

Cooperative learning in science: follow-up from primary to high school

Thurston, Allen; Topping, Keith J; Tolmie, Andrew; Christie, Donald; Karagiannidou, Eleni; Murray, Pauline

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Thurston, A., Topping, K. J., Tolmie, A., Christie, D., Karagiannidou, E., & Murray, P. (2010). Cooperative learning in science: follow-up from primary to high school. *International Journal of Science Education*, 32(4), 501-522. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690902721673>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Cooperative learning in science: Follow-up from primary to high school

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Science Education</i>
Manuscript ID:	TSED-2008-0117.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	cooperative learning, primary school, secondary school, science education
Keywords (user):	cooperative learning, primary school, secondary school



1 Cooperative learning in science
2

3 **Cooperative learning in science: Follow-up from primary to high school**
4

5
6 **Abstract**
7

8
9
10
11 This paper reports a two year longitudinal study of the effects of cooperative learning on
12 science attainment, attitudes towards science and social connectedness during
13 transition from primary to high school. A previous project on cooperative learning in
14 primary schools observed gains in science understanding and in social aspects of
15 school life. This project followed 204 children involved in the previous project and 440
16 comparison children who were not as they undertook transition from 24 primary to 16
17 high schools. Cognitive, affective and social gains observed in the original project
18 survived transition. The implications improving the effectiveness of school transition by
19 using cooperative learning initiatives are explored. Possibilities for future research and
20 the implications for practice and policy are discussed.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science
2
3

4 **Introduction**
5
6
7

8 *Cooperative learning in science*
9
10

11
12 Groupwork and cooperative learning in science education are already incorporated into
13 the pedagogical practices in many countries (Howe et al, 2007). Groupwork in science
14 often forms part of practitioner guides (e.g. Harlen & Qualter, 2004; Sharp, Peacock,
15 Johnsey, Simon & Smith, 2007; Topping & Thurston, 2005). Within Scotland groupwork
16 has reached the level of national policy in the new 'Curriculum for Excellence' science
17 outcomes which specifically identify the need for group discussion in effective learning
18 (Scottish Government, 2008). The effectiveness of groupwork and cooperative learning
19 strategies in science have been widely reported over a number of years. Basili and
20 Sanford (1991) reported that in a sample of 62 students studying in a community
21 college, use of cooperative groupwork in chemistry resulted in students holding fewer
22 misconceptions than those taught by direct tuition. Howe et al (2007) reported that in a
23 sample of primary school pupils drawn from 24 classes that groupwork, and the
24 discussion it facilitated, played a critical role in enhancing the learning of pupils in two
25 science topics in rural and urban settings in the UK. However, there is an absence of
26 literature regarding the longevity of such gains, and no previous literature that looks at
27 whether such gains survive transition after a change of school.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

The Group Work Transition (GWT) project built on and extended on a previous research project sponsored under the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Teaching and Learning Research Project (TLRP). It was designed as a longitudinal follow-up to the Scottish extension project: "Supporting Group Work in Scottish Schools: Age and Urban/Rural Divide" (SCOTSPRING). The original project found evidence of gains in science attainment and social connectedness as a result of the intervention. Therefore, the project explored the effects of transitions (moving from one school context to another) and transfers (the ability of pupils to use previous learning, attitudes and skills in the new educational context) as the original study group moved school in urban and rural geographical locations. Both transition and transfer are reported as being critical influences on a child's development and schooling.

Transition between schools

It has long been recognised that movement from elementary/primary to middle/high school can result in decreased academic attainment and motivation after transition (e.g. Finger & Silverman, 1966). In a sample of 933 pupils, decreased attainment scores and decreased levels of motivation were observed at transitions from elementary to middle and middle to high school in a sample drawn from Ogden Utah City School District, USA (Barber & Olsen, 2004). Significant declines in science attainment scores were evident after transition for a sample of 225 twelve-year-old students drawn from an urban school in Chicago, Illinois, USA (Petersen & Crockett, 1985). The falls in academic performance were related to decreased self-concept as a learner, decreased

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 self concept in individual subjects and a mismatch between the development needs of
4
5 young adolescents at the end of elementary school and the environment of the middle
6
7 school (Mullins & Irvin, 2000).
8
9

10
11
12 At a time when friendships and the peer group are becoming increasingly important in
13
14 the development of the adolescent, the transition between schools often serves to
15
16 disrupt, alter or sever them (Mizelle & Irvin, 2000). Barber and Olsen (2004) reported
17
18 increased loneliness and depression and decreased initiatives with peers after transition
19
20 to middle school for a sample of 933 twelve-year-old pupils. Similar findings were
21
22 reported in a two year longitudinal study of 143 ten-eleven-year-old pupils from a school
23
24 district with an associated population of 100,000 people in Midwestern USA (Hirsch &
25
26 DuBois, 1992). Peer support prior to transition was inversely correlated to increased
27
28 psychological symptomatology during the period of school transition from elementary to
29
30 junior high (although effects lessened over time).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 A number of interventions have been reported to promote more effective transition.
40
41 These include development of shared pedagogy in staff between schools, promoting
42
43 study skills in students, involving parents in transition, and giving information/ orientation
44
45 sessions to students (Mizelle, 2005). Mizelle concluded that an effective way to
46
47 enhance transition was to engage students in positive social relationships with other
48
49 incoming students. Lindsay (1998) reported an initiative in Kilbourne High School,
50
51 Worthington, Ohio, USA that closed the school to all students except new entrants. This
52
53 resulted in the formation of positive social relationships between new students and
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 decreased levels of anxiety. Facilitating the perpetuation of peer relationships stemming
4
5 from the previous school setting is also reported to promote effective transition (Carter,
6
7 Clark, Cushing & Kennedy, 2005). Peer relationships are reported by students to be a
8
9 cause of anxiety regarding transition (Arowosafe & Irvin, 1992). Missing friends from
10
11 elementary school, having trouble making new friends and not being part of a group
12
13 were reported as stressors by a sample of eleven-year-old children in New Jersey
14
15 assessed four weeks after transition to middle school (Elias, Gara & Ubriaco, 1985).
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 The role of peer relationships has long been recognised as a buffer as students
23
24 undergo transition (Hertzog, Morgan, Diamond & Walker, 1996). Students who had a
25
26 structured series of peer interactions with older students at transition displayed fewer
27
28 failing grades and missed fewer days of school than students who did not participate in
29
30 such a programme (Cognato, 1999). It was also reported that in Cognato's programme
31
32 female students in particular benefited in socialisation and maintained self-esteem.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Academic performance after transition is influenced by the extent to which previous
40
41 knowledge can be carried over or transferred successfully to the new school context.
42
43 For some students this is a major barrier as they enter high school. In a sample of
44
45 25,795 students (average age 14.09 years) almost one quarter of students who had
46
47 good eighth grade attainment results failed at least one subject in ninth grade in the first
48
49 semester after transition to senior high school high school in Chicago, Illinois, USA
50
51 (Roderick & Camburn, 1999). The question remains as to what could promote effective
52
53 transfer of previous learning at transition. Given that it appears that transfer may not
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 occur automatically for all students at transition, further explorations as to processes
4
5 that may promote transfer are required.
6
7

8
9
10 *Transfer theory*
11

12
13
14
15 Transfer or generalization of learning can occur over time and space. Transfer can be
16
17 implicit or explicit. This latter distinction has been termed 'low road' (depending on
18
19 extensive and varied practice of a skill so that it is automatic) and 'high road'
20
21 (dependent on the learner's deliberate "mindful abstraction" and subsequent application
22
23 of general principles) transfer (Perkins & Salomon, 1987). The latter is akin to what
24
25 many term 'meta-cognition' - knowledge about one's own cognition and the regulation of
26
27 that cognition (Simons, 1994). Meta-cognition includes reflection, self-knowledge of
28
29 strengths and weaknesses, learning strategies and monitoring learning.
30
31
32

33
34
35
36 Opinions are divided on issues of transfer of learning. In the field of adult learning, strict
37
38 adherents of theories of "situated learning" (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Resnick & Collins,
39
40 1994) contend that skills are quite use-specific and are acquired and situated in certain
41
42 contexts. A more moderate view is that there are specific requirements for transfer to
43
44 occur - the structure of the activity required in the situation which is the target for
45
46 transfer must be similar to that in the original situation. Much education actually
47
48 proceeds on the assumption of transfer (e.g. one subject into another, one year into
49
50 another, or transition between schools).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3 Gray and Orasanu (1987) reviewed the literature and concluded pessimistically that
4 training has a limited effect in enhancing intellectual performance; skills did not transfer
5
6 to novel contexts. Niedelman (1991) reviewed the evidence on 'low road' and 'high road'
7 transfer, and did not find research supporting the use of highroad mechanisms to foster
8 transfer of domain-specific knowledge or higher-order thinking. In contrast, Perkins and
9 Salomon (1989) argued that transfer could be obtained when general principles of
10 reasoning were taught together with self-monitoring practices. Campione, Shapiro and
11 Brown (1995) concluded there are multiple manifestations of transfer, ranging from the
12 understanding of domain-specific concepts through the deployment of relatively domain-
13 general argumentation strategies.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Sternberg and Frensch (1993) identified that transfer of an item depends upon how it
30 was encoded and organised - and whether a person has the ability to perceive how a
31 task or situation may carry over to other situations. Bransford, Brown and Cocking
32 (1999) reviewed evidence on transfer of learning and concluded that to facilitate
33 transfer, learners must understand when what has been learned can be used. This
34 occurs when learners have conceptual knowledge, mental representations of problems
35 and understanding of the relationships of the components in the overall structure of a
36 problem. In addition learners need to be self-aware and have self-appraisal strategies
37 (i.e. meta-cognition). Pintrich's (1999) review emphasised the role of learner motivation,
38 suggesting that self-regulated learning could be facilitated by adoption of mastery goals
39 (e.g. success in self-improvement and learning) and to some extent by relative ability
40 goals (e.g. competing with others), but can be hindered by the adoption of extrinsic
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 instrumental goals (e.g. getting good grades). Alexander and Murphy (1999) suggested
4
5 that nurturing transfer requires that teachers used a three-pronged attack (knowledge;
6
7 strategy; motivational training) that promoted principled understanding.
8
9

10
11
12 To promote transfer, Campione, Shapiro and Brown (1995) used collaborative learning
13
14 (discussion involving students explaining what they were learning to others); knowledge
15
16 building and transformation (rather than knowledge telling); understanding within
17
18 domains; reasoning strategies; reflection and meta-cognitive skills. Students taught
19
20 these showed “impressive degrees of transfer” compared with controls. There have
21
22 been several successful attempts to teach meta-cognitive strategy and skills
23
24 (Covington, 1987). Simons (1994) proposed 14 principles for ‘Meta-cognitive
25
26 Instruction’, which included:
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

- 34 • centrality of the interaction of cognitive, meta-cognitive and affective components of
35 learning;
36
- 37 • emphasising learning processes (rather than outcomes) and deeper cognitive
38 processing;
39
- 40 • helping students to recognise and practice their learning strategies, reflectivity and
41 self-regulation skills;
42
- 43 • shifting responsibility for learning and its regulation gradually to the students; and
44 building new learning onto students’ existing knowledge and conceptions.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

Urban and rural schooling

The issue of urban and rural education is important in Scotland. Scotland has a population density of 64 inhabitants per square kilometre (although in much of the highlands the average is 8 inhabitants per square kilometre) (General Register Office for Scotland, 2004). By contrast England has a population density average of 379 inhabitants per square kilometre (Demographia, 2008) and the population densities of France, Germany and Italy are 110, 232 and 193 inhabitants per square kilometre respectively (United Nations World Populations Prospects Report, 2004). Therefore, rural education plays an essential role in the education of many Scottish children. The rural/urban location can have an effect on the pedagogical practices employed by teachers. It was reported that teacher behaviour was different in large and small classes in Norwegian rural schools. Teachers in larger classes exhibited greater control on individual behaviour. This led towards the development of classroom environments dominated by teaching and mediation of knowledge. Smaller rural classrooms tended towards individual and collective freedom. This allowed social constructivist approaches to develop more effectively (Kvalsund, 2004). It was reported that pupils in rural schools in Northern Ireland had more extensive cross age and cross sex peer relationships than pupils in urban schools (Gallacher, 2005). Thurston et al., (2008) reported that teachers in rural settings used more group work and facilitated more classroom discussion as a result. Whilst it might be assumed that transition between schools in rural and urban locations may result in different experiences and outcomes, the research literature in this field is incomplete.

Cooperative learning in science

Aims

Two interwoven issues are to be addressed in this paper. Firstly, the paper will explore whether pupils were able to transfer gains from the original project to their new high school setting. Secondly, if there is effective transition, what aspects of the original project may be responsible for promoting this, especially in relation to the differential effects of undergoing transition from either an urban or rural primary school setting. Science attainment, attitudes towards science and the social connectedness of follow-up pupils will be assessed and compared to that of children not involved in the original project. The research aimed to:

- track pupils who had been involved in the original groupwork project after they had undergone transition from primary to high school (follow-up pupils),
- explore whether gains in attainment in science, attitudes towards science and range and nature of social connections persisted over time and were still present after transition,
- explore whether transition resulted in differential effects for pupils in rural and urban contexts,
- identify pupils with whom comparisons could be made - those who had not been involved in the original study (non follow-up comparator pupils).

Cooperative learning in science

Research Questions

The project had the following research questions:

- 1 In the two academic years after involvement in the original research, did gains in science understanding, attitudes and social relationships transfer and endure despite the changed context?
- 2 If gains did endure and transfer occurred, what relevant differences if any were evident between rural and urban schools?
- 3 Could differences be identified in science attainment, attitudes towards science and the nature of social relationships during science classes after transition to high school between original experimental pupils and comparator pupils?

Methods

Background

The Group Work Transition (GWT) project was designed as a longitudinal follow-up to the Scottish extension project: "Supporting Group Work in Scottish Schools: Age and Urban/Rural Divide" (SCOTSPRING) associated to the Phase II project "Improving Effectiveness of Pupils Groups in Classrooms". The project websites can be viewed at www.tlrp.org/proj/phase111/Scot_extb.html and www.groupworkscotland.org. The

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 SCOTSPRING project examined the effects of a group work intervention in science on
4
5 10-12 year old pupils in rural and urban primary school in Scotland:
6
7

8
9
10 In the SCOTSPRING project twenty-four experimental classes were drawn from schools
11
12 (twelve rural and twelve urban). Pupils in experimental classrooms engaged in general
13
14 group work skills training and two structured group work projects in science. Important
15
16 aspects of the work undertaken during the original SCOTSPRING project were that it
17
18 took place in authentic classrooms and the implementation covered structural features,
19
20 teacher role, and pupil interaction. SCOTSRPING started with activities for developing
21
22 generic group skills. These activities began with a continuing professional development
23
24 session, where teachers were introduced to desired structural features and teacher
25
26 roles. Subsequently, teachers took their classes through group-based exercises
27
28 designed to promote skills such as listening, questioning, helping, giving explanations
29
30 and reaching agreement. In these respects the SCOTSPRING science group work
31
32 differed significantly from the sort of group work that already exists in schools. The
33
34 exercises were described in resource packs that the researchers provided, and were
35
36 introduced during the continuing professional development session. Second,
37
38 subsequent to skills training, the pupils went through two programmes of science
39
40 teaching, one addressing evaporation and condensation, and the other addressing
41
42 forces. Each programme covered key concepts, and required pupils to design
43
44 investigations. For instance, the forces programme covered the angle, smoothness and
45
46 height of slopes, and the weight and streamlining of cars as influences on motion, and
47
48 introduced the concepts of gravity, friction and air resistance. The group tasks
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3 incorporated features shown in earlier experimental studies (primarily Howe & Tolmie,
4
5 2003; Howe et al., 1995, 2000; Tolmie, Howe, Mackenzie, & Greer, 1993) to maximise
6
7 the chances of pupils proposing ideas, disagreeing, explaining their reasoning, referring
8
9 back and reaching consensus. In other words, the generic training was designed to
10
11 promote pupil and teacher confidence and capability to use effective interaction when
12
13 undertaking group work activities in science. The tasks themselves were designed to
14
15 support the forms of pupil interaction that previous research had found to be beneficial.
16
17 The programmes were implemented by teachers using researcher- supplied resources
18
19 (which had themselves been developed in consultation with teachers), and in each case
20
21 involved two to three hours of teaching spread over several weeks.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Pupil understanding of evaporation and condensation and forces was tested before and
30
31 after the programmes, and progress significantly exceeded that made by control pupils
32
33 who received teaching in the two topic areas, but did not participate in the group skills
34
35 training or the SCOTSPRING science programmes. Observational data were collected
36
37 while the programmes were being implemented, and these supported the conclusions
38
39 that enhanced ability of pupils to use appropriate discourse and dialogue (directly
40
41 related to the group work communication skills training the pupils received in
42
43 SCOTSPRING, namely, proposing and explaining explanations of scientific concepts)
44
45 were good predictors of subsequent gains in attainment. Data from the SCOTSPRING
46
47 project was analysed with multiple regression analysis to examine the extent to which
48
49 post-test scores were predicted by the proposition/explanation frequencies and
50
51 indicated that they predicted post-test score for both evaporation and condensation ($\beta =$
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science
2

3 0.28, $t = 3.10$, $p < 0.01$), and force and motion ($\beta = 0.29$, $t = 3.13$, $p < 0.01$) (Howe *et al.*,
4
5 2007). General science attainment was also assessed using the Performance Indicators
6
7 in Primary Schools (PIPS) instrument. Significant gains in general science attainment
8
9 were observed in the experimental classes. Significant changes in observed group work
10
11 behaviours were evident in both urban and rural classes. Changes in group work
12
13 behaviour were correlated to increased general and specific science attainment. The
14
15 increases in the number of ideas suggested by children were significantly correlated to
16
17 increases in science attainment in the urban condition ($r=0.557$, $n=37$, $p<0.001$).
18
19 Increases in offering explanations were correlated to increases in science attainment in
20
21 the rural condition ($r=0.465$, $n=40$, $p<0.01$) (Thurston *et al.*, 2008). Therefore data from
22
23 the SCOTSRPING research strongly indicated that increases in science attainment
24
25 were significantly related to group work behaviours that improved during the
26
27 intervention.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Other findings of the research were:

- 38 1 In achievement gains, both urban and rural classes demonstrated measurable gains,
39
40 but urban tended to gain most.
41
42
- 43 2 In the social domain, rural and urban pupils showed significant gains in the number of
44
45 relationships they reported. Urban pupils showed greatest growth on this measure,
46
47 but they started the project reporting a lower number of connections to other pupils.
48
49
- 50 3 There were positive changes over time in quality of pupil-to-pupil interactions in the
51
52 classroom (pupils became more likely to be engaged in conversations that would
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 promote learning and attainment). These positive changes were associated with
4
5 better attainment outcomes and were greater in urban classes.
6
7

8
9
10 The focus of the current project was to investigate whether any of these gains survived
11
12 transition from primary to high school.
13

14 15 16 17 *Recruitment and sampling* 18

19
20
21 Twelve and thirteen-year-old pupils who had been involved in the SCOTSPRING project
22
23 and some of their classmates for comparison purposes were tracked as they undertook
24
25 transition from primary to high school. The progress of the sample was monitored.
26
27 Target high schools were therefore only those to which the primary project pupils had
28
29 transferred. A total of 21 relevant high schools were identified. Data was collected from
30
31 those classes where science teachers expressed their willingness to participate. There
32
33 were 16 follow-up schools - five schools declined to participate. Data was collected from
34
35 a total of 630 pupils - 252 follow-up pupils and 378 comparator/control pupils. The
36
37 detailed composition and average age of the sample set is presented in Table 1.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 INSERT TABLE 1 HERE
47
48
49

50
51 This study emerged as a post-hoc development due to the success of the original
52
53 project. Therefore, it was not possible to identify true control groups as these had not
54
55 formed an integral part of the design of the original study. This was a limitation of the
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science
2

3 design of this study and it is acknowledged that results from the study must be viewed
4
5 within the confines of this constraint.
6
7
8
9

10 *Measurements* 11

12
13
14
15 A battery of assessments was developed or adapted for the testing of both cognitive
16 and affective domains. In the original project the Performance Indicators in Primary
17 School instrument for Primary 7 pupils was used to assess science attainment. This
18 measure was specific to the age and stage of the children at the original time of testing.
19
20 It would have been inappropriate to use this same measure two years later. Therefore,
21
22 a new measure that had been widely used in Scottish schools was identified. The new
23
24 measure was a 21-item assessment in general science derived from the full standard
25
26 2002 Assessment of Achievement Programme (AAP) test (scored out of 61). The test
27
28 covered general science, but excluded items that were connected to the two topics
29
30 covered by the SCOTSPRING project in primary school science (forces and materials).
31
32 Nine items asked questions about living things and the processes of life (five multiple
33
34 choice and four sentence completion), five items were given on energy (three multiple
35
36 choice and two sentence completion), five items were included about chemical changes
37
38 (two multiple choice and three sentence completion) and two items were included about
39
40 the earth in space (one multiple choice and one true/false). The test was reported to
41
42 have Cronbach's alpha values of between 0.7 and 0.8 when used with 1306 twelve and
43
44 thirteen year old pupils in Scottish schools during the AAP testing phase of 2002
45
46 (Scottish Executive Education Department, 2005).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3
4
5
6 A test was also developed which measured longevity of gains from the previous
7
8 intervention in the specific science topic of *Forces*, comprising 29 items (scored out of
9
10 37). This was administered to assess enduring knowledge on the topic from the primary
11
12 project. Cronbach's alpha for test/retest scores of 525 pupils during the original project
13
14 was 0.66. Fourteen questions addressed the properties of slopes and cars relevant to
15
16 speed of rolling. The questions were associated with diagrams, each of which showed a
17
18 pair of slopes and cars. The pairs varied along one dimension (e.g. high or middle
19
20 slope), two dimensions (e.g. bumpy or smooth slope, medium or big push), or three
21
22 dimensions (e.g. high or middle slope, bumpy or smooth slope, pointed- or flat-fronted
23
24 car). The task with each diagram was to identify which car would roll furthest, and why
25
26 this would happen (from five options, e.g. 'the car is lighter', 'there is less air
27
28 resistance'). Twelve further questions focused generally on forces. Definitions were
29
30 requested for gravity (five options, e.g. 'air pushing down', 'the pull of one object on
31
32 another'), friction (five options, e.g. 'the rubbing of one surface against another', 'wind
33
34 blowing against an object') and air resistance (five options, e.g. 'the push of air against
35
36 an object', 'wind pushing an object along'). Then each force was to be drawn on a
37
38 diagram, which showed a car on a slope, and explanations were to be given of what the
39
40 force does (two options, i.e. 'make the car move', 'slow the car down'), and how it works
41
42 (four options, e.g. 'rubs back against the wheels', 'the air pushes the car down'). The
43
44 test ended with three questions where, due to combinations of slope and car
45
46 characteristics, the car could be said to be moving quickly, moving slowly or not moving.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 Explanations were to be given (five or six options, e.g. 'the car is very heavy', 'there is
4
5 less air resistance on the car').
6
7

8
9
10 *Attitudes to Science*, a 21-item questionnaire, was used to explore pupils' attitudes
11 towards the school subject of science (Pell & Jarvis, 2001). Items were slightly modified
12 from the 'what I think of science' scale. This scale was reported by Pell and Jarvis to
13 have good reliability and validity (Cronbach's alpha 0.74 with a group of 116 eleven-
14 year-old pupils). Each of 21 items was scored on a five point Likert scale with only the
15 poles marked as agree and disagree. Children were asked to indicate whether they
16 agreed or disagreed with statements. Half of the items on each sub-scale were worded
17 such that the polarity of the response was reversed.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30
31 Finally, as in the ScotSPRinG project, a Sociometric measure was employed to
32 investigate pupils' social relationships and patterns of interaction both inside and outside
33 school. In the SCOTSPRING project the instrument showed reasonable reliability when
34 used with 575 ten to twelve-year-old pupils (Cronbach's alpha 0.69). 'People in your
35 Class' was presented in the form of a matrix and asked respondents to consider four
36 key context questions (columns) regarding their relationships with all other members of
37 their science class (already printed in rows on the instrument). 'People in your group'
38 asked the pupils to undertake the same task, but only for the science work group (with
39 the names of those in their science work group already printed on the instrument). Both
40 instruments asked the pupils to mark all those pupils in their class / group that they:
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

- Worked with regularly in their class/group
- Liked working with in science
- Liked spending time with at break time
- Liked seeing out of school

Procedure

All measures were administered by two research assistants. Each researcher worked to a pre-determined administration protocol within schools in a defined geographical area centred around one of two major cities. They administered the tests and measures giving similar instructions and examples of how to complete responses to items and allowing a set time for completion (120 minutes for the total battery of tests administered in two sittings, before and after a 15 minute break). All measures were administered within a three week period in the last two weeks of October to the end of the first week in November. Tests were marked according to predefined marking templates and any anomalous answers discussed within the group for consistency of decision making. Therefore, inter-rater consistency between markers was excellent with them performing at exactly the same level of performance in the pilot marking exercises. No errors in marking were reported during this process. Each researcher collated data onto a pre-defined data handling template and the two data files were merged after completion.

Cooperative learning in science

Results

In the results section data is only presented for each item where no discrepancies in any item were reported during the marking process. In addition correlation and regressions are reported only when data from all the instruments required to perform such analyses were completed in a satisfactory manner. For this reason it should be noted that degrees of freedom may differ between analyses. Average pre and post-transition cognitive and attitudinal measure scores for follow-up and comparator pupils are presented in Table 2.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Post-transition follow-up pupils scored higher in the forces test ($F(1, 596)=12.28$, $p<0.001$) than comparator pupils. The advantage in science attainment in the topic of forces that the follow-up pupils originally exhibited (Howe at al., 2007) was still identifiable eighteen months after the initial project ended. The forces attainment scores of the follow-up pupils were not significantly lower than scores obtained for the same pupils at the end of the original project ($F(1, 183)=1.636$, ns). No significant differences in post-transition general science attainment were observed between follow-up and comparator populations ($F(1, 354)=0.31$, ns).

Pre-transition one way ANOVA showed there were no significant differences between the rural and urban follow-up pupils in science attainment ($F(1, 131)=1.908$, ns) or in the

Cooperative learning in science

forces test ($F(1, 185)=2.11$, ns). After transition no significant differences were observed between the rural and urban follow-up pupils in either science attainment ($F(1,196)=160.56$, ns) or the forces test ($F(1,196)=0.016$, ns). This indicated that pupils in both rural and urban contexts had transferred science knowledge with equal effectiveness.

Follow-up pupils reported more positive attitudes towards science than non follow-up pupils, but differences did not achieve significance ($F(1,457)=0.985$, $p=ns$). However, when analysed as separate sub-groups both urban ($F(1,121)=7.143$, $p<0.01$) and rural ($F(1,91)=4.29$, $p<0.05$) follow-up pupils reported more positive attitudes towards science than comparator pupils. Positive correlations (Pearson's r) were found between attitudes towards science and post-transition forces test scores ($r=0.329$, $p>0.001$, $n=155$) and science attainment ($r=0.283$, $p>0.001$, $n=155$).

Data from the sociometric instrument are presented in Table 3. Significant regression relationships were evident between percentages of pupils in the science work-groups reported as 'liked seeing out of school' and post-transition science attainment ($\beta=0.163$, $t(457)=3.531$, $p<0.0001$; $R^2=0.024$, $F(1,457)=4.87$, $p<0.0001$), and percentage of pupils from the science work-groups reported as 'liked spending time with at break' and post-transition science attainment ($\beta=0.123$, $t(456)=2.651$, $p<0.01$; $R^2=0.013$, $F(1,456)=6.04$, $p<0.01$). Positive correlations were found between post-transition science attainment and percentage of pupils from the science work-groups that children reported they liked

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 working with in science ($r=0.183$, $p>0.05$, $n=167$), liked spending time with at break
4
5 ($r=0.188$, $p>0.05$, $n=167$), and liked seeing with out of school ($r=0.170$, $p>0.05$, $n=166$).
6
7

8
9
10 There was evidence of transfer of social gains from the original project. The percentage
11
12 of people from their science work group that pupils reported that they liked to work with
13
14 in science was predicted by the percentage of their classmates that pupils reported they
15
16 liked to work with in primary school. Regression analysis indicated that this relationship
17
18 was linear and significant ($\beta=0.349$, $t(159)=4.698$, $p<0.0001$; $R^2=0.122$, F
19
20 ($1,159$)= 22.068 , $p<0.0001$). Those pupils who showed the greatest ability to form
21
22 positive work relationships at the end of the original project still exhibited this ability after
23
24 transition.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Pupils from follow-up groups reported higher average percentage of work and play
31
32 relationships than comparator pupils (Table 3). However, these differences were not
33
34 significant. Pupils from both follow-up and comparator groups showed a stronger
35
36 inclination to focus relationships on peers within their science work-group rather than in
37
38 their class. For follow-up pupils the percentage of the science work-group was greater
39
40 than the percentage of the class that they reported they liked working with in science
41
42 ($t=-8.933$, $df=167$, $p<0.0001$, one tailed); liked spending time with at break ($t=-8.207$,
43
44 $df=167$, $p<0.0001$, one tailed); and liked spending time with out of school ($t=-7.706$,
45
46 $df=166$, $p<0.0001$, one tailed). For comparator pupils similar patterns were observed.
47
48
49 The percentage of the science work-group was greater than the percentage of the class
50
51 that they reported they liked working with in science ($t=-14.129$, $df=313$, $p<0.0001$, one
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

tailed); liked spending time with at break ($t=-12.357$, $df=313$, $p<0.0001$, one tailed); and liked spending time with out of school ($t=-11.956$, $df=313$, $p<0.0001$, one tailed).

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

In summary results indicated that there was evidence of transfer of gains (forces test attainment results) by pupils involved in the original project. They were significantly advantaged in the science topic of forces compared to the comparator pupils (despite general science attainment being similar in both follow-up and comparator populations). Pupils from rural and urban primary school settings showed similar patterns of transfer. In general follow-up pupils reported more positive attitudes towards science than comparator pupils. These differences reached significant levels when analysed in the rural and urban populations independently. Social and attitudinal aspects to learning and peer support were significant and important predictors of post transition attainment. Those pupils who demonstrated an ability to develop social connections to their peers in primary school were the same group who were able to establish effective peer relationships in high school. Evidence of transfer was thus observed in the follow-up population.

Discussion

The original project appeared to have a two-fold effect. Firstly, it appeared that gains in learning and social skills observed in the SCOTSPRING project could be transferred

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3 and effectively used after transition. Attainment gains that accrued during the original
4
5 study persisted over time, and gains were still observable in the experimental group
6
7
8 eighteen months after the original cooperative learning project. Campione et al. (1995)
9
10 concluded that cooperative learning could be a critical factor that dictates whether
11
12 learning can subsequently be transferred. This may be due to the way that learning is
13
14 encoded during the cooperative learning processes. The important aspect of the
15
16 encoding process when undertaking cooperative group work is that learning may
17
18 proceed with knowledge on how the learning relates to prior learning, learner self-
19
20 awareness about what they are doing (self-regulation of learning being promoted and
21
22 facilitated by immediate feedback from peers) and that talking about thinking is possible
23
24 as the group works on a problem. Thus learning may be encoded with metacognition.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 It had previously been reported that when mathematics was taught using cooperative
33
34 learning and metacognitive strategies to 384 twelve and thirteen-year-old pupils the
35
36 possibility of knowledge transfer to other contexts was enhanced (Kramarski &
37
38 Mevarech, 2003). Similar findings were reported for 206 nine and ten-year-old children
39
40 undertaking cooperative learning tasks, which were reported to promote metacognitive
41
42 awareness about learning (Meloth & Deering, 1994). A possible mechanism for this may
43
44 be that cooperative groupwork enables and facilitates a greater volume of engaged and
45
46 successful practice, leading to consolidation, fluency and automaticity of core skills (see
47
48 Figure 1). As this occurs, group members give feedback to each other, implicitly and/or
49
50 explicitly. The quantity and immediacy of feedback to the learner is likely to be greater
51
52 than that which could be generated by teacher intervention alone. Explicit reinforcement
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 might stem from within the groupwork or beyond it, by way of verbal and/or non-verbal
4
5 praise, social acknowledgement and status, or official accreditation. As the learning
6
7 relationship develops, group members should begin to become more consciously aware
8
9 of what is happening in their learning interaction, and consequently more able to
10
11 monitor and regulate the effectiveness of their own learning strategies. This
12
13 development into fully conscious explicit and strategic meta-cognition is likely to encode
14
15 learning in such a way that might facilitate later transfer. It should also make group
16
17 members more confident that they can achieve even more, and that success is the
18
19 result of their own efforts.
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27 INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 It might be that each stage of the peer learning process feeds back into the originating
35
36 sub-processes - forming a continuous iterative process and a virtuous circle that
37
38 promotes metacognition as learning is encoded. If as cooperative groupwork proceeds
39
40 information is iteratively encoded with knowledge, understanding and self-regulation of
41
42 that learning (i.e. metacognition), then this would explain why learning encoded in such
43
44 circumstances can be transferred to new contexts (Campione et al., 1995; Bransford et
45
46 al., 1999; Sternberg & Frensch, 1993). Whilst there was evidence that the level of
47
48 productive feedback and reinforcement given to group members in the original project
49
50 was positively influenced by the intervention (Howe et al, 2007, Thurston et al. 2008),
51
52 further work is required to explore this process and possible mechanisms more fully.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3
4
5
6 Data indicated pupils undergoing transition in rural and urban contexts transferred
7
8 cognitive gains equally. Previous research reported that rural pupils fared less well at
9
10 school transition as they moved from smaller, friendlier school settings to larger, more
11
12 impersonal school settings (Barber & Olsen, 2004). This finding is not consonant with
13
14 that. This might lead to the re-examination of previous assumptions regarding school
15
16 transition in the rural context.
17
18

19
20
21
22 Secondly, the social relationships that could be developed by pupils after transition were
23
24 significantly related to higher post-transition attainment. A significant finding of the
25
26 original project had been increased ability to develop and maintain more peer
27
28 relationships. Transfer of previous learning was directly related to the scope and extent
29
30 of work based relationships after transition. There may be some support for the
31
32 hypothesis that social gains from the original project had the potential to act as buffers
33
34 to the effects of transition and helped promote transfer. A significant finding of the
35
36 original project was the increased ability of pupils to form positive work relationships
37
38 with classmates after training (Thurston, Topping, Tolmie & Christie, 2008). Peer
39
40 relationships formed in work based settings (i.e. peer relationships formed with pupils
41
42 with whom respondents worked with in science, as opposed to those whom they were
43
44 just in the same science class as) dominated the nature of relationships formed in the
45
46 classroom, the playground and outside of school for both follow-up and comparator
47
48 pupils. This finding is in line with other researchers who have reported the important
49
50 buffering effects of peer relationships in students undergoing transition (Hertzog,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 Morgan, Diamond & Walker, 1996). At a time when friendships and the peer group
4
5 become important in the development of students, transition between schools can
6
7 disrupt, alter or sever existing relationships (Erikson, 1980, Mizelle & Irvin, 2000). The
8
9 social advantage after transition was significantly related to the observed science
10
11 attainment scores. This suggests that ability to develop effective work relationships in
12
13 the science classroom may provide a buffering effect against dips in science attainment
14
15 after transition. These findings are consistent with those of other studies and add weight
16
17 to literature surrounding the importance of peer relationships at school transitions
18
19 (Hirsch & DuBois, 1992; Cognato, 1999).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Conclusion**

28
29
30
31 The data presented in this research indicates that using co-operative learning strategies
32
33 in science may allow transfer of knowledge and skills acquired to new contexts. Prior
34
35 learning undertaken during the previous project in the science topic of forces was still
36
37 evident and appeared stable after transition to high school. Follow-up pupils were
38
39 advantaged in respect of their knowledge in this topic when judged against comparator
40
41 pupils. Pupils from both rural and urban school contexts transferred learning
42
43 successfully at transition. Follow-up pupils reported more positive attitudes towards
44
45 science than comparator pupils from similar geographical contexts. Peer relationships
46
47 appeared to play an important role in promoting effective transition and transfer for both
48
49 follow-up and comparator pupils. Pupils tended to focus peer relationships on pupils
50
51 with whom they worked, rather than more generally with the class.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3
4
5
6 It may be incumbent upon schools to adopt appropriate pedagogical strategies before
7
8 transition. Such pedagogical strategies would include providing specific development
9
10 work with pupils on social and communication skills training. When undertaking peer
11
12 learning activities then clear protocols for interaction, assigning roles within the group
13
14 and ensuring that teacher feedback focuses on both effective group work issues as well
15
16 as cognitive issues would appear to maximise the changes of the peer learning having a
17
18 positive and lasting outcomes. If peer learning constructed along the lines of the original
19
20 SCOTSPRING design is used as a context for the delivery of work prior to transition
21
22 then this may lead to more effective transfer of learning as pupils undergo transition. In
23
24 turn this may have the potential to minimise falls in science attainment. It appears to be
25
26 important that schools make effective use of peer-support mechanisms prior to
27
28 transition. Pupils from the SCOTSPRING project appeared to be more able than the
29
30 comparator group to make and foster new working relationships with their new
31
32 classmates. Therefore, it may be reasonable to construct a hypothesis that some of the
33
34 advantages that accrued for pupils from the original social and communication skills
35
36 training may still be evident in the follow-up sample. Some form of training opportunities
37
38 for pupils on how to develop and maintain peer relationships may be useful to them and
39
40 aid pupils to transfer cognitive structures, promote positive affective dispositions
41
42 towards working and generate effective social skills that help pupils develop working
43
44 relationships in the new school environment. The results presented in this study, and
45
46 the previous SCOTSPRING study indicates that effective training of this nature may
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 include both social skills and communication skills. These social and communication
4
5 skills can be summarised as:
6
7

- 10 1. Taking turns at talking
- 11
- 12 2. Active listening to others in the group
- 13
- 14 3. Asking and answering questions
- 15
- 16 4. Making and asking for suggestions from all group members
- 17
- 18 5. Expressing and requesting ideas and opinions from all group members
- 19
- 20 6. Brainstorming suggestions, ideas and opinions together
- 21
- 22 7. Giving and asking for help from group members and from the teacher
- 23
- 24 8. Giving and asking for explanations from group members and from the teacher
- 25
- 26 9. Explaining and evaluating ideas
- 27
- 28 10. Making group decisions and coming to consensus
- 29
- 30 11. Summarising conversations to fully represent the ideas of all group members
- 31
- 32 12. Using persuasive talk to help others members of the group reshape their thinking
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40

41 There is evidence from the original project that when training for pupils included items
42 such as those listed above then effective use of talk during group discussions was
43 enhanced. This resulted in the SCOTSPRING post intervention observations (as
44 compared to pre intervention observations) indicating increased levels of children
45 suggesting ideas or courses of action ($F(1,129)=25.03, P<0.0001$), offering explanations
46 to propositions ($F(1,129)=4.29, p<0.05$), and telling someone to carry out an action
47 ($F(1,129)=19.42, p<0.0001$) (Thurston, Christie, Howe, Tomie & Topping, 2008). In the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Cooperative learning in science

1
2
3 SCORSPRING project it was reported that the frequency of children suggesting ideas
4
5 and courses of actions and telling someone to carry out an action were predictors post-
6
7 test scores in science tests in evaporation and condensation ($\beta=0.28$, $t=3.10$, $p<0.01$)
8
9 and forces and motion ($\beta=0.29$, $t=3.13$, $p<0.01$) (Howe, Tolmie, Thurston, Topping,
10
11 Christie, Livingston *et al*, 2007). Qualitative data from teacher questionnaires indicated
12
13 that teachers involved in the original project reported that there was increased social
14
15 skills in children and increased social inclusion within the class. They reported that
16
17 '*Children who might have felt 'alone' in class activities were made to 'belong' in a group*
18
19 *situation*' and that '*Some 'rocky' children found that the group discussion work enabled*
20
21 *them to do well, and as a result feel great*' (Thurston *et al*, 2008). As these original test
22
23 score gains, and the social gains detected and reported by teacher participants, were
24
25 still evident in the sample of follow-up children then this would suggest that the
26
27 SCORSPRING intervention had a positive and lasting effect on these pupils. This may
28
29 indicate that interventions that are similar in nature, may have the potential to work in
30
31 other contexts.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The opportunities that co-operative learning affords are not limited to science. Many
42
43 other initiatives in cooperative learning are reported in other curriculum areas such as
44
45 reading (e.g., Duran & Monereo, 2005) and maths (e.g., Topping, Kearney, McGee &
46
47 Pugh, 2004). Further research may wish to establish whether transfer of learning during
48
49 transition can be promoted in other curriculum areas by co-operative learning. In
50
51 addition further empirical testing of the model presented in Figure 1 may explore the
52
53 links between cooperative learning and its association with metacognition. This would
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 allow full exploration of the most effective strategies for pupils to encode information
4
5 with concomitant metacognition in such as way that may promote later transfer.
6
7
8
9

10 **Acknowledgement**

11
12
13
14
15 To be inserted.
16
17
18
19

20 **References**

- 21
22
23
24 Alexander, P. A. & Murphy, P. K. (1999). Nurturing the seeds of transfer: A domain-
25 specific perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31(7), 561-576.
26
27
28 Arowosafe, D.S. & Irvin, J.L. (1992). Transition to a middle level school: What kids say.
29
30
31 *Middle School Journal*, 24(2), 15-19.
32
33
34 Barber, B.K. & Olsen, J.A. (2004). Assessing the transitions to middle and high school.
35
36
37 *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 19(1), 3-30.
38
39 Basili, P. A. & Sanford, J. P. (1991). Conceptual change strategies and cooperative
40
41
42 group work in chemistry. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 28(4), 293-304.
43
44 Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (Eds.) (1999). *How people learn: Brain,*
45
46
47 *mind, experience and school*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.
48
49 Campione, J.C., Shapiro, A.M., & Brown, A.L. (1995). Forms of transfer in a community
50
51
52 of learners: Flexible learning and understanding. In McKeough, A., Lupart, J., &
53
54
55 Marini, A. (Eds.) *Teaching for transfer: Fostering generalization in learning* (pp 35-
56
57
58
59
60 68). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

1 Cooperative learning in science
2

3 Carter, E.W., Clark, N.M., Cushing, L.S. & Kennedy, C.H. (2005). Moving from
4 elementary to middle school: Supporting a smooth transition for students with
5 severe disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 37(3), 8-14.
6
7

8
9
10 Cognato, C.A. (1999) Cited In Mizelle, N.B. & Irvin, J.L. (2000). Transition from middle
11 school to high school. *Middle School Journal*, 31(5), 57-61.
12

13
14
15 Covington, M.V. (1987). Instruction in problem-solving planning. In Friedman, S.L.,
16 Scholnick E.K., & Cocking, R.R. (Eds.) *Blueprints for thinking: The role of planning*
17 *in cognitive development* (pp 469-511). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge
18 University Press.
19
20
21
22

23
24
25 Demographia (2008). England local authorities: Ranked by population density. Available
26 at www.demographia.com/db-englad.htm (16th April 2008).
27

28
29
30 Duran, D. & Monereo, C.(2005).Styles and sequence of cooperative interaction in fixed
31 and reciprocal peer tutoring, *Learning & Instruction*, 15, 179-199.
32

33
34 Elias, M.J., Gara, M. & Ubriaco, M. (1985). Sources of stress and support in children's
35 transition to middle school: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Clinical Child*
36 *Psychology*, 14(2), 112-118.
37
38

39
40 Erikson, E. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. London: Norton.
41

42
43
44 Finger, J.A. & Silverman, M. (1966). Changes in academic performance in the junior
45 high school. *Personal and Guidance Journal*, 45, 157-164.
46

47
48
49 Gallacher, T. (2005) *Small rural schools in Northern Ireland. A policy discussion*
50 *document for the Rural Community Network*. Available at:
51 ruralcommunitynetwork.unite.net/files/pdf/RCN%20Small%20schools.pdf (25th May
52 2005).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 General Register Office for Scotland (2004). *2001 census results* Available at: [www.gro-](http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/grosweb/grosweb.nsf/pages/censushm)
4 [scotland.gov.uk/grosweb/grosweb.nsf/pages/censushm](http://www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/grosweb/grosweb.nsf/pages/censushm) (20th November 2004).
5
6

7
8 Gray, W.D. & Orasanu, J.M. (1987). Transfer of cognitive skills. In Cormier, S.M. &
9
10 Hagman, J.D. (Eds.) *Transfer of learning: Contemporary research and applications*
11
12 (pp 183-215). San Diego: Academic Press Inc.
13

14
15 Harlen, W. & Qualter, A. (2004). *The teaching of science in primary schools* (4th ed).
16
17 London: David Fulton.
18

19
20 Hertzog, C.J., Morgan, P.L., Diamond, P.A. & Walker, M.J. (1996). Transition to high
21
22 school: A look at students' perceptions. *Becoming*, 7(2), 6-8.
23

24
25 Hirsch, B.J. & Dubois, D.L. (1992). The relation of peer social support and psychological
26
27 symptomatology during the transition to junior high school: A two-year longitudinal
28
29 analysis. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 20(3), 333-347.
30

31
32 Howe, C. J., & Tolmie, A. (2003). Group work in primary school science: discussion,
33
34 consensus and guidance from experts. *International Journal of Educational*
35
36 *Research*, 39, 51-72.
37

38
39 Howe, C. J., Tolmie, A., Greer, K., & Mackenzie, M. (1995). Peer collaboration and
40
41 conceptual growth in physics: task influences on children's understanding of
42
43 heating and cooling. *Cognition and Instruction*, 13, 483-503.
44

45
46 Howe, C. J., Tolmie, A., Duchak-Tanner, V., & Rattray, C. (2000). Hypothesis testing in
47
48 science: group consensus and the acquisition of conceptual and procedural
49
50 knowledge. *Learning and Instruction*, 10, 361-391.
51

1 Cooperative learning in science
2

3 Howe, C.J., Tolmie, A., Thurston, A., Topping, K.J., Christie, D., Livingston, K. et al.,
4
5 (2007). Group work in elementary science: Organisational principles for supporting
6
7 pupil learning. *Learning & Instruction*, 17(5), 549-563.
8
9

10 Kvalsund, R. (2004) Schools as environments for social learning-shaping mechanisms?
11
12 Comparisons of smaller and larger rural schools in Norway, *Scandinavian Journal*
13
14 *of Educational Research*, 47(4), 347-371.
15
16

17 Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.
18
19 Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
20
21

22 Lindsay, D. (1998). Middle-level to high-school transition. *Education Digest*, 63(6), 62-
23
24 74.
25
26

27 Kramarski, B. & Mevarech, Z.R. (2003). Enhancing mathematical reasoning in the
28
29 classroom: The effects of cooperative learning and metacognitive training.
30
31 *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 281-310.
32
33

34 Meloth, M.S. & Deering, P.D. (1994). Task talk and task awareness under different
35
36 cooperative learning conditions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(1),
37
38 138-165.
39
40

41 Mizelle, N.B. (2005). Moving out of middle school. *Educational Leadership*. 62(7), 56-
42
43 60.
44
45

46 Mizelle, N.B. & Irvin, J.L. (2000). Transition from middle school to high school. *Middle*
47
48 *School Journal*, 31(5), 57-61.
49
50

51 Mullins, E.R. & Irvin, J.L. (2000). Transition into middle school. *Middle School Journal*,
52
53 31(3), 57-60.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 Niedelman, M. (1991). Problem solving and transfer. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*,
4
5 24(6), 322-329.
6

7
8 Pell, T. & Jarvis, T. (2001). Developing attitude to science scales for use with children of
9
10 ages from five to eleven years. *International Journal of Science Education*, 23(8),
11
12 847 – 862.
13

14
15 Perkins, D.N. & Salomon, G. (1987). Transfer and teaching thinking. In Perkins, D.N.,
16
17 Lochhead, J., & Bishop, J. (Eds.) *Thinking: The second international conference*.
18
19 Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
20

21
22 Perkins, D.N. & Salomon, G. (1989). Are cognitive skills context-bound? *Educational*
23
24 *Researcher*, 18(10), 16-25.
25

26
27 Petersen, A.C. & Crockett, L. (1985). Pubertal timing and grade effects on adjustment.
28
29 *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 14, 191-206.
30

31
32 Pintrich, P.R. (1999). The role of motivation in promoting and sustaining self-regulated
33
34 learning. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 31(6), 459-470.
35

36
37 Resnick, L. & Collins, A. (1994). Cognition and learning. In Husen, T. & Postlethwaite,
38
39 T. (Eds.) *The international encyclopaedia of education*, 2nd edition, volume 2 (pp
40
41 835-38). Oxford: Elsevier/Pergamon.
42

43
44 Roderick, M. & Camburn, E. (1999). Risk and recovery from course failure in the early
45
46 years of high school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 303-343.
47

48
49 Scottish Executive Educations Department (2005). Assessment of achievement
50
51 programme: Sixth survey of science 2003. Edinburgh, UK: Scottish Executive
52
53 Education Department.
54

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 Scottish Government (2008) Draft Science Outcomes: Curriculum for Excellence.

4
5 Available at

6
7
8 [www.curriculumforexcellencescotland.gov.uk/Images/science_outcomesv2_tcm4-](http://www.curriculumforexcellencescotland.gov.uk/Images/science_outcomesv2_tcm4-443199.pdf)
9
10 [443199.pdf](http://www.curriculumforexcellencescotland.gov.uk/Images/science_outcomesv2_tcm4-443199.pdf) (16th April 2008).

11
12 Sharp, J., Peacock, G., Johnsey, R., Simon, S. & Smith, R. (2000). *Achieving QTS:*
13
14 *Primary science teaching theory and practice* (3rd ed). Exeter, UK: Learning
15
16 Matters.
17
18

19
20 Simons, P.R.J. (1994). Teaching and testing for metacognitive strategies. In Husen, T.,
21
22 & Postlethwaite, T. (Eds.) *The international encyclopaedia of education*, 2nd edition,
23
24 volume 7 (pp 3788-92). Oxford: Elsevier/Pergamon.
25
26

27
28 Sternberg, R.J. & Frensch, P.A. (1993). Mechanisms of transfer. In Detterman, D.K. &
29
30 Sternberg, R.J. (Eds.) *Transfer on trial: Intelligence, cognition and instruction* (pp
31
32 25-38). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
33

34
35 Thurston, A., Christie, D., Howe, C.J., Tolmie, A. & Topping, K.J. (2008). Effects of
36
37 continuing professional development on group work practices in Scottish primary
38
39 schools. *Journal of In-service Education*, 34(3), 263-282.
40

41
42 Thurston, A., Topping, K.J., Christie, D., Donaldson, C., Howe, C.J., Jessiman, E. et al.,
43
44 (2008). Effects of group work training on science attainment in rural and urban
45
46 schools. *Research in Science & Technology Education*, 26(1), 31-45.
47

48
49 Thurston, A., Topping, K.J., Tolmie, A. & Christie, D. (2008). Effect of cooperative
50
51 learning on cognitive/affective factors during transition from elementary to high
52
53 school. Paper presented at American Education Research Association Annual
54
55 Gathering, New York, March 24th-28th 2008.
56
57
58
59
60

1 Cooperative learning in science

2
3 Tolmie, A., Howe, C. J., Mackenzie, M., & Greer, K. (1993). Task design as an influence
4 on dialogue and learning: Primary school group work with object flotation. *Social*
5
6 *Development*, 2, 183-201.
7
8

9
10 Topping, K. J., Kearney, M., McGee, E., & Pugh, J. (2004). Tutoring in mathematics: A
11 generic method. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 12(3), 353-370.
12
13

14
15 Topping, K.J. & Thurston, A. (2005). *Enjoying science together*. Grangemouth, UK:
16 Geoquest.
17
18

19
20 United Nations World Populations Prospects Report (2004). World population
21 prospects: The 2004 revision analytical report. Available at
22 www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WPP2004/WPP2004_Volume3.htm (16th
23
24
25
26
27 April 2008).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Composition of the sample used in the study

Condition	Sample	Number n	Average age (standard deviation)
Follow-up pupils	male	118	155.78 (7.17)
	female	134	155.06 (6.33)
Comparator/control pupils	male	182	156.30 (6.96)
	female	196	156.37 (6.73)
Total of both follow- up and comparator pupils	male	300	156.10 (7.04)
	female	330	155.84 (6.58)
	male and female combined	630	155.98 (6.79)

Table 2: Mean pre and post transition cognitive and attitudinal measure scores for follow-up and non follow-up comparison pupils (standard deviation) [n]

		Pre-transition scores		Post-transition scores		
Condition	Rural/ urban location	Mean forces test score (out of 37)	Mean science attainment test score (out of 100)	Mean forces test score (out of 37)	Mean science attainment test score (out of 61)	Mean attitudes towards science (min=21, max=105)
Follow-up pupils	Rural	23.13 (4.71) [74]	48.98 (9.59) [48]	23.30 (6.27) [74]	28.57 (10.09) [74]	60.241 (11.08) [58]
	Urban	24.11 (4.26) [123]	46.54 (9.75) [85]	23.19 (5.24) [123]	26.81 (9.29) [123]	60.239 (12.62) [96]
	Whole sample	23.78 (4.43) [187]	47.41 (9.73) [133]	23.23 (5.63) [197]	27.47 (9.61) [197]	60.24 (12.02) [154]
Non follow-up comparator pupils	Rural	-	-	23.12 (4.87) [73]	30.27 (9.39) [74]	57.28 (12.47) [52]
	Urban	-	-	21.15 (6.82) [85]	25.89 (11.31) [85]	53.85 (12.70) [59]
	Whole sample	-	-	22.06 (6.06) [158]	27.92 (10.66) [158]	55.45 (12.65) [149]

Table 3: Social connectedness of follow-up and non follow-up comparison pupils (standard deviation) [n]

	Mean % of the science work-group that pupils reported that they liked:			Mean % of the science class group that pupils reported that they liked:		
	working with in science	spending time with at break	seeing out of school	working with in science	spending time with at break	seeing out of school
Follow-up pupils	66.92 (40.78) [168]	46.80 (39.24) [168]	36.99 (37.71) [167]	32.25 (38.69) [168]	21.08 (29.46) 169]	14.37 (25.01) [167]
Non follow-up comparison pupils	63.25 (42.01) [314]	43.90 (40.15) [314]	34.58 (37.18) [314]	30.53 (22.56) [314]	18.55 (42.01) [314]	13.33 (12.61) [314]

Figure 1: Peer learning and metacognition

