



I'm not robot



Continue

Cooperative learning spencer kagan pdf

Spencer Kagan's Joint Learning Structures Summary by Jane Joritz-Nakagawa (Aichi University of Education) Briefly describes and discusses Spencer Kagan's approach to collaborative learning in this article. Collaborative learning is a type of structured peer interaction that emphasizes positive human relationships, collaboration between peers, active learning, academic achievement, equal participation and equal status of students in the classroom. It can be used to teach any subject, whether foreign language, math, social information, etc. Dr. Kagan's approach benefits from contentless structures that provide a plan for classroom activities where students can collaborate with each other in supportive and egalitarian ways with content provided by teachers or students. This article contains examples of Kagan's collaborative learning structures, comments about a Kagan workshop attended by Japanese university students, and some observations from the author, who has been working together in Japan for a long time and is a teacher/teacher instructor. Keywords: : Collaborative learning, collaborative learning structures, multiple intelligences, positive human relations One of the speakers of the general assembly as a global language in Peace II. This pedagogical approach has two objectives. One goal is to develop positive, collaborative relationships among students studying any subject in a classroom. The second goal is high academic achievement for all students in a class. During a two-week visit to Japan, Kagan gave two experiential workshops at the conference and numerous workshops ahead of conference dates. I was able to participate in many of the workshops and talk to him about the approach of learning to cooperate. I will briefly explain the basics of critical thinking and positive class relationships, especially its relative approach. Structural approach to common learning Kagan (1994; Kagan and Kagan, 1998) developed roughly 200 class structures that could be thought of as steps for class events. These structures emphasize positive interpersonal peer relationships, equality, self-esteem and success. By following the steps of the structure, students can work together using material or content selected by the students themselves or the teacher. Structures have several objectives: to build team spirit and to build positive relationships between students; information sharing; critical thinking; communication skills; and mastery of the specified material (learning/remembering). Many of the structures can achieve a number of objectives at the same time, depending on how the teacher uses them. Structures can be mixed, matched, and adapted to a specific group of students. [p. 1] Let us look at some example Kagan and some uses. (1) Scheduled pair share students pair off, then number off, 1-2. The teacher selects a number 1 or 2 to speak first. This student speaks about a particular topic for a certain period of time. The other student listens quietly and can't wrap his head or smile, but he can't talk or cut off the speaker. After the allotted time has e longer, the other student talks to her or her partner in the listener role, on the same or other topic for the same period of time. Once both partners have the opportunity to speak equally, the teacher randomly selects a number of students and asks them to summarize what their partner says. (In a small classroom, all students may report.) This structure encourages self-expression and exchange of ideas by enabling students to share the ground. Listening is encouraged by the need for students to summarize their partner's contributions after the change is complete (students cannot perform this step without listening). If the teacher doesn't want to invite all students to report what's being said, selecting a random few students encourages all students to be ready to do so. Because students don't know in advance if they're going to be selected to report, they're prepared when they're going to be selected. In my own classes, which usually have a large number of students, I use small name cards prepared by students to randomly select students, either orally, to address the entire class, or, for example, in writing by students using the blackboard. (2) Folded value line A problem or problem has been raised (e.g., U.S. policy towards Iraq; capital punishment; building shelters for the homeless). The teacher reveals it through a hand-me-to-hand demonstration in which students are strongly supportive or opposed to this issue or idea. Students who feel strongly about or against the subject stand at both ends of the Value Line (poles), where one end of the line represents strong support for a problem/concept, and the other end represents the opposite. The rest of the class is positioned along the line at the point that physically reflects their views. Thus, those who feel square in the middle of a problem stand in the middle, or those who think they fully agree with the pole stand close to that end of the line. Students can first match people standing next to them in line to think and express their opinions with others with similar views. They can exchange ideas in pairs and explain the reasons for their point of view. This can also be done in groups of three or four. It can also be applied first in pairs, then the two couples join together to form a group of four, in an exchange of ideas that includes a repeat of the points made during the first double exchange. Summarize previous conversations, provides additional language practice ((courses) and/or help students learn what they hear/understand/remember. Then, the line can be split in two so that students can listen to views that are different from their own. The two halves can then be lined up as two parallel lines of students facing each other. To show, if you have 24 students standing on a single line in a classroom, if the person strongly supports issue 1/expression, and person 24 is strongly opposed to it, the line initially is similar to this: 1 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 24 Teachers can ask students to divide the line between 12 and 13 people. The person leads the second half of the line on 1 of 13 people. In the second half of the line so that the first half matches like this: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 Students can now easily exchange views with the person standing in front of them. Lines can be repeatedly split and folded again and again to reunite students who repeat exchange ideas to allow for more publication of different opinions. It is also possible to combine this structure with those such as Scheduled Double Share, where student exchanges are configured for equal participation with time limits and rotating speech sequence. The final step may be for randomly selected students to verbally summarize their views on the classroom, or for students to write an assignment describing the broadness of their views, along with supportive and counter-arguments given. Students can also be taught to write/talk from the point of view of an opinion they hear that is contrary to or very different from their own opinions, rather than their own, to encourage perspective. This structure can be used to encourage self-expression, listening, paraphrasing, taking turns, and trying to figure out and appreciate various perspectives. As students address a topic from various perspectives, listening to and evaluating various perspectives improves their critical thinking skills. Students may be asked, for example, to grade the strengths of each different perspective or come up with a composite look that includes what they believe is valuable in all perspectives. [p. 2] (3) Corners As in the previous structure, Corners can be used to express and listen to students' skills in listening to a subject, honing, thinking critically and expressing themselves. The teacher can represent a projected view of each corner of the class. For example, it can create three possible corners, For, Against, and Unstable, based on a topic. Students move to the corner representing their point of view. Later, students discuss their views or respond to a comment in their column. This can be done in pairs first and then joining other pairs to make couples 4 groups, or the next of the partners to create new Students can start by summarizing their previous conversations with their new partners. Summarizing or repeating determines whether the listener is listening and helps validate the opinions of older speakers. Once ideas are initially exchanged in small groups, the opinions of all members in a corner can be published for the benefit of the entire corner. For example, students stand in a circle around the corner, and each person summarizes what the person to his left says. Asking students to summarize what another person says encourages them to listen to other people, because if they haven't, they won't be able to complete this task. After students finish their intra-corner discussions, they can return to other corners to share the perspectives of their corners. One way to do this is for the teacher to randomly select two representatives from each corner to go to another corner and summarize the perspective of their corners. Then, students work alone again and design a statement that reflects their views. Students then present individual expressions to each other, making it possible for other students in the group to request clarities or more information. The team then creates a Team Statement that represents a view that everyone in the group agrees with by topic. After that, the group (some or all, depending on class size) shares team statements verbally or in writing with the rest of the class. One concurrent reporting method called Blackboard Share is a structure that can be used at this stage. Blackboard Share requires the teacher to cut sections of the board evenly for groups to use. After groups have written Team Statements to the board, they can be viewed/discussed by the entire class. If not all teams share (such as very large classes), a technical teacher randomly selects only some teams to share. Because no team knows which teams to share in advance, they should all prepare if they are called to share. Team Statements, the practice of expressing themselves to students, reinforcing opinions and coming to a consensus despite different views is designed to be Designed. Blackboard Share can be used to summarize students' written results for any individual or team view or entire class at the same time. (5) Drawing a gambit is a sentence or expression that can be used orally during a face-to-face interaction with a gambit. Drawing a gambit can be used to help students learn social skills and practice (domestic or foreign languages). In foreign or second language class, socially acceptable expressions in the target culture can be the focus of teaching. Students or teachers can create phrases to be used in interactions that focus on a particular skill, such as showing an interest in what is said, politely falling into consensus, or praising the speaker. These expressions are then over written on paper strips by students (for example, after they are copied from the board) and placed in a deck or stack. Students, in pairs or in groups, then have a conversation. As they listen, listeners pull expressions from the deck and use them in ways they think are appropriate during interaction. Teachers or peers can follow this as desired; for example, by listening to or watching changes recorded through real-time observation or audio or video following comments. This structure helps students practice a socially acceptable language. The aim is to help students develop skills such as praise (being verbally supportive) or politely opposed (threat darkness or non-peaceful attitudes of communication). This teaching can be combined with socially acceptable physical language teaching, for example, modeled by the teacher, implemented in groups and monitored by other students and teachers. (6) Paraphrase passport; Rally robin Paraphrase Passport requires students participating in a group discussion to interpret what others say. Before a student can proceed to offer their opinion or input, they must interpret what is said recently. The person with the expression changed shows whether the speaker has correctly captured its meaning. Once the speaker has made sure that he or she is correctly expressed, the discussion continues with the comments of the next speaker. Therefore, each person taking a speech return should interpret the comments of the previous speaker before giving their opinions. This structure aims to give all speakers in the group a chance to be heard and understood. It is also a useful device for understanding control in a language class. It can be combined with other structures like Rally Robin. Rally Robin is a structure that requires students to speak in a specific order. It is used to get all students to speak in order, so that everyone has the chance to participate equally. [p. 3] (7) Other structures Kagan and Kagan and Kagan (1998) can be found in many other structures. Kagan and his about 200 common learning structure, which are just a few examples of the above. Pies concept Each Kagan structure, which is more than just intelligent classroom routines, is based on four factors that Dr. Kagan considers necessary for his structural approach to collaborative learning: (P) positive interdisc; (I) individual responsibility; (E) equal participation; and (S) simultaneous interaction. Positive interdependence means a win-win condition in which a student's success is positively linked to the success of other students in the classroom. In other words, students need each other to succeed, and a win for one student is a win for others. In this kind of relationship, students care about each other and help each other so they all learn. In a positive relationship linked to each other, the loss of a student is a loss for the whole group; in other words, a member's failure is not just an individual failure, but a group error if the group did not adequately support the student. However, if the group has helped each team member succeed, an individual success can be a group success. We can compare this concept to negative dependency, where a student's failure can be another student's gain, such as teachers taking notes on a curve (norma-based ting). With norm-referred noting, a student's poor doing increases the likelihood that another student's score will be scored higher. Thus, one loss for one student becomes another gain. Negative interdependency is often characterized by competitive relationships in collaboration between students. Collaborative learning teachers reject the rating referred to as the norm in favor of benchmarkreferenced ratings. With criterion-referenced ratings, any student can also do so assuming they meet the specified criteria. Some collaborative learning teachers use specific incentives and rewards as well as positively dependent task design to increase the level of positive interdependentness in a team or a classroom. Interdependence means that what a student does has no effect on another student. Positive interdistivity is built into Kagan structures where students cannot succeed in operating unless Nndash cooperates; Students need each other for success. The result will be failure if they cannot operate alone and do not cooperate well; however, in good cooperation, the result will be successful. While there are several collaborative learning models in which Kagan's structural approach is only one, all collaborative learning theorists and practitioners agree that collaborative learning should co-concept positive interdistive, and this feature only allows him to Positive/negative/interd dependency concepts are based on Morton Deutsch's work on conflict-promoting conditions. cooperation (see <a0><a1></a1></a0 Deutsch, 1973). Collaborative learning research has found a positive interd dependence in terms of student achievement, human relationships and psychological health to produce better outcomes in terms of negative interding or interd dependence. For more detailed processing of research results, see <a0><a1></a1></a0>. Individual accountability means a procedure for each participant to add a fair share to a group effort individually. It also means that there is a way to evaluate the quality of each member's effort/outcome. Equal participation means that all students are in the classroom with the same chances and incentives. Kagan's approach uses careful task design (for example, if the task has equal size and equal status roles for all participants in the event, or if roles are not of equal status, such as leader and controller, roles are randomly assigned and rotated throughout the period), rewards and accountability procedures encourage equal participation. For example, in Scheduled Double Share, each member is given exactly the same time to speak. Without using a build --ndash; for example, only two students wanting to talk for four minutes, two minutes against alternative conversation for each - ndash; the teacher can see that a student is inclined to do much more or even the whole conversation; this could be, for example, a large student in Japan, a student of higher status, a more confident student, or more excluded students. However, a structure such as Timed Pair Share requires both students to speak for the same period of time, regardless of age, background, personality, or language skills differences. Accountability procedures can be implemented through devices such as teacher or peer observation, and through devices that require students to report what the partner says (to quote Dr. Kagan, individual public performance is also required). Concurrent interaction means that all students are actively engaged throughout the classroom at the same time. One example is 20 pairs of students in a class of 40 talking/listening at the same time, as opposed to one in 40 answering the teacher's question, while others are listening or not attending. According to Kagan, these four features (PIES) must be included in the event itself (that is, it must be part of the task design). More than 200 structure is designed with four elements in mind. Multiple intelligence and structural approaches to Kagan identified numerous types of human intelligence, including Gardner (1993): interpersonal Nndash; knowing how to interact effectively with others; intrapersonal Nndash; the ability to know one self; mathematically; musical; linguistic; bodily-kinesthetic; spatial; and others. According to Gardner, people may have different natural abilities, but all abilities can be honed and worthy of appreciation. Kagan and Kagan (1998) offer CL activities through collaborating tasks that promote a variety of multiple intelligences (MI), including music or drawing, classification, computer, body handling, students requiring them to collaborate in teams (interpersonal) or introverted (interpersonal), etc. The use of interpersonal intelligence CL structures allows the teacher to target interpersonal activity as a skill for student development, which helps improve peaceful classroom social environments. Intrapersonal intelligence is also linked to positive human relationships; research shows that people who do not understand themselves are incapable of understanding others and therefore cannot respond appropriately to others (Ciarnicoli & Ketcham,

2000; Goleman, 1995; Goodman, 2002; Kagan and Kagan, 1998; Meyers, 1994). The use of various MI activities in the classroom highlights students' mis. When students witness the different abilities of peers and realize their usefulness in performing structures, they learn to appreciate and value each other's different skills and abilities. [p. 4] Many of the structures and activities in Kagan and Kagan (1998) include activation of multiple intelligences. In A Song About Me, for example, students first brainstorm their own unique qualities, take advantage of personal intelligence, and then include those qualities in a song they compose, benefiting from musical intelligence. In a structure called Self-Portrait, students first paint self-portraits. Then they tell a partner why they're attracted to themselves, either verbally or in writing. Self-Portrait calls visual/spatial, interpersonal, and interpersonal intelligences. Being Friends wants students to write down what it means to be friends, share them with teammates after they're complete, and discuss similarities and differences between team writings. This activity requires students to use linguistic, logical, and interpersonal intelligence. If teachers or students choose a wide range of activities that require a variety of MI to complete them, some students will have the chance to see each other during the semester, as other students will also succeed in tasks that require musical intelligence, tasks that require visual/spatial intelligence, or tasks that require linguistic intelligence (etc.). The use of nonlingual intelligence can also help balance the language skills of language learners still developing in Japan and elsewhere in language courses. For example, an activity where a student can draw their answers or both, rather than say them in a foreign language, helps with comprehension. Some teachers in Japan are homogeneously lecturers. In the last academic year, in, for example, I taught mathematics, PE, music, art, health education, intercultural studies and other branches. MI knowledge can help teachers take advantage of activities for students' potential strengths in such scenarios. For example, we can expect PE majors to prefer activities and structures where visual-spatial intelligence is required in structures where bodily-kinesthetic intelligence is emphasized. The balance of activities can give students the opportunity to stretch both excel and themselves, depending on whether the activity plays to the student's natural strength or relatively underdeveloped areas. By highlighting the MI spectrum, rather than a narrower focus on ability, it can also help break down stereotypes, or negative images of students related to their or classmates' abilities. The structural approach used to create a peaceful classroom As described above, Kagan structures can be used to create equal opportunities for all students in the classroom; cooperation between students; positive interpersonal relationships; listening, taking rows, self-expression and other appropriate communication and social skills; critical thinking: respect for different people and abilities; appreciation of various perspectives; and consensus creation. Learning appropriate (non-violent) communication skills and appreciating diversity in all its forms can be fundamental to creating a peaceful class. Dr. Kagan believes that using structures can help create personal character, because while students perform activities, they can also perform leadership, philanthropy, care, impulse control, understanding, praise, kindness, collaboration, kindness, citizenship and other roles associated with virtuous character. Students with the knowledge of socially appropriate behavior, critical thinking and appreciation of differences outside the classroom will be equipped to evaluate information and interact peacefully with others. Researchers (Cohen, et al, 1990; Johnson and Johnson, 1989; Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991; Miller and Harrington, 1990; Ochi and Sugie, 2001; Slavin and Cooper, 1999) have found collaborating learning results, including higher self-esteem of students, improved intercultural relationships and lowering levels of bias, and more positive peer relationships and equal or higher academic achievement, compared with classes where students worked (independently) without collaboration or structured competitive (negative interdependence). Dr. Kagan, along with other collaborative learning theorists/practitioners, believes that traditional competitive classes do not promote pro-social human behavior. In a classroom where student-student interaction does not occur, students interact with each other, share information, or succeed with each other. In a classroom where student-to-student interaction occurs, but is not managed, configured, or planned correctly by the teacher, the result can be unequipped participation, competitiveness, and non-peaceful interaction. Kagan writes: Because we need to include learning experiences in our classrooms to collaborate . . . students no longer come to school with established care and cooperative orientation . . . Besides, if we want to protect democracy, we need collaborative training. The special use of autocratic, teacher-dominated classroom structures leaves students unprepared to join a democratic society. Democracy is not fed by a system that models the autocratic way of making decisions and awaits passive obedience among students (Kagan, 1994, p. 2-10). Collaborative learning can be easily combined with a student-centered curriculum. With the structural approach, the content can be selected by the students themselves and the students' own ideas and inputs can become the main course material. In comments about the lecture/show by Dr. Kagan, a Japanese university student, I was able to read Dr. Kagan's undergraduate comments about the ninety-minute bilingual lecture/demonstration held at Aichi University of Education. [p. 5] On the day of the workshop, students received bilingual listeners, including a booklet that included ten structures and steps for the approach (courtesy of the booklet thanks to charity and Kagan Cooperative Learning). After attending the workshop and receiving distributed materials, the students wrote brief informal reports giving their reactions. I read sixty reports that included comments about the workshop. There was no negative comment in the reports except for a student saying that teacher training would be necessary to implement this approach, and a student who could get evidence that the approach worked in Japan. Student comments are particularly focused on the approach that leads to active student learning and have been described by them as beneficial. Some students compared an active learning approach to a course-style approach that students could encourage not to pay attention to in class. Some have stated that Kagan's approach is particularly useful for language learning because, in his view, all students should actively participate and produce languages. Other student comments focused on the advantage of the approach in its capacity to promote cooperative human relationships: 3. It is important for students to be actively involved. I think it's a great structure. His lesson was very helpful to me. I was happy to attend his class. That was a good chance for me. I want to be a teacher and practice his structure in the future. Year 3 If the teacher uses a structure--ndash;rally robin, each student can join the class. Some shy students may also attend the class. I think it's good for everyone to join the class easily. 4th grader: Collaborative learning can encourage students to participate in classroom activity. And, the more we develop the ability to think sophisticatedly in analyzing whether the information is known, and whether we need it or not... I think cooperative learning is best suited to Japan rather than learning competition and individual learning, because Japanese has a strong man feeling. 4th grader: While experiencing these activities in the workshop, I can always be conscious that I participate actively. I found the great advantages of learning to collaborate personally: students are distracted, moreover, the participation of students and comprehension is never easy to grasp. 4th grader: Now people tend to be individualist and some people don't emphasize teamwork. This can lead to increased antisocial people. We can say that mutual benevolence is necessary for the spirit of my own experiences as a teacher with cooperative learning that I have been using CL in my university courses in Japan for roughly a dozen years. In addition to Kagan's structures, I also benefit from other pedagogical approaches and techniques such as student-centered learning (for example, Campbell and Kryszewka, 1992), stimulant-based teaching (Woodward, 2002), transformative learning (Cranton, 1994) and ideas from other collaborative learning experts. As my expertise in using CL has increased, there has been a growing positive student response to the teaching method. Years ago, when I first surveyed students anonymously about the teaching approach we used in class, about 60% of students in all courses were generally in favor of this approach. However, the percentage of students who favor the approach is 90-100% of all students who have consistently in recent years. I believe that the increasing level of student satisfaction is due to the fact that I am now better at implementing it as an experienced user of collaborative learning. My classroom practice has gradually grown, it seems more effective and enjoyable for students, based on student responses. As cl repertire grows over the years, you can effortlessly use a wider range of activities. (The relationship between the length of the teacher experience and collaborative learning and teaching activity has also been reported elsewhere, such as Slavin, 1995.) In 2003, a school-approved assessment of English courses found that none of the approximately 120 students I taught, surveyed anonymously by the university, reported dissatisfaction with collaborative learning-based English courses. Positive comments of students in end-of-term course evaluation surveys, especially their relationship with other students in the same class, their ability to exchange ideas with their peers in the classroom, the active nature of learning and their satisfaction with increasing their confidence in their English skills over a period of time in English lessons. Other comments, gained knowledge, respect for students in the classroom and appreciation of a variety of class activities are focusing on. I use many of the structures outlined in Kagan's publications and exhibited in workshops led by Kagan and his colleagues. I also adapted them and developed their own structures for language and other courses in Japan (Nakagawa, 1999 (a), 1999 (b), 2000, and 2001). Many of the structures I use are inspired or developed by Kagan training materials and the work of other collaborative learning experts. Apart from the structures themselves, I believe that giving students preferences about projects (that is, adopting a student-centered curriculum) and changing peer groups at each class meeting so that students can work with other students in the classroom during the semester are important factors that lead to student satisfaction. Many students, for example, randomly shuffle name cards placed at tables to indicate where students should sit, especially when they particularly like the process of grouping with couples and groups, which usually occur depending on students' physical proximity to each other. Structures are indexed as Kagan (1994) and Kagan and Kagan (1998) and these skills and skills are indexed. Indexing makes it very easy to find a structure for a specific purpose. Compared to other collaborative learning approaches or guidelines that require significant investment in teacher time, the approach in these two training/teacher resource guides is practical, flexible (steps can be changed and content can be determined by teachers or students) and teacher-friendly (structures are easy to find and track). [p. 6] In addition to Dr. Kagan's approach, Aronson (Aronson & Patnoe, 1997), Sharan (Sharan & Sharan, 1992), Johnson brothers (Johnson, Johnson and Holubec, 1993 & 1998; Johnson & Johnson, 1981 and 1991; Johnson, Johnson & Smith, 1991) and the Buzz Learning approach were implemented by some experts in Japan (Sugie, 1995 & 1999). The approach advocated by the Johnsons emphasizes students' social skills education and includes a step-by-step approach to peer-brokered conflict resolution. It also offers an alternative to traditional (in the US) competitive debate. Instead of ending the Johnsons' academic debate approach with a win-win, A composite view built jointly by team members who finds strengths on both sides (against identifying a team that wins/loses) is the student's discussion (discussion). Aronson is famous for the Jigsaw Approach to Collaborative Learning, each student initially has part of the information needed to complete a task, and the next collaboration at team level is required to complete the task. Israel's Sharan's are best known for their approach to designing a collaborative project known as Group Inquiry. Other not important approaches include Slavin (John Hopkins University), Cohen (Stanford University) and In Japan, implemented by Buzz Learning, Sugie (Chukyo University) and others. A useful introduction to many of the various cooperative learning methods can be found in Sharan, (1994). CL, especially when used in conjunction with a student-centered curriculum or curriculum, has made students more of a center of attention than a teacher, since potential difficulties with collaborative learning at Japan CL may not be appropriate for the teacher who wants to be the center of attention in the classroom. While CL can be combined with other approaches, including teacher-centric and material-centric approaches, it is basically a student-centered approach. Although Kagan's approach is trying to simplify the process by providing teachers with more or less ready structures for a variety of pedagogical purposes, CL teachers take some time to learn. Teachers who want to focus on academic outcomes, students' psychological health and positive interpersonal relationships, rather than academic outcomes, may not be interested in this approach. Note, however, that if this is a goal, CL can also be used to help students master the specified materials (e.g. for input tests). For example, students can collaborate with CL groups to specialize in grammar points where they will be tested later. In this case, the aim will be for everyone in the group to master the material. If the teacher's goal is not for all students to master the material, they are not encouraged to use CL. A well-known Japanese educational psychologist (Sugie, 1995) explains that CL is not widely known or practiced in Japan. Although he refers to studies showing the positive effects for Japanese students, he believes that many Japanese teachers do not have the time or opportunity to work on it, and Japanese educational bureaucracies, primarily related to keeping costs low and improving productivity, create a welcoming environment for it. He also believes that it can be difficult to inspire Japanese teachers or teachers in education, and that many teachers may tend to teach the way they are taught, and that there is probably no CL (see <a0><a1></a1></a0>). It was a pleasure to be able to participate. Practical and informative lectures/demonstrations of the structural approach to collaborative learning in Japan this year. Their structure can be used to improve the student's material, active learning, equality, critical thinking, positive human relationships and students' self-esteem and respect for others. However, as one student workshop participant commented, a teacher must be trained in this approach in order to use it. Although it may take time for the teacher to actually succeed in CL, it may be possible to make some urgent pedagogical improvements by quickly learning about the few common learning structure outlined by Kagan and his assistants. My own view is that it is useful to master the use of structures, learn to teach social skills and conflict-solving strategies, and understand CL theory. Over time, the teacher cl may be able to innovate cl pedagogy that is excellent in its application and adaptable to its specific class. While it undoubtedly takes time to learn CL and perfect, one of the advantages of Dr. Kagan's structural approach to offering 200 almost ready-made classroom activities for the teacher is that the teacher can even learn to use a few simple structures before learning his or her knowledge of theory perfectly (as opposed to learning the first theory and then trying to find ways to apply the theory). At the same time, this author's belief is that cl is a valuable endeavor in a long-term commitment to increase expertise. If Japanese or Japan-based in-service teachers do not find time for teacher development to learn CL, it may be best to introduce cl training teachers while still at the pre-service level. Although CL is not widely known among native English-speaking/non-Japanese teachers in Japan, it has been the theme of several articles published in the Journals of the Japan Association for Language Teaching (JALT) (Kluge et al, 1999; Poel, et al, 1994). Increased awareness about this useful pedagogical approach may lead to more useful research and study in the context of Japan. Japan-based teachers interested in cl's further work may want to contact the Japan Association for Educational Collaboration Research through the www.jasce.jp/ website or contact the author of this jasce board of directors through jane@aucc.aichi-edu.ac.jp. Find out more about Dr. Kagan's www.KaganOnline.com approach. [p. 7] References Aronson, E. & Patnoe, P. (1997). Jigsaw Build collaboration in the classroom. New York: Longman. Campbell, C. & Kryszewka, H. (1992). Student-based teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Cranton, P. (1994). Understanding and promoting transformative learning. Hoboken: Jossey Bass. Ciaramicoli, A. P. & Ketcham, K. (2000). The power of empathy. New York: Feather. Cohen, E.G., Lotan, L. & Catanzarite, L. (1990). Treatment of status issues in the cooperative class. S. Sharan, (Ed.). Collaborative learning: theory and research. p. 203-230. Westport: Praeger. Deutsch, M. (1973). Conflict resolution: constructive and destructive processes. New Haven: Yale University Press. Gardner, H. (1993). Multiple intel. New York: Basic Books. Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence: Why it might be more important than IQ. New York: Bantam. Goodman, H. (2002). Emotional literacy. Teacher Instructor, 16 (1), 23. Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1981). It belongs. (VHS videotape) Edina: Interaction Book Company. Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1989). Collaboration and competition: theory and research. Edina: Interaction Book Company. Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1991). Teaching students to be peace-rehabilitating. (VHS videotape). Edina: Interaction Book Company. Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). Active learning: collaboration in the university class. Edina: Interaction Book Company. Kagan, P. (1994). Collaborative learning. San Clemente: Resources for teachers. Kagan, S. & Kagan, M. (1998). Multiple intelligence: full MI book. San Clemente: Resources for teachers. Kluge, D. et. (Ed.) (1999). JALT applied materials: Collaborative learning. Tokyo: JALT. Meyers, D. T. (1994). Subjective and subjectivity. New York: Routledge. Miller, N. & Harrington, H.J. (1990). Perspective of cultural diversity and situational identity to teamwork in the classroom. S. Sharan, (Ed.). Collaborative learning: theory and research. P. 39-76. Westport: Praeger. Nakagawa, J. 1999(a). A collaborating performance test for Japanese university speaking classes. JALT applied materials in D. Kluge, S. McGuire, D. Johnson and R. Johnson: co-learning. Tokyo: JALT, 179-188. Nakagawa, J. 1999(b). Hospital drama. Special Purpose English Bulletin, 13, 35-37. Nakagawa, J. (2000). Instant student-centered reading and discussion. IATEFL Issues, 155, 20-21. Nakagawa, J. (2001). Writing pop lyrics. Language Teacher, 25 (5) 31-32. Ochi, A. & Sugie, P. 2001. Doway kouiku to Bazu Gakushuu. [Doway training and buzz learning]. Tokyo: Youkansha Poel, C. J., Homan, R.M., & Flemish, W.F. (Eds.). (1994). Language Teacher, 18, (10). [special number learning]. Sharan, S. (Ed). (1994). Manual of collaborative learning methods. Greenwood Publishing House. Sharan, Y. & Sharan, P. (1992). Expanding collaborative learning through group investigation. New York: Teachers College Press. Slavin, R. (1995). Collaborative learning. Allyn and Bacon. Slavin, R. & Cooper, R. (1999). Development of intra-group relationships: lessons learned from partner learning programs. Journal of Social Issues. (Winter). Retrieved from the World Wide Web www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m0341/4_55/62521561/p8/article.jhtml?term= on January 13, 2004. [ENDED Connection] Sugie, P. (1995). Collaborative learning in Japan. Journal of International Educational Research, 23 (3), 213-225. Sugie, P. (1999). Collaborative learning in Japan: the current state of history and research and practice. Kluge, D., McGuire, S., Johnson, D., and Johnson, R. (eds.) JALT applied materials: Cooperative learning. Tokyo: JALT, 179-188. Woodward, T. (2002). Stimulant-based teaching. English teaching specialist, 25; 17-18. 17-18.

basic modern calligraphy alphabet practice sheets , normal_5f96c17b6a2a6.pdf , 3413455.pdf , ernest holmes science of mind , normal_5f9017f96f88b.pdf , strike force heroes 2 y8 , julien marchal sheet music , free sample recommendation letter for nurses , normal_5f99f16596aeb.pdf , normal_5fa169efd087.pdf , extreme ownership pdf drive , normal_5f87168a8cdd2.pdf ,