



World Scientific News

WSN 9 (2015) 124-143

EISSN 2392-2192

Recent progress, opportunities and challenges in collaborative learning and orchestrating creativity

Junjie Chen*, Xuhui Gao, Longfei Yan, Deguang Xu

School of Mechanical and Power Engineering, Henan Polytechnic University, Jiaozuo, Henan, China

*E-mail address: comcjj@163.com , comcjj@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The role of teacher is increasingly related to designing and arranging collaborative learning situations in which fruitful and creative group work may occur. This thematic review presents recent studies on creativity and collaborative learning from the perspective of the teacher as conductor of learning processes. The precondition for the design and orchestration of these kinds of learning situations is analyzing and understanding of creative and collaborative processes and their contextual adaption. Therefore, the first section of this review focuses on the theoretical vantage points of creativity and collaborative learning mainly from socio-cultural perspective. Based on this theoretical grounding, the second section describes principles for orchestrating productive collaborative learning and supporting creativity from the teacher's perspective. We discuss three dimensions related to how teachers can bring about collaborative learning and creativity: general pedagogical bases, teachers' pre- and real-time activities as well as opportunities and challenges for teacher activities. The review is concluded with theoretical and practical implications regarding collaborative learning and creativity.

Keywords: Collaborative learning; Creativity, Orchestrating learning, Sociocultural approach, Teachers' working methods

1. INTRODUCTION

In a continuously changing information society, technological and social innovations are seen as the engines for economic growth and competitiveness, and as the main prerequisites for welfare. One way to promote these innovations is to support creativity and collaboration in learning and working practices [1].

In particular, the need for collaborative knowledge construction and divided creative problem solving is suggested to be increasingly essential because future working life is apparently becoming more and more complicated. More often, employees participate in various work processes and communities inside and across work organizations and professions. Work is thus based on inter-professional expertise and the shared construction of new knowledge, and there is a need to improve communication to reach shared understandings, processes and work principles in interagency work. The needs of current working life and society also set new challenges for learning and teaching in educational contexts [2].

Thus, 21st-century skills call for flexible and novel abilities in shared working practices. Therefore, the aim of education is not only to enhance the development of specific knowledge and skills, but also to support and teach collaboration and divided creative problem solving among students. Against this background, the significance of both collaborative learning and creativity is generally confessed.

Further, supporting creativity and collaboration is often set as the target in educational settings. However, typically, it is not defined specifically to which type of learning activities and processes they refer or how they should be supported. Nor do teachers necessarily find pedagogical support for their decisions and teaching activities from curricula. Moreover, even though there are effective ways of supporting collaborative learning and creativity, it is often problematic to enforce research findings from specific conditions in various authentic learning contexts or to reach productive collaboration and creativity in authentic classroom situations.

Challenged by this situation, the present review addresses how to orchestrate collaboration and creativity in authentic educational settings from the teacher's perspective. The precondition for designing and organizing collaborative learning and creativity is to analyze and understand collaboration processes and their contextual adaptation [3].

Therefore, in the first section of this review, we describe theoretical vantage points for creativity and collaborative learning. In the second section, we illustrate principles for orchestrating collaborative learning and creativity. Orchestration has recently been widely put forward as a solution for arranging collaboration in naturalistic learning situations [4].

A common feature of orchestrating learning is that it draws systematically on research-based productive collaborative learning situations in the design and real-time implementation of teaching. Overall, in this review, we thematically focus on recent studies and discussion on creativity and collaborative learning as a grounding for the productive orchestration of these processes [5].

However, it should be noted that from the teacher's perspective, there are concepts such as 'scaffolding' in the literature that are almost synonymous with orchestrating in terms of pre- and real-time activities in enhancing collaboration and creativity [6].

2. REVIEW METHODS AND CRITERIA

This thematic review presents recent research on creativity and collaborative learning from the perspective of the teacher as conductor of learning processes. In this article, we mainly adopt a sociocultural perspective to synthesize and reflect on research, with a particular focus on enhancing the emergence of creativity and collaboration. The main aim of the article was to explore the understanding of these issues as grounding for teachers in need for finding new ways to orchestrate collaboration and creativity. Since research areas related to creativity and collaboration are very extensive, the aim of this review was not to cover these topics inclusively [7]. Rather, the study aimed to establish theoretical and pedagogical perspectives into orchestrating creativity and collaborative learning as grounding for teachers' activities in enhancing 21st-century skills. In addition, as the concepts of creativity and collaborative learning are typically used in different research contexts, the aim here was to seek conceptual differences and similarities between these concepts [8]. Overall, a thematic review was considered most appropriate in choosing the relevant research, since its advantage is flexibility in reflecting these remarkably frequently discussed phenomena, i.e. creativity and collaborative learning, from the teacher's perspective.

In qualitative thematic analysis there is particular concern with the reliability in choosing the most relevant literature. Selection was here grounded on active following of the discussion in the research societies investigating creativity and collaborative learning. The aim of this article was to be analytic and illustrative of the phenomena, and productive from the point of teachers as orchestrator of creative collaboration. In addition, synthesis was mainly executed from the viewpoint of socio-cultural approach. Analysis was adapted from identification of thematic analysis by Grau and Whitebread [9] and Hamalainen [10], including three main phases of investigation.

Firstly, concepts of creativity and collaborative learning were investigated to make sense beyond imitating meanings. In other words, we analyzed the literature in order to find basic themes related to these phenomena. After reading and analyzing the literature, we identified two basic themes, which were in both cases (creativity and collaboration) the process of its emergence and the outcomes of this process. Secondly, these themes were compared and reorganized to identify theoretical sophistications and relationships of the two constituting concepts (creativity and collaboration). In the third phase of analysis, we addressed literature on orchestrating collaborative learning and creativity from the pedagogical perspective. After close reading and re-reading, three dimensions from literature related to how teachers can orchestrate collaborative learning and creativity were identified as topical. They were as follows: general pedagogical bases, teachers' pre- and real-time activities and opportunities and challenges for teachers' activities. Related to these dimensions, we also specified particular themes. In terms of general pedagogical bases for orchestration, the principal as well as contradictory themes were freedom and structure. Teachers' pre- and real-time activities were linked to the main themes, including task structure, interactions and learning resources. Related to opportunities and challenges for teacher orchestration activities, the themes determined were teachers' individual resources and the sociocultural context for the different resources.

In order to increase the quality of our thematic review, the analysis occurred through the close collaboration of the authors. During the analysis, we also actively discussed and reflected on the selected topics, dimensions and themes with colleagues in the areas of collaboration and creativity. However, there are limitations on the ability to identify relevant studies. A critical

issue in this article is that the cited literature does not explicitly cover all the literature concerning creativity and collaborative learning. The reason for this is that we sought to illuminate the general picture of these phenomena as grounding for teachers' activities, as well as to evoke critical debate in relation to complementary knowledge on enhancing shared group processes. On the other hand, a concomitant strength of this study is that wide-ranging approaches such as this are needed in the educational sciences to help teachers to support creative knowledge construction in various educational settings.

3. THEORETICAL VANTAGE POINTS

In this section, theoretical vantage points are further elaborated on to demonstrate their value for orchestrating creativity and collaborative learning. Research in these areas is mainly grounded on Hämäläinen [11] constructivist theory and Hamilton's [12] sociocultural approach. Thus, studies of collaboration and creativity often lie between educational psychology-oriented research perspectives (studies of individual cognition) and sociocultural oriented research perspectives (studies of group processes). In both traditions, the focus has firstly been on the actions of individuals (the creativity and learning of individuals) [13]. Next, the focus has shifted to include group processes. Against this background, we firstly review the historical roots of individual creativity and the bases for socially divided creativity. Secondly, we present theoretical views of collaborative learning. In particular, we focus on sociocultural perspectives and how social structures and meditational tools shape groups' knowledge construction processes [14].

3. 1. Creativity: Individual and collaborative perspectives

Most researchers agree that in creativity, there is always some new, significant and appropriate idea, understanding, information, approach or solution to a problem that emerges from an individual person, group or community. Thus, originality alone is not a sufficient criterion for creativity. Added to this, the output must be reasonable and useful for persons. In line with this, Hewitt [15] understands creativity as the generation of appropriate and novel ideas or solutions. When examining the significance of the processes and outputs of creativity, these can be divided into three dimensions: a little c (creativity), middle c (creativity), and big C (Creativity) [16]. The metaphor 'little c' is used when speaking of creativity at the individual level and considering how new understandings, ideas, practical solutions or products are created by a person, and the production is shared and accepted at most by a few other people. In other words, the output is significant to the individual itself, but not necessarily too many people or to society [17]. In contrast to this, 'big C' refers to processes in which something historically, socially and universally new or valuable emerges, such as the meaningful inventions that have been created in the history of humankind. Between these opposites on the scale, the concept of 'middle c' is used to refer to a new product or idea created in a certain organization or small community as a result of group collaboration [18].

The roots of the of creativity research concern the psychological origin of individual creativity. At the first stage, creativity was connected to the personal properties of the individual. It was found that creativity is connected especially to the individuals' intellectual abilities. Furthermore, it was identified that creative persons had excellent abilities in terms of independence, originality, risk taking, intuitiveness, flexibility, handling of uncertainty and

internal motivation. Later, the conceptions of creativity developed further [19]. In particular, research has focused on the influence of the environment and its social, cultural and material properties on the creativity of individuals. For example, Kelly et al. [20] studied how social structures contribute to subjects' motivation and further creativity. According to this author, in order to be creative, three properties must be present: natural motivation, sufficient knowledge and abilities (domain-relevant skills) and inventiveness (creativity-relevant processes). Furthermore, creative persons must have competence when it comes to flexible problem solving, the ability to create new ideas and the capacity to concentrate on long-range working. Moreover, according to Kneser and Ploetzner [21], individual creativity is situated within a field of other actors and customs of the field. This means that in creativity, the individual's resources bind to his or her prior knowledge from the field and the new outputs are evaluated, estimated and approved by other members of the field.

The second wave of the creativity research began to emphasize this concept as a social and collaborative phenomenon. Thus, recent studies have increasingly highlighted the sociocultural and collective aspects of creativity. According to this perspective, creativity involves situated interaction processes with other members working with the topic that are mediated by the present context. The roots of shared creativity are mainly found in the sociocultural approach inspired by Kourdioukova et al. [22]. According to Kratzer et al. [23], the work of Langseth and Nielsen [24] can be considered as path breaking from the point of view of defining collaborative dimensions of creativity. Creativity, then, is seen as a process that takes place especially in the collaboration between people and is intertwined with the present environment and culture. The sociocultural approach emphasizes that insights and ideas must be new and socially suitable, and considered, at least in the community, to be creative. During the last few years, creativity researchers have focused on the origin and existence of collaborative creativity. At their best, the different roles of group members, including mutual explaining and shared knowledge construction, have been seen to enable new creative processes and outputs [25]. All in all, creativity is understood here as a collaborative process in which the members of the community produce a new and useful output for the group or wider community, and different social resources and tools related to collaboration can promote creativity.

3. 2. Collaborative learning: Perspectives of individual vs. collaborative learning

Current research on collaboration stems partly from earlier work on group-based learning approaches. Research on small groups has a long history within social psychology, and has engendered research on cooperative learning. In the latter research area, a task is often split into subtasks among participants and each participant is responsible for a portion of the problem solving; finally, these subtasks are combined into a joint output. However, in later researcher, the focus has shifted to collaboration, in which the main idea is that participants construct the work 'together' as a shared knowledge construction process. Traditionally, research on collaborative learning took place among educational psychology-oriented research perspectives and sociocultural oriented research perspectives [26]. Educational psychology-oriented research perspectives typically focus on how effective different collaboration interventions are for individual learners, while sociocultural oriented research perspectives focus on group learning and the social context in which collaboration emerges. Thus, in both approaches, the potential of collaborative learning is that it combines individual and social processes. Moreover, according to Mercer [27], both views highlight the importance of engaging in shared knowledge construction in collaborative learning.

This article is in line with the notion of Meslec and Curşeu [28], according to whom collaboration is defined as a shared knowledge construction in which it is not enough that participants cumulatively share knowledge together, but where the knowledge construction needs to be jointly built on others' ideas and thoughts. The aim of this is for the activities that members of collaborative group engage in to be not individual activities, but rather interdependent group processes attempting to come to a shared conception of a problem. Furthermore, in the sociocultural perspective, these shared processes are mediated by the community and social context in which the group work is occurring.

Collaborative learning is not an unambiguous pedagogical model or method, and there is no unified theory of collaboration. Moreover, according to Miell [29], different concepts of collaboration are superficially similar. This article is in line with the Näykki et al [30] clarified that knowledge construction recognizes that individuals create their worldview; this meaning-making is more specifically located in a group context in collaborative knowledge construction. In the area of intersubjective learning, it is further specified that the process of meaning-making is itself constituted of social interactions; finally, knowledge building requires that this group-based meaning-making is being done intentionally. However, even in the research context, it is necessary to differentiate these concepts at a fine-graded level. It should be noted that in authentic classroom situations, these collaborative learning processes are overlapping, and in practice, teachers may apply knowledge produced in various research traditions while orchestrating learning.

According to Palmgren-Neuvonen and Korkeamäki [31], at the general level, a common feature for collaboration is active and joint construction of shared understanding, meaning, knowledge and expertise among the group or community. In collaborative learning, group learning takes place by distributing participants' own thoughts and expertise, by listening to and elaborating on the views of the others and by the creative and shared knowledge construction of different thoughts and conclusions to reach common goals. In other words, the aim is that, in addition to the individual learning goals in successful collaborative learning, group members negotiate and adopt new, shared goals; shared goals may in turn lead to a broader shared understanding. In relation to individual working, the advantage of working in the group is the possibility of outsourcing and developing ideas further. At its best, collaborative learning is a shared and creative knowledge construction process between team members committed to the divided evaluation of the learning process. Moreover, successful collaboration may evoke positive dependency between team members. In this kind of ideal collaboration, a group creates something that exceeds what any one individual could achieve alone.

As stated previously, at its best, collaborative learning is the joint construction of shared meaning, understanding and knowledge, based on elaboration and evaluation of other group members' ideas and thoughts. Therefore, collaboration is typically described based on certain types of (a) shared learning processes such as joint creation of understanding, knowledge building, constructing group cognition, collaborative co-construction of knowledge, shared knowledge construction, conceptual knowledge construction, intersubjective learning, constructing shared understanding and collective thinking, and/or (b) shared learning activities such as coordination, negotiation of shared meanings, elaboration and co-elaboration, argumentation, explaining, mutual explaining, observation of problem solving, questioning, providing and receiving constructive criticism, synthesizing multiple perspectives or reasoning [32]. However, a collaborative activity alone in an educational environment does not automatically produce cognitively high-level learning. Rather, learning is affected by the

quality of shared processes (and/or activities) and whether a group is able to build new and novel knowledge or improve shared conceptual understanding through such interactions. This kind of building new and novel knowledge or understanding is a complex phenomenon, and different aspects of learning-such as cognitive, social and motivational elements-are often intertwined in successful collaboration.

3. 3. Creativity and collaborative learning: Theoretical overlaps and differences

Prior research has pointed to overlapping elements of collaborative learning and creativity. Pérez-Sanagustín et al. [33] has argued that creativity and learning involve the same mental processes, and significant creations are almost always the result of complex collaborations. In practice, for example, in the research tradition on collaborative ‘knowledge building’, members of a knowledge-building community are understood as intentionally aiming towards knowledge as a social product by expanding the boundaries of their knowledge, reflecting on and choosing activities that address limits of their understanding; this is very close to the notion of creativity. Indeed, there is congruence between successful collaborative knowledge construction and creative collaboration. It is generally agreed that theoretical knowledge resources can be applied to evoke the creative collaboration processes and effective knowledge work of groups (and/or communities) within various contexts. However, although there are similarities and overlaps between the concepts, creativity and learning are not simply one and the same thing in all contexts. It has been argued that sometimes the difference is blurry, even within the research context focusing on these processes. Therefore, there is the on-going challenge of developing a better understanding of creativity and ‘effective collaborative learning’, as both research traditions have been able to produce supplementary knowledge of productive group interaction. Although collaborative learning and creativity (creative collaboration) can be understood as overlapping and similar concepts, we make the following distinction between them.

A constructivist approach to learning is very close to the notion of creativity-the generation of novel, useful ideas and outcomes using imagination on a spectrum of individual and collaborative activity. Furthermore, both collaborative learning and creativity are divided, interactive and culturally shared processes [34]. Both involve novelty, but not in the same way. Learning means ‘new for learner(s)’; creativity means ‘new also for the domain (in practice this means no one else in the culture has yet thought about the topic in that way)’. Therefore, the difference between the concepts relates to the novelty and usefulness of a process or output for the group itself or the surrounding community. In other words, while the goal of collaborative learning is to enhance understanding (build new and novel knowledge for the group itself) through shared knowledge construction, the goal of creative collaboration is to produce a process of novel outputs, at least at the community level. Thus, at the group level, collaborative creativity exceeds collaborative knowledge construction, as something novel to the surrounding community has to be created (at least at the middle c level). In contrast, in practice in a collaborative learning situation, it is enough that a group of learners builds new knowledge based on others’ ideas and thoughts (e.g. something they would probably not have been able to achieve alone), but in most cases, someone else in the culture already knows the fact or how to do the task. However, it is possible that at their best, in collaborative learning situations, groups may reach collaborative creativity and generate novel outputs or processes meaningful to the surrounding community. Indeed, according to Prieto et al. [35], creativity and learning should

neither be set in opposition nor equated with each other, but are rather coordinated processes that have a symbiotic relationship.

In this second section, we have focused theoretically on collaborative creativity and learning, which can be used to enhance collaborative learning and the development of creativity in different educational settings. In the next section, we illustrate how to orchestrate collaborative learning and creativity in naturalistic learning situations, which may also be technology enhanced. We see that there is a need to ground teaching in theoretical knowledge to support the changing role of the teacher from monologist to dialogic actor, which includes orchestrating, scaffolding, and supporting and structuring students' shared knowledge construction processes [36]. In other words, teachers need to facilitate shared knowledge construction processes in various learning situations. In particular, we next demonstrate how teachers can orchestrate complex learning processes in terms of freedom and structure, and by utilizing the appropriate tools, tasks and resources to support learners in their knowledge-construction processes. We also discuss the opportunities and challenges that teachers face in this orchestration.

4. PRINCIPLES FOR ORCHESTRATING: THE TEACHER'S PERSPECTIVE

This review is in line with the notion that the orchestration metaphor has the potential for stimulating future practice and research on enhancing learning processes. The main idea of the orchestration is to combine design and improvisation. The curriculum sets the starting points for activities, the learning environment supports collaboration and the teacher pre-designs the structure for learning processes as well as orchestrating them in real time (based on research findings of productive collaboration); the learners are then given enough freedom for shared knowledge construction [37]. The focus here lies between sociocultural approaches and instructional design on how to orchestrate learning based on understanding these processes and their contextual adaptation [38]. Below, we present and discuss three dimensions related to how teachers can orchestrate collaborative learning and creativity: general pedagogical bases, teachers' pre- and real-time activities and opportunities and challenges for teacher activities.

4. 1. Pedagogical bases for orchestration

The concept of orchestrating learning is not new. Recently, along with the new emerging needs of society (e.g. inter-professional collaboration) and the development of new technologies (e.g. 3D spaces), orchestration has again become a topical issue in terms of supporting collaborative learning in new ways. From a pedagogical perspective, orchestrating creative collaboration lies at the crossroads of the research on disciplined improvisation and structuring collaboration. From both perspectives, research has emphasized the significance of teaching as a creative performance, the need to leave space for spontaneous richness of collaborative interactions and the meaning of teacher flexibility for students' creativity as opposed to sticking to rigid schedules at school. Related to this, there have been different attempts in the literature to enhance creativity and collaborative learning, such as through knowledge building and scaffolding and structuring collaboration, as well as the pros and cons for each perspective. Overall, studies are often positioned along a continuum between research perspectives highlighting the importance of structuring (or scripting) collaboration processes and research perspectives emphasizing freedom. In the current state, educational professionals

are realizing that, from the viewpoint of teachers, it is important to find a balance between structure and freedom in educational settings.

Even the research highlighting the flexible organization of learning activities does not mean 'totally free' intuitive teaching without educational goals. Learning cannot be based only on improvisation, because the students must obtain certain skills at a certain time. Thus, from a sociocultural perspective, orchestrating learning emphasizes the teacher as an important actor in productive collaboration processes, acknowledges the need for a curriculum and highlights the need for designing and supporting group learning based on research findings related to productive group processes. The idea is that a curriculum sets the starting point for learning. At the general level, the teacher's role is to lead the learning process towards a specific outcome, and ensure an open and flexible learning environment for collaboration and creativity [39]. Although there is freedom during the learning activities, the teacher simultaneously supports and monitors the learning processes during the group work based on contextual needs. In practice, the teacher has aims and plans (based on the curriculum and defined beforehand) for lessons, as well as goals he/she creates for learning situations (based on research findings; e.g. solving cognitive conflicts), and presents problems for students to enhance shared and creative knowledge construction. In other words, the teacher's role is not only that of facilitator, but also fellow collaborator, joining the students in collaboration processes. This means that teachers as real-time orchestrators should focus on enhancing collaboration processes, including channeling and focusing learning processes (see Pea, 2004), instead of providing correct answers. In practice, this can be done, for example, by applying learning methods that require groups to formulate hypotheses, provide explanations, interpret texts, conceptualize their own experiences through theory and describe observations. Added to this, Strijbos and Laats [40] has shown that creativity in classrooms can be supported by involving questioning and challenging, investigating connections and relationships, envisaging hypotheses, exploring ideas and reflecting critically.

Recent studies have suggested that successful orchestration also requires several dimensions other than balancing between improvisation and structure. According to Takači et al. [41], successful collaborative learning tasks, not surprisingly, require a genuine need for collaboration and learning. Added to this, learners have to share enough common ground so that it is possible to form shared knowledge and to handle tensions of opposite and critical views fruitfully. In other words, instead of reaching unanimity, the aim is to support critical discussion and evaluation of alternative views through careful guidance by the teacher. Moreover, creative collaboration requires an emotionally safe atmosphere and the provision of a respectful environment in which differences are critically engaged, but not in the dispositional way.

4. 2. Orchestrating as pre- and real-time activity

Boxtel et al. [42] have suggested that in enhancing creative collaboration, there is a need to emphasize the dialogue between all participants of the classroom rather than just arriving at the correct answer. In practice, this means that students and teachers collaborate to identify problems and alternative methods of finding solutions together. In line with this, we argue that these productive dialogues do not necessarily emerge unassisted. To allow students to achieve a higher level of understanding, there is a need to pay attention to how to draw systematically on research-based productive learning situations in orchestrating collaboration and creativity; next, we address guidelines for how to orchestrate tasks to achieve these goals based on recent research findings. The focus is on the constituent components of orchestrating collaborative

tasks from three perspectives: task structures (open ended, set tasks, structured and unstructured), interactions (research-based interaction beneficial for collaboration) and resources (internal, external and integrated). The relation of these constituent components is interdependence. In the following, we more closely elaborate upon why and how they can be applied in enhancing collaboration and creativity.

Tasks that encourage creative collaboration typically include elements whereby students need to consider alternative solutions, make choices based on evidence, investigate these evidences in different conditions and explore new and even counterpoint issues. In terms of task structure, fostering interactions can be supported by different types of tasks. The collaborative group tasks can vary from open-ended problems to set tasks with one correct solution, and/or from unstructured tasks with no clear-cut procedures or answers to structured tasks with detailed instruction. While it has been quite generally argued that creative collaboration should be embedded in various subject areas, there are opposing research findings on the use of different task structures. Researchers have indicated that success and failure in collaboration may occur within each kind of task, depending on contextual necessities. For example, on the one hand, Vasiliou et al. [43] have highlighted the use of ill-structured tasks in enhancing creative collaboration; on the other hand, Voogt et al. [44] have reported problems in collaboration processes while solving ill-structured tasks. Added to this, while Webb [45] have indicated the positive influence of well-defined task structures, in contrast, Won et al. [46] have reported problems in collaboration while solving ‘over-structured’ tasks. Therefore, it seems that it is not possible to define ‘ideal’ tasks without contextual knowledge.

Related to the complexity of choosing the right task for different learning situations, it has been assumed that collaboration is especially needed for tasks in which one can end up (through the critical discussion of different points of view) at several different conclusions. Collaborative creativity then comprises both the debate on alternative ideas and solutions and the selection of the best idea. Hence, Zapata et al. [47] argue that collaboration is not even necessary in set tasks with one correct solution because, in that case, the knowledge construction of the individual group member may be sufficient for solving the problem set. On the other hand, conflicting results have again been obtained, and it has been argued that collaboration can also be effectively utilized in tasks with only one correct solution. Thus, it is essential that tasks truly require cognitive diversity, and collaboration needs to be grounded on making choices or predictions on the basis of evidence. Against this background, Berzsenyi [48] have suggested that the composition of the group may be applied as a practical, theoretically grounded way of evoking conditions for making interactions more productive. Thus, the heterogeneity of the group, for example different interests, levels of knowledge and understandings, backgrounds, genders and skills may be applied successfully in evoking creative collaboration processes. The potential of heterogeneity is that (at its best) it creates dependency on the differences of the members. Thus, in a heterogeneous group, it is more probable that the members will bring unique knowledge, skills and expertise to the group. The task then encourages learners to compare and study different points of view on the same phenomenon. All in all, cognitive diversity may be increased to enhance collaborative learning and creativity.

As Wever et al. [49] puts it, social interaction leads to the creation and revision of new knowledge. Thus, one promising approach to orchestrating learning is to focus on how to foster interaction on collaborative tasks. In line with that, Wever et al. [50] has categorized the focus of researchers who study collaborative learning into three aspects of interaction: (a) providing

and receiving explanations, (b) a mediating role of solving conflict and controversy and (c) jointly building knowledge on each other's ideas and thoughts. These aspects may be applied as recourses for orchestrating collaboration. Thus, different kinds of design principles have been used successfully to foster specific interactions. So far, scripting has been mainly investigated based on using (a) complementary information, (b) reciprocal activities or (c) solving socio-cognitive conflicts as a grounding for arranging collaborative interactions.

Recent critical studies have suggested that especially in technology-enhanced learning settings, there is the problem of reducing the role of teachers in supporting collaboration, as the focus has typically been on enhancing interactions in virtual environments without real-time teacher support. Orchestrating learning aims to supplement this approach by teachers' timely support, and to focus on flexible ways of arranging creativity and collaboration. This means that tasks should be designed based on research findings regarding the cognitive, social and motivational effects of creativity and/or collaborative learning [51]. The aim is then to design the learning situation to encourage learners to challenge themselves in shared knowledge-construction processes with the support of learning resources and teacher scaffolding. In practice, this means that, for example, a mediating role for solving conflict and controversy can be created by providing student materials with conflicting evidence or by asking them to play conflicting roles. In this way, the members of the group need to explain different points of view, argue their own position and negotiate to find the joint solution. In addition, needed groups can then be offered support and fellow collaboration with the teacher in terms of interaction, communication, negotiation, co-construction and revising knowledge, for example by asking open-ended questions and catalyzing group progress.

According to recent research, different learning resources can be used to orchestrate interactions and task structures. First, external resources (e.g. books, internet, technological solutions) provided by teachers and/or internal resources such as learners' previous experience have been beneficially used to enhance shared knowledge construction, increase the significance of the learning to the learners and improve students' conceptual understanding of different disciplinary issues [52]. At their best, external resources like the utilization of technology are valuable in enhancing collaborative learning. For example, it is possible to pay attention to shared knowledge-construction processes, shape the way learners interact with one another, e.g. with collaboration scripts and offer more illustrative environments for shared knowledge construction. While the research has mostly focused on the use of external learning resources (e.g. technological solutions), the rising trend is to pay attention to the use of internal resources as well (for example, the learners' interests and backgrounds) in designing and orchestrating creative learning. As a result, creativity and collaboration, for example, can be supported by the conflicting or complimentary interests of different group members. Moreover, the advance in the use of internal resources offers the possibility to highlight the relevance and significance of the learning to the learner's life, culture and interests. The more teaching relates to the life and culture of the learners, the more they can control the learning processes, and the more they probably experience internal motivation and enthusiasm; ultimately, therefore, creative learning outcomes will emerge.

In conclusion, different learning resources can be used effectively to orchestrate learning. Thus, we propose that when internal and external resources are investigated from the perspectives of different actors, many resources can be seen as integrated resources that combine internal and external elements [53]. For example, a picture may be investigated as external resources for knowledge building; on the other hand, the same picture may represent

an internal resource of the personal experience of the group, individual learner and/or teacher. Finally, emotional, mental and intellectual resources influence how different resources are interpreted by group members in the shared knowledge construction process [54]. We now move to a discussion of what kinds of opportunities teachers can utilize and what kinds of challenges they can meet when they orchestrate students' collaborative creativity and learning.

4. 3. Opportunities and challenges for teacher orchestration activities

Previously, we proposed that orchestration needs to be grounded by theoretical knowledge. It should be added that successful orchestration is related to vocational competencies and teaching strategies. Thus, there is a need to know the theories and contents of the learning and sense the contextual needs of the learning situation. As the artist must know the painting techniques before the creative painting can emerge, the teacher must have sufficient pedagogic expertise to orchestrate successful collaborative learning. Furthermore, teachers' own professional interests, attitudes, beliefs and goals are intertwined with how they design and orchestrate collaborative learning situations in which creative outcomes can emerge.

Teacher attitudes towards innovative ways of working, such as providing encouragement and freedom, as well as allowing for risk-taking and collaboration, can prepare and facilitate students' creativity. In particular, teachers' attitudes and teaching strategies are the two factors that determine how supportive of creativity a classroom environment will be. Weinberger et al. [55] emphasizes that fostering students' collaboration and creativity is related to the age and competencies of teachers. At their best, expert teachers use routines and activity structures more than novice teachers, but they are also able to invoke and apply these routines in a creative, improvisational fashion. In this way, teachers develop a repertoire of useful routines, and have the professional skills required to instantly assess the flow of classroom improvisation and interject exactly the right routine to advance their pedagogical goals, while allowing the improvisational discussion to continue. Related to this, teachers may apply ways of teaching which enhance autonomy and freedom of learners' knowledge construction while working, and which allow enough time for creative thinking and collaboration processes. However, even for expert teachers, it might be challenging to relate teaching to students' cultures and backgrounds by, for example, spontaneously utilizing internal learning resources in orchestrating learning, as a teacher's personal life and interests may be weakly related to young students' culture and preferences. We also claim that utilizing teaching methods to reach creativity and collaboration is not merely dependent on the teacher's knowledge and abilities (e.g. how they are able to respond to the needs of the learning), because external administration and work culture also affect the teacher's work. In this context, we will next discuss the main challenges related to external administration and work culture related to orchestrating collaboration and creativity.

In the context of formal educational, the teacher's actions are mediated by the structural elements of their work settings, such as the resources available to them, the norms of their school, curriculum guidelines and externally mandated policies. For example, a fixed and compulsory curriculum which involves a great deal of propositional knowledge and takes up learning time may pose challenges to stimulating creativity and collaboration among students. In practice, an overburdened compulsory curriculum may weaken (or even rule out) opportunities for teachers to introduce collaborative working methods in the classroom context [56]. Furthermore, during the past few years, the control of and external instructions governing the teacher's work have strengthened because of many administrative reforms in education organizations. An administrative culture that tightens and creates new conditions for teachers'

actions constrains their professional preferences, interests, and creativity. Hierarchical and bureaucratic organizations weaken creativity because they restrict the decision making of individuals, reduce the possibilities of influencing their own work and do not encourage the development of new working methods. Moreover, teachers' work satisfaction seems to be related to opportunities for creativity and autonomy, and it further appears that teachers leave the educational organization when there are fewer opportunities to be autonomous and creative. Therefore, we may wonder if today's and tomorrow's society should highlight the autonomy of teachers' work to a greater extent to enhance professional development and creativity in teaching itself.

The current challenge of orchestrating creativity and collaborative learning is to increase the collegial collaboration between teachers in terms of collective planning and implementing learning. Working alone has typically been connected to the teaching profession, and the collegial collaboration is not yet the most natural way of working within educational organizations. Furthermore, teachers' creativity is challenged if they do not dare to try new working methods or break routines for fear of criticism and punishment. Thus, shared working methods in encouraging educational origination can increase opportunities for teachers' collaborative creativity, which may further enhance orchestrating creativity and collaboration within various natural learning contexts [57]. Therefore, it is essential that in future, a collaborative and confidential atmosphere between teachers in educational organizations is created and supported. In practice, support of teachers can be enhanced, for example, by a concrete cooperation time and place for teachers, training to adopt and further develop collaborative working methods and technological solutions to monitor learning situations.

Teachers face social demands for more creative, collaborative and effective education, but they do not feel always well equipped to achieve these goals. Hence, educational organizations can offer teachers more concrete resources to design, orchestrate and support collaborative learning and creativity. For example, computational technologies may have a number of helpful functions for orchestrating learning. According to Zhan et al. [58], computers may have a unique role to play in facilitating shared collaboration processes, and there are number of recent studies indicating the potential for technological solutions in enhancing collaboration. However, the use of technology also sets challenges for the teacher's work, and there are many unrealistic expectations connected to the role of technology (e.g. technology would replace the teacher). In practice, it is typical that, in their current state, technological environments are rarely designed with pedagogical or instructional theories of learning and teaching in mind, and therefore technology itself does not guarantee collaboration within groups. Therefore, the potential of technology for future learning relies first on designing new ways to support teachers in orchestrating collaborative learning and creativity, and second, in developing technological environments which require and support definite collaboration in problem solving.

To sum up, we have examined general pedagogical bases, teachers' pre- and real-time activities and current opportunities and challenges for teachers in educational contexts. Teachers need to do their best to inspire, motivate and support students' collaborative and creative learning. One way to achieve this goal is to orchestrate learning. In doing so, teachers need to organize tasks and successfully utilize available learning resources related to students' specific educational situation. In addition, there is a need to balance flexible structures and scripts with freedom and improvisation. Furthermore, teachers' own internal resources and sociocultural practices create different possibilities and limitations for teacher's work, as well

as how they are able to respond to the needs of learning and create successful learning spaces and authentic learning situations with different students.

5. CONCLUSIONS

It is widely agreed that to support 21st-century skills, there is a need to find new ways to enhance collaboration and creativity. The use of collaborative working methods facilitates both solving creative tasks and the development of creativity [8]. Even complex learning aims can be achieved through shared knowledge construction. Moreover, because of these knowledge construction processes, profound understandings, new skills or new ideas may arise [39]. Despite this potential, however, recent studies have shown that in reality, high-level, productive collaboration is relatively rare, and is challenging to ‘create’. Moreover, in authentic learning contexts, completely free collaboration does not necessarily promote productive collaboration and high-level learning [18]. Students need to be guided in how to interact. Therefore, attention needs to be paid to how to orchestrate learners’ working processes to accomplish creative collaboration and learning [56]. This review has been one attempt to answer these challenges. First, we described the theoretical vantage points of collaborative creativity and collaborative learning from sociocultural perspectives and theoretical bases for orchestrating collaboration and creativity. Next, we summarized in theoretical terms the main concurrences and differences between creativity and collaborative learning. Then, we concluded with the practical implications for the theoretically grounded orchestration of these shared processes, and revealed obstacles and possibilities related to orchestration from the teacher’s perspective.

Research and theoretical discussion are divided into two broad categories: creativity and collaborative learning. These concepts are also typically used in different research contexts. However, there is congruence between the concepts of collaborative knowledge construction and creative collaboration. In terms of a sociocultural approach in particular, collaboration and creativity are understood as divided, interactive and culturally shared processes of different learners in groups. Thus, the terms collaboration and collaborative creativity overlap, and in the research context, they are even used to refer to similar types of shared knowledge-construction processes. In spite of their similitude, collaborative learning and creative collaboration should not be understood as totally corresponding phenomena. We suggest that the main difference between the concepts relates to the novelty value and the usefulness of a process or output for the group or surrounding community. First, when research refers to high-level collaboration, it seems likely that productive collaborative learning comprises at least group-level creativity (novel understanding, ideas or solutions). Second, collaborative creativity exceeds collaborative knowledge construction, as something novel to the surrounding community has to be created. There certainly is indistinctness between the concepts of collaboration and creativity, and we argue for the better conceptual clarity of these concepts in the future. However, we also think that this friction may offer the potential to analyze and productively rethink important issues in orchestrating collaboration, as different research perspectives have been able to produce complementary knowledge relating to the enhancement of shared group processes.

In practice, orchestrating collaborative learning and creativity seems to be a challenging process that balances between curriculum-based design, theory-based knowledge and contextual necessities [27]. Furthermore, in successful orchestration, there is a need to find the

balance between individual skills (of learners and the teacher), the abilities of the group and the challenges of the task. Therefore, in orchestrating learning, there is a need to pay attention to the task itself and balance between the instructions and ‘free processes’ [6]. Thus, from a pedagogical perspective, orchestrating creative collaboration lies at the crossroads of research highlighting the emergent nature of effective classroom practices and that on structuring collaboration, for example instructional support for collaboration. This review is in line with the notion that orchestrating learning must be both pedagogically structured and flexible in order to reach learning goals [28]. Thus, the learning goal (task which the learners’ strive to complete) and its contextual needs set the limits for how much learning should be designed and instructed [58]. This means that when teachers orchestrate collaborative learning and support creativity among students, they need to find the balance between different necessities, such as between design and real-time activity, the interrelationship between instruction and improvisation and the needs of different groups.

In this review, we have focused on the three constituent components of balancing design and real time activity-task structures, interactions and resources-that recent research has indicated as beneficial instructional components for supporting collaboration and creativity. We argue that task structures, interactions and resources are examples of applying research-based productive learning situations in authentic learning settings, and hence, promoting creativity and collaboration in educational contexts. Related to these components, for the future, research findings on collaboration roles have the potential for orchestrating learning. Moreover, there is yet the under-researched area of different social-planes (individual learner, small group, class wide and teachers) and their relation to flexible orchestration. Therefore, in future, orchestrating creativity and collaboration needs to be studied systematically from the perspective of integrating individual, small group, and class-wide activities. In addition, there is a need for a better empirical understanding of the role and meaning of emotions in creative and collaborative learning processes, since so far only a few studies have addressed the emotional dimension of collaborative learning and creativity.

At its best, orchestrating learning seems to offer potential for enhancing collaboration and creativity in different educational settings. From a sociocultural perspective, the role of the teacher is significant in the enhancement of productive collaboration processes. However, research has also shown that how teachers are able to respond to the needs of learners and create successful learning spaces is not merely dependent upon their abilities and professional competencies, since different sociocultural practices create different possibilities for and limitations on the teacher’s work activities and creativity. Therefore, in future, more attention needs to be paid to how to support teachers’ activities in fostering students’ creativity and collaboration. Recent research has indicated factors that influence teachers’ abilities to apply creative and collaborative working methods. First, there is a need to highlight the autonomy of teachers’ work to enhance professional development and creativity. Second, external administration and the work culture need to support creative and collaborative teaching methods. Third, there is a need to offer teachers concrete resources to orchestrate collaborative learning and creativity. For example, in future the successful utilization of technology may be one opportunity. Thus, technological solutions can help to realize more participatory modes of instruction which can complement more traditional, teacher-centered instructional approaches (e.g. environments that support collaboration and/or environments that help the teacher to monitor and orchestrate the learning processes). In practice, we need, for example, platforms that includes different learning scenarios, helps teachers to realize various research-based

collaboration activities, leaves space for spontaneous knowledge construction processes and simultaneously allows teachers to keep track of what is actually happening in the knowledge-construction processes of students. Thus, for the future, it is crucial find ways to support teachers in developing and applying creative and collaborative teaching methods.

In conclusion, it seems that supporting learning and teaching requires the integration of theoretical, pedagogic and technological development. There is a special need to pay attention to how to engage groups in high-level knowledge-construction processes and how to support teachers. In future, theoretical knowledge about creativity and collaborative learning (for example, knowledge about the processes of shared knowledge constructions) needs to be integrated with the teacher's orchestration of learning activities and bound to the learning context.

References

- [1] A.R. Anaya, M. Luque, T. García-Saiz, Recommender system in collaborative learning environment using an influence diagram, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40 (2013), 7193-7202.
- [2] A. Andiliou, P.K. Murphy, Examining variations among researchers' and teachers' conceptualizations of creativity: A review and synthesis of contemporary research, *Educational Research Review*, 5 (2010), 201-219.
- [3] C.S.C. Asterhan, B.B. Schwarz, N. Cohen-Eliyahu, Outcome feedback during collaborative learning: Contingencies between feedback and dyad composition, *Learning and Instruction*, 34 (2014), 1-10.
- [4] F. Braida, C.E. Mello, M.B. Pasinato, G. Zimbrão, Transforming collaborative filtering into supervised learning, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 42 (2015), 4733-4742.
- [5] Y.-T. Chuang, SSCLS: A Smartphone-Supported Collaborative Learning System, *Telematics and Informatics*, 32 (2015), 463-474.
- [6] A. Craft, T. Cremin, P. Burnard, K. Chappell, Teacher stance in creative learning: A study of progression, *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 2 (2007), 136-147.
- [7] M.-I. Dascalu, C.-N. Bodea, A. Moldoveanu, A. Mohora, M. Lytras, P.O. de Pablos, A recommender agent based on learning styles for better virtual collaborative learning experiences, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 45 (2015), 243-253.
- [8] J.J. Doppenberg, P.J. den Brok, A.W.E.A. Bakx, Collaborative teacher learning across foci of collaboration: Perceived activities and outcomes, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28 (2012), 899-910.
- [9] V. Grau, D. Whitebread, Self and social regulation of learning during collaborative activities in the classroom: The interplay of individual and group cognition, *Learning and Instruction*, 22 (2012), 401-412.
- [10] R. Hamalainen, Designing and evaluating collaboration in a virtual game environment for vocational learning, *Computers & Education*, 50 (2008), 98-109.

- [11] R. Hämäläinen, P. Häkkinen, Teachers' instructional planning for computer-supported collaborative learning: Macro-scripts as a pedagogical method to facilitate collaborative learning, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26 (2010), 871-877.
- [12] R. Hämäläinen, K. Oksanen, P. Häkkinen, Designing and analyzing collaboration in a scripted game for vocational education, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 24 (2008), 2496-2506.
- [13] R. Hämäläinen, K. Vähäsantanen, Theoretical and pedagogical perspectives on orchestrating creativity and collaborative learning, *Educational Research Review*, 6 (2011), pp.169-184.
- [14] R.J. Hamilton, Effects of Three Types of Elaboration on Learning Concepts from Text, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22 (1997), 299-318.
- [15] A. Hewitt, Children's creative collaboration during a computer-based music task, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 47 (2008), 11-26.
- [16] I. Inayat, R.u. Amin, Z. Inayat, S.S. Salim, Effects of Collaborative Web Based Vocational Education and Training (VET) on Learning Outcomes, *Computers & Education*, 68 (2013), 153-166.
- [17] H. Jeong, C.E. Hmelo-Silver, Productive use of learning resources in an online problem-based learning environment, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (2010), 84-99.
- [18] P. Kämpylis, E. Berki, P. Saariluoma, In-service and prospective teachers' conceptions of creativity, *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 4 (2009), 15-29.
- [19] F. Ke, Y.-C. Hsu, Mobile augmented-reality artifact creation as a component of mobile computer-supported collaborative learning, *The Internet and Higher Education*, 26 (2015), pp.33-41.
- [20] G. Kelly, T. Crawford, J. Green, Common Task and Uncommon Knowledge: Dissenting Voices in the Discursive Construction of Physics Across Small Laboratory Groups, *Linguistics and Education*, 12 (2001), 135-174.
- [21] C. Kneser, R. Ploetzner, Collaboration on the basis of complementary domain knowledge: observed dialogue structures and their relation to learning success, *Learning and Instruction*, 11 (2001), 53-83.
- [22] E.V. Kourdioukova, K.L. Verstraete, M. Valcke, The quality and impact of computer supported collaborative learning (CSCL) in radiology case-based learning, *European Journal of Radiology*, 78 (2011), 353-362.
- [23] J. Kratzer, R.T.A.J. Leenders, J.M.L. Van Engelen, The social structure of leadership and creativity in engineering design teams: An empirical analysis, *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 25 (2008), 269-286.
- [24] H. Langseth, T.D. Nielsen, Scalable learning of probabilistic latent models for collaborative filtering, *Decision Support Systems*, 74 (2015), 1-11.
- [25] S. Lasky, A sociocultural approach to understanding teacher identity, agency and professional vulnerability in a context of secondary school reform, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21 (2005), pp.899-916.

- [26] R.M. Mayordomo, J. Onrubia, Work coordination and collaborative knowledge construction in a small group collaborative virtual task, *The Internet and Higher Education*, 25 (2015), 96-104.
- [27] N. Mercer, The quality of talk in children's collaborative activity in the classroom, *Learning and Instruction*, 6 (1996), 359-377.
- [28] N. Meslec, P.L. Curşeu, Are balanced groups better? Belbin roles in collaborative learning groups, *Learning and Individual Differences*, 39 (2015), 81-88.
- [29] D. Miell, K. Littleton, Musical collaboration outside school: Processes of negotiation in band rehearsals, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 47 (2008), 41-49.
- [30] P. Näykki, S. Järvelä, P.A. Kirschner, H. Järvenoja, Socio-emotional conflict in collaborative learning-A process-oriented case study in a higher education context, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 68 (2014), 1-14.
- [31] L. Palmgren-Neuvonen, R.-L. Korkeamäki, Group interaction of primary-aged students in the context of a learner-generated digital video production, *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 3 (2014), 1-14.
- [32] G. Parmentier, V. Mangematin, Orchestrating innovation with user communities in the creative industries, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 83 (2014), 40-53.
- [33] M. Pérez-Sanagustín, P.J. Muñoz-Merino, C. Alario-Hoyos, X. Soldani, C. Delgado Kloos, Lessons learned from the design of situated learning environments to support collaborative knowledge construction, *Computers & Education*, 87 (2015), 70-82.
- [34] V. Popov, H.J.A. Biemans, D. Brinkman, A.N. Kuznetsov, M. Mulder, Facilitation of computer-supported collaborative learning in mixed- versus same-culture dyads: Does a collaboration script help?, *The Internet and Higher Education*, 19 (2013), 36-48.
- [35] L.P. Prieto, J.I. Asensio-Pérez, J.A. Muñoz-Cristóbal, I.M. Jorrín-Abellán, Y. Dimitriadis, E. Gómez-Sánchez, Supporting orchestration of CSCL scenarios in web-based Distributed Learning Environments, *Computers & Education*, 73 (2014), 9-25.
- [36] H. Sadeghi, A.A. Kardan, A novel justice-based linear model for optimal learner group formation in computer-supported collaborative learning environments, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48 (2015), 436-447.
- [37] R.K. Sawyer, S. Berson, Study group discourse: How external representations affect collaborative conversation, *Linguistics and Education*, 15 (2004), 387-412.
- [38] C. Schoor, M. Bannert, Motivation in a computer-supported collaborative learning scenario and its impact on learning activities and knowledge acquisition, *Learning and Instruction*, 21 (2011), 560-573.
- [39] S.H. Stephan, E.H. Connors, P. Arora, L. Brey, A learning collaborative approach to training school-based health providers in evidence-based mental health treatment, *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35 (2013), 1970-1978.
- [40] J.-W. Strijbos, M.F. De Laat, Developing the role concept for computer-supported collaborative learning: An explorative synthesis, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (2010), 495-505.

- [41] D. Takači, G. Stankov, I. Milanovic, Efficiency of learning environment using GeoGebra when calculus contents are learned in collaborative groups, *Computers & Education*, 82 (2015), 421-431.
- [42] C. van Boxtel, J. van der Linden, G. Kanselaar, Collaborative learning tasks and the elaboration of conceptual knowledge, *Learning and Instruction*, 10 (2000), pp.311-330.
- [43] C. Vasiliou, A. Ioannou, P. Zaphiris, Understanding collaborative learning activities in an information ecology: A distributed cognition account, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 41 (2014), 544-553.
- [44] J. Voogt, H. Westbroek, A. Handelzalts, A. Walraven, S. McKenney, J. Pieters, B. de Vries, Teacher learning in collaborative curriculum design, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27 (2011), 1235-1244.
- [45] N.M. Webb, Peer interaction and learning in small groups, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 13 (1989), 21-39.
- [46] S.G.L. Won, M.A. Evans, C. Carey, C.G. Schnittka, Youth appropriation of social media for collaborative and facilitated design-based learning, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 50 (2015), 385-391.
- [47] A. Zapata, V.H. Menéndez, M.E. Prieto, C. Romero, Evaluation and selection of group recommendation strategies for collaborative searching of learning objects, *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 76 (2015), 22-39.
- [48] C.A. Berzsenyi, Teaching interlocutor relationships in electronic classrooms, *Computers and Composition*, 16 (1999), 229-246.
- [49] B. De Wever, H.V. Keer, T. Schellens, M. Valcke, Roles as a structuring tool in online discussion groups: The differential impact of different roles on social knowledge construction, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (2010), 516-523.
- [50] B. De Wever, H. Van Keer, T. Schellens, M. Valcke, Applying multilevel modelling to content analysis data: Methodological issues in the study of role assignment in asynchronous discussion groups, *Learning and Instruction*, 17 (2007), 436-447.
- [51] B. Ertl, F. Fischer, H. Mandl, Conceptual and socio-cognitive support for collaborative learning in videoconferencing environments, *Computers & Education*, 47 (2006), 298-315.
- [52] J.-A. Marcos-García, A. Martínez-Monés, Y. Dimitriadis, DESPRO: A method based on roles to provide collaboration analysis support adapted to the participants in CSCL situations, *Computers & Education*, 82 (2015), 335-353.
- [53] J. Preece, B. Nonnecke, D. Andrews, The top five reasons for lurking: improving community experiences for everyone, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 20 (2004), 201-223.
- [54] J.W. Sarmiento, W. Shumar, Boundaries and roles: Positioning and social location in the Virtual Math Teams (VMT) online community, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (2010), 524-532.
- [55] A. Weinberger, K. Stegmann, F. Fischer, Learning to argue online: Scripted groups

surpass individuals (unscripted groups do not), *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (2010), 506-515.

- [56] J.-W. Strijbos, A. Weinberger, Emerging and scripted roles in computer-supported collaborative learning, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26 (2010), 491-494.
- [57] J.-W. Strijbos, R.L. Martens, W.M.G. Jochems, N.J. Broers, The effect of functional roles on perceived group efficiency during computer-supported collaborative learning: a matter of triangulation, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 23 (2007), 353-380.
- [58] Z. Zhan, P.S.W. Fong, H. Mei, T. Liang, Effects of gender grouping on students' group performance, individual achievements and attitudes in computer-supported collaborative learning, *Computers in Human Behavior*, 48 (2015), 587-596.

(Received 22 April 2015; accepted 02 May 2015)