 25-40.

Peer-mediated instructional strategies such as cooperative learning are commonly used in general education classrooms in secondary schools; however, students with disabilities often lack the group interaction and discussion skills necessary to fully benefit from evidence-based interventions. The present study used a multiple baseline across participants design to evaluate the use of video modeling to promote the cooperative behaviors and higher level discussion skills of high school students with learning disabilities participating in a Numbered Heads Together (NHT) group discussion strategy in a secondary social studies class. Results indicate that the simple technological intervention of video modeling effectively and efficiently promoted the use of group social skills and discussion skills among students with learning problems who experience difficulty with peer-mediated instructional strategies in secondary content-area classes.

Schul, J. E. (2011). Revisiting an old friend: The practice and promise of cooperative learning for the twenty-first century. *Social Studies, 102*(2), 88-93.

Cooperative learning has long been at the disposal of school teachers. However, it is often misunderstood by some teachers as just another form of collaborative group work. This article revisits cooperative learning, including a sampling of its popular variation, with practical approaches toward effectively integrating it into classroom instruction. Moreover, this article highlights the promise that cooperative learning holds for democratic education in the twenty-first century with special attention paid to its social implications.

Snášel V., Abraham A., Martinovi, Dráždilová P., Slaninová K., Daradoumis T., Martiínez-Monés A. (2012). A layered framework for collaborative learning interactions. *Evaluating On-Line.* Retrieved on 28.2.2012 from http://tutorial.softcomputing.net/jctn2012_snasel.pdf

Evaluating on-line collaborative learning interactions is a complex task due to the variety of elements and factors that take place and intervene in the way a group of students comes together to collaborate in order to achieve a learning goal. The aim of this paper is to provide a better understanding of group interaction and determine how to best support the collaborative learning process. We propose a generic framework for the study and analysis of group interaction and group scaffolding, which is built by combining different aspects and issues of collaboration, learning and evaluation. In particular, we define learning activity indicators at several levels of description, which prompt to the application of a mixed interaction analysis scheme and the use of different data types and specific tools. At an initial layer, the basis of the approach is set by applying a qualitative process for evaluating the individual and group task performance as well as the group functioning and scaffolding. The interaction analysis

process is completed by defining and applying two more layers: a social network analysis of the group activity and participation behavior and a quantitative analysis of group effectiveness as regards task achievement and active interaction involvement. Our work defines a grounded and holistic conceptual model that describes on-line collaborative learning interactions sufficiently and applies it in a real, web-based, complex and long-term collaborative learning situation. An in-depth empirical evaluation of the conceptual model is fully discussed, which demonstrates the usefulness and value of the approach.

Stockall, N. (2011). Cooperative groups: Engaging elementary students with pragmatic language impairments. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 44*(2), 18-25.

Continued research is needed related to students with specific learning disabilities and pragmatic language issues and how they contribute in groups. Currently, there is limited empirical research on the precise nature of the communication that occurs in classroom-based groups. For children with language impairments, full engagement depends upon the degree to which they can use social language to gain entrance into a group and sustain the ongoing interaction. Without explicit instruction in pragmatic language skills, children with language impairments will have difficulty moving from being unengaged to full engagement. Teachers and therapists can work together to integrate pragmatic skills into existing structures of cooperative group learning. Only then will students with language impairments gain an equitable chance to benefit from the complex and rich communication of classroom-based groups.

Strom, P. S., & Strom, R. D. (2011). Teamwork skills assessment for cooperative learning. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 17*(4), 233-251.

Teamwork skills are required at work, but teacher efforts in many countries to track achievement within this context have been hindered by lack of assessment tools and input from students. The Teamwork Skills Inventory relies on peer and self-evaluation to establish accountability, identify competencies, and detect learning needs. Twenty-five items state the criteria students refer to in reporting observations about whether individual members of their cooperative learning group attend to teamwork, seek and share information, communicate with teammates, think critically and creatively, and get along with teammates. Ways to prepare students for authentic assessment and to process anonymous feedback from peers are discussed. A field test of 303 high school students and teachers determined validity and reliability. Students were able to recognize team skills as well as deficits of peers, and gender differences in competencies were acknowledged. A portfolio record of team skills enables teachers across subjects to apply united interventions.

Szewkis, E., Nussbaum, M., Rosen, T., & Abalos, J. (2011). Collaboration within large groups in the classroom. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning, 6*(4), 561-575. doi: 10.1007/s11412-011-9123-y

The purpose of this paper is to show how a large group of students can work collaboratively in a synchronous way within the classroom using the cheapest possible technological support. Making use of the features of Single Display Groupware and of Multiple Mice we propose a computer-supported collaborative learning approach for big groups within the classroom. The approach uses a multiple classification matrix and our application was built for language-learning (in this case Spanish). The basic collaboration mechanism that the approach is based upon is "silent collaboration," in which students--through suggestions and exchanges--must compare their ideas to those of their classmates. An exploratory experimental study was performed along with a quantitative and qualitative study that analyzed ease of use of the software, described how the conditions for collaborative learning were achieved, evaluated the achievements in learning under the defined language objectives, and analyzed the impact of silent and spoken collaboration. Our initial findings are that silent collaboration proved to be an effective mechanism to achieve learning in large groups in the classroom.

Vanderhaegen, F. (2012). Cooperation and learning to increase the autonomy of ADAS**.** *Cognition, Technology & Work, 14*(1), 61-69.

This paper discusses on the cooperation and the learning processes to increase the autonomy of a human–machine system or an artificial or human agent. The autonomy is defined as the capacity for a system or an agent to fend alone. It is described in terms of competences and the limits of these competences. Cooperation and learning aim then at increasing the competences or managing the system limits. The management of the autonomy is detailed through different structures of cooperation. It concerns the sharing control between systems or between agents in order to recover their limits. Different classes of learning processes are proposed: the mimicry-based approaches, the dysfunction-based ones, and the wait-and-see-based ones. Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) are usually designed integrating cooperation characteristics. Two case studies about the use of cooperative ADAS are then proposed. They are hypothetical scenarios that are discussed to introduce possible future ADAS perspective implementing competences such as learning or cooperative learning.

Wafaa S. Al-Yaseen. (2011). Expectations of a group of primary school teachers trained on cooperative learning on the possibility of successful implementations. *Education, 132(2), 273-284.*

This present study examines the opinions of a trained group of primary stage teachers on cooperative learning seeking the possibility of a successful implementation. The twenty participants received 25 training hours delivered in five working days. The trainees were introduced to the concept of cooperative learning, its advantages, the social part involved in, and the basic elements of cooperative learning. Towards the end of the program, teachers presented micro-teachings for discussion and feedback. Post the micro-teaching, the participants responded to a questionnaire composed of twenty six items representing teaching competencies and social skills which teachers and students could benefit from. The results highlight teachers' positive expectations when implementing cooperative learning, and draw the attention of the Ministry of Education to the necessary steps to guarantee that.

Zheng, C. (2012). Understanding the learning process of peer feedback activity: An ethnographic study of Exploratory Practice. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(1), 109-126.

This ethnographic study attempts to find, reveal and understand the learning possibilities, from the social learning perspective, in the process of peer feedback activity in a College English classroom for non-English majors in China. The study reveals the nature of Exploratory Practice (EP), and the investigation is guided by EP principles, aiming at exploring the viability of the practice in this specific teaching and learning context. Through classroom observation, discourse analysis, discussion, interviews and drafts of students' writing, the study finds five group cooperative patterns, represented by the five patterns of discursive interaction: collaborative, expert-novice, dominant-dominant, dominant-passive and passive-passive. Wherein the former two patterns witness the obvious reciprocal nature, the latter three seem not to. The subsequent classroom discussion reveals a general conformability of the teacher and students' understanding of the virtues and problems of the activity, and the broadening of the teacher's understanding in this social process. Meanwhile through discussion and interview, the practitioners reached a consensus that the teacher's tutoring is necessary to turn the problems into possible learning opportunities where the learners act as the learning agents. The study also discussed the possible ways of the teacher's tutoring in the activity in a specific context.

Thanks to Kathryn Markovchick and Joyce Lang for making accessible some articles on the Internet.

From the Journals, To the Field and Back

By Yael Sharan

The end of a decade is traditionally a time for summing up, not only for *Time* and *Newsweek*, but also for CL-related issues. In the March 2000 issue of the IASCE newsletter, Shlomo Sharan, first secretary and second president of IASCE, reviewed a small but significant sample of the research published in the preceding decade. At the close of the first decade of the new century two comprehensive publications contributed to a summing up of research and theory, with an eye to the future. David Johnson and Roger Johnson presented a sweeping review of the research on social interdependence theory that had led to revisions of the theory and, in turn, generated new research (2009). Slavin offered "a theoretical model of cooperative learning processes that acknowledges the contributions of work from each of the major theoretical perspectives…and suggests the likely role each plays in cooperative learning processes." Slavin went on to suggest the "research and development needed to advance cooperative learning scholarship so that educational practice may truly benefit from the lessons of thirty years of research" (2010, p.348).

Between periodic summaries of the field readers of the IASCE newsletter have enjoyed uninterrupted access to the flow of CL-related research studies in the feature *From the Journals*, and for a while, also in *From the Web*. CL in all its manifestations continues to be the most thoroughly researched educational approach. The wealth of abstracts show that many perennial concerns and areas of investigation, such as CL in math, science and second language learning classes at all levels, are revisited in new contexts. In the past decade new foci have been added, such as distance learning, computer-based instruction, higher education in various fields, "topics about which early researchers could not even have dreamed," as co-president Lynda Baloche wrote in the December, 2011 newsletter. As readers of the newsletter have come to expect, in her opening letter, Lynda sums up highlights of the abstracts presented in each issue. Inspired by Lynda's observations, it occurred to me that 2011 might be a good time to survey the *From the Journals* feature of the past ten years (plus one) to get a more detailed idea of the topics that interested CL investigators, and see if there are more areas that early researchers hadn't dreamt of. So here's an overview of some of the directions in CL research, based on the more than 50 topics found in abstracts in *From the Journals* of the past 11 years.

Topics less studied. Interest in investigating two issues that concerned researchers in previous decades—the understanding of how CL enhanced students' achievement and their motivation to learn —seems to be in decline. Abstracts of studies that centered on the effect of CL on the following topics appeared less than five times each: group size and composition, classroom climate, decision making, brain based teaching, learning styles, gender, education for peace, leadership, gifted students, preschoolers, individual differences, and creativity. Studies of social and discussion skills appeared five times. Although not the foci of research, many of the above topics were embedded in studies that focused on other issues.

General vs. specific CL. Abstracts are understandably short and concise and researchers' methods and conclusions are not presented in full detail. Although most of the conclusions cited in the abstracts were positive, they were often couched in general statements about indications that cooperation was favored by students or had enhanced their learning (or motivation, or communication, or thinking, etc.), without revealing the exact CL procedures that were studied.

A few studies did focus on the effect of a specific CL procedure, as in a study that used Jigsaw for improving race relations (in the March 2006 issue). Another abstract, cited in the February 2011 issue, reported on a study of the effects of Numbered Heads Together on the daily quiz scores and on-task behavior of students with disabilities in language arts lessons.

ESL and EFL. This topic took center stage in the past decade, with over 50 studies cited, at all levels and in several countries. Many of the investigations of the effect of CL on second or foreign language learning were generally quite specific about the effect on learning a second or foreign language of a particular method or procedure, such as STAD, Jigsaw, peer tutoring, etc. Most interesting are the few studies that investigated the effects of original cooperative procedures especially designed by a teacher to suit a particular cultural context.

Peer work. Close runners up were the number of studies of the different aspects of peer work in various content areas and at all grade levels. These included peer tutoring, peer assessment, peer feedback, interaction, collaboration and rejection. A study of the effects of peer "tootling" appeared in the December 2009 newsletter.

CL in higher education. In this area most research studies continued to examine some form of CL in math, sciences, computer-mediated learning and distance learning. They expanded to include CL in a long list of other subject matter as well: business, engineering (e.g. CL in a soil mechanics undergraduate course in Portugal), and music, economics; training of medical, physical therapy and nursing students; accounting, athletic training education, interior design classes, psychology, nutrition courses and more. Applying CL to higher education seemed to be the initiative of individual teachers or researchers and not yet institutional policy.

Multiculturalism. As of 2007, cultural diversity gained momentum as a focus of CL-related research. Included in this category were studies that examined the connection between CL and cross-ethnic friendship, multiethnic classrooms, and racial identity, and how CL can be adapted to specific cultural norms. In this area there were some very creative efforts, such as in a study of the effects on students' collaboration of a puppetry project in a multicultural setting in India (July 2010).

Details of students' and teachers' behaviors. More and more researchers turned their attention to the study of detailed behaviors that promote or hinder CL procedures and processes. In the February 2007 issue of the newsletter, readers were introduced to a study by IASCE Board member Robyn Gillies. Since then we have followed the ongoing detailed investigations conducted by Gillies and her colleagues of students' and teachers' behaviors, discourse, problem solving, and learning in CL classrooms, as well as the effects of structured vs. unstructured groups. This body of work and others stress that adequate preparation of students and of teachers is an undisputed condition for successful cooperative work in groups.

Buchs and her colleagues (in the July 2010 and February 2011 newsletters) also closely examined specific aspects of CL, such as the effects of peer work with identical information vs. complementary information and the role of discussion aids in promoting learning. Their findings contribute to the understanding of resource interdependence no matter which CL method may be used.

Teacher education for CL. A sizeable number of studies were devoted to teachers, investigating their perceptions of CL, their satisfaction with CL, their motivation to work with CL, the different ways their training can affect these areas, as well as teachers' efficacy in using CL. Findings support the experiential mode of teacher preparation and the need to clarify teachers' conceptions of and resistance to CL in pre- and in-service training.

In Sum

This informal (and admittedly incomplete) survey of the abstracts in *From the Journals* reinforces the fact that CL has made a significant inroad into almost every kind of educational setting, subject matter and level. Drawing on additional sources, Lynda Baloche (2011) fills some of the gaps in this survey, and deepens the view of topics and concerns prominent in CL research today. There is room for a more accurate survey and one that also accounts for embedded and overlapping themes. Before the field gets unwieldy, it seems like a good idea for some diligent graduate students to put all this wealth of information together for a spectacular PhD on the evolution of CL-related research. Meanwhile, we can follow future developments in the *From the Journals* feature in this newsletter.

I look forward to the next summary of CL research at the close of this decade. Will it bare out Pasi Sahlberg's belief, stated in his interview in the February 2011 newsletter, that CL can provide learners with more inspiring environments to learn and grow so they can contribute creative solutions to the increasing globalization of our world? And which will be the topics that we haven't yet dreamt of ?

References

Baloche, L. (2011.) A brief view of cooperative learning from across the pond, around the world, and over time. *Journal of Co-operative Studies, 44(*3), 25-30, ISSN096157.

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning, *Educational Researcher, 38*(5), 365-379.

Slavin, R. E. (2010). Instruction based on cooperative learning. In R. Mayer (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction.* London: Taylor and Francis.

Thanks to George Jacobs for reading an earlier draft of this article and for his helpful comments.

IASCE Executive Board

The IASCE, established in 1979, is the only international, non-profit organization for educators who research and practice cooperative learning in order to promote student academic improvement and democratic social processes.

What does IASCE do?

- ☆ Supports the development and dissemination of research on cooperative learning, particularly educator research and inquiry that fosters understanding of the effects of context on implementing cooperative learning
- ☆ Helps organizations develop structures that enhance cooperation in education, working through the inclusion of people of diverse backgrounds in our schools and society
- ☆ Works with local, national, and international organizations to extend high quality practices of cooperative learning.

- ☆ Sponsors collaborative conferences and projects that extend the understanding of cooperative learning principles in different settings.

How does IASCE do this?

Through our MEMBERSHIP DUES!

MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS INCLUDE:

Our NEWSLETTER is published three times a year and provides information essential to anyone involved in cooperation in education through:

- ☆ Research and project reports from the international perspective.
- ☆ New ideas from leaders in the field.
- ☆ Reports on the latest research and journal publications.
- ☆ Book and media reviews.
- ☆ New resources for CL on the WWW.
- ☆ Articles by international experts on topics such as cooperative learning and technology, cooperative learning with different ages and populations, teacher education and staff development.
- ☆ Our international and regional conferences bring together cooperative educators from around the world to share ideas, compare successes, discuss challenges, and review the latest research.

Website

The IASCE website, which is supported by membership dues, offers many links to sites related to cooperative learning and announces opportunities for face-to-face learning with internationally recognized leaders in cooperative learning.

- ☆ IASCE also offers a membership directory (upon request) for the purposes of networking.
- ☆ A list of board members, who are veteran experts in the field, to contact for consultation and professional assistance.
- ☆ Occasional discounts on publications and conferences.

Please visit us on the web at:
www.iasce.net

IASCE Mission Statement

To become a member of IASCE,
visit our website
OR fill out the form below and mail or fax to:

IASCE - Cooperative Learning

Kathryn Markovchick
11 South Road
Readfield, Maine 04355 USA
Phone: 207-685-3171 Fax: 1 (866) 883-9271
office@syntiro.org

Membership form

Surname/Last Name: _____

First Name: _____

Institution: _____

Street: _____

City: _____

State or Province: _____

Zip/Postal code: _____

Country: _____

E-mail: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

Annual Dues

INDICATE TYPE OF MEMBERSHIP
Circle only the box that applies.
Fees are in US Dollars

Types of Membership	One Year	Two Years	Three Years
Basic Individual Membership (receiving newsletter electronically):	$20	$35	$50
Basic Individual Membership (newsletter by post):	$30	$55	$80
Institutional Memberships (newsletter by post):	$35	$65	$95

Make checks payable to IASCE. For non-US postage (airmail), please add $10 for each year's subscription.

Check one: ❑ Visa ❑ Mastercard
#:
Expiration:
Order Total:
Signature:

❑ Please check here if you would like to receive your Newsletter electronically.

IASCE

The International Association
for the
Study of Cooperation in Education
ON THE WEB AT www.iasce.net

IASCE International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education

Join the worldwide community of educators, administrators, researchers and staff developers working together to create more effective learning environments for our students and ourselves, through cooperation in education.

International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education

IASCE

www.iasce.net

Check your mailing label for your membership expiration date.

If you receive your copy electronically, we will email your membership expiration date along with your newsletter.

IASCE
11 South Road
Readfield, Maine 04355
(207) 685-3171
www.iasce.net