

CSCCL2011

computer-supported collaborative learning

July 4-8, 2011 🌸 Hong Kong, China

Connecting research
to
policy and practice

Conference Proceedings Volume I **Long papers**

Editors: Hans Spada, Gerry Stahl, Naomi Miyake, Nancy Law



International Society of
the Learning Sciences



Centre for
Information Technology
in Education
The University of Hong Kong

Beyond Small Groups: New Opportunities for Research in Computer-Supported *Collective* Learning

Yasmin B. Kafai, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia PA 10194, kafai@upenn.edu
 Kylie A. Peppler, Indiana University, 201 Rose Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47405, kpeppler@indiana.edu

Abstract: CSCL research has focused on understanding and designing collaborative learning in diverse settings and configurations with support of computers. Within this research, however, most efforts have concentrated on studying small group configurations and thus examined what we would like to call ‘collaborative’ learning (i.e., the abilities needed to participate and support collaborations of typically two to five people). Much less emphasis has been placed on studying massive communities and participation in large groups prominent in today’s social networking sites and online gaming cultures that would shift the focus to ‘collective’ learning (i.e., the abilities needed to participate and support collaborations in massive groups). In this paper, we identify key dimensions of collective learning, present observations of online and local participation in one open-source Web 2.0 community with over 630,000 members, called Scratch (scratch.mit.edu), and outline a research agenda for computer-supported *collective* learning.

Introduction

Research in CSCL, by its very name, has focused on understanding various dimensions of group work such as productivity of different group arrangements (Engelmann & Hesse, 2010), design of scaffolds (van der Pol, Admiraal, & Simons, 2006), argumentation practices (Scheuer, Loll, Pinkwart, & McLaren, 2010) and interactions between online and offline collaborations (Birchfield & Megowan-Romanowicz, 2009). With some exceptions (e.g., Fields & Kafai, 2009; Guzdial & Rick, 2006), there is one assumption about collaboration underpinning many of these efforts, which is the idea that collaboration happens in small groups, often of dyads and triads, as they engage in computer-supported collaborative tasks. For the most part, the focus of this research has been to understand and develop what we will refer to as *collaborative* learning because it emphasizes the abilities to participate in small groups whether online or offline or in combinations thereof.

Recent developments, however, suggest new forms of collaborations are developing in online communities (e.g., Boyd, 2008; Shirky, 2008). One striking feature of these communities is their size and collaboration that can take place among hundreds, if not thousands, of members. Consider the millions of contributions to entries in the Wikipedia or to programs in Linux (Benkler, 2006), the interactions of members of fan fiction sites where thousands of writers create new stories and participants provide constructive feedback (Black, 2006), or the participation in guilds in multiplayer online role-playing game communities with millions of players (Gee, 2003). We have chosen to call this type of collaboration *collective* learning because it emphasizes the abilities to participate and perform in collectives and thus might be different from participation in small groups. Our concept of collective learning is inspired by recent research in different communities: the work of social scientist Pierre Levy on collective intelligence (1997) examining the potential of intellectual contributions from large groups; the work of gaming researcher Jane McGonigal (2008) observing self-organized coordination among players in collective gaming; and the work of media scholar, Henry Jenkins (2006) studying participatory culture in networked communities. Taken together, this body of work converges, helping us to recognize that large-scale communities can promote new forms of opportunities, as well as challenges, for learning together.

As increasing numbers of learning communities in K-12 and higher education move online, so too grows our need for understanding how to engage large groups of learners effectively in these networked communities. The starting point for our investigation on collective learning is a simple question: Does the size of the group matter? We realize that there will be no simple answer because massive communities such as social networking sites, virtual worlds, and multiplayer online role-playing games are each organized around different purposes and practices and thus participants have different incentives for joining and collaborating with each other (see also Hung, Lim, Chen, & Koh, 2008). We begin with a review of what research has identified as key features of collaborative learning in small and large groups. We then draw upon research and our knowledge of one such large-scale networked community, called Scratch (scratch.mit.edu), to describe and articulate the different dimensions of collective learning. In our discussion, we outline the emerging challenges and opportunities for research in computer supported *collective* learning.

Background

The work in CSCL draws upon hundreds, if not thousands, of research studies that have investigated various aspects of collaboration, including the nature of various group arrangements such as reciprocal teaching or

jigsaw techniques, interactions with members of different gender, race, ability, and experience, and causes for success and failures of group work (O'Donnell, 2006; Webb & Palincsar, 1996). The research on computer supported collaborative learning, as documented in the *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning* (ijCSCL), has built on this substantial body of research and provides compelling evidence that collaboration can be arranged and even fostered in instrumental ways via computer support, albeit with a focus on what we would like to call *collaborative* learning – the ability to interact in and contribute to small groups. By contrast, the research on *collective* learning – the ability to interact in and contribute to large groups – is only now beginning to build such a body of work. We call this collective learning because groups are described by being in a particular space such as a virtual world or gaming community and often focused on tasks such as contributing to a collaborative repository.

To date, only a few studies in *ijCSCL* have tackled aspects of collective learning by designing wiki activities for university classes (Guzdial & Rick, 2006) or studying an afterschool gaming club participating in a tween virtual world with over 1.5 million players (Fields & Kafai, 2009). Some researchers have begun to conceptually map out issues of understanding collaboration and learning in Web 2.0 communities (Dohn, 2009) as well as to identify issues of trust building (Gerdes, 2010), while others have argued against adopting these models for school communities (Hung, Lim, Chen, & Koh, 2008). The size in number of participating members in these online communities is indeed impressive, especially considering that the possibility to interact with hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of others across geographical boundaries is unprecedented in history. This is particularly true for youth who might have connected at most with hundreds or thousands of others in their local communities and schools. Research is now showing that participation in these online communities can provide rich opportunities for learning to solve complex problems and for learning to collaborate with others in large groups (boyd, 2008; Gee, 2003; Ito et al., 2008). Yet it is unclear what it means to participate effectively in large-scale groups, to develop and foster a sense of community and belonging, and to design for collective learning interactions.

Closest to issues associated with collective learning is the work on Computer Supported Intentional Learning Environments (CSILE) (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1991) and other studies following the knowledge forum tradition, since they examine how students' knowledge-sharing, knowledge-construction, knowledge-creation, and knowledge-assessment (e.g., Ares, 2008; Eddy, Chan & van Aalst, 2006; von Aalst, 2009) come into play. Most CSILE implementations have operated within a classroom environment, sometimes connecting students from other classes or previous years, and thus are far away from the size of social media communities today. Despite this, Scardamalia (2002; see also Zhang, Scardamalia, Reeve, & Messina, 2009) articulated early on the need for collective cognitive responsibility describing it as the “conditions in which responsibility for the success for a group is distributed across all the members rather than being concentrated on the leader” in addition for taking on responsibility “for knowing, what needs to be known, and for insuring that others know what needs to be known” (p. 2). Concepts such as collective cognitive responsibility indicate that interactions in these online communities could have different constraints and affordances due to their massive number of participants, unstructured and structured groups with concurrent asynchronous and synchronous nature of interactions, ongoing persistence of online life in absence of individual presence in addition to the nature of collaborative tasks and contributions. To better understand what collaborative vs. collective learning in a large-scale networked community looks like, we will first use an illustrative case study of Scratch community to examine some of its features in context before highlighting similarities and differences between these two paradigms of social interaction.

Computer-Supported Collective Learning in Networked Community of Scratch

We have chosen as a case study one open-source Web 2.0 application, called Scratch (scratch.mit.edu), to illustrate different dimensions of both collaborative and collective learning. Scratch is a media-rich programming language that allows youth to design, share, and remix software programs in form of games, stories, and animations. Scratch uses a familiar building block command structure (Resnick, et al., 2009), eliminating thorny debugging processes and the risk of syntax errors (see Figure 1a). Furthermore, programmed objects can be any imported two-dimensional graphic image, hand-drawn or downloaded from the Web, to further personalize each project. This makes it particularly amenable to an array of novice programmers wanting to build their own software and engage in the participatory culture. Since its public launch in May of 2007, the Scratch website (<http://scratch.mit.edu>) has been the primary means for users to share their work with one another (see Figure 1b). With over 1.2 million registered contributors and over 630,000 projects shared to date, the Scratch website is a vibrant online community with over 1,000 new projects being uploaded every day. It is possible to use Scratch as an individual programming tool or in traditional small groups formats (e.g., pair programming) but the website facilitates remixing and open-source like sharing of programs with others across time and space. In the following section, we review prior work on the emerging Scratch community and reframe this work with respect to our paper's central thesis: collaborative versus collective learning.




Figure 1. (a) Screenshot Scratch Interface and (b) Screenshot of Scratch Website.

We first present the typical activities that are organized collaboratively and collectively within the Scratch community. Each of these activity structures occur simultaneously within the community serving separate ends and potential contribute to separate types of learning experiences. In order to better articulate the differences between collaborative and collective learning, we have compiled a table (see Table 1) that highlights the key differences and similarities between collaborative and collective learning. It's important to note that our example, the Scratch community, affords both types of learning simultaneously, and while layered, each has its own distinctions.

Collaborative activities include mostly goal-oriented activities. Typically in the classroom, these would include small group work, team projects, discussion groups and so on. Outside the classroom, collaborative activities include playing board games, most platform style videogames with members of your family, sitting on committees, or playing in a rock band. In the Scratch online community, collaborative activities typically revolve around the production of particular types of Scratch projects by a small group of individuals that have commonly met one another in the online environment. One study focused on observations of a small collaborative group within the Scratch community called "Green Bear Group" that had formed spontaneously on the Scratch website by three children ages 8, 13, and 15 (Aragon et al., 2009). Over time, this group expanded and was later joined by over a dozen other members. They posted their projects on a gallery and members vote on which projects to further develop since each member brought different skills such as music, graphics or editing to the group. Based on an analysis of comments on the gallery as well as a survey, researchers observed found 19% of comments related directly to the job that needed to get done, 49% on socio-emotional aspects such as socializing and personal discussions, and 32% on contextual aspects such as arranging how to organize work, system administration and hardware issues. This suggests that collaborative groups do more than just getting the job done, they can also provide social and emotional support. Moreover, while bearing similarities to collaborative groups found in many assigned classrooms, what distinguishes these types of online collaboratives from regular groups are that they're self-organized and with flexible roles.

Collective activities, by contrast, include larger groups of individual with participation that is less goal-oriented and revolves more about sustained, enjoyed participation within the community over time. These types of activities although sparse in classroom settings, are common particularly in online affinity groups and in the arts. In the performing arts in particular, collective activities are common including African dance circles or orchestra performances. Wikipedia, Facebook, and Massively-Multiplayer Online Games are examples of collective activities where there may be some goal-oriented activities that drive participation but the community is driven by many individuals making modest contributions or participating peripherally and by a few intense participants. Within the Scratch community, this move toward membership in a large-scale community like Scratch can be a complex interplay between how young software designers develop personal agency with programming and gain status as experts amongst their peers. For instance, we followed two 12-year old participants, Lucetta and Matthew, as they learned the programming software Scratch and then joined scratch.mit.edu both in an after-school club and in a class as part of a four-month long ethnographic study (Kafai, Burke & Fields, 2010). We found that the web community furthered both Lucetta and Matthew's membership in a programming community in different ways. Lucetta friended other users, commented on projects, and uploaded her own projects, taking advantage of the social community on the site. This fit her cooperative social style, mixing with others while sharing an interest in Scratch. In contrast, Matthew embraced the potential of remixing, though there were other aspects of participation that he did not take up such as sharing his own project for validation and feedback from the community. However, Lucetta's initial resistance to migrating online and Matthew's own reluctance to upload his club project to the Scratch website, also suggest that establishing membership in a larger programming community is not as easily achieved as we had hoped. This suggests that navigating the collective community can accommodate an array of participation strategies and that there is a range of ways to participate in the collective and that it's probably necessary to learn about how to participate in collective activities in ways that might be initially uncomfortable. For example, what's lost or gained in Matthew and Lucetta's participation? What are the learning benefits of each of their participation

strategies? How might we teach them to participate in collectives in new ways, identifying with new practices? Moreover, what's the potential role that schools can play in this landscape?

Table 1: Collaborative vs. collective learning.

	Collaborative Learning	Collective Learning
Group size is...	Small groups with less than 5 individuals, and more typically 2-5 individuals	Large groups of more than 5 individuals; can involve whole class instruction, frequently groups of 30-40 or possibly even hundreds or thousands of individuals that embrace a common set of practices and ways of participation
Typical Activities include...	Also includes mostly goal-oriented activities (i.e., a group assignment in a course). Small group work; Team projects; Discussion groups; Board games; Platform Video games; Committees; Rock bands	Affinity groups; Wikipedia; Dance Circles; Massively Multiplayer Online Games; Sports teams; Orchestras
Time is...	Often relatively short, task-based time periods that can be either synchronous or asynchronous and is usually organized by the group leader.	Often needs to happen over long periods of time with cyclical patterns or trends of involvement that can be further analyzed. Most often this is asynchronous but there may be spurts of synchronous large-scale activity. Less organization to the way in which time is organized in the collective. The web-master has the most immediate impact on the organization of time (e.g., calling for work on a certain theme) but the community can arrange happenings as well (e.g., flash mobs).
Leadership is...	In classroom communities, it is often centralized (e.g., a teacher directs activity).	In online communities, leadership is emergent, decentralized, and distributed among a large group of individuals; Collective leadership is also an inherent to the role that designers play in shaping the online community but also co-constructed in the community.
Division of Labor is...	Usually prescribed; roles of either group leader and participants. Participants usually take on the same role in the group with one leader emerging from the group. Absenteeism affects the group. There is a need for every member to take on a strong role in the group – if one or more members are reticent members, the group's goals can be compromised.	Members take on one role to fill a legitimate community need within the larger group. Absenteeism affects the collective less until it becomes widespread. Roles are un-prescribed and fluid – individuals can inhabit a range of roles but don't take on all roles. Newcomers can be peripheral participants in the activity without affecting the collective goals.
Knowledge is...	Distributed among a small group of individuals that commonly have some face-to-face interaction. Less institutional history (i.e., course assignments are repeated year after year in the course with little communication among students)	Collective knowledge, by contrast, by de facto is stored on the main site or with links to other off-site information (perhaps a how-to webpage) and is readily accessible to the community to have large-scale impact. Collective knowledge is also distributed among individuals, commonly separated in time and space. Knowledge usually has some institutional memory as old-timers remain in the group, and CSCL Communities typically create shared artifacts to share tips with other.

The entire Scratch community, however, is not made from simply small collaboratives and individuals participating in the collective activities fostered by the website. There are also collective groups (i.e., large affinity groups) that work to produce work of a similar interest over an unspecified period of time. For example, and within the online community, similar themes emerge and spread quickly among members with similar interests, including projects around the Japanese manga character, Naruto, projects inspired by Logo Art, and other popular videogames. We have also observed the emergence of large-scale collectives in local contexts around the use of Scratch. For example, a sub-community of 30-40 Scratch programmers in South LA began making Scratch projects based on Low Riders—highly personalized cars often characterized by having low suspensions and original paint and hubcap designs (Peppler & Kafai, 2007). This local affinity group worked to produce a number of Low Rider Scratch projects over the course of a year. While working almost entirely offline, this community looks similar to affinity groups that have emerged within the online community as well.

Moreover, new practices emerge at the collective level that are simply not possible in small collaborative groups. For example, a particular form of participation within the Scratch is called “remixing”, taking existing Scratch projects and changing them before uploading them back to the website. It has been argued that remixing is a key practice in today's networked culture in support of our knowledge production. Crediting ownership consists of referencing the intellectual origins of “text” used in media productions. For instance, remixing Scratch projects (i.e., taking an existing project and modifying code or graphics) is a common practice in the larger Scratch community; in fact, over 40% of all projects posted on the web site are remixes of existing Scratch projects (Senivirate & Monroy-Hernández, 2010) and this number has been steadily increasing since its launch. The culture of remixing in Scratch itself is not without fraught as positive and negative comments are prevalent. In an after-school club, Scratch programmers ages 10-12 years were adamant that their fellow programmers credited the origins of programs that they had remixed and posted online. While Scratch programmers initially were concerned about others taking their programs, they also came to understand

the remixes as a form of recognition that represented attention they received from others (Kafai, Burke, & Fields, 2010).

In addition to the differences in group sizes and types of activities that collaborative and collective groups tend to engage in, there are several additional distinguishing features about collaborative learning versus collective learning, which we summarize here in the ways that collectives organize time, community leadership, the division of labor, and knowledge, which are further described below and draw upon the examples mentioned above. In collaborative groups, time is often organized in relatively short intervals in a typically synchronous but sometimes asynchronous fashion. Additionally, time is usually organized by the group's leader, which makes goal-oriented deadlines. For example, a project leader might organize a time for the group to meet or a deadline for materials to be received as in the case of the Green Bear Group. By contrast, time within a collective is more open and with cyclical patterns or windows/ opportunities for involvement at an upcoming event or happening. Most often though time in collectives is asynchronous and not deadline oriented. For example, online communities typically have round the clock involvement of its members, so that no matter what time you login there are always large groups of individuals in the environment. Time in the collective also demonstrates patterns of activity, which allow for trends to emerge over time with little intentional coordination from its members. While in the Scratch community there is no unified effort to post projects on a certain day or time around a specified theme, there is nevertheless certain trends or memes that spread quickly within the community similar to the Low Rider creators mentioned above. For example, there was a sudden posting and remixing of Mother's day projects in May 2010.

Leadership within collaborative groups usually falls upon a single individual or small group of individuals. While some aspects of this type of top-down leadership can still be seen in collectives, leadership is also distributed among its members, emergent, and decentralized. For example, the online community was tweaked by its designers to highlight "Top Remixed Projects" to promote more remixing within the community. After doing so, the number of projects claiming to have remixed another project went up substantially as well as the number of projects that were created as tools for others to build on and remix went up substantially (as is the case with projects like side-scrolling game engines). Individuals also began to make new types of projects that could be remixed and to advertise and compete for these slots on the homepage in ways that were unexpected by the webmasters. Similarly, prior studies in MMOs have demonstrated this type of emergent leadership and use of tools in unexpected ways that the designers hadn't intended.

Accordingly, the division of labor is quite different within these two types of groups. Within a collaborative group, members all take on particular identities within the group as the programmer, the designer, musician, and editor with a distinct contribution to the group's production goals. These roles are usually prescribed by the teacher or group leader and somewhat stagnant over the course of the project. Absenteeism also highly affects the group. There is a need for every member to take on a strong role in the group because if one or more members are reticent members, the group's goals can be compromised. Within the collective, members take on a role to fill a perceived need within the community. Absenteeism also affects the collective less until it becomes widespread as there are multiple individuals with similar expertise available to fill in and knowledge is dispersed amongst its members. Roles are also un-prescribed and fluid. Individuals can inhabit a range of roles but don't necessarily take on all roles and newcomers can be peripheral participants in the activity without affecting the collective goals.

Lastly, knowledge is public and well distributed among members of the Scratch community. This is most visible when you look at the community as a whole and seeing it growing and changing in many ways over time. One might wonder whether expertise grows over time in these informal communities, and, indeed it does. Based on data from the South LA field site of Scratch users, pre- and post-test analyses revealed that youth learned about the big ideas of computer programming as well as visual/multimodal media arts production over the course of two years in absence of direct instruction (Maloney, Peppler, Kafai, Resnick, & Rusk, 2008). These analyses were consistent for individual learning as well as community learning (i.e., new members were being apprenticed into the community to produce more sophisticated work over the course of the study). This body of research demonstrates that the collective can generate competence in a domain in the absence of direct instructions and what is traditionally thought to be subject area expertise. In fact, the corpus of projects growing on the Scratch website at exponential rates reflects a similar growing understanding made more accessible by the fact that any project can be downloaded, analyzed and easily remixed to enable new generations of members to achieve tasks like creating side-scrolling gaming engines more quickly and easily than the ones prior.

Discussion

In this paper we examined different dimensions of participation in massive networked communities. We return to our initial question: does the size of group matter? As expected, there is no simple answer to this question. Collective learning is really about the development of a new community of practice over time (Lave and Wenger, 1991). This is particularly true for a community like the Scratch online community, which has only emerged in the past few years. As a result, specific notions of what it means to share work and start new projects

evolve in this community. But we also do know that practices around sharing information and collaborating have evolved differently than in other programming communities such as StarLogo or Alice where remixing pop culture texts like *Naruto* or *Manga* is not core to participation in the community. While some aspects, for instance the voluntary forms of peer production and contribution for the common good, suggest that new forms of collaborations are emerging, others such as the formation of small groups and issues of intellectual ownership suggest very much a continuation of previous collaborative practices. We have organized our discussion around the following four main themes: groups, designs, ethics, and research in collective learning environments. This list is by no means comprehensive but it serves as a promising starting point for thinking about new research opportunities in computer-supported collective learning.

Our first theme focuses on the group as the main unit of analysis. This has been a focal point in collaboration research, and to some extent, continues to be a focal point for research in massive communities as we observed in the formation of smaller groups in Scratch online and offline communities. It is clear that we need more research to understand how such groups are being formed, who decides to join, and how these groups continue working together, and also when and why they fail in their efforts. We also need to better understand differences in group formation and how this relates to the nature of artifacts produced. For instance, in many gaming communities players organize in guilds to engage in quests. These guilds are highly structured organizations where players assume different roles and contribute to the success of the mission (e.g., Gee, 2003). Contrast this with the free formation of the “Green Bear Group” in Scratch that set out to design games. Here members contributed based on their expertise but roles could change based on needs. The traditional collaboration research (Cohen, 1994) as well as CSCL research provides us with little information about the dynamics of unstructured group collaborations as prevalent in many massive communities. We can say that one aspect of collective learning is to assume multiple roles; these roles are not prescribed though members are valued and recognized in the community for their particular abilities. Such changes in participation are also part of communities of practice and often assumed for successful collaboration in small groups. Perhaps it is the prescriptive nature of assigned roles in small group collaboration that make it difficult for members to adopt the fluidity needed to function and perform and larger collectives.

Technical designs are equally important in studying collective learning since massive networked communities are artifacts, meaning that structures and features are designed by programmers and modified through community use. There are multiple feedback mechanisms and documentation notes that can be integrated and made accessible to participants. For instance, we do not understand which features lead members to contribute productively to large efforts and which ones might hinder such contributions. While some of these, such as recognizing heritage in remixed projects are social issues, they also involve technical solutions. For instance, in Scratch, the system automatically keeps track and makes visible such lineage. On the other hand, we have participants who are playing a growing role in content production, in the case of many virtual worlds such as *Second Life*, even are the main content producers for the community. How much of this control is ceded to participants is something that needs to be considered in the setup of these community as well as the technical prerequisites of lay designers themselves, in particular when we talk about younger participants.

We also need to consider issues about ethics that invariably come up in the context of collective production, sharing and commenting and are particularly relevant in the context of schooling that still favors individual recognition. What does it mean when members contribute to a larger project, how is this recognized? What about remixes that take up existing projects and modify them – a practice very common in networked communities? In a recent *ijCSCL* article, researcher Gerdes (2008) raised the issue of developing trust that surely plays a growing role in massive communities where participants do not know each other and perhaps never meet face to face.

Finally we need to expand our repertoire of research methods in describing and analyzing collective learning. Studies of gaming and social network communities (Boelstorff, Taylor, Nardi & Pearce, in press; Hine, 2000; Williams, Yee, & Caplan, 2008) reveal an unhealthy split in either quantitative or qualitative research approaches. For instance, survey methods and statistical data mining seem to drive many efforts in coming to grips what engages members in these communities. On the other end, we have ethnographies of single massive community (see Boelstorff, 2008; Taylor, 2006) that inform us with a fine-grained detail of cultural practices and activities. Of course, others have complained about this dichotomy and argued for a mixed methods approach (Williams, 2005). In our view it is not just about juxtaposing data sources and analytical methods but also about developing ways that integrate both in a productive manner. As a case in point, we have suggested and employed connected ethnographies that make use of the data mining and reduction in large data sets to identify particular participants based on their contribution profiles and to cross reference and develop these through in-depth ethnographies (Kafai & Fields, in press; see also Reimann (2009). Such analyses leverage the explanatory potential of each method and allow us to contextualize cases within larger community trends.

All of these features come into prominence when we think about the design of massive intentional learning or knowledge building communities (Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1991) that design for collective learning. In the case of Scratch, we have started collaborative design challenges in the online community that invite

members to work together on programming projects. Our efforts focus on understanding how groups and collectives form and interact across global and local Scratch communities and how to better design and support computer-supported collaborative and collective learning. Our observations suggest that it might be worthwhile to think about the second C in CSCL not just as collaborative but also as collective learning. It's not just a simple matter of involving larger numbers of participants but also of considering the nature of activities, the roles that participants will assume, and the performances or artifacts that present the culmination of efforts to effectively design and study collective learning environments. We suggest that CSCL researchers step outside the boundaries of small groups and begin to consider alternative arrangements. Both collaborative and collective learning technologies, activities, and environments that we design are greatly influenced by how we think about learning as a socially situated activity. Size does matter – we just need to know how and when to engage in collective vs. collaborative learning.

References

- Aragon, C., Poon, S., Monroy-Hernandez, A., & Aragon, D. (2009). A tale of two online communities: Fostering Collaboration and Creativity in Scientists and Children. In *Proceedings of the ACM Creativity and Cognition Conference*, Berkeley, CA.
- Ares, N. (2008) Cultural practices in networked classroom learning environments. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 3(3), 301-326.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press
- Birchfield, D. & Megowan-Romanowicz, C. (2009) Earth science learning in SMALLab: A design experiment for mixed reality. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4 (4), 403-421.
- Black, R.W. (2008). *Adolescents and Online Fan Fiction*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Boellstorff, T. (2008). *Coming of age in second life: An anthropologist explores the virtually human*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Boellstorff, T., Nardi, B., Pearce, C. & Taylor, TL (in press) (Eds.). *A Handbook of Ethnographic Methods for Virtual Worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- boyd, d. (2008). Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, Identity and Digital Media* (pp. 119-142). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Brown, A., & Campione, J. (1994). Guided discovery in a community of learners. In K. McGilly (Ed.), *Classroom lessons: Integrating cognitive theory and classroom practice* (pp. 229-290). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cohen, E. G. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 1-35.
- Dohn, N. (2009). Web 2.0: Inherent tensions and evident challenges for education. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4(3), 343-363.
- Eddy, Y.C.L., Chan, C., & van Aalst, J. (2006). Students assessing their own collaborative knowledge building. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 1(1), 57-87.
- Engelmann, T. & Hesse, F.W. (2010) How digital concept maps about the collaborators' knowledge and information influence computer-supported collaborative problem solving. *ijcscl* 5 (3), pp. 299-320.
- Fields, D. A. & Kafai, Y. B. (2009). "U wanna go to the moon?" A connective ethnography of peer knowledge sharing and diffusion in a tween virtual world. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4(1), 47-68.
- Gerdes, A. (2010) Revealing preconditions for trustful collaboration in CSCL. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 5 (3), 345-353.
- Hill, M. B., Monroy-Hernández, A., & Olson, K. (2010). Responses to Remixing on a social media sharing website. *Fourth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Hine, C. (2000). *Virtual ethnography*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hung, D., Lim, D., Chen, V. & Koh, T. S. (2008) Leveraging Online Communities in Fostering Adaptive Schools. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 3(4), 373-386.
- Jenkins, H., Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A., & Weigel, M. (2006). Confronting the challenges of participation culture: Media education for the 21st century. White paper. Chicago, IL: The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.
- Kafai, Y. B. & Fields, D. A. (forthcoming). Understanding Player Participation and Practices in Virtual Worlds: A Proposal for Qualitative Analyses of Log File Data. In D. Thomas (Ed.), *Research methods in virtual worlds*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Knobel, M. & Lankshear, C. (2009) Wikis, digital literacies, and professional growth *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(7), 631-634.

- Leadbeater, C. & Miller, P. (2004). *The Pro-Am Revolution: How enthusiasts are changing are economy and society*. London: Demos.
- Levy, P. (1997). *Collective intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: Helix Books.
- McGonigal, J. (2008). 'Why I love bees: A case study in collective intelligence gaming' in K. Salen (Ed.), *The ecology of games: Connecting youth, games, and learning* (pp. 199-228). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Maloney, J., Peppler, K., Kafai, Y., Resnick, M., & Rusk, N. (2008, March). *Programming by choice: Urban youth learning programming with Scratch*. Paper presented at the SIGCSE 2008 Conference, Portland, OR.
- Monroy-Hernandez, A. & Resnick, M. (2008). Empowering kids to create and share programmable media. *Interactions*, 15(2), 50-53.
- O'Donnell, A. M. (2006). The role of peers and group learning. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology*, 2nd Edition. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' Need for Belonging in the School Community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323-367.
- Peppler, K. A. & Kafai, Y. B. (2007). From SuperGoo to Scratch: Exploring creative digital media production in informal learning. *Learning, Media, and Technology*, 32(2), 149-166.
- Reimann, P. (2009) Time is precious: Variable- and event-centered approaches to process analysis in CSCL research. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4(3), pp. 239-257.
- Resnick, M., Maloney, J., Author 2 Rusk, N., Eastmond, E., Brennan, K., Millner, A., Rosenbaum, E., Silver, J., Silverman, B., & Author. (2009). Scratch: Programming for all. *Communication of the ACM*, 52(11), 60-67.
- Scardamalia, M. (2002). Collective cognitive responsibility for the advancement of knowledge. In B. Smith (Eds.), *Liberal education in a knowledge society* (pp. 67-98). Chicago: Open Court.
- Scheuer, O., Loll, F., Pinkwart, N., & McLaren, B. M. (2010) Computer-supported argumentation: A review of the state of the art. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 5 (1), pp. 43-102.
- Senivirate, O. & Monroy-Hernández, A. (2010). Remix culture on the web: A survey of content reuse on different user-generated content web sites. *Web Science Conference*. Raleigh, NC.
- Shirky, C. (2008). *Here Comes Everybody: The Power of Organizing Without Organizations*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.
- van Aalst, J. (2009) Distinguishing knowledge-sharing, knowledge-construction, and knowledge-creation discourses. *International Journal of Computer Supported Collaborative Learning*, 4(3), pp. 259-287
- Webb, N. & Palincsar, A. (1996). Collaborative learning. In D. Berliner (Ed.), *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (pp. 345-413), New York: Macmillan.
- Williams, D. (2005). Bridging the methodological divide in game research. *Simulation & Gaming*, 36(4), 1-17.
- Williams, D., Yee, N. & Caplan, S. (2008). Who plays, how much, and why? Debunking the stereotypical gamer profile. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13(4), 993-1028.
- Zhang, J., Scardamalia, M., Reeve, R., & Messina, R. (2009). Designs for Collective Cognitive Responsibility in Knowledge-Building Communities. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 18(1), 7-44.

Acknowledgments

The writing of this paper was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF-CDI-1027736) to the first author and a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation's Digital Media and Learning Initiative to the second author. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Foundations, University of Pennsylvania or Indiana University.

AUTHOR INDEX

- Abels, Kristina, 1
 Abrahamson, Dor, 272
 Abrami, Philip, 756
 Adams, Anne, 916
 Aditomo, Anindito, 128
 Agrawal, Pulkit, 462
 Ahmad, S Zanariah, 1120
 Ahmad, Salman, 112
 Ahmet, Zeynep, 160
 Alagha, Iyad, 1081
 Alavi, Hamed, 350, 510
 Alcaniz, Mariano, 841
 Aleo, Franc, 160
 Allaire, Stephane, 900, 1168
 Allert, Heidrun, 1000
 Alterman, Richard, 240
 Amelung, Chris, 591
 Anastopoulou, Stamatina, 1202
 Arastoopour, Golnaz, 626
 Armitt, Gillian, 781
 Arnold, Franziska, 864, 1259
 Asensio-Perez, Juan, 1103
 Asher, Itay, 904
 Avouris, Nikolaos, 446
 Bagley, Elizabeth, 1214
 Bamberger, Jeanne, 992
 Banica, Dan, 771
 Bao, Xianqing, 1045
 Baumgartner, Adrian, 601
 Bauters, Merja, 1150
 Becher, Katharina, 1
 Beckers, Anna, 1
 Bereiter, Carl, 57, 571, 1089, 1111, 1123
 Berland, Matthew, 666
 Bertram, Johanna, 192
 Betrancourt, Mireille, 478
 Beuth, Jack, 398
 Bielaczyc, Katherine, 1089, 1111, 1123
 Blake, Canan, 726, 916, 1202
 Blancafort, Marta, 1178
 Blikstein, Paulo, 976
 Blondel, Francois-Marie, 846
 Bodemer, Daniel, 358, 962, 1065, 1170
 Bohm, Sonja, 716
 Boluda, Pere, 1178
 Bonnard, Quentin, 510
 Bopardikar, Anushree, 104, 731
 Boticki, Ivica, 168
 Boutin, Pier-Ann, 1178
 Boyer, Mark, 978
 Brennan, Karen, 342
 Brett, Clare, 960
 Breuleux, Alain, 856, 1134
 Brown, Scott, 978
 Brunger, Adrienne, 806, 934, 1081
 Buckley, Barbara, 1188
 Buder, Jürgen, 358, 374, 796, 962
 Bull, Susan, 761
 Burd, Elizabeth, 1081
 Bures, Eva, 756
 Caeiro-Rodriguez, Manuel, 691
 Cakir, Murat Perit, 534
 Calvo, Rafael, 128
 Chai, Shaoming, 898, 1045
 Chan, Anwar, 1073
 Chan, Carol K. K., 49, 914, 1053, 1111, 1139, 1207
 Chan, Lok Sze, 1185
 Chan, Tak-Wai, 646, 932, 944, 1289
 Chan, Yuen-Yan, 914
 Chang, Hsin-Yi, 1029, 1197
 Chang, Hsiu-Mei, 80, 944, 1264
 Chang, Yu-Hui, 858
 Chapman, Robbin, 970, 974
 Charles, Elizabeth S., 641, 866
 Chasteen, Michael, 696
 Chaves, Gina, 1154
 Chaves, Wendy, 1154
 Chen, Bodong, 571, 998, 1111, 1123
 Chen, Chih-Mao, 944
 Chen, Ching-Huei, 940
 Chen, Fei-Ching, 80
 Chen, Frank, 112
 Chen, Gaowei, 776
 Chen, Jennifer King, 1029
 Chen, Mark, 661
 Chen, Wenli, 144, 414, 454, 786, 836, 1015, 1037, 1073
 Chen, Xidiao, 1045
 Chen, Yen-Hua, 646
 Chen, Zhi-Hong, 932, 944
 Cheng, Gang, 1045
 Cheng, Jiaming 程佳銘, 1302
 Cheng, Kai-Tien, 80
 Cheng, Kenneth, 1159
 Cheong, Siew Kheng, 1120
 Chesler, Naomi, 626
 Chi, Ed H., 1010
 Chin, Chee-Kuen, 144
 Ching, Dixie, 671
 Chiu, Chieh-Hsin, 912
 Chiu, Jennifer, 984, 1029, 1197
 Chiu, Ming Ming, 64, 776, 1015
 Cho, Kwangsu, 1166
 Choi, Yin Wai Yvonne, 1185
 Chounta, Irene-Angelica, 446
 Chow, Chi Kin, 1175
 Choy, Chong Wah Cedric, 1120
 Chu, Ka Tim, 1175

- Chu, Samuel Kai Wah, 1148
 Chuy, Maria, 57, 571, 998, 1111
 Clegg, Tamara, 248
 Collier, Nicole, 964
 Collins, Trevor, 726, 916
 Condamines, Thierry, 486
 Constantinou, Constantinos, 904
 Constantinou, Costas P., 686
 Contero, Manuel, 841
 Coughlan, Tim, 916
 Coulter, Bob, 1023
 Craft, Brock, 1183
 Cress, Ulrike, 1, 192, 566, 864, 938
 Crider, Jeremy, 806, 934, 1081
 Cuendet, Sebastien, 510
 Daily, Shaundra, 974
 Damsa, Crina, 200, 470, 1095, 1150
 D'Angelo, Cynthia, 626
 Danish, Joshua, 216
 Dascalu, Mihai, 781
 Davies, Sarah, 916
 Davis, Sarah, 890
 Dayan, Jacob, 651, 1209
 de Jong, Frank, 821
 de Jong, Ton, 1202
 de Laa, Maarten, 1200
 de Laat, Hanneke, 821
 DeBarger, Angela Haydel, 518
 Dede, Chris, 902
 De-Groot, Reuma, 952, 1162
 Deguchi, Akiko, 896
 Deiglmayr, Anne, 676
 Delacruz, Girlie, 216
 Deng, Liping, 882
 Devlin, Alison, 874
 Dickinson, Anthony R., 656
 Dillenbourg, Pierre, 184, 350, 510, 1199
 Dimitracopoulou, Angelique, 741
 Dimitriadis, Yannis, 518, 1073, 1103
 Dohrmann, Patrick, 886
 Do-Lenh, Son, 510
 Dong, Zhijiang, 696
 Downton, Michael, 992
 Dubrowski, Adam, 990
 Dugdale, Michael, 641
 Dunleavy, Matt, 1023
 Duval, Erik, 1011
 Dyke, Gregory, 454, 1015, 1193
 Eberbach, Catherine, 982
 Edwards, Margaret, 1306
 Effendi, David, 890
 Elinich, Karen, 9, 870
 Ellis, Cali, 636
 El-Refai, Walid, 120
 Engler, Jan, 1202
 Enriquez, Rutchelle, 1029
 Enyedy, Noel, 216
 Erkens, Gijsbert, 200, 264
 Eseryel, Deniz, 586
 Evans, Michael A., 806, 934, 946, 1081
 Feenberg, Andrew, 756
 Fernandez, Eloy, 1103
 Ferreira, Deller, 888
 Fesakis, Georgios, 741
 Fields, Deborah, 701, 910
 Fischer, Frank, 120, 304, 382, 390, 406, 422, 438, 716, 894, 958, 1081, 1103, 1199, 1289
 Fraser, Danae Stanton, 1037
 Fu, Ella L. F., 49, 1239
 Fueyo, Vivian, 964
 Fukuda, Hiroyuki, 880
 Funaoi, Hideo, 880
 Fung, Yuen Han, 1053, 1139
 Fyfe, Vilma, 918
 Gao, Fei, 1296
 Gardner, Christina, 248
 Ge, Xun, 586
 Gehlen-Baum, Vera, 406
 Gentile, Sylvia, 216
 Georgiou, Agni, 721
 Gnesdilow, Dana, 104
 Gnoli, Alessandro, 1081
 Goel, Ashok, 982
 Goeze, Annika, 894
 Goggins, Sean P., 591
 Goodyear, Peter, 831
 Gorsky, Paul, 862
 Greene, Daniel, 976
 Grotzer, Tina, 902
 Gu, Xiaoqing, 1045
 Guichon, Nicolas, 478
 Guo, Shaoqing, 1045
 Guribye, Frode, 136
 Gutierrez, Jose, 272
 Gweon, Gahgene, 462
 Ha, Henry, 1175
 Hakkarainen, Kai, 948, 1089, 1111
 Håklev, Stian, 1123, 1308, 1310
 Halatchliyski, lassen, 566, 1254
 Hamalainen, Raija, 631, 946
 Hamel, Christine, 900
 Hamilton, Eric, 1004, 1006, 1154, 1312
 Hansson, Lena, 904
 Harding, Nancy, 1154
 Harrer, Andreas, 1103, 1162
 Hasenbein, Melanie, 616
 Hatch, Andrew, 176
 Haussmann, Annette, 1
 Heo, Gyeong Mi, 856
 Hernandez, Juan Carlos, 986
 Hernandez-Leo, Davinia, 1103
 Herodotou, Christothea, 904
 Herrmann, Thomas, 811, 938
 Hesse, Friedrich W., 152, 374

- Hewitt, Jim, 960
 Higgins, Steve, 176, 1081
 Hirashima, Tsukasa, 880
 Hmelo-Silver, Cindy, 550, 982, 1013, 1289
 Ho, K. C., 1164
 Hoadley, Christopher, 671, 1013, 1207
 Hong, Huang-Yao, 858, 912, 1111
 Hong, Ming, 912
 Honwad, Sameer, 982
 Hoppe, H. Ulrich, 986, 1202
 Howley, Iris, 366
 Hsiao, Ying-Ting, 88, 711
 Hsieh, Fang-Pei, 1029
 Hu, Chun, 918, 1126
 Hu, Zhiwen, 1294
 Hubscher, Roland, 1013
 Hui, Diane, 656, 1139
 Hundertmark, Sarah, 924
 Hunter, Judith, 990
 Hussmann, Heinrich, 716
 Idris, Sufian, 621
 Ilomaki, Liisa, 502, 1150
 Im, Jungtaek, 1166
 Inagaki, Shigenori, 896
 Ioannou, Andri, 721
 Ishiguro, Hiroshi, 1205
 Jacobson, Michael, 1126
 Jaeger, Allison, 1081
 Janssen, Jeroen, 200, 326
 Jeong, Heisawn, 454, 550, 786, 1015
 Jermann, Patrick, 184, 510
 Jing, Leng, 1168
 Johansson, Carolina, 160
 Jonassen, David, 1059
 Jones, Ann, 726
 Jonsson, Martin, 160
 Jordan, Rebecca, 982
 Joyce-Gibbons, Andrew, 176
 Jurgens, Alke, 886
 Kaendler, Celia, 676
 Kafai, Yasmin, 17, 701, 910, 1013
 Kahrmanis, Georgios, 446
 Kai Chan, Keung, 1159
 Kali, Yael, 651, 831, 1209
 Kam, Matthew, 671
 Kamarainen, Amy, 902
 Kamvar, Sep, 112
 Kanda, Takayuki, 1205
 Kangas, Kaiju, 851
 Kaplan, Frederic, 510
 Kapur, Manu, 1065, 1126, 1170
 Karlgren, Klas, 1150
 Kartiko, Iwan, 1126
 Kawasaki, Miho, 988
 Kay, Judy, 25
 Kennedy-Clark, Shannon, 596, 706, 878
 Kerawalla, Lucinda, 726
 Kim, Beaumie, 920
 Kim, Gwang-Jo, 1009
 Kim, Jihie, 892
 Kim, Mi Song, 920
 Kimmerle, Joachim, 1, 566
 Kirschner, Paul A, 264, 326
 Kita, Chigusa, 112
 Klopfer, Eric, 1023, 1130
 Knickle, Kerry, 990
 Knight, Katherine, 224
 Knipfer, Kristin, 938
 Koedinger, Kenneth R., 334
 Koh, Quee Boon, 1029
 Kohen-Vacs, Dan, 681, 1103
 Kohnle, Carmen, 958
 Kollar, Ingo, 120, 382, 390, 422, 946, 1081
 Kollias, Vassilis, 904
 Kolodner, Janet, 248, 1053
 Koper, Rob, 766
 Kopp, Birgitta, 616, 736
 Krauskopf, Karsten, 152
 Krumm, Andrew, 868, 1234
 Ku, Yiu Yee, 1159
 Kubota, Yoshihiko, 930
 Kumar, Melissa, 216
 Kumar, Rohit, 398
 Kurti, Arianit, 681
 Kusunoki, Fusako, 896
 Kwok, Ching Yin, 1185
 Kwok, S. M., 1164
 Kynigos, Chronis, 1162
 Kyza, Eleni, 904
 Kyza, Eleni A., 686
 Laferrière, Thérèse, 900, 1111, 1134, 1168, 1178
 Laffey, James, 591, 816
 Lai, Ming, 33, 581
 Lakkala, Minna, 502, 1150
 Lally, Vic, 874
 Lam, Bonnie, 1164
 Langer, Sybille, 422
 Lapeyre, Jaime, 990
 Larusson, Johann, 240
 Lasry, Nathaniel, 866
 Lau, Alison, 1159
 Lau, Siu Fan, 1185
 Laurillard, Diana, 526, 1183
 Law, Nancy, 33, 208, 526, 581, 882, 936, 1015, 1139, 1164, 1168, 1178, 1291
 Law, Victor, 586
 Lawless, Kimberly, 978
 Lax, Leila, 990
 Lea, John, 916
 Lee, Chwee Beng, 1059
 Lee, Hsueh Chien Dawn, 1120
 Lee, Namseok, 1166
 Lee, Shuh Shing, 884
 Lee, Sunghye, 1029

- Lee, Yeung, 526, 882, 1164
 Lee, Yew-Jin, 1120
 Lei, Chunlin, 1269
 Lei, Jing, 1029
 Leng, Jing, 872
 Leung, Lawrence, 208
 Lewis, Armanda, 860
 Li, Cen, 696
 Li, Kangli, 1045
 Li, Kedong, 1045
 Li, Na, 1273
 Li, Yanyan, 1045
 Liao, Calvin C. Y., 932
 Lin, Chiu-Pin, 646
 Linn, Marcia, 994, 1029
 Lit, Shirley, 1175
 Liu, Lei, 826
 Ljubojevic, Dejan, 1183
 Loll, Frank, 296, 980
 Lomas, Derek, 671
 Lonn, Steven, 868
 Looi, Chee-Kit, 168, 414, 454, 646, 786, 836, 1015, 1037, 1073, 1199
 Lopez, Oscar Hernandez, 1178
 Loser, Kai-Uwe, 811
 Lu, Jingyan, 882, 936
 Luckin, Rosemary, 611, 1037
 Ludvigsen, Sten, 470, 1095
 Lui, Michelle, 430, 641, 990, 1081, 1143
 Lund, Kristine, 454, 1015, 1207, 1306
 Luo, Heng, 1029
 MacLennan, Cameron, 990
 Madeira, Cheryl Ann, 558, 966, 968
 Makitalo-Siegl, Kati, 958
 Maldonado, Heidy, 1202
 Maldonado, Luis Facundo, 986
 Mandl, Heinz, 616, 736
 Mann, Susanna, 746
 Marbouti, Farshid, 88, 711
 Maria, Chuy, 1123
 Markauskaite, Lina, 596, 831
 Martin, Taylor, 666
 Martinez, Roberto, 25
 Martínez-Monés, Alejandra, 1195
 Mathews, Jim, 1023
 Matschke, Christina, 864
 Matteucci, Maria Cristina, 736
 Matuk, Camillia, 994, 1029
 Mavrikis, Manolis, 1162
 Mayfield, Elijah, 366, 438
 McGillion, Michael, 990
 McLaren, Bruce, 980, 1162
 Medina, Richard, 454, 1015
 Mercier, Emma, 176, 1081
 Messina, Richard, 1053, 1123
 Metcalf, Shari, 902
 Michael, Georgia, 686
 Milrad, Marcelo, 681, 1202
 Miyake, Naomi, 96, 1059, 1205
 Mochizuki, Toshio, 930
 Moher, Tom, 1081
 Molinari, Gaelle, 1065, 1170
 Montané, Mireia, 1178
 Moraveji, Neema, 112, 876
 Morley, Elizabeth, 1053, 1123
 Moskaliuk, Johannes, 192, 864
 Motto, Andrea, 806, 934, 1081
 Mous, Karel, 1029
 Mu, Jin, 406, 438
 Mu, Su, 898
 Mullins, Dejana, 184, 676
 Muukkonen, Hanni, 1095, 1150
 Najafi, Hedieh, 996, 1002
 Namdar, Bahadia, 1029
 Nancy, Law, 1045
 Nasser, Samira, 904
 Nelson, Suzanne, 890
 Newstead, Anne, 1126
 Nicolaido, Iolie, 904
 Notari, Michele P., 601
 Nussbaum, Miguel, 1199
 Nüssli, Marc-Antoine, 184
 O'malley, Claire, 1202
 Oksanen, Kimmo, 631
 Oldershaw, Cally, 904
 Ortega, Mario, 841
 Oshima, Jun, 1015, 1111, 1200
 Paavola, Sami, 1150
 Palaiodimos, Aggelos, 741
 Papanastasiou, Elena, 721
 Park, Jonghwi, 866
 Parussel, Karla, 874
 Patel, Kishan, 671
 Patton, Charles, 542
 Patton, Charlie, 1073
 Pea, Roy, 152, 876, 1012, 1202
 Pei, Xinning 裴新宁, 1304
 Penuel, William, 518, 1073
 Peppler, Kylie, 17, 992
 Perez-Lopez, David, 841
 Perez-Rodriguez, Roberto, 691
 Perreault, Christian, 1168, 1178
 Perrotta, Carlo, 946
 Perry, Judy, 1023, 1130
 Peters, Vanessa, 926
 Peterson, Patricia, 928
 Petrick, Carmen, 666
 Phielix, Chris, 326
 Pilz, Florian, 1081
 Pinkwart, Niels, 296, 886, 980
 Plesch, Christine, 676
 Poon, Tung Keung, 1159
 Porte, John, 1126
 Prié, Yannick, 478

- Prieto, Luis P., 518, 1073, 1249
 Prilla, Michael, 938
 Prins, Frans, 326
 Puntambekar, Sadhana, 104, 224, 731, 1013, 1037
 Raes, Annelies, 751, 922, 1219
 Raj, Bhiksha, 462
 Rausch, Andreas, 886
 Reale, Nathan, 696
 Rebedea, Traian, 771, 781
 Redfors, Andreas, 904
 Reedy, Gabriel B., 972
 Reffay, Christophe, 846, 1195
 Reilly, Mark, 908
 Reimann, Peter, 128, 746, 1059
 Ren, Youqun 任友群, 1302
 Resendes, Monica, 57, 571, 998, 1111, 1123
 Reynaud, Stéphane, 1306
 Richards, Debbie, 706, 1126
 Richter, Christoph, 1000, 1150
 Ritella, Giuseppe, 948, 1089
 Robb, Anja, 990
 Rogers, Yvonne, 916
 Ronen, Michaela, 1103
 Ronen, Miki, 681
 Rosberg, Maria, 904
 Roschelle, Jeremy, 542, 1073, 1199
 Rose, Carolyn P., 366, 398, 438, 462, 1015, 1193
 Rosenheck, Louisa, 1023, 1130
 Roy, George, 964
 Rudat, Anja, 962, 1224
 Rugaber, Spencer, 982
 Rummel, Nikol, 334, 676, 1065, 1170
 Rusman, Ellen, 766
 S. Quellmalz, Edys, 1188
 Saarivesi, Eini, 1150
 Saballus, Ulf, 904
 Saito, Moegi, 96
 Salvador-Herranz, Gustavo, 841
 Sami, Rahul, 636
 Sánchez, Mayra Fabiana Angeles, 1283
 Sander, Birgit, 950
 Sarmiento-Klapper, Johann, 534
 Sasaki, Hiroshi, 930
 Sato, Elissa, 994
 Sawyer, Keith, 1015
 Scanlon, Eileen, 726, 1202
 Scardamalia, Marlene, 57, 571, 998, 1053, 1089, 1111, 1123
 Schank, Patricia, 518, 1073
 Schanze, Sascha, 904, 924
 Schellens, Tammy, 751, 922, 1219
 Scheuer, Oliver, 980
 Schmidt, Matthew, 816
 Schooneveld, Jackie Van, 870
 Schrader, Josef, 894
 Schubert, Kai, 950
 Schwarz, Baruch, 1162
 Schwendimann, Beat, 954, 956, 1029
 Schwind, Christina, 374, 796
 Sclater, Madeleine, 874
 Seitamaa-Hakkarainen, Pirita, 851, 948, 1089, 1111
 Shaffer, David Williamson, 626
 Shao, Yin-Juan, 646
 Shapiro, R. Benjamin, 494, 1023
 Shaw, Erin, 892
 Sheldon, Josh, 1023
 Shen, Haifeng, 908
 Shen, Ji, 1029, 1197
 Shen, Rui 沈睿, 1300
 Shin, Ho-Chul, 1166
 Shirouzu, Hajime, 988, 1015, 1205
 Showalter, Stephen, 928
 Silva, Brenda López, 1081
 Sim, Chor Miang, 1120
 Sinha, Suparna, 982
 Sloep, Peter, 766
 Slof, Bert, 264
 Slotta, James D., 430, 558, 641, 966, 968, 996, 1002, 1045, 1081, 1143, 1308
 Smith, Garrett, 731, 1278
 So, Hyo-Jeong, 41
 Songer, Nancy, 926
 Southavilay, Vilaythong, 596
 Spada, Hans, 676
 Speer, Jennifer, 88, 711
 Spikol, Daniel, 942, 1202
 Spreeuwenberg, Lia, 821
 Squire, Kurt, 1023
 Stahl, Gerry, 256, 534, 1089
 Stegmann, Karsten, 382, 406, 438, 716, 1103
 Steinmeier, Christopher, 9, 870
 Stichter, Janine, 816
 Stieff, Mike, 288
 Streng, Sara, 716
 Strijbos, Jan Willem, 1015
 Subramaniam, Nantha Kumar, 621
 Sugimoto, Masanori, 896
 Sullivan, Sarah, 224
 Sumon, Saiful, 160
 Sun, Daner, 1029
 Sun, Jizhen, 168
 Sun, Yanqing, 72
 Suthers, Daniel D., 454, 1015, 1200
 Suzuki, Hideyuki, 930
 Svihla, Vanessa, 232
 Tabak, Iris, 904, 1037
 Takeda, Yoshiaki, 896
 Tan, Esther, 41
 Tan, Seng Chee, 1059
 Tarchi, Christian, 1123
 Tauzia, Vincent, 1306
 Taylor, Charlotte, 1126
 Taylor, Meredith, 1126
 Teasley, Stephanie, 868

- Tee, Meng Yew, 884
 Teplovs, Christopher, 846, 1015, 1168, 1200
 Thiel, Ansgar, 1
 Tholander, Jakob, 160
 Thompson, Kate, 596, 706, 878
 Tian, Stella, 914
 Tissenbaum, Mike, 430, 641, 1081, 1143, 1308
 Tohyama, Sayaka, 1244
 Toikka, Seppo, 1150
 Tomasetto, Carlo, 736
 Toyama, Yukie, 542
 Trausan-Matu, Stefan, 771, 781, 906, 1015
 Trninic, Dragan, 272
 Tsai, Pei-Chen, 858, 912
 Tse, Andrew Chung Yee, 1159
 Tse, Hidy, 1053
 Tucker, Sean, 9
 Tutwiler, M. Shane, 902
 Twiner, Alison, 726
 Tzeng, Ren-Yow, 80
 Udani, Mikesh, 462
 Unal, Zafer, 964
 Underwood, Joshua, 611, 1037
 Untch, Roland, 696
 Vahey, Phil, 964
 Valbuena, Widman Said, 986
 Valcke, Martin, 766
 van Aalst, Jan, 454, 914, 1015, 1053, 1059, 1111
 van Bruggen, Jan, 766
 van de Sande, Carla, 280
 van der Meij, Hans, 904
 van Heijst, Hennie, 821
 Vanderhoven, Ellen, 751, 922
 Vanover, Charles, 964
 Varma, Keisha, 1197
 Vatrappu, Ravi, 606, 761
 Viilo, Marjut, 1111
 Villagra-Sobrinho, Sara, 518, 1073
 Vogel, Bahtijar, 681
 Waddington, Richard, 868
 Wagner, Christine, 716
 Wake, Jo Dugstad, 136
 Walker, Erin, 334
 Wan, Wing-San, 914
 Wang, Haiyan, 1308
 Wang, Joyce, 9, 870
 Wang, Lu, 1045
 Wang, Po-Hsien, 858
 Wang, Xinghua, 382
 Wang, Xueli, 920
 Wang, Zhan, 776
 Ward, Mary-Helen, 831
 Wardrip, Peter, 494
 Warnecke, Tim, 886
 Wasson, Barbara, 136
 Watt-Watson, Judy, 990
 Wecker, Christof, 304, 390, 422, 1103
 Wegerif, Rupert, 312, 888, 1162
 Weibert, Anne, 950
 Weinberger, Armin, 1065, 1170
 Wen, Yun, 414, 836
 Westermann, Katharina, 1229
 Wever, Bram De, 751, 946
 Whittaker, Chris, 641, 866
 Wichmann, Astrid, 1202
 Wiley, Jennifer, 1081
 Wilkins, Jesse L.M. (Jay), 806, 934, 1081
 Winters, Niall, 611
 Wise, Alyssa Friend, 64, 88, 711
 Wong, Lung-Hsiang, 144, 168
 Wong, Wai Yat, 918, 1126
 Wong, Wing, 1168
 Woo, David James, 801
 Wu, Chun-Ping, 319
 Wu, Hsin-Kai, 1029
 Wu, I-Chia, 940
 Wu, Jing, 576, 1120
 Xie, Charles, 1029
 Xin, Cindy, 756
 Xu, Hui, 1045
 Yacef, Kalina, 25
 Yamaguchi, Etsuji, 896
 Yamasaki, Kazuya, 880
 Yang, Euphony F. Y., 944
 Yang, Xianmin, 1045
 Yang, Yang, 312, 1162
 Yeh, Charles Y. C., 932
 Yeo, Jennifer, 576, 1120
 Yip, Jane, 1175
 Yoo, Jaebong, 892
 Yoon, Susan, 9, 826, 870
 Yu, Fu-Yun, 319
 Yu, Qiong 俞琼, 1302, 1304
 Yu, Shengquan, 1045
 Yuen, Johnny, 791, 1168, 1178
 Zahn, Carmen, 152
 Zeini, Sam, 1200
 Zhan, Yi 詹艺, 1302, 1304
 Zhan, Ying, 144
 Zhang, Baohui, 1029
 Zhang, Jianwei, 57, 72, 1053, 1111, 1123
 Zhang, Yonghe, 1168
 Zhao, Jian, 1045
 Zhao, Jianhua, 898, 1045
 Zhao, Naxin, 996, 1002, 1308
 Zhou, Nan, 534
 Zin, Abdullah Mohd, 621
 Zong, Hua 宗华, 1298
 Zottmann, Jan, 894
 Zufferey, Guillaume, 510