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CSCL in the next decade faces the challenge of not only designing educational technologies and interventions, but of having to invent analytic methodologies and theoretical frameworks appropriate to the unique character of collaborative learning as an interactional group accomplishment.
This paper argues that thinking in CSCL settings should be primarily analyzed at the small-group unit of analysis, where contributions coming from individual interpretive perspectives are interwoven into group cognition.
Locus of Agency

- The *collaborative discourse* is the agent of knowledge building that requires computer support and curriculum design.
Group Cognition

➢ Groups “think”!
Can Groups Think?

- Can computers think?
- Can groups think?
- Collaborative knowledge building ⇔ thinking?
The AI question:
- Can computers think?

Three major considerations:
- Turing test
- Searle’s Chinese room (in Taiwan?)
- Dreyfus: computers still can not think
In 1950, Turing asked, “Can machines think?”

His paper defined much of what the field of AI has tried to do for 50 years.

He defined the “Turing test” to measure if computers could be said to think.

Can a computer answer questions like a person, so you cannot tell which is which?

Computer (and AI) failed the test.
Suppose you posed questions to a small group and to an individual person online.

Could you tell which was not a person?

(a) The group could just elect an individual to answer.

(b) The content of a monologue and a group response can be identical if only text is seen and the group tries to respond as one.
Searle did a “thought experiment” to see if computers think when they answer questions using AI techniques.

He imagined himself doing the processing in a computer responding to Chinese.

He could answer the questions correctly without understanding Chinese or the questions by following algorithms in English.

This would not be “thinking” because he would not understand what the questions were about.
If a group answers questions, is the group thinking?

If Searle were in the group, participating in the answering, he would understand.

If the answers were by the group as a whole, he would say that he understood the answers and that the group understood them.
Dreyfus argues that AI does not capture the way that people act, understand and think. He draws on the analysis of human Being-in-the-world of Heidegger & Merleau-Ponty. AI retrieval from large info sources does not scale like human retrieval; more is not better. AI cannot represent skills and expertise. AI cannot determine relevance like an expert.
Dreyfus

- A group does act, understand & think like individual people.
- It can retrieve better info if it knows more.
- It can act skillfully with expertise.
- A group can determine what is relevant.
- A group performs cognitive tasks in much the same way that individuals do.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Can computers think?</th>
<th>Can groups think?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turing test</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionality thought experiment</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological analysis</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, what are the implications of the discovery of group cognition for the agenda of CSCL in the next 10 years?
CSCL Agenda

- A time for reflection on the past & next 10 years.
- Who are “we”: the global CSCL community?
- A community of individual researchers, teams, projects, inter-national & multidisciplinary collaborations, regional networks, a global set of conferences, books, journals, ….
- Personal agendas parallel, intertwine, follow and lead the larger, collaborative, historical agendas of the disciplines.
My agenda

- My personal CSCL research history for the past several years:
  - need for theory to clarify concepts of collaboration (CSCL 2002)
  - meaning is a shared group phenomenon, interpreted by individuals (CSCL 2003)
  - need to focus on small-group unit of analysis (Kaleidoscope 2004)
  - Group cognition (book & CSCL 2005)
Our agenda at Drexel

- Inquiry into how to foster & support group cognition involving computers.
- Identify episodes of computer-supported group cognition.
- Analyze methods online groups use to accomplish cognitive tasks collaboratively.
- Document the potential and barriers to more effective group cognition.
Virtual Math Teams

- Year 2/5 of project with mathforum.org.
- Invite small groups of students to chat room to collaboratively discuss interesting mathematics.
- Automatically collect almost all aspects of interactions.
- Analyze chat logs with Conversation Analysis, multi-D coding, ethnography.
- Develop software, service, math problems, mentoring, community building, etc.
Avr (21:46): Okay, I think we should start with the formula for the area of a triangle

Sup (22:17): ok

Avr (22:28): \[ A = \frac{1}{2}bh \]

Avr (22:31): I believe

pin (22:35): yes

pin (22:37): i concue

pin (22:39): concur*

Avr (22:42): then find the area of each triangle

Avr (22:54): oh, wait

Sup (23:03): the base and height are 9 and 12 right?

Avr (23:11): no

Sup (23:16): o

Avr (23:16): that's two separate triangles

Sup (23:19): ooo

Sup (23:20): ok

Avr (23:21): right

Avr (23:27): i think we have to figure out the height by ourselves

If possible

pin (24:05): i know how

pin (24:09): draw the altitude'

Avr (24:09): how?

Avr (24:15): right

Sup (24:19): proportions?

Avr (24:19): this is frustrating

Avr (24:22): I don't have enough paper

pin (24:43): i think i got it

pin (24:54): its a 30/60/90 triangle

Avr (25:06): I see
The unit of analysis is the math proposal/response pair.

It incorporates both *uptake* (Suthers) and *inter-animation* (Wegerif) of personal interpretive perspectives in the collaborative building of shared meaning or group cognition.
Math chats proceed through “math proposal adjacency pairs”

Line 23 was a “failed proposal”

Close analysis shows by contrast what goes into intuitively constructing an effective proposal

Group Cognition, chapter 21

EARLI 2005, CRIWG 2005, ICCE 2005
Ethnomethodological – understanding how people interact in complex ways that are taken-for-granted

Analogous to Conversation Analysis – talk-in-interaction constructs sequential meaning following patterns of turn taking, repair, negotiation, group constitution, etc.

Face-to-face conversation uses gesture, gaze, pause, ....

Online chat imposes different constraints and possibilities: parallel threads, simultaneous contributions, persistent text, relative anonymity, software supports (awareness, whiteboard, computer & Internet environment, ....)

What are the methods people systematically use to converse in chat? To solve problems together? To do math collaboratively?
Design-based research

- Built on Problems of the Week at [mathforum.org](http://mathforum.org) solved individually.
- Open invitation to “powwows” using popular [AOL Instant Messenger](https://www.aol.com/icq).
- Solicited through teachers for new math worlds using ConcertChat with whiteboard.
- Developing software further iteratively; also math, pedagogy, service, motivations, etc.
Case studies

- Evidence of collaborative learning is in brief episodes of shared meaning making, not in long-term cognitive changes in individual minds.

- Interaction episodes are highly unique and incomparable – but they illustrate general methods that people use (within a given culture) to accomplish common actions.

- Breakdowns, failures, barriers, breaches make explicit what is usually tacit, and makes it visible for analysis.

- Case studies allow researchers to understand what takes place in interaction.
Interaction analysis

- Individual utterances only *make sense* within their context – must be analyzed at *group cognition unit*.
- Interpretations by different people, using different perspectives reveals complex, overlapping relationships among words, gestures, etc.
- Close study of brief interactions reveals common, taken-for-granted patterns or “member methods”.
- How groups constitute & structure themselves.
- Systematics of methods groups use for doing math through online interaction.
Group cognition

- Group cognition is not a sum of individual thinking, but displays its own sequentiality, accountability & intentionality.
- As the locus of agency of collaborative knowledge building, group cognition provides the foundation for CSCL.
- We need to find ways to overcome barriers (group think, failed proposals, power relations) to surpass individual cognition.
- Analysis of group cognition will guide design of technologies to foster it and support it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotypical paradigm</th>
<th>CSCL next 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental design</td>
<td>Design-based research of technological mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of controlled variables</td>
<td>Case studies of group methods, social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome measurements</td>
<td>Interaction analysis, coding patterns, ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual cognition</td>
<td>Group cognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group Cognition (the book) from MIT Press in the Spring – prepublication version available now: www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/mit
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