

SUSTAINING GROUP COGNITION IN A MATH CHAT ENVIRONMENT

GERRY STAHL

*College of Information Science & Technology, Drexel University
Philadelphia, PA 19104 USA
Gerry.Stahl@drexel.edu
<http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry>*

Learning takes place over long periods of time that are hard to study directly. Even the learning experience involved in solving a challenging math problem in a collaborative online setting can be spread across hundreds of brief postings during an hour or more. Such long-term interactions are constructed out of posting-level interactions, such as the strategic proposing of a next step. This paper identifies a pattern of exchange of postings that it terms *math proposal adjacency pair*, and describes its characteristics. Drawing on the methodology of conversation analysis, the paper adapts this approach to investigating mathematical problem-solving communication and to the computer-mediated circumstances of online chat. Math proposals and other interaction methods constitute the collaborative group as a working group, give direction to its problem solving and help to sustain its shared meaning making or group cognition. Groups sustain their online social and intellectual work by building up longer sequences of math proposals, other adjacency pairs and a variety of interaction methods. Experiences of collaboration and products of group cognition emerge over time.

Keywords: group cognition; CSCL; mathematics education; asynchronous chat; math proposal adjacency pair; failed proposal; conversation analysis; intersubjective meaning making.

Research in learning has traditionally focused on psychological processes at the individual unit of analysis. With the shift to socio-cultural approaches in recent years, the community unit of analysis has come to the fore. In a new book on group cognition, we have identified small groups as defining a middle ground between individual people and communities of practice:

Small groups are the engines of knowledge building. The knowing that groups build up in manifold forms is what becomes internalized by their members as individual learning and externalized in their communities as certifiable knowledge. At least, that is a central premise of this book. (Stahl, 2006b, p. 16)

The concept of group cognition, however, retains a certain ambiguity of scale. On the micro level, it is based on the discovery by conversation analysis that a smallest element of meaning in discourse is the adjacency pair, a product of interaction within

1 a dyad or small group, and not an expression of individual cognition (Duranti, 1998;
2 Schegloff, 1991). On the macro level, it is a vision of collaborative knowledge
3 building, where knowledge arises through community, interpersonal or social
4 interaction (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1996; Vygotsky,
5 1930/1978). Taking one approach or the other, we can analyze how a small group of
6 students establishes a detailed point of shared understanding or we can, for instance,
7 analyze how they apprentice participation in the community of math discourse. The
8 question remains: how can we understand what happens in a group at the interesting
9 meso level during a one-hour math chat consisting of many detailed interactions but
10 perhaps not measurably increasing the group's community participation?

11 This paper tries to address the gap in the methodology of the learning sciences in
12 a preliminary way. It begins with a detailed analysis of a particular interaction that
13 actually occurred in a student chat. It then gradually broadens the discussion of
14 online math chat sessions, discussing various aspects of how the elemental adjacency
15 pairs in such a momentary interaction contribute to a sustained group experience over
16 a somewhat longer period of time. The presentation proceeds through these steps:

- 17 1. The context of online math chats which provide the empirical basis for our
18 observations is first motivated and described.
- 19 2. The concept of adjacency pairs from conversation analysis is adapted to the
20 situation of online math chats and is particularized as "math proposal adjacency
21 pairs."
- 22 3. A specific adjacency pair is analyzed as a "failed proposal," which by contrast
23 sheds light on the nature of successful proposals.
- 24 4. We then describe our design-based research approach in which we revise our
25 software and pedagogy in response to issues observed during a sequence of
26 evolving trials.
- 27 5. Next, we look at a more extended interaction that occurred in our revised chat
28 environment, involving methods of computer-supported deictic referencing that
29 build from adjacency pairs to longer sequences of cognitive work.
- 30 6. To extrapolate beyond one or two detailed interactions and analyze more
31 extended sessions with some generality would require volumes of exposition.
32 We therefore rely on our other studies, our general impressions from observing
33 and participating in many online math chats, and from related work by others to
34 discuss a number of relevant aspects of sustained group cognition.
- 35 7. We conclude with reflections on how groups construct and sustain their on-going
36 sense of shared experience. This points to future work.

37 **1. Doing Mathematics Together Online**

38 Technology-enhanced learning offers many opportunities for innovation in
39 education. One of the major avenues is by supporting the building of collaborative
40 meaning and knowledge (Stahl, 2006b). For instance, it is now possible for students
41 around the world to work together on challenging math problems. Through online
42 discussion, they can share problem-solving experiences and gain fluency in
43 communicating mathematically. Research on mathematics education stresses the
44 importance of student discourse about math (NCTM, 2000; Sfard, 2002), something
45 that many students do not have opportunities to practice face-to-face.

46 While much research on computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) has
47 analyzed the use of asynchronous threaded discussion forums, there has been

1 relatively little research on the use of synchronous chat environments in education.
2 The research reported here suggests that chat has great promise as a medium for
3 collaborative learning if the medium and its use are carefully configured. This paper
4 investigates how math discourse takes place within the chat medium and how we use
5 our analyses to inform the design of effective math chat environments.

6 In the Virtual Math Teams (VMT) research project at the Math Forum
7 (<http://mathforum.org/vmt>), we invite middle-school students to participate in online
8 chats about interesting problems in beginning algebra and geometry. The following
9 math problem, discussed in the chat excerpt analyzed below, is typical:

10 If two equilateral triangles have edge-lengths of 9 cubits and 12 cubits, what
11 is the edge-length of the equilateral triangle whose area is equal to the sum
12 of the areas of the other two?

13 We rely on a variety of approaches from the learning sciences to guide our
14 research and to analyze the results of our trials, including coding along multiple
15 dimensions (Strijbos & Stahl, 2005), analysis of threading (Cakir *et al.*, 2005) and
16 ethnography (Shumar, 2006). In particular, we have developed an
17 ethnomethodologically-informed (Garfinkel, 1967; Heritage, 1984) chat analysis
18 approach based on conversation analysis (Pomerantz & Fehr, 1991; Psathas, 1995;
19 Sacks, 1992; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; ten Have, 1999) to understand the
20 structure of interactions that take place in student chats. In this paper, we adapt a
21 finding of conversation analysis to math chats and analyze a specific form of
22 adjacency pairs that seem to be important for this context. Before presenting these
23 findings, it may be useful to describe briefly how the notion of adjacency pairs
24 differs from naïve conceptions of conversation.

25 There is a widespread common-sense or folk-theory (Bereiter, 2002; Dennett,
26 1991) view of conversation as the exchange or transmission of propositions (Shannon
27 & Weaver, 1949). This view was refined and formalized by logicians and cognitive
28 scientists as involving verbal “expression” in meaningful statements by individuals,
29 based on their internal mental representations. Speech served to transfer meanings
30 from the mind of a speaker to the mind of a listener, who then interpreted the
31 expressed message. Following Wittgenstein (1953) in critiquing this view, speech act
32 theory (Austin, 1952; Searle, 1969) argued that the utterances spoken by individuals
33 were ways of acting in the world, and were meaningful in terms of what they
34 accomplished through their use and effects. Of course, the expression, transmission
35 and interpretation of meaning by individuals can be problematic, and people
36 frequently have to do some interactional work in order to re-establish a shared
37 understanding. The construction of common ground has been seen as the attempt to
38 coordinate agreement between individual understandings (Clark & Brennan, 1991).

39 Conversation analysis takes a different view of conversation. It looks at how
40 interactional mechanisms, like the use of adjacency pairs, co-construct inter-
41 subjectivity.

42 *Adjacency pairs* are common sequences of utterances by different people—
43 such as mutual greetings or question/answer interchanges—that form a
44 meaningful speech act spanning multiple utterances, which cannot be
45 attributed to an individual or to the expression of already formed mental
46 states. They achieve meaning in their very interaction.

47 We are interested in what kinds of adjacency pairs are typical for math chats. The
48 topic of adjacency pairs is taken up extensively in sections 2 and 6.1 below. Stahl
49 (2006b) further discusses the implications that viewing adjacency pairs as the
50 smallest elements of meaning making has for the intersubjective foundation of group
51 cognition, a process of jointly constructing meaning in discourse.

1 The medium of online chat has its own peculiarities (Lonchamp, 2006;
2 Mühlpfordt & Wessner, 2005; O'Neill & Martin, 2003). Most importantly, it is a text-
3 based medium, where interaction takes place by the sequential response of brief texts
4 to each other (Livingston, 1995; Zemel, 2005). As a quasi-synchronous medium
5 (Garcia & Jacobs, 1999), chat causes confusion because several people can be typing
6 at once and their texts can appear in an order that obscures to whom or to what they
7 are responding. Furthermore, under time pressure to submit their texts so that they
8 will appear near the post to which they are responding, some chat participants break
9 their messages into several short texts. Because of these peculiarities of chat, it is
10 necessary for researchers to carefully reconstruct the intended threading of texts that
11 respond to each other before attempting to interpret the flow of interaction (Cakir *et*
12 *al.*, 2005; Strijbos & Stahl, 2005).

13 Math chats differ from ordinary informal conversation in a number of additional
14 ways. They are focused on the task of solving a specific problem, and they take place
15 within a somewhat formal institutional setting. They involve the *doing* of
16 mathematics (Livingston, 1986). And, of course, they are computer-mediated rather
17 than face-to-face. The approach of conversation analysis is based on
18 ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967), which involves the study of the *methods* that
19 people use to accomplish what they are doing. So, we are interested in working out
20 the methods that are used by students in online math chats. In this paper we discuss a
21 particular method of collaboration in math chats that we have elsewhere called
22 *exploratory participation*: participants engage each other in the conjoint discovery
23 and production of both the problem and possible solutions (Wegerif, 2006; Zemel,
24 Xhafa, & Stahl, 2005).

25 2. Math proposal adjacency pairs

26 In order to begin to analyze the methods that students use in math chats, we take a
27 close look at an excerpt from an actual chat. Figure 1 shows an excerpt from near the
28 beginning of the log of one of our first online collaborative math problem-solving
29 sessions. Three students—named Avr, Sup and Pin—have just entered the chat room,
30 said hello to each other and read the problem involving three triangles.

31 The first thing to notice here is a pattern of proposals, discussions and
32 acceptances similar to what takes place in face-to-face discourse. Bids for proposals
33 about steps in solving the math problem are made by Avr in lines 1, 3, 8, 17 and by
34 Pin in lines 20, 27. These proposals are each affirmed by someone else in lines 2, 6,
35 10, 19, 22, 28, respectively.

36 To avoid chat confusion, note that line 21 responds to line 19, while line 22
37 responds to line 20. The timestamps show that lines 20 and 21 effectively overlapped
38 each other chronologically: Avr was typing line 21 before she saw line 20. Similarly,
39 lines 24 and the following were responses to line 20, not line 23. We will correct for
40 these confusions later, in Figure 2, which reproduces a key passage in this excerpt.

41 In Figure 1, we see several examples of a three-step pattern:

- 42 1. A proposal bid is made by an individual for the group to work on: “I think we
43 should”
- 44 2. A proposal acceptance is made on behalf of the group: “Ok,” “right”
- 45 3. There is an elaboration of the proposal by members of the group. The proposed
46 work is begun, often with a secondary proposal for the first sub-step.

1. **Avr (8:21:46 PM)**: Okay, I think we should start with the formula for the area of a triangle
2. **Sup (8:22:17 PM)**: **ok**
3. **Avr (8:22:28 PM)**: $A = 1/2bh$
4. **Avr (8:22:31 PM)**: I believe
5. **pin (8:22:35 PM)**: **yes**
6. **pin (8:22:37 PM)**: **i concue**
7. **pin (8:22:39 PM)**: **concur***
8. **Avr (8:22:42 PM)**: then find the area of each triangle
9. **Avr (8:22:54 PM)**: oh, wait
10. **Sup (8:23:03 PM)**: **the base and heigth are 9 and 12 right?**
11. **Avr (8:23:11 PM)**: no
12. **Sup (8:23:16 PM)**: **o**
13. **Avr (8:23:16 PM)**: that's two separate triangles
14. **Sup (8:23:19 PM)**: **ooo**
15. **Sup (8:23:20 PM)**: **ok**
16. **Avr (8:23:21 PM)**: right
17. **Avr (8:23:27 PM)**: i think we have to figure out the height by ourselves
18. **Avr (8:23:29 PM)**: if possible
19. **pin (8:24:05 PM)**: **i know how**
20. **pin (8:24:09 PM)**: **draw the altitude'**
21. **Avr (8:24:09 PM)**: how?
22. **Avr (8:24:15 PM)**: right
23. **Sup (8:24:19 PM)**: **proportions?**
24. **Avr (8:24:19 PM)**: this is frustrating
25. **Avr (8:24:22 PM)**: I don't have enough paper
26. **pin (8:24:43 PM)**: **i think i got it**
27. **pin (8:24:54 PM)**: **its a 30/60/90 triangle**
28. **Avr (8:25:06 PM)**: I see
29. **pin (8:25:12 PM)**: **so whats the formula**

Figure 1. Excerpt of 3½ minutes from a one-hour chat log. Three students chat about a geometry problem. Line numbers have been added and screen-names anonymized; otherwise the transcript is identical to what the participants saw on their screens.

1 The three-step pattern consists of a pair of postings—a bid and an acceptance—that
 2 form a proposal about math, and some follow-up effort. This suggests that
 3 collaborative problem-solving of mathematics may often involve a particular form of
 4 adjacency pair. We will call this a *math proposal adjacency pair*.

5 Here are seven successful math proposal adjacency pairs from Figure 1:

- 6
- 7 1. **Avr**: Okay, I think we should start with the formula for the area of a triangle
- 8 2. **Sup**: **ok**
- 9
- 10 3. **Avr**: $A = 1/2bh$
- 11 6. **pin**: **i concue**
- 12
- 13 8. **Avr**: then find the area of each triangle
- 14 10. **Sup**: **the base and heigth are 9 and 12 right?**
- 15
- 16 17. **Avr**: i think we have to figure out the height by ourselves
- 17 19. **pin**: **i know how**

1
2 20. pin: draw the altitude'
3 22. Avr: right
4
5 27. pin: its a 30/60/90 triangle
6 28. Avr: I see
7

8 Note that the response is not always literally immediately adjacent to the bid in the
9 chat log due to the complexities of chat posting. But the response is logically
10 adjacent as an up-take of the bid.

11 Many varieties of adjacency pairs allow for the insertion of other pairs between
12 the two parts of the original pair, delaying completion of the original pair. For
13 instance, a question/answer pair may be delayed by utterances seeking clarification of
14 the question. As we will see in Section 5, the clarification interaction may itself
15 consist of question/answer pairs, possibly with their own clarifications—this may
16 continue recursively. With math proposal adjacency pairs, the subsidiary pairs seem
17 to come after the completion of the original pair, in the form of secondary proposals,
18 questions or explanations that start to do the work that was proposed in the original
19 pair. This characteristic leads to their role in sustaining group inquiry.

20 Math proposals tend to lead to some kind of further mathematical work as a
21 response to carrying out what was proposed. Often—as seen in the current
22 example—that work consists of making further proposals. In this way, the three-step
23 structure of the math proposal adjacency pair starts to sustain the group interaction.
24 The proposal bid by one person calls forth a proposal response by someone else. If
25 the response is one of acceptance, it in turn calls forth some further work to be done
26 or a bid for another proposal. If the response is a rejection, it may lead to
27 justification, discussion and negotiation.

28 It is striking that the proposed work is not begun until there is agreement with
29 the proposal bid. This may represent consent by the group as a whole to pursue the
30 proposed line of work. Of course, this idea is not so clear in the current example,
31 where there are only three participants and the interaction often seems to take place
32 primarily between pairs of participants. As confirmed by other chat examples,
33 however, the proposal generally seems to be addressed to the whole group and opens
34 the floor for other participants to respond. The use of “we” in “we should” or “we
35 have to” (stated or implied) constitutes the multiple participants as a plural subject—
36 an effective unified group (Lerner, 1993). Any one other than the proposer may
37 respond on behalf of the group. The fact that the multiple participants are posited as a
38 group for certain purposes, like responding to a proposal bid, by no means rules out
39 their individual participation in the group interaction from their personal
40 perspectives, or even their independent follow-up work on the math. It simply means
41 that the individual who responds to the bid may be doing so on behalf of the group.

42 Moreover, there seems to be what in conversation analysis is called an
43 interactional *preference* (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977) for acceptance of the
44 proposal. That is, if one accepts a proposal, it suffices to briefly indicate agreement:
45 “ok.” If one wants to reject a proposal, however, then one has to account for this
46 response by giving reasons. If the group accepts the bid, one person’s response may
47 serve on behalf of the group; if the group rejects the bid, several people may have to
48 get involved.

49 We would like to characterize in more detail the method of making math
50 proposal adjacency pairs. Often, the nature of an interactional method is seen most
51 clearly when it is breached (Garfinkel, 1967). Methods are generally taken for
52 granted by people; they are not made visible or conducted consciously. It is only

1 when there is a *breakdown* (Heidegger, 1927/1996; Winograd & Flores, 1986) in the
 2 smooth, tacit performance of a method that people focus on its characteristics in
 3 order to overcome the breakdown. The normally transparent method becomes visible
 4 in its breach. In common-sense terms we say, “The exception proves the rule,”
 5 meaning that when we see why something is an exceptional case it makes clear the
 6 rule to which it is an exception. Heidegger made this into an ontological principle,
 7 whereby things first become experience-able during a breakdown of understanding.
 8 Garfinkel uses this, in turn, as a methodological fulcrum to make visible that which is
 9 commonly assumed and is effective but unseen.

10 We can interpret Sup’s posting in line 23 as a *failed proposal*. Given the
 11 mathematics of the triangle problem, a proposal bid related to proportionality, like
 12 Sup’s, might have been fruitful. However, in this chat, line 23 was effectively
 13 ignored by the group. While its character as a failed proposal did not become visible
 14 to the participants, it can become clear to us by comparing it to successful proposal
 15 bids in the same chat and by reflecting on its sequential position in the chat in order
 16 to ask why it was not a successful bid. This will show us by contrast what the
 17 characteristics are that make other proposal bids successful.

18 3. A Failed Proposal

19 Let us look at line 23 in its immediate interactional context in Figure 2. We can
 20 distinguish a number of ways in which it differed from successful math proposal bids
 21 that solicited responses and formed math proposal adjacency pairs:

22 (a) All the other proposal bids (1, 3, 8, 17, 20, 27) were stated in relatively
 23 complete sentences. Additionally, some of them were introduced with a phrase to
 24 indicate that they were the speaker’s proposal bid (1. “I think we should ...,” 17. “I
 25 think we have to ...,” 20. “i know how ...” and 27. “i think i got it ...”). The

<p>17, 18. Avr (8:23: 29 PM): i think we have to figure out the height by ourselves ... if possible</p> <p>19. pin (8:24:05 PM): i know how</p> <p>21. Avr (8:24:09 PM): how?</p> <p>20. pin (8:24:09 PM): draw the altitude'</p> <p>22. Avr (8:24:15 PM): right</p> <p>24. Avr (8:24:19 PM): this is frustrating</p> <p>23. Sup (8:24:19 PM): proportions?</p>
--

Figure 2. Part of the chat log excerpt in Figure 1, with order revised for threading.

26 exceptions to these were simply continuations of previous proposals: line 3 provided
 27 the formula proposed in line 1 and line 8 proposed to “then” use that formula. Line
 28 23, by contrast, provided a single word with a question mark. There was no syntactic
 29 context (other than the question mark) within the line for interpreting that word and
 30 there was no reference to semantic context outside of the line. Line 23 did not
 31 respond in any clear way to a previous line and did not provide any alternative
 32 reference to a context in the original problem statement or elsewhere. For instance,
 33 Sup could have said, “I think we should compute the proportion of the height to the
 34 base of those equilateral triangles.”

35 (b) The timing of line 23 was particularly unfortunate. It exactly overlapped a
 36 line from Avr. Because Avr had been setting the pace for group problem solving
 37 during this part of the chat, the fact that she was involved in following a different line

1 of inquiry spelled doom for any alternative proposal around the time of line 23. Pin
2 either seemed to be continuing on his own thread without acknowledging anyone else
3 at this point, or else he was responding too late to previous postings. So a part of the
4 problem for Sup was that there was little sense of a coherent group process—and
5 what sense there was did not include him. If he was acting as part of the group
6 process, for instance posing a question in reaction to Pin and in parallel to Avr, he
7 was not doing a good job of it and so his contribution was ignored in the group
8 process. It is true that a possible advantage of text-based interaction like chat over
9 face-to-face interaction is that there may be a broader time window for responding to
10 previous contributions. In face-to-face conversation, turn-taking rules may define
11 appropriate turns for response that expire in a fraction of a second as the conversation
12 moves on. In computer-based chat, the turn-taking sequence is more open. However,
13 even here if one is responding to a posting that is several lines away, it is important to
14 make explicit somehow the post to which one is responding. Sup could have said, “I
15 know another way to find the height – using proportions.” His posting does not do
16 anything like that; it relies purely upon sequential timing to establish its context, and
17 that fails in this case.

18 (c) Sup’s posting 23 came right after Pin’s proposal bid 20: “draw the altitude.”
19 Avr had responded to this with 22 (“right”), but Sup seems to have ignored that.
20 Pin’s proposal had opened up work to be done and both Avr and Pin responded after
21 line 23 with contributions to this work. So Sup’s proposal bid came in the middle of
22 an ongoing line of work without relating to it. In sequential terms, he made a bid for
23 a proposal when it was not time to make a proposal. Sup’s proposal bid was not
24 positioned within the group effort to sustain a promising line of inquiry. It is like
25 trying to take a conversational turn when there is not a pause that creates a turn-
26 taking opportunity. Now, it is possible—especially in chat—to introduce a new
27 proposal at any time. However, to do so effectively, one must make a special effort to
28 bring the on-going work to a temporary halt and to present one’s new proposal as an
29 alternative. Simply saying “proportions?” will not do it. Sup could have said,
30 “Instead of drawing the altitude, let’s use proportions to find it.”

31 (d) To get a proposal response to a proposal bid, one can elicit at least an
32 affirmation or recognition. Again, this is a matter of pre-structuring a sustained
33 interaction. Line 23 does not really solicit a response. For instance, Avr’s question,
34 21: “how?” called for an answer—that was given by Pin in line 20, which actually
35 appeared in the chat window just prior to the question and with the same time stamp.
36 But Sup’s posting does not call for a specific kind of answer. Even Sup’s own
37 previous proposal bid in line 10 ended with “right?”—requiring agreement or
38 disagreement. Line 10 elicited a clear response from Avr, line 11 (“no”) followed by
39 an exchange explaining why Sup’s proposal was not right.

40 (e) Other proposal bids in the excerpt are successful in contributing to sustaining
41 the collaborative knowledge building or group problem solving in that they open up a
42 realm of work to be done. One can look at Avr’s successive proposal bids on lines 1,
43 3, 8 and 17 as laying out a work strategy. This elicits a proposal response from Sup
44 trying to find values to substitute into the formula and from Pin trying to draw a
45 graphical construction that will provide the values for the formula. Sup’s proposal
46 bid in line 23, however, neither calls for a response nor opens up a line of work.
47 There is no request for a reaction from the rest of the group, and the proposal bid is
48 simply ignored. Since no one responded to Sup, he could have continued by doing
49 some work on the proposal himself. He could have come back and made the proposal
50 more explicit, reformulated it more strongly, taken a first step in working on it, or
51 posed a specific question related to it. But he did not—at least not until much later—
52 and the matter was lost.

1 (f) Another serious hurdle for Sup was his status in the group at this time. In
2 lines 10 through 16, Sup had made a contribution that was taken as an indication that
3 he did not have a strong grasp of the math problem. He offered the lengths of the two
4 given triangles as the base and height of a single triangle (line 10). Avr immediately
5 and flatly stated that he was wrong (line 11) and then proceeded to explain why he
6 was wrong (line 13). When he agreed (line 15), Avr summarily dismissed him (line
7 16) and went on to make a new proposal that implied his approach was all wrong
8 (lines 17 and 18). Then Pin, who had stayed out of the interchange, re-entered,
9 claiming to know how to implement Avr's alternative proposal (lines 19 and 20) and
10 Avr confirmed that (line 22). Sup's legitimacy as a source of useful proposals had
11 been totally destroyed at precisely the point just before he made his ineffective
12 proposal bid. Less than two minutes later, Sup tries again to make a contribution, but
13 realizes himself that what he says is wrong. His faulty contributions confirm
14 repeatedly that he is a drag on the group effort. He makes several more unhelpful
15 comments later and then drops out of the discourse for most of the remaining chat.
16 Sustaining a math chat discourse involves work to maintain an ongoing social
17 interaction as well as work to continue the math inquiry. Proposal bids and other
18 postings are constrained along multiple dimensions of efforts to sustain the activity.

19 The weaknesses of line 23 as a proposal bid suggest (by contrast, exception,
20 breach or breakdown) some characteristics for successful proposals:

- 21 (a) a clear semantic and syntactic structure,
- 22 (b) careful timing within the sequence of postings,
- 23 (c) a firm interruption of any other flow of discussion,
- 24 (d) the elicitation of a response,
- 25 (e) the specification of work to be done and
- 26 (f) a history of helpful contributions.

27 In addition, there are other interaction characteristics and mathematical requirements.
28 For instance, the level of mathematical background knowledge assumed in a proposal
29 must be compatible with the expertise of the participants, and the computational
30 methods must correspond with their training. Additional characteristics become
31 visible in other examples of chats. Successful proposals contribute in multiple ways
32 to sustaining the group cognitive process.

33 As we have just seen, the formulation of effective bids for math proposals
34 involves carefully situating one's posting within the larger flow of the chat. This is
35 highly analogous to taking a turn in face-to-face conversation (Sacks *et al.*, 1974).
36 Where conversation analysis developed a systematics of turn taking, we are trying to
37 discover the systematics of chat interaction. This would describe how math proposals
38 and other chat methods must be designed to fit into—and thereby contribute to—the
39 sustained flow of group interaction.

40 So far in this paper, the notion of math proposal adjacency pairs has been
41 illustrated in just a single chat log excerpt. But in our research we have seen both
42 successful and failed math proposals many times. Other researchers have also noted
43 the role of successful and failed proposals in collaborative problem solving (Barron,
44 2003; Cobb, 1995; Dillenbourg & Traum, 2006; Sfard & McClain, 2003).

45 Each proposal bid and uptake is unique—in its wording and its context. The
46 interactional work that it does and the structuring that it employs are situated in the
47 local details of its sequential timing and its subtle referencing of unique and
48 irreproducible elements of the on-going chat. Each group of students develops
49 somewhat different methods of engaging with math problems and making math
50 proposals. Even within a given chat, each posting pair that might be a proposal must
51 be analyzed as a unique, meaning-making interaction in order to determine if it is in
52 fact a math proposal adjacency pair. That is why case studies provide the necessary

1 evidence—the essential details of interaction methods are lost in aggregation, in the
2 attempt to overcome what Garfinkel (1967) terms the “irreducible indexicality” of
3 the event. To the extent that identifying proposal pairs is a useful analytic approach,
4 it is important to determine what interactional methods of producing such proposals
5 are effective (or not) in fostering successful knowledge building and group cognition,
6 as we have begun to do here.

7 An understanding of methods like proposal making can guide the design of
8 activity structures for collaborative math. As we are collecting and analyzing a
9 corpus of chat logs under different technological conditions, we are evolving the
10 design of computer support through iterative trials and analyses.

11 4. Designing Computer Support

12 If the failure of Sup’s proposal about proportions is considered deleterious to the
13 collaborative knowledge building around the triangles problem, then what are the
14 implications of this for the design of educational computer-based environments? One
15 response would be to help students like Sup formulate stronger proposals.
16 Presumably, giving him positive experiences of interacting with students like Avr
17 and Pin, who are more skilled in chat proposal making, would provide Sup with
18 models and examples from which he can learn—assuming that he perseveres and
19 does not drop out of the chat.

20 Another approach to the problem would be to build functionality into the
21 software and structures into the activity that scaffold the ability of weak proposal
22 bids to survive. As students like Sup experience success with their proposals, they
23 may become more aware of what it takes to make a strong proposal bid.

24 Professional mathematicians rely heavily upon inscription—the use of
25 specialized notation, the inclusion of explicit statements of all deductive steps and the
26 format of the formal proof to support the discussion of math proposals—whether
27 posted on an informal whiteboard, scrawled across a university blackboard or
28 published in an academic journal. Everything that is to be referenced in the
29 discussion is labeled unambiguously. To avoid ellipsis, theorems are stated explicitly,
30 with all conditions and dependencies named. The projection of what is to be proven
31 is encapsulated in the form of the proof, which starts with the givens and concludes
32 with what is proven. Perhaps most importantly, proposals for how to proceed are
33 listed in the proof itself as theorems, lemmas, etc. and are organized sequentially.
34 (This view of proof is an idealization that abstracts from unstated tacit background
35 knowledge of the mathematical community, as Livingston (1999) and Wittgenstein
36 (1944/1956) before him have demonstrated.)

37 One could imagine a chat system supplemented with a window containing an
38 informal list of proposals analogous to the steps of a proof. After Sup’s proposal, the
39 list might look like Figure 3. When Sup made a proposal in the chat, he would enter a
40 statement of it in the proof window in logical sequence. He could cross out his own
41 proposal when he felt it had been convincingly argued against by the group (see
42 dashed lines in Figure 3 crossing out the proposal that base and height = 9 and 12).

43 The idea is that important proposals that were made would be retained in a
44 visible way and be shared by the group. Of course, there are many design questions
45 and options for doing something like this. Above all, would students understand this
46 functionality and would they use it? The design sketch indicated in Figure 3 is only
47 meant to be suggestive.

48 Another useful tool for group mathematics would be a shared drawing area. In
49 the chat environment used by Sup, Pin and Avr, there was no shared drawing, but a




Figure 3. A list of proposals.

1 student could create a drawing and send it to the others. Pin did this twelve minutes
 2 after the part of the interaction shown in the excerpt. Before the drawing was shared,
 3 much time was lost due to confusion about references to triangles and vertices. For
 4 math problems involving geometric figures, it is clearly important to be able to share
 5 drawings easily and quickly. Again, there are many design issues, such as how to
 6 keep track of who drew what, who is allowed to erase, how to point to items in the
 7 drawing and how to capture a record of the graphical interactions in coordination
 8 with the text chatting.

9 Because we are designing a computer-supported experience that has never
 10 before existed and because we want our design to be based on detailed study of how
 11 students actually create their collaborative experience in the environment we are
 12 designing, we follow a highly iterative try-analyze-redesign cycle of design-based
 13 research (Design-Based Research Collective, 2003), in order to asymptotically
 14 approach an effective computer-supported environment and math discourse
 15 community.

16 We started with a simple online service. We used AOL's IM commercial chat
 17 system that was already familiar to many students. We invited students into chat
 18 rooms and presented a problem from the Math Forum's well-established Problem of
 19 the Month service. An adult facilitator was present in the room to help with any
 20 technical problems. When we saw how necessary a shared whiteboard was we tried
 21 an open source solution and also WebCT's and Blackboard's interactive classrooms.
 22 Eventually we collaborated with researchers in Germany to use and further develop
 23 ConcertChat. Together, we have gradually evolved ConcertChat into a sophisticated
 24 environment for both students and researchers.

25 Since the early AOL-based chat analyzed above, we have gone through many
 26 cycles of design, trial and analysis. In addition to designing support for persistent
 27 summaries of work (such as that in Figure 3) and a shared whiteboard for

1 constructing geometric drawings (discussed in the following section and shown in
 2 Figure 4), we have incorporated the following: a referencing tool; a way for users to
 3 explicitly thread their chat postings; several forms of social awareness; tutorials on
 4 how to use the new features; a help system on using the tools, collaborating and
 5 problem-solving; and a lobby to support group formation. We have also
 6 experimented extensively with how best to formulate math problems or topics and
 7 how to provide feedback to students on their work.

8 5. References and Threading

9 The more we study chat logs, the more we see how interwoven the postings are with
 10 each other and with the holistic Gestalt of the interactional context that they form.
 11 There are many ways in which a posting can reference elements of its context. The
 12 importance of indexicality to creating shared meaning was stressed by Garfinkel
 13 (1967). Vygotsky also noted the central role of pointing for mediating
 14 intersubjectivity in his analysis of the genesis of the infant-and-mother's pointing
 15 gesture (1930/1978, p. 56). Our analysis of face-to-face collaboration emphasized
 16 that spoken utterances in collaborative settings tend to be elliptical, indexical and
 17 projective ways of referencing previous utterances, the conversational context and
 18 anticipated responses (Stahl, 2006b, chapter 12).

19 Based on these practical and theoretical considerations—and working with the
 20 ConcertChat developers—we evolved the VMT-Chat environment. As shown in
 21 Figure 4, it not only includes a shared whiteboard, but has functionality for
 22 referencing areas of the whiteboard from chat postings and for referencing previous
 23 postings. The shared whiteboard is necessary for supporting most geometry




Figure 4. Screen view of VMT-Chat with referencing. Line 12 of the chat is selected.

1 problems. (This will save Avr the frustration of running out of paper, and also let Pin
 2 and Sup see what she is drawing and add to it or reference it.) Sharing drawings is
 3 not enough; students must be able to reference specific objects or areas in the
 4 drawing. (For example, Sup could have pointed to elements of the triangles that he
 5 felt to be significantly proportional.) The whiteboard also provides opportunities to
 6 post text where it will not scroll away. (Sup could have put his failed proposal in a
 7 text box in the whiteboard, where he or the others could come back to it later.) The
 8 graphical references (see the bold line from a selected posting to an area of the
 9 drawing in Figure 4) can also be used to reference one or more previous postings
 10 from a new posting in order to make the threads of responses clearer in the midst of
 11 “chat confusion” (Fuks, Pimentel, & de Lucena, 2006).

12 In one of our first chats using VMT-Chat, the students engaged in a particularly
 13 complex interaction of referencing a figure in the whiteboard whose mathematics
 14 they wanted to explore (Stahl, Zemel *et al.*, 2006). Here is the chat log from Figure 4
 15 (graphical references to the whiteboard are indicated by “[REF TO WB]” in the log):
 16

17	1	ImH:	what is the area of this shape? [REF TO WB]
18	2	Jas:	which shape?
19	3	ImH:	woops
20	4	ImH:	ahh!
21	5	Jas:	kinda like this one? [REF TO WB]
22	6	Jas:	the one highlighted in black and dark red?
23	7	ImH:	between th stairs and the hypotenuse
24	8	Jas:	oh
25	9	Jas:	that would be a tricky problem, each little
26			“sector” is different
27	10	Jas:	this section [REF TO WB]
28	11	ImH:	perimeter is $12\sqrt{3}$
29	12	Jas:	is smaller than this section [REF TO WB]
30	13	ImH:	assume those lines are on the blocks
31	14	Jas:	the staircase lines?
32	15	ImH:	yeah
33	16	Jas:	they already are on the blocks

34
 35 Line 1 of the chat textually references an abstract characteristic of a complex
 36 graphical form in the whiteboard: “the area of this shape.” The software function to
 37 support this reference failed, presumably because the student, ImH, was not
 38 experienced in using it and did not cause the graphical reference line to point to
 39 anything in the drawing. Line 5 provides a demo of how to use the referencing tool.
 40 Using the tool’s line, a definite textual reference (“the one”) and the use of line color
 41 and thickness in the drawing, lines 5 and 6 propose an area to act as the topic of the
 42 chat. Line 7 makes explicit in text the definition of a sub-area of the proposed area.
 43 Line 8 accepts the new definition and line 9 starts to work on the problem concerning
 44 this area. Line 9 references the problem as “that” and notes that it is tricky because
 45 the area defined does not consist of standard forms whose area would be easy to
 46 compute and add up. It refers to the non-uniform sub-areas as little “sectors.” Line 10
 47 then uses the referencing tool to highlight (roughly) one of these little sectors or
 48 “sections.” Line 12 continues line 10, but is interrupted in the chat log by line 11, a
 49 failed proposal bid by ImH. The chat excerpt continues to reference particular line
 50 segments using deictic pronouns and articles as well as a growing vocabulary of
 51 mathematical objects of concern: sectors, sections, lines, blocks.

52 Progress is made slowly in the collaborative exploration of mathematical
 53 relationships, but having a shared drawing helps considerably. The students use
 54 multiple textual and graphical means to reach a shared understanding of

1 mathematical objects that they find interesting but hard to define. In this excerpt, we
2 start to get a sense of the complex ways in which brief textual postings weave dense
3 webs of relationships among each other and with other elements of the collaborative
4 context.
5 This example shows how creating shared meaning can require more than a
6 simple adjacency pair. In order to establish a reference to “this shape” that could
7 allow the two participants to discuss that math object, the dyad had to construct a
8 complex involving nested question/answer pairs, math proposal pairs, a failed
9 proposal bid, drawing, coloring, labeling, pointing, multiple repairs, computations.
10 Here we see a more sustained group cognitive process. Across 16 postings and
11 considerable coordinated whiteboard activity during two minutes, the student dyad
12 defines a math object for investigation. The definition is articulated by this whole
13 sequence of combined and intricately coordinated textual and graphical work.

14 **6. Sustaining the Group Interaction**

15 The goal of our research is to provide a service to students that will allow them to
16 have a rewarding experience collaborating with their peers in online discussions of
17 mathematics. We can never know exactly what kind of subjective experience they
18 had, let alone predict how they will experience life under conditions that we design
19 for them. For instance, it is methodologically illegitimate to ask if ImH already
20 “intended” or “had in mind” in line 1 the shape that the group subsequently arrived
21 at. We know from the log that ImH articulated much of the explicit description, but
22 he only did this in response to Jas. If we interviewed ImH afterwards he might quite
23 innocently and naturally project this explicit understanding back on his earlier state
24 of mind as a retrospective account or rationalization (Suchman, 1987).

25 Our primary access to information related to the group experiences comes from
26 chat logs (including the whiteboard history). The logs capture most of what student
27 members see of their group on their computer screens. They therefore constitute a
28 fairly complete record of everything that the participants themselves had available to
29 understand their group interaction. We can even replay the logs so that we see how
30 the session unfolded sequentially in time. Of course, we are not engaged in the
31 interaction the way the participants were, and recorded experiences never quite live
32 up to the live version because the engagement is missing. To gain some first-hand
33 experience, we do test out the environments ourselves and enjoy the experience, but
34 we experience math and collaboration differently than do middle-school students. We
35 also interview students and their teachers, but teenagers rarely reveal much of their
36 life to adults.

37 So we try to understand how collaborative experiences are structured as
38 interpersonal interactions that are sustained over time. The focus is not on the
39 individuals as subjective minds, but on the human, social group as constituted by the
40 interactions that take place within the group. Although we generally try to ground our
41 understanding of interaction through close, detailed analysis of excerpts from chat
42 recordings, we do not have room to document our analysis of longer scale structures
43 at that level of detail in this paper. We have collected over 50 hours of small-group
44 chat about math. We engage in weekly collaborative data sessions (Jordan &
45 Henderson, 1995) to develop case studies of unique chat excerpts. A number of
46 published papers arising from these sessions are available at
47 <http://www.mathforum.org/vmt/researchers/publications.html>. The discussion in the
48 remainder of this paper is a high-level summary based on what we have observed.

6.1. Replies, up-take, pairs and triplets

Figure 5 provides a diagram of the responses of postings in the chat discussed in Sections 2 and 3 above involving Avr, Pin and Sup. The numbers of the posts by each participant are placed in chronological order in a column for that participant. Math proposal adjacency pairs are connected with solid arrows and other kinds of responses are indicated with dashed arrows. Note that Sup's failed proposal bid (line 23) is isolated. Most of the chat, however, has coherence, flow or motion due to the fact that most postings are responses to previous messages. This high level of responses is due to the fact that many postings elicit responses or up-take, the way that a greeting invariably calls forth another greeting in response, or a question typically produces an answer. In a healthy conversation, most contributions by one participant are taken up by others. Conversationalists work hard to fit their offerings into the timing and evolving focus of the on-going interaction. In chat, the timing, rules and practices are different, but the importance of up-take remains.

The fact that the group process and the cross-ties between people are central to collaborative experiences does not contradict the continuing importance of the individuals. The representation of Figure 5 uses columns to indicate the connections and implicit continuity within the sequence of contributions made by an individual (compare the representation in Sfard & McClain, 2003). We may project psychological characteristics onto the unity of an individual's postings, attributing this unity to personal interests, personality, style, role, etc. Such attributions may change as the chat unfolds. The point is that the individual coherence and unfolding of each participant's contributions adds an important dimension of implicit sustaining connections among the postings.

Adjacency pairs like math proposals, greetings and questionings provide important ties that cut across the connections of individual continuities. They form the smallest elements of shared meaning precisely by binding together postings from different people. A proposal bid that is not taken up is not a meaningful proposal, but at best a failed attempt at a proposal. A one-sided greeting that is not recognized by the other is not an effective greeting. An interrogative expression that does not call for a response is no real questioning of another. These adjacency pairs are all interactional moves whose meaning consists in a give-and-take between two or more people. When we hear something that we recognize as a proposal bid, a greeting or a question, we feel required to attempt an appropriate response. We may ignore the proposal bid, snub the greeter or refuse to answer the question, but then our silence is taken as a response of ignoring, snubbing or refusing—and not simply a lack of response.

In fact, the way that a response is taken is also part of the interaction itself. In discussing the building of "common ground," Clark argues that shared understanding by A and B of A's




Figure 5. Threading of adjacency pairs and other uptake.

1 utterance involves not only B believing that he understands A, but also A agreeing
2 that B understands (Clark & Brennan, 1991). This requires an interaction spanning
3 multiple utterances. For instance, the most prevalent interaction in classroom
4 discourse is when a teacher poses a question, a student provides an answer
5 demonstrating understanding and then the teacher acknowledges the student response
6 as such an understanding (Lemke, 1990). Here, the elemental cell of interactional
7 meaning making is a sequence of contributions by different people.

8 It is clear in this analysis that the meaning is constructed through the interaction
9 of multiple people, and is not a simple expression of pre-existing mental
10 representations in any one individual's head. This is the philosophical importance of
11 the concept of adjacency pair: that meaning in groups is made through the interaction
12 of multiple people, not completely by an individual's mental activity. In calling this
13 "group cognition," we extend the term "cognition" from individual psychology to
14 apply to processes in which small groups through their discourse construct meaning
15 structures like logical arguments or mathematical proofs—that is, they engage in
16 processes which are considered thinking when conducted by individual people. This
17 approach is consistent with dialogical theories that actually view higher-level
18 thinking by individuals as derivative of such intersubjective meaning making
19 (Bakhtin, 1986; Linell, 2001; Stahl, Koschmann, & Suthers, 2006; Vygotsky,
20 1930/1978; Wegerif, 2006).

21 **6.2. Longer sequences**

22 Although much attention has been given to adjacency pairs in conversation analysis
23 and although such pairs can be thought of as the elements of meaning making in
24 collaborative interaction, they form only one of many levels of analysis. For instance,
25 there are *longer sequences* (Sacks, 1992, vol. II, p. 354), *episodes* (Linell, 2001) and
26 *topics* in dialogs and chats (Zemel, Xhafa, & Cakir, 2005) that provide layers of
27 structure and sense. An hour-long chat is not a homogeneous interchange. A typical
28 math chat might start with a period of introductions, greetings, socializing. Then
29 there could be some problem-solving work. This might be periodically interrupted by
30 joking, playing around, or silliness. People may come and go, requiring catching up
31 and group reorganization. Each of these episodes has boundaries during which the
32 group members must negotiate whether or not to stop what they were doing and start
33 something else. These transitions may themselves be longer sequences of interaction,
34 especially in large groups. We have barely begun to explore these different layers.

35 In social conversation, people work hard to strike up conversations, to propose
36 new topics of mutual interest and to keep the conversation going. Online math chats
37 face similar challenges. Students hesitantly greet each other and get things started.
38 Math proposals are often used to introduce new topics and to carry forward a train of
39 thought together. Finally, participants engage in considerable interaction work to
40 sustain their sessions, intertwining humor, socializing and math inquiry—often using
41 one of these modes to sustain others. Eventually every group decides to disband, at
42 least until a future session.

43 The referencing excerpt from VMT-Chat in Section 5 above was from the
44 second hour-long session in a series of four chats by the same group. The sessions
45 referred back to previous sessions and prepared for future ones. We hope to foster a
46 community of Math Forum users who come back repeatedly to math chats,
47 potentially with their friends. Their chats will reference other chats and different
48 online experiences, building connections at the community level. This adds more

1 layers of interconnections. It may sustain group interaction, inquiry and reflection
2 over more significant periods of time.

3 **6.3. Constructing proofs**

4 Learning math involves becoming skillful in the social practices of the math
5 community (Livingston, 1999). The math community is an aspect of the world-
6 historical global community. The most central participants are the great
7 mathematicians, who have invented new mathematical objects and developed new
8 forms of mathematical practice (Sfard & Linchevski, 1994). Most of the population
9 has low math literacy and participates on the periphery of the math discourse
10 community. They are unable to manipulate math concepts fluidly in words or
11 mathematical symbolism (Sfard, 2002). Nevertheless, they can use basic arithmetic
12 methods for practical purposes (Lave, 1988). One of the most fundamental methods
13 of math is counting, which children are drilled at extensively. Formal math assumes
14 that the practitioner is skilled at following rules, such as the non-formalized rules of
15 numeric sequencing (Wittgenstein, 1944/1956).

16 In our chats, students work on math problems and themes. In solving problems
17 and exploring math worlds or phenomena, the groups construct sequences of
18 mathematical reasoning that are related to proving. Proofs in mathematics have an
19 interesting and subtle structure. To understand this structure, one must distinguish:

- 20 • the problem statement-and-situation;
- 21 • the exploratory search for a solution;
- 22 • the effort to reduce a haphazard solution path to an elegant, formalized proof;
- 23 • the statement of the proof; and
- 24 • the lived experience of following the proof (Livingston, 1986, 1987).

25 Each of these has its own structures and practices. Each implicitly references the
26 others. To engage in mathematics is to become ensnarled in the intricate connections
27 among them. To the extent that these aspects of doing math have been distinguished
28 and theorized, it has been done as though there is simply an individual mathematician
29 at work. There has been virtually no research into how these could be accomplished
30 and experienced collaboratively—despite the fact that talking about math has for
31 some time been seen as a priority in math education (NCTM, 1989; Sfard, 2002).

32 **6.4. The stream of group consciousness**

33 Psychologists like William James and novelists like Jack Kerouac have described
34 narratives that we tell ourselves silently about what we are doing or observing as our
35 stream of consciousness. This “inner voice” rattles on even as we sleep, making
36 connections that Sigmund Freud found significant (if somewhat shocking in his day).
37 In what sense might online chats—with their meanderings, flaming, associative
38 referencing, unpredictable meaning making and unexpected images—deserve equal
39 status as streams of (group) consciousness? Group cognition can be self-conscious:
40 The group discourse can talk about the existence of the group discourse itself and
41 comment on its own characteristics.

42 Our sense of sustained time and the rhythms of life are largely reliant upon the
43 narratives we tell ourselves (Bruner, 1990; Sarmiento, Trausan-Matu, & Stahl, 2005).
44 We know that we have already lived through a certain part of the day or of our life
45 because our present is located within a nexus of ties to the past or hopes for the

1 future. In similar ways, a chat's web of references that connects current postings to
2 prior ones to which they respond and to future postings that they elicit defines a
3 temporality of the chat. This is experienced as a lived sense of time that is shared by
4 the group in the chat. Like our individual internal clocks, the group temporality is
5 attuned to the larger world outside—the world of family life that calls the students
6 away from the chat for dinner or the world of school that interrupts a chat with class
7 changes or homework pressures. The temporality that defines a dimension of the
8 collaborative experience is constrained by the nature of the social situation and by the
9 functionality of the technological environment.

10 **7. Constructing the Group Experience**

11 Groups constitute themselves (Garfinkel, 2006, pp. 189ff; Sacks, 1992, vol. I, pp.
12 144-149). We can see how they do this in the chat logs. At one level the VMT
13 service brings several students together and locates them in a chat room together. It
14 may supply a math problem for them to work on and it may provide a facilitator who
15 introduces them to the environment. At this point, they are a potential group with a
16 provisionally defined membership. The facilitator might say something like,
17 "Welcome to our first session of Virtual Math Teams! I am the facilitator for your
18 session. . . . As a group, decide which question you would like to work on." (This is,
19 in fact, part of the facilitator script from the session involving ImH and Jas excerpted
20 above.) Here we can see that the facilitator has defined the group ("as a *group* ...
21 *you*") and distinguished her own role as outside the group ("I am the facilitator ...
22 *your* session"). The potential group projected by the facilitator need not necessarily
23 materialize. Individual students may come to the setting, look around, decide it is
24 lame, and leave as individuals. However, this rarely happens. Sometimes an
25 individual will leave without ever interacting, but as long as enough students come
26 there, a group emerges.

27 Students enter the chat environment with certain motivations, expectations and
28 experiences. These are generally sufficient to get the group started. One can see the
29 group form itself. This is often reflected in the shift from singular to plural pronouns:
30 "*Let's* get started. Let *us* do some math." We saw this in Avr's proposal: "*I* think *we*
31 have to figure out the height by *ourselves*." The proposal bid comes from an
32 individual, but the projected work is for the group. Through her use of "*we*," Avr
33 constitutes the group. Through her proposal bid, she constitutes the group as a
34 recipient of the bid and elicits a response from them. Someone other than Avr must
35 respond to the bid on behalf of the group. When Pin says, "I know how: draw the
36 altitude," he is accepting Avr's proposal as a task for the group to work on and in so
37 doing he makes a proposal about how the group should go about approaching this
38 task (by making a geometric construction). In this interchange, the group (a) is
39 projected as an agent ("*we*") in the math work (Lerner, 1993), and (b) is actually the
40 agent of meaning making because the meaning of Avr's proposal is defined by the
41 interaction within the group (e.g., by a math proposal adjacency pair).

42 If the group experience is a positive one for the participants, they may want to
43 return. Some chats end with people making plans to get together again. In some
44 experiments, the same groups attended multiple sessions. We would like to see a
45 community of users form, with teams re-forming repeatedly and with old-timers
46 helping new groups to form and learn how to collaborate effectively.

47 The recognition that collaborative groups constitute themselves interactionally
48 and that their sense making takes place at the group unit of analysis has implications
49 for the design of cognitive tools for collaborative communities. The field of

1 computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL) was founded a decade ago to
2 pursue the analysis of group meaning making and the design of media to support it
3 (Stahl, Koschmann *et al.*, 2006). We view the research described here as a
4 contribution to this CSCL tradition.

5 We are designers of tools for collaborative groups. We want to design an online
6 collaborative service, with strong pedagogical direction and effective computer
7 support. Our goal is to design an environment that fosters exciting mathematical
8 group experiences for students and inspires them to return repeatedly. Our ultimate
9 vision is to foster a sustainable community of math discourse among students. We
10 approach this by trying to understand how groups of students construct their
11 experience in such settings.

12 When students enter our website now, they are confronted by a densely designed
13 environment. The lobby to our chat rooms is configured to help students find their
14 way to a room that will meet their needs. In the room, there is a daunting array of
15 software functionality for posting and displaying chat notes, drawing geometric
16 forms and annotating them, keeping track of who is doing what and configuring the
17 space to suit oneself. There may be a statement of a math problem to solve or an
18 imaginary world to explore mathematically. The service, problems and software are
19 all designed to enhance the user's experience. But how can a student who is new to
20 all this understand the meanings of the many features and affordances that have been
21 built into the environment?

22 Groups of students spontaneously develop methods for exploring and responding
23 to their environments. They try things out and discuss what happens. A new group
24 may doodle on the whiteboard and then joke about the results. They bring with them
25 knowledge of paint and draw programs and skills from video games, SMS and IM.
26 The individuals may have considerable experience with single-user apps, but react
27 when someone else erases their drawing; they must learn to integrate coordination
28 and communication into their actions. The math problems they find in the chat rooms
29 may be quite different than the drill-and-practice problems they are used to in
30 traditional math textbooks. It may take the group a while to get started in productive
31 problem solving, so the group has to find ways to keep itself together and interacting
32 in the meantime. There may be various forms of socializing, interspersed with
33 attempts to approach the math. As unaccustomed as the math may be, the students
34 always have some knowledge and experience that they can bring to bear. They may
35 apply numerical computations to given values; try to define unknowns and set up
36 equations; graph relationships; put successive cases in a table; use trigonometric
37 relationships or geometric figures; draw graphical representations or add lines to an
38 existing drawing. Mainly, they put proposals out in the chat stream and respond to
39 the proposals of others. Sometimes the flow of ideas wanders without strong
40 mathematical reflection. Other times, one individual can contribute substantial
41 progress and engage in expository narrative to share her contribution with the group
42 (Stahl, 2006a).

43 Groupware is never used the way its designers anticipated. The designers of
44 VMT-Chat thought that its referencing tools would immediately clarify references to
45 elements of drawings and transform chat confusion into logical threaded chat. But
46 our studies of the actual use of these designed functions tell a quite different and
47 more interesting story. The shared whiteboard with graphical references from the
48 chat may allow more complex issues to be discussed, but they do not make pointing
49 problem free. We saw in Section 5 how much work ImH and Jas engaged in to
50 clarify for each other what they wanted to focus on. In the excerpt and in the longer
51 chat, they used a variety of textual, drawing and referencing methods. Through this
52 process, they learned how to use these methods and they taught each other their use.

1 Within a matter of a fraction of a minute, they were able to reach a shared
2 understanding of a topic to work on mathematically. During that brief time, they used
3 dozens of deictic methods, some that would prove more useful than others for the
4 future.

5 Chat is a highly constrained medium. Participants feel various pressures to get
6 their individual points of view out there. In a system like VMT-Chat, there is a lot to
7 keep track of: new postings, changes to the whiteboard, signs that people are joining,
8 leaving, typing, drawing. Small details in how something is written, drawn or
9 referenced may have manifold implications through references to present, past or
10 future circumstances. Students learn to track these details; apply them creatively;
11 acknowledge to the group that they have been recognized; check, critique and repair
12 them. Each group responds to the environment in its own way, giving group meaning
13 to the features of the collaborative world and thereby putting their unique stamp on
14 their group experience.

15 In the process, they create a group experience that they share. This experience is
16 held together with myriad sorts of references and ties among the chat postings and
17 drawings. Often, what is not said is as significant as what is. Individual postings are
18 fragmentary, wildly ambiguous, and frequently confusing. In lively chats, much of
19 what happens remains confusing for most participants. Clarity comes only through
20 explicit reflections, up-takes, appreciations or probing. The interactions among
21 postings, at many levels, cohere into a stream of group consciousness, a flow of
22 collaboration, a shared lived temporality and, with luck, an experience of
23 mathematical group cognition.

24 The small groups who meet in the VMT-Chat rooms participate in the larger
25 collaborative communities of: the VMT project, the Math Forum user community
26 and the math discourse community at large. In general, interacting small groups
27 mediate between their individual members and the larger communities to which they
28 belong. The discourse within the small group evokes and collects texts, drawings and
29 actions by different participants, who bring multiple interpretive perspectives to the
30 shared meaning making. Enduring ambiguity, mutual inconsistency and down-right
31 contradiction pervade the resultant group cognition, with its “inter-animation of
32 perspectives” (Bakhtin, 1986; Wegerif, 2006). Whether or not we assume that an
33 individual’s thoughts are logically consistent and interpretively determinant, it seems
34 that much of a group chat generally remains a mystery to both participants and
35 researchers. Yet, from out of the shrouds of collective fog insights are co-constructed
36 that could not otherwise shine forth. The tension arising from conflicting or
37 ungraspable interpretations in place of harmonious shared meaning fuels the creative
38 work of constructing innovative group understanding.

39 The chat environment as incorporated in the VMT project is essentially different
40 from familiar conversational situations, as we have seen in this paper. In general,
41 there is little known by the participants about each other, except for what appears in
42 the chat text or whiteboard drawings. No one’s age, gender, appearance, accent,
43 ethnicity is known. Even people’s real names are replaced in the chat with
44 anonymous login handles. Participants do not observe each other typing and
45 correcting text until it is posted. Nor do they see what people are doing or saying in
46 their lives outside the chat—if they have gone for a snack, are talking on the phone or
47 are engaged in other, simultaneous online interactions. Normally, a person’s history,
48 culture and personality are conveyed through their vocal intonation and physical
49 appearance (Bourdieu, 1972/1995); these are absent in chat. The one-hour duration of
50 most VMT chats limits the history that can be established among participants through
51 the available outlets of text and drawing, interaction style, word choice and use of
52 punctuation. Yet these drastically restricted means somehow allow incredibly rich,

1 unique, creative and sophisticated interactions to take place. Insights take place and
2 are shared; meaning is constructed and made sense of by groups. Perspectives and
3 personal voices are established and acknowledged. Like characters in a Beckett play,
4 chat participants learn to survive using radically impoverished discourse within a
5 sensuously desolate landscape, and they sustain surprising forms of interaction for
6 about an hour.

7 **8. Conclusion**

8 As we have seen in this paper, when students enter into one of our chats they enter
9 into a complex social world. They typically quickly constitute a working group and
10 begin to engage in activities that configure a group experience. This experience is
11 conditioned by a social, cultural, technological and pedagogical environment that has
12 been designed for them. Within this environment, they adopt, adapt and create
13 methods of social practice for interacting together with the other students who they
14 find in the chat environment. Over time, they explore their situation together, create
15 shared meaning, decide what they will do and how they will behave, engage in some
16 form of mathematical discourse, socialize, and eventually decide to end their session.

17 Then our job as researchers begins: to analyze what has happened and how the
18 software tools we are designing condition the collaborative experiences that groups
19 construct and sustain. We face the same poverty of knowledge about our subjects that
20 the participants themselves face about each other. But, here too, less can be more.
21 This record is conducive to careful, detailed analysis, without the interpretive
22 complexities of video recording and transcription. We can analyze what happens at
23 the group unit of analysis, with the methods of interaction adopted by the
24 participants, because everything that could have gone into the shared understanding
25 of the participants is available in the persistent record of the chat room history.

26 We can study this record at our leisure and make explicit the influences which
27 the group experienced tacitly in the flow of its life. We can observe how several
28 students constitute and sustain their group cognition in the math chat environment we
29 are designing with them.

30 We can identify successful and failed math proposals, questions, greetings and
31 other low-level interactions. We can observe how groups construct, identify, make
32 sense of and explore math objects. But we can also see how these elementary
33 interactions build up longer sequences of group cognition (Stahl, 2006b),
34 intersubjective meaning making (Suthers, 2006) and sustained collaborative group
35 experiences.

36 **Acknowledgments**

37 An earlier version of the first part of this paper won a Best Paper Award at ICCE
38 2005 in Singapore (Stahl, 2005). The Virtual Math Teams Project is a collaborative
39 effort at Drexel University. The Principal Investigators are Gerry Stahl, Stephen
40 Weimar and Wesley Shumar. A number of Math Forum staff work on the project,
41 especially Stephen Weimar, Annie Fetter and Ian Underwood. The graduate research
42 assistants are Murat Cakir, Johann Sarmiento, Ramon Toledo and Nan Zhou. Alan
43 Zemel is the post-doc; he facilitates weekly conversation analysis data sessions. The
44 following visiting researchers have spent 3 to 6 months on the project: Jan-Willem
45 Strijbos (Netherlands), Fatos Xhafa (Spain), Stefan Trausan-Matu (Romania), Martin
46 Wessner (Germany), Elizabeth Charles (Canada). The VMT-Chat software was

1 developed in collaboration with Martin Wessner, Martin Mühlpfordt and colleagues
2 at the Fraunhofer Institute IPSI in Darmstadt, Germany. The VMT project is
3 supported by grants from the NSDL, IERI and SoL programs of the US National
4 Science Foundation.
5

6 References

- 7 Austin, J. (1952). *How to do things with words*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
8 Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX:
9 University of Texas Press.
10 Barron, B. (2003). When smart groups fail. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 12 (3), 307-359.
11 Bereiter, C. (2002). *Education and mind in the knowledge age*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence
12 Erlbaum Associates.
13 Bourdieu, P. (1972/1995). Structures and the habitus (R. Nice, Trans.). In *Outline of a theory*
14 *of practice* (pp. 72-95). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
15 Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
16 Cakir, M., Xhafa, F., Zhou, N., & Stahl, G. (2005). *Thread-based analysis of patterns of*
17 *collaborative interaction in chat*. Paper presented at the international conference on AI in
18 Education (AI-Ed 2005), Amsterdam, Netherlands. Retrieved from
19 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/germy/pub/aied2005.pdf>.
20 Clark, H., & Brennan, S. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L. Resnick, J. Levine & S.
21 Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially-shared cognition* (pp. 127-149). Washington, DC:
22 APA.
23 Cobb, P. (1995). Mathematical learning and small-group interaction: Four case studies. In P.
24 C. H. Bauersfeld (Ed.), *The emergence of mathematical meaning: Interaction in classroom*
25 *cultures* (pp. 25-129). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
26 Dennett, D. C. (1991). *Consciousness explained*. Boston, MA: Little Brown and Company.
27 Design-Based Research Collective. (2003). Design-based research: An emerging paradigm for
28 educational inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 32 (1), 5-8.
29 Dillenbourg, P., & Traum, D. (2006). Sharing solutions: Persistence and grounding in
30 multimodal collaborative problem solving. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 15 (1), 121-
31 151.
32 Duranti, A. (1998). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
33 Fuks, H., Pimentel, M., & de Lucena, C. J. P. (2006). R-u-typing-2-me? Evolving a chat tool to
34 increase understanding in learning activities. *International Journal of Computer-Supported*
35 *Collaborative Learning*, 1 (1). Retrieved from
36 http://ijcscl.org/preprints/volume1_issue1/fuks_pimentel_lucena.pdf.
37 García, A., & Jacobs, J. B. (1999). The eyes of the beholder: Understanding the turn-taking
38 system in quasi-synchronous computer-mediated communication. *Research on Language*
39 *and Social Interaction*, 34 (4), 337-367.
40 Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
41 Garfinkel, H. (2006). *Seeing sociologically: The routine grounds of social action*. Boulder,
42 CO: Paradigm Publishers.
43 Heidegger, M. (1927/1996). *Being and time: A translation of Sein und Zeit* (J. Stambaugh,
44 Trans.). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
45 Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
46 Jordan, B., & Henderson, A. (1995). Interaction analysis: Foundations and practice. *Journal of*
47 *the Learning Sciences*, 4 (1), 39-103. Retrieved from [http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/c-](http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/c-merkel/document4.HTM)
48 [merkel/document4.HTM](http://lrs.ed.uiuc.edu/students/c-merkel/document4.HTM).
49 Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life*.
50 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
51 Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*.
52 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
53 Lemke, J. (1990). *Talking science*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- 1 Lerner, G. (1993). Collectivities in action: Establishing the relevance of conjoined
2 participation in conversation. *Text*, 13 (2), 213-245.
- 3 Linell, P. (2001). *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical*
4 *perspectives*. New York, NY: Benjamins.
- 5 Livingston, E. (1986). *The ethnomethodological foundations of mathematics*. London, UK:
6 Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 7 Livingston, E. (1987). *Making sense of ethnomethodology*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan
8 Paul.
- 9 Livingston, E. (1995). *An anthropology of reading*. Bloomington: IN: Indiana University
10 Press.
- 11 Livingston, E. (1999). Cultures of proving. *Social Studies of Science*, 29 (6), 867-888.
- 12 Lonchamp, J. (2006). Supporting synchronous collaborative learning: A generic software
13 framework. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 1 (2).
- 14 Mühlpfordt, M., & Wessner, M. (2005). *Explicit referencing in chat supports collaborative*
15 *learning*. Paper presented at the international conference on Computer Support for
16 Collaborative Learning (CSCL 2005), Taipei, Taiwan.
- 17 NCTM. (1989). *Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics*. Alexandria,
18 VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- 19 NCTM. (2000). *Principles and standards for school mathematics*. Alexandria, VA: National
20 Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- 21 O'Neill, J., & Martin, D. (2003). *Text chat in action*. Paper presented at the ACM Conference
22 on Groupware (GROUP 2003), Sanibel Island, FL.
- 23 Pomerantz, A., & Fehr, B. J. (1991). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social
24 action as sense making practices. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction:*
25 *Discourse studies, A multidisciplinary introduction, volume 2* (pp. 64-91). London, UK:
26 Sage.
- 27 Psathas, G. (1995). *Conversation analysis: The study of talk-in-interaction*. Thousand Oaks,
28 CA: Sage.
- 29 Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- 30 Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the
31 organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50 (4), 696-735. Retrieved from
32 www.jstor.org.
- 33 Sarmiento, J., Trausan-Matu, S., & Stahl, G. (2005). *Co-constructed narratives in online,*
34 *collaborative mathematics problem solving*. Paper presented at the international
35 conference on AI in Education (AI-Ed 2005), Amsterdam, Netherlands. Retrieved from
36 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/pub/aiedwkshp.pdf>.
- 37 Scardamalia, M., & Bereiter, C. (1996). Computer support for knowledge-building
38 communities. In T. Koschmann (Ed.), *CSCL: Theory and practice of an emerging*
39 *paradigm* (pp. 249-268). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. D.O.I.: [1996].
- 40 Schegloff, E. (1991). Conversation analysis and socially shared cognition. In L. Resnick, J.
41 Levine & S. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150-171).
42 Washington, DC: APA.
- 43 Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the
44 organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53 (2), 361-382. Retrieved from
45 www.jstor.org.
- 46 Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, UK:
47 Cambridge University Press.
- 48 Sfard, A. (2002). There is more to discourse than meets the ears: Looking at thinking as
49 communicating to learn more about mathematical learning. In C. Kieran, E. Forman & A.
50 Sfard (Eds.), *Learning discourse: Discursive approaches to research in mathematics*
51 *education* (pp. 13-57). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer.
- 52 Sfard, A., & Linchevski, L. (1994). The gains and the pitfalls of reification -- the case of
53 algebra. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 26, 191-228.
- 54 Sfard, A., & McClain, K. (2003). Analyzing tools: Perspectives on the role of designed
55 artifacts in mathematics learning: Special issue. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 11 (2 &
56 3).
- 57 Shannon, C., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. Chicago, IL:
58 University of Illinois Press.

- 1 Shumar, W. (2006). *The production of self, other and group through f2f and online chat*
2 *interactions at the Math Forum*. Paper presented at the 27th Urban Ethnography in
3 Education Research Forum, Philadelphia, PA.
- 4 Stahl, G. (2005). *Sustaining online collaborative problem solving with math proposals [winner*
5 *of best paper award]*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Computers and
6 Education (ICCE 2005), Singapore, Singapore. Proceedings pp. 436-443. Retrieved from
7 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/pub/icce2005.pdf>.
- 8 Stahl, G. (2006a). Analyzing and designing the group cognitive experience. *International*
9 *Journal of Cooperative Information Systems*. Retrieved from
10 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/pub/ijcis.pdf>.
- 11 Stahl, G. (2006b). *Group cognition: Computer support for building collaborative knowledge*.
12 Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/mit/>.
- 13 Stahl, G., Koschmann, T., & Suthers, D. (2006). Computer-supported collaborative learning:
14 An historical perspective. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *Cambridge handbook of the learning*
15 *sciences*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from
16 http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/cscl/CSCL_English.pdf (in English)
17 http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/cscl/CSCL_Chinese.pdf (in Chinese).
- 18 Stahl, G., Zemel, A., Sarmiento, J., Cakir, M., Weimar, S., Wessner, M., et al. (2006). *Shared*
19 *referencing of mathematical objects in chat*. Paper presented at the International
20 Conference of the Learning Sciences (ICLS 2006), Bloomington, IL. Retrieved from
21 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/pub/icls2006.pdf>.
- 22 Strijbos, J. W., & Stahl, G. (2005). *Chat-based problem solving in small groups: Developing a*
23 *multi-dimensional coding scheme*. Paper presented at the Eleventh Biannual Conference of
24 the European Association for Research in Learning and Instruction (EARLI 2005),
25 Nicosia, Cyprus. Retrieved from
26 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/pub/earli2005jw.pdf>.
- 27 Suchman, L. (1987). *Plans and situated actions: The problem of human-machine*
28 *communication*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 29 Suthers, D. D. (2006). Technology affordances for intersubjective meaning making: A research
30 agenda for CSCL. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 1
31 (3).
- 32 ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing conversation analysis: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA:
33 Sage.
- 34 Vygotsky, L. (1930/1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 35 Wegerif, R. (2006). A dialogical understanding of the relationship between CSCL and teaching
36 thinking skills. *International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*, 1
37 (1). Retrieved from http://ijcscl.org/preprints/volume1_issue1/wegerif.pdf.
- 38 Winograd, T., & Flores, F. (1986). *Understanding computers and cognition: A new foundation*
39 *of design*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 40 Wittgenstein, L. (1944/1956). *Remarks on the foundations of mathematics*. Cambridge, MA:
41 MIT Press.
- 42 Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- 43 Zemel, A. (2005). *Texts-in-interaction: Collaborative problem-solving in quasi-synchronous*
44 *computer-mediated communication*. Paper presented at the International Conference of
45 Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL 05), Taipei, Taiwan.
- 46 Zemel, A., Xhafa, F., & Cakir, M. (2005). *What's in the mix? Combining coding and*
47 *conversation analysis to investigate chat-based problem-solving*. Paper presented at the
48 11th Biennial Conference of the European Association for Research on Learning and
49 Instruction (EARLI 2005), Nicosia, Cyprus.
- 50 Zemel, A., Xhafa, F., & Stahl, G. (2005). *Analyzing the organization of collaborative math*
51 *problem-solving in online chats using statistics and conversation analysis*. Paper presented
52 at the CRIWG International Workshop on Groupware, Racife, Brazil. Retrieved from
53 <http://www.cis.drexel.edu/faculty/gerry/pub/criwg2005zemel.pdf>.