Chapter 6+:

From collaborative learning to classroom orchestration

EPFL

How do people learn ?

- by exploration, trial and error
- by incremental mastery
- by verbal elaboration

Constructivism

mastery learning

socio-constructivism

If you were a school teacher, would you ask students to work in teams? Pick what you might decide and why. *

- ◯ Yes, it might force them to deepen the contents of my lecture
- ◯ Yes, even if they won't necessarily learn more, they might at least learn to work together
- ◯ No, they can learn to work in teams in many activities outside school
- ◯ No, teamwork takes too much time; I have to move faster in the curriculum

If you would decide anyway to make teams, which size of the teams would you choose? *

- ◯ Teams of 3, because the third can kind of arbitrate the disagreements between the two other ones, so the team would work better
- ◯ Teams of 2, because with larger teams, there is often one person that does not contribute much, which is unfair for the two other ones
- ◯ Teams of 5, so that I can detect which students take leadership
- ◯ Teams of 10, because that's often the size of the teams they will join later on in the workplace

Let's say that you finally decide to make teams of 2, what would be the best team composition? *

- ◯ Two students with different viewpoints so that they produce multiple solutions
- ◯ Two students with a different backgrounds, so that they get used to handle diversity
- ◯ Two students with the same level, otherwise the better students will waste time with the weaker one
- ◯ Two students with different levels, so that one develops the skills of helping other students

If during their teamwork, three students start to argue loudly what would you do? *

- ◯ Ask them to elaborate a list of pros and cons and connect it to what was taught in the last lecture
- ◯ Discuss with them to see if some opinions are scientifically incorrect
- ◯ Nothing, I will ask them to less loud then I will check who wins the argumentation
- ◯ Nothing, it may force them to deepen their understanding of the task

If you were a school teacher, would you ask students to work in teams? Pick what you might decide and why. *

- ◯ Yes, it might force them to deepen the contents of my lecture
- ◯ Yes, even if they won't necessarily learn more, they might at least learn to work together
- ◯ No, they can learn to work in teams in many activities outside school
- ◯ No, teamwork takes too much time; I have to move faster in the curriculum

If you would decide anyway to make teams, which size of the teams would you choose? *

- ○ Teams of 3, because the third can kind of arbitrate the disagreements between the two other ones, so the team would work better
- ○ Teams of 2, because with larger teams, there is often one person that does not contribute much, which is unfair for the two other ones
- ○ Teams of 5, so that I can detect which students take leadership
- ○ Teams of 10, because that's often the size of the teams they will join later on in the workplace

Let's say that you finally decide to make teams of 2, what would be the best team composition? *

- ◯ Two students with different viewpoints so that they produce multiple solutions
- ◯ Two students with a different backgrounds, so that they get used to handle diversity
- ◯ Two students with the same level, otherwise the better students will waste time with the weaker one
- ◯ Two students with different levels, so that one develops the skills of helping other students

If during their teamwork, three students start to argue loudly what would you do? *

- ○ Ask them to elaborate a list of pros and cons and connect it to what was taught in the last lecture
- ○ Discuss with them to see if some opinions are scientifically incorrect
- ○ Nothing, I will ask them to less loud then I will check who wins the argumentation
- ○ Nothing, it may force them to deepen their understanding of the task

Collaboration as a method



Cognition is individual

Cognition is social

Collaboration as a skill

If you were a school teacher, would you ask students to work in teams? Pick what you might decide and why.

- [2, -2] 'Yes, it might force them to deepen the contents of my lecture'
- [2, -2] 'Yes, even if they won't necessarily learn more, they might at least learn to work together '
- [2, -2] 'No, they can learn to work in teams in many activities outside school'
- [-2, 2] 'No, teamwork takes too much time; I have to move faster in the curriculum.'

If you would decide anyway to make teams, which size of the teams would you choose?

- [-1, -1] 'Teams of 3, because the third can kind of arbitrate the disagreements between the two other ones
- [2, -2] 'Teams of 2, because with larger teams, there is often one person that does not contribute much, w
- [-2, -2] 'Teams of 5, so that I can detect which students take leadership '
- [3, -2] 'Teams of 10, because that's often the size of the teams they will join later on in the workplace'

Let's say that you finally decide to make teams of 2, what would be the best team composition?

- [1, -2] 'Two students with different viewpoints so that they produce multiple solutions.'
- [2, -2] 'Two students with a different backgrounds, so that they get used to handle diversity'
- [-1, 2] 'Two students with the same level, otherwise the better students will waste time with the weaker or
- [2, -2] 'Two students with different levels, so that one develops the skills of helping other students.'

If during their teamwork, three students start to argue loudly what would you do?

- [0, 2] 'Ask them to elaborate a list of pros and cons and connect it to what was taught in the lats lecture"
- [-3, 2] 'Discuss with them to see if some opinions are scientifically incorrect.'
- [-2, -2] 'Nothing, I will ask them to less loud then I will check who wins the argumentation."
- [2, 2] ''Nothing, it may force them to deepen their understanding of the task.''

1 + 1 > 2

Is learning in teams
more effective
than learning alone ?

Research Phase 1
Is Collaborative Learning Effective ?

	Learning Gains		
Meta-analyses: collaborative versus individual	>	=	<
Slavin, 1983.	**26**	14	1
Johnson & Johnson, 1989	**829**	645	109

Research Phase 1
Is Collaborative Learning Effective ?



Springer, L., Stanne, M. E., & Donovan, S. S. (1999). Effects of small-group learning on undergraduates in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology: A meta-analysis. *Review of educational research*, *69*(1), 21-51.

Kyndt, E., Raes, E., Lismont, B., Timmers, F., Cascallar, E., & Dochy, F. (2013). A meta-analysis of the effects of face-to-fa

9 <
48 =
95 >



Fig. 1. Forest plot with weighted effect sizes for all studies of the meta-analysis.

Research Phase 1
Is Collaborative Learning Effective ?

A decision maker could conclude that the probability that team learning is effective is high enough to use it.

A learning scientist would conclude that team learning is not effective per se, but depends on the conditions… see next slide

Research Phase 2
When is collaborative learning effective ?



Factors:

- Group composition: number, level, gender, age, …
- Task features: verbalizable, open, …
- Medium: face-to-face, synchro/not, text/audio/video,…
- Context: school/work

The effects of collaborative depends upon so many variables (plus their interaction effects) that it is impossible to predict that a given teamwork in a specific context will be effective

Pitfalls in Teamwork



‘social loafing’, ’free rider effect’

Pitfalls in Teamwork

- Free-rider / Social Loafing: some teams members let the others do the work
- …

Meeting at the White House Cabinet Room
during the Cuban Missile Crisis on October 29, 1962.

GroupThink

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=glUUmsBb_58

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/EXCOMM#/media/File:EXCOMM_meeting,_Cuban_Missile_Crisis,_29_October_1962.jpg

Pitfalls in Teamwork

- Free-rider / Social Loafing: some teams members let the others do the work
- 'GroupThink': as soon as they agree, learners return the solution to the teacher without checking if it is the optimal solution In education, as soon as they agree, learners return the solution to the teacher without checking if it is the best one
- In education, consensus to satisfy the teacher
- ….



Domination / Disengagement

Pitfalls in Teamwork

- Free-rider / Social Loafing: some teams members let the others do the work
- 'GroupThink': as soon as they agree, learners return the solution to the teacher without checking if it is the optimal solution In education, as soon as they agree, learners return the solution to the teacher without checking if it is the best one
- In education, consensus to satisfy the teacher
- Domination: some team members dominate verbal interactions; contributions from some members are rejected or not taken into consideration
- ~~Misunderstandings~~
- Emotional (vs epistemic) conflict: « your suggestion is so stupid ! »
- Lack of alignment on goals or commitment
- Lack of « collaboration skills » (one of the 'transversal skills ')


PISA 2015 Results
COLLABORATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING
VOLUME V
OECD


375
400
425
450
475
500
525
550
575
Singapore
Japan
Hong Kong (China)
Korea
Canada
Estonia
Finland
Macao (China)
New Zealand
Australia
Chinese Taipei
Germany
United States
Denmark
United Kingdom
Netherlands
Sweden
Austria
Norway
Slovenia
Belgium
Iceland
Czech Republic
Portugal
Spain
B-S-J-G (China)
France
Luxembourg
Latvia
Italy
Russia
Croatia
Hungary
Israel
Lithuania
Slovak Republic
Greece
Chile
Bulgaria
Uruguay
Costa Rica
Thailand
United Arab Emirates
Mexico
Colombia
Turkey
Peru
Montenegro
Brazil
Tunisia
> OECD average
~ OECD average
< OECD average

Apprendre à collaborer ?



Research Phase 3

Which interactions make collaborative learning effective ?

1. Elaborated explanations

The (self-)explanation effect

A ball with mass 10kg on the desk is shooting at initial velocity of 10m/s. Calculate the velocity of the ball when it hits the ground.



Solution

When the ball leave from the desk, the ball is forced by weight force only. The object will keep constant velocity motion in X direction and constant acceleration motion in Y direction.

1) flight time t

$$h = \frac{1}{2} \times g \times t^2 \longrightarrow t = \sqrt{\frac{2h}{g}} = 2s$$

2) velocity in X direction

$$v_x = v_{0x} = 10m/s$$

3) velocity in Y direction

$$v_y = v_{0y} + g \times t = 0 + 10 \times 2 = 20(m/s)$$

4) total velocity

$$v = \sqrt{v_x^2 + v_y^2} = 10\sqrt{5}m/s$$

Explaining aloud a worked out problem

https://www.researchgate.net/figure/Worked-example-problem-as-adequate-scaffolding-to-the-original-unsolved-problems_fig13_313617511

Moderator	k	$\hat{g}(SE)$	$CI_{\hat{g}}$	$Q_b(df_b)$
Type of Self-Explanation				1.11(2)
Prompted	31	.39(.08)	.24 to .54	
Spontaneous	6	.50(.18)	.15 to .85	
Instructional	5	.24(.17)	-.11 to .60	
Instructional Format				0.21(2)
Worked Example	19	.40(.01)	.20 to .58	
Conventional	10	.33(.14)	.05 to .61	
Text	11	.40(.13)	.16 to .65	
Type of Population				1.80(2)
Post-Secondary	26	.38(.08)	.22 to .54	
Secondary	7	.54(.15)	.24 to .84	
Primary	9	.26(.15)	-.03 to .55	
Element Interactivity				0.04(1)
High	39	.38(.07)	.25 to .51	
Low	3	.43(.24)	-.04 to .91	
Field of Study				0.31(3)
Mathematics	22	.36(.09)	.18 to .54	
Engineering/technical	6	.42(.17)	.09 to .75	
Science	9	.45(.15)	.16 to .73	
Other	5	.37(.19)	.00 to .74	
Pacing of Learning				0.00(1)
Limited	8	.51(.13)	.26 to .76	
Self-Paced	25	.50(.08)	.35 to .65	
Feedback				0.03(1)
Yes	9	.37(.16)	.09 to .64	
No	33	.39(.07)	.25 to .54	

Note. k = number of effect sizes; $\hat{g}$ = Hedges' effect size; *SE* = standard error; $CI_{\hat{g}}$ = 95% confidence interval around the effect size; Q_b = variability between the categories of moderators; *df* = degrees of freedom.

The (self-)explanation effect

Hedge's Effect size

https://www.academia.edu/8601818/A_Meta_Analysis_of_the_Self_Explanation_Effect

The (self-)explanation increases

A. the intrinsic cognitive load
B. the extrinsic cognitive load
C. the germane cognitive load



Is germane cognitive load higher

A. self-explanation
B. explaining to other

Mutual modelling

Learning by teaching

https://digest.bps.org.uk/2018/05/04/learning-by-teaching-others-is-extremely-effective-a-new-study-tested-a-key-reason-why/

Learning by teaching / tutoring



Verbal elaboration

Protégé effect

students make greater effort to learn for their TAs than they do for themselves

https://aaalab.stanford.edu/assets/papers/2009/Protege_Effect_Teachable_Agents.pdf



The cowriter project

Remediation of handwriting difficulties

- Testing the system with the same child for 9 months.
- One session per week, followed by a therapist.
- At regular intervals, Raphael was asked to do a BHK test, which was rated by a professional.

Acquisition of handwriting in children with and without dysgraphia: A computational approach

Thomas Gargot, Thibault Asselborn, Hugues Pellerin, Ingrid Zammouri, Salvatore M. Anzalone, Laurence Casteran, Wafa Johal, Pierre Dillenbourg, David Cohen, Caroline Jolly

Published: September 11, 2020 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0237575

https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0237575

Longitudinal study









Learning by teaching / tutoring



Verbal elaboration

Protégé effect

Does it increase:

A. intrinsic motivation
B. extrinsic motivation

?

Research Phase 3

Which interactions make collaborative learning effective ?

1. Elaborated explanations
2. Conflict resolution, Argumentation / Négociation

ArgueGraph

Research Phase 3

Which interactions make collaborative learning effective ?

1. Elaborated explanations
2. Conflict resolution, Argumentation / Négociation
3. Mutual Regulation


https://gds.blog.gov.uk/2017/09/04/the-benefits-of-coding-in-the-open/
High level subtasks
Low level subtasks


High level subtasks
mutual regulation
Low level subtasks


High level subtasks
mutual regulation
Low level subtasks


High level subtasks
self-regulation
Low level subtasks

Collaboration ≠ Cooperation

Emerging and instable division of labour

Fixed division of labour

Research Phase 1
Is Collaborative Learning Effective ?

A decision maker could conclude that the probability that team learning is effective is high enough to use it.

A learning scientist would conclude that team learning is not effective per se, but depends on the conditions… see next slide

Research Phase 2
When is collaborative learning effective ?

Factors:

- Group composition: number, level, gender, age, …
- Task features: verbalizable, open, …
- Medium: face-to-face, synchro/not, text/audio/video,…
- Context: school/work

The effects of collaborative depends upon so many variables (plus their interaction effects) that it is impossible to predict that a given teamwork in a specific context will be effective

Research Phase 3

Which interactions make collaborative learning effective ?

1. Elaborated explanations
2. Conflict resolution, Argumentation / Négociation
3. Mutual Regulation

Collaborative learning occurs when team members engage into the ‘productive interactions’ listed above.

These interactions are summarized as “the effort” that team members engaged to reach and maintain a shared understanding of the task.

Research Phase 4:

Which design increases the probability that teams produce rich verbal interactions (that make collaborative learning effective) ?





(proactive)

STRUCTURE

(reactive)

(self-) REGULATE

Self-regulation Tools



P. Jermann

Self-regulation Tools



Example of domination in teamwork

Self-regulation Tools



Reflect Table

•K. Bachour, F. Kaplan, W. Hokenmeier

Reflect

Self-regulation Tools



(reactive) REGULATE

(proactive) STRUCTURE

SCRIPTS

Semi-Structured Interfaces



Belvedere (Suther et al.)

Multi Input Devices: the participation of each learner is "designed" because each mouse only access some screen functions



M. Nussbaum, UC Chile

Multi Input Devices:

the participation of each learner is “designed” because each mouse only access some screen functions



M. Nussbaum, UC Chile

"Computer-supported collaborative learning" (CSCL)

1990-2000: Technologies enable collaboration

2000-2010: Technologies shape collaboration (design)

2010-2020: Technologies that integrate collaboration

•Conditions of coll. learning

•Interactions

•Effects

(reactive) REGULATE

(proactive) STRUCTURE

SCRIPTS

Semi-Structured Interfaces

Pedagogical scenario for increasing the probability that interactions X,Y,Z occur in teamwork.

Orchestration Graph



Collaborative learning is not a dogma

Today's lesson:

"Please discuss about the pros and cons of collaborative learning and the role of computers !"




1
Δ_3
Δ_1
Δ_2
0
Degree of divergence
The effort to reach a shaored understanding
Shared Understaning
Random Pairing
Today's Pairing
(Pseudo) Agreement

“Jigsaw”

- Task: How to prevent a large earthquake ?
- Roles:
  - Maire of San Francisco
  - Insurance agent
  - Security officer
  - Geologist
- Context: Previous experiments in Denver



In the Jigsaw script, every team member receives a subset of the information necessary to solve the task. This task cannot be solved without the contribution of each individual.

Jigsaw

Phase “Groups”



Phase “Experts”




Lecture
Lecture
a1
a5
Expert groups
Task groups
a3a
a3b
a2
a4
a3c
a3d
Decision

Grid

Place the concepts below on this grid then click on the link between two concepts to define their similitude or difference with the help of your group members. You might change the concepts place to define other relations.

Target 0	Legislative	Constituency	Target 3
Referendum	Democracy	Target 6	Target 7
Target 8	Election	parliament	Executive
Target 12	Target 13	Federalism	Target 15

"Democracy" vs "Election"

Relationship: Similar

Comments: Democracy is a form of goverment in which it is recognized that ultimate authority belongs to the people, who have the right to participate in the decision-making process called elections, to appoint and dismiss their rulers.

Save | Reset


Debrief
Class
Intro
Distribute
Build grid
Team
Individual
Read papers

1. Collaborative learning occurs when team members engage into

rich verbal interactions

These interactions are summarized as "the effort" that team members engaged to reach and maintain a shared understanding of the task.

2. Collaborative learning is not a religion. It benefits from being integrated into classroom scenarios that integrate individual, team and class wide activities.

3. It takes talented teachers to orchestrate these scenarios

Apprentissage


KOSMOS
KAEFER-ROBOTER
ART. NR. 658014
INHALT: 5 STK.
MADE IN CHINA
KOSMOS
GEHEIM-PERISKOP
ART. NR. 658618
INHALT: 5 STK.
MADE IN CHINA
Elektro-Krokodil



The TinkerLamp

Guillaume Zufferey, Patrick Jermann




Simpliquity

Gerbeur

20 étages

20 mini

SB = 288 m²

SBST = 244 m²

Degré d'utilisation 86%

5% = 50m²

Degré 2 : 17%

Degré 3 : 20%

surface brut de stockage : 240m²

degré d'utilisation (1) 83%

surface net de stockage : 68 m²

20 mini

surface net de stockage / brut = 23%

net de stockage / brut de stockage = 28%

22cl = 45 m² 15 étage.

14 m 40

= 15 %

= 19 %

Contre poids

13 étageres

14.13

= 13%





No sign. effect in understanding



mean = 7.84 vs. mean = 7.43
F(1,14) = .25; p > .05

No sign. effect in problem-solving



mean = 5.16 vs. mean = 5.15
F(1,14)=.06, p>.05

“Tentation de manipulation”




Fiche Simulation
Repartition des surfaces de stockage
Chariot élévateur
Gerbeur
Mise en place
Sauver
Choisir
Effacer
SIMULATE
GROUP
- Run a simulation of the current layout.
- Ask the students to predict before


PAUSE CLASS
CLASS
- Pause all the actions (simulation, building model, etc.) in the whole class



Son DoLenh, Patrick Jermann

Post-test

Sign. effect in understanding



Sign. effect in problem-solving



Measures	Warehouse study's conditions		Evaluation of TinkerLamp 2.0 conditions	
	Paper/pen	TinkerLamp 1.0	TinkerLamp 2.0 WithTinkerBoard	TinkerLamp 2.0 NoTinkerBoard
Understanding score	7.84(2.85)	7.43(2.82)	9.38(2.03)	10.31(1.70)
Problem-solving score	5.16(1.70)	5.15(1.78)	6.44(1.65)	6.59(1.53)

Question

Please order a standard return 2nd clas

Enter command

from Lausanne to Davos standard C2 re

Question

Please order a young return 2nd class ticket from Basel to Geneve without bike.

Your Ticket

From
Basel

To
Geneve

Travel
Return

Fare

Class

Bike

City

Basel | Davos | Fribourg
Geneve | Lausanne | Neuchatel
Zurich

Travel

One-way | Return

Fare

Standard | Young | Half-fare

Class

Bike

Question

Please order a standard return 2nd class ti

From:
Fribourg

To:
Zurich

Travel:
Return

Fare:
Standard

Class:
2nd

Bike:
No

:24

Question

Please order a standard return 2nd class ticket from Basel to Zurich with a bike.

From
Basel

To
Zurich

Travel
- One-way
- Return

Fare
- Standard
- Young
- Half-fare

Class
- 1st
- 2nd

Bike
- Yes
- No

:36

HELP

BUY

Please select the interfaces and rank them with 1 being the best and 4 being the worst. Please justify your ranking.

If you rarely buy a train ticket rank the interfaces in the order that you would most prefer them.

Ryan's List

1. **Drag and Drop**
2. **Command**
3. **Form**
4. **Map**

The drag and drop is easiest to see all of the options.

Submit

Class

Team

Solo



Socio-cognitive conflict

Class

Team

Solo



Arguing with data

Class

Team

Solo



	(1) Connaissances sémantiques liées à la tâche	(2) Connaissances sémantiques liées à la transposition informatique de la tâche	(3) Connaissances syntaxiques, arbitraires
NOVICES	✓		
INTERMITTENTS	✓	✓	
EXPERTS	✓	✓	✓

Debriefing



Orchestration Graph


Class
operators
Team
A time for telling
Solo

Classroom Orchestration

Timing


Admin
Graph Editor
Preview
Teacher View
session:
UY56
Dashboards
Stroop (open)
progress
leaderboard
stroop
Activity Progress
Progress
Complete
Average Class Progress
100
75
50
25
0
0
1
2
3
4
Time Elapsed
Users who started activity 3
Users who completed activity 0
Create Session
Switch Session


INDIVIDUAL FIELDWORK SHEET
1. Consider 4 layouts
Look at the 4 best layouts you and other groups built during the class.
Which one is your favorite? Why?
I like the first one.
Because it is the fastest.
Forklifts can move faster
Layout 1
Layout 2
Layout 3
Layout 4
2. Fill the blanks
Fill in the blanks in the Prediction column.
Prediction/Solution
1. Biggest Net surface is layout 4
2. Biggest Raw surface is layout 3
3. Biiggest Utilizat. degree is layout
4. Fastest Avg speed is layout
3. Compare with your company

Homework

Surfaces de stockage

Entrepôt

1) Implantez l'entrepôt dont le plan est dessiné sur la figure ci-contre.



2) Reportez les valeurs des surfaces de stockage dans les cases prévues de la feuille de travail ci-contre.

Que pensez-vous du degré d'utilisation de cet entrepôt?

Comment pourriez-vous l'augmenter? Pourquoi est-ce important?

Surfaces de stockage

Surf. brute	=	largeur x hauteur	=		=	m2
Surf. brute de stockage	=	Surf. brute - locaux annexes	=		=	m2
Surf. nette de stockage	=	Surf. brute de stockage - Allées de circulation	=		=	m2
	=	Nombre d'étagères x Surf. d'une étagère	=			
Degré d'utilisation	=	Surf. nette de stockage / Surf. brute de stockage	=		=	%

Exploitation

3) Simulez 30 minutes de travail avec 1 gerbeur, et reportez les valeurs dans les cases prévues ci-contre.
Combien faudrait-il de gerbeurs pour sortir 100 palettes en 1 heure?

A votre avis, quel est le type de chariot le plus efficace dans cet entrepôt?

Chariots élévateurs

Type	Nombre
Gerbeur	
Mat rétract.	
Contrepoids	

Heure :

Palettes sorties : Par jour:

Article 1 : Article 1 :

Article 2 : Article 2 :

Article 3 : Article 3 :

Temps moyen par palettes (sec.):

ABC oui ○ non ○

Curriculum Relevance



Quentin Bonnard


Bravo vous avez choisi les bonnes briques!
la rotation de la brique 125 n'est pas correcte
la rotation de la brique 136 n'est pas correcte
Montrer la solution
Sebastien CUendet


Vue de face
Activité 5
Effectuez le rabattement de l'arête a.
Zone pour poser les blocs

The « logistics » of education

- How much time is lost before they really start?
- Does the teacher see what the students are doing?
- Can the teacher walk between the tables?
- How to cope with absences?
- Does the activity leave traces?

"no worth a theory"

D'Esposito & Gaillard

Y. Guibinelli


The colour of the computer



Teacher position heat map

I. Sarrade


3PT
7AF
7PT
time.minutes
10
20
30
40
50
0.0
2.5
5.0
7.5
aX

EPFL Exercises Session

"While Waiting Productivity" LOSS : 62% ➽ 6%

H. Alavi, Olivier Guédat

"While Wa g Productivity" LOSS : 62% ➒ 6%

H. Alavi, Olivier Guédat

EPFL


Success Story ?

The 3 circles of usability

The user is…	Usability constraints are…
3. Classroom	*Discipline, Curriculum, time, Time segmentation, Safety, sustainability,grading, …*
2. Group	*Interdependence, WYSIWIS,…*
1. Individual	*Cognitive load, pre-requisites,...*

The future of learning is personal

By Gary Martin 13/03/2020 - 09:58

EDUCATION OPINION FREE TO READ

OPINION: Far from making teachers obsolete, personalised learning requires them to use their current skills while developing new ones.

Technology has been a game changer in terms of individualised learning. *Photo: Stockphoto*

Social Interaction



Reasoning

Thinking is a dialogue with oneself .

The hardware is individual
but the software is social

Summary of chapter 7

1. Collaborative learning is often effective, but not systematically.
2. Effective tasks require some degree of interdependence among team members
3. It is effective when rich verbal interactions occur such as explanation, argumentation, mutual regulation
4. To make it more effective, classroom scripts increase the probability for students to produce these interactions by integrating team, individual and class wide activities
5. It takes a talented teachers to orchestrate these scenarios
6. The theory behind emphasizes that cognition is inherently social because thinking mostly relies on language.