



Measuring Collaborative Knowledge Building

- Content-based analyses (e.g., Hakkarainen, 2003; van Aalst & Chan, 2007; Zhang et al., 2007);
- Behavioral measures that look at student participation and interaction (Aviv, Erlich, Ravid, & Geva, 2003; Hewitt & Teplovs, 1999; Howell-Richardson & Mellar, 1996; Zhang, Scardamalia, Reeve, & Richard, in press);
- Linguistic and rhetoric analyses (e.g., special vocabulary, sharing of control) (Hong & Scardamalia, 2008; Sun, Zhang, & Scardamalia, in press).

Significance? Interconnections?

This Study

- A secondary analysis of knowledge building measures applied to the same dataset.
- 22 fourth-graders
- Four-month knowledge building on light, supported by Knowledge Forum

Socio-behavioral, Content-based, and Linguistic Measures

Category	Measures
Socio-behavioral	Note contribution
measures	
	Note reading percentage
	Note reading network: in-degree and out-degree
	Note linking network: in-degree and out-degree
	Note linking network: cliques
Content-based measures	Inquiry threads
	Problems
	Incorporating new resources
	Use evidence
Lexical measures	1 st 1,000 words
	Academic words
	Domain-specific words



Students' Knowledge Gains

- Depth of understanding: epistemic complexity X scientific sophistication
 - Epistemic complexity: 1 unelaborated facts, 2

 elaborated facts, 3 unelaborated
 explanations, and 4 elaborated explanations;
 - Scientific sophistication: 1 pre-scientific, 2 hybrid, 3 basically scientific, and 4 scientific.

Correlations	(Pearson r and	p)	between	the	Socio-Behavioral	Measures	and
		* '					

	Notes written	% of notes read	Note reading in- degree	Note reading out-degree	Note linking in edegree	Note -linking out-degre	Cliques belonging eeto
Depth of	.437*	.398	.519*	.398	.431*	.214	.469*
understanding	(.042)	(.067)	(.013)	(.067)	(.045)	(.338)	(.028)
Breath of	.198	.105	.308	.061	.364	068	.159
understanding	(.377)	(.644)	(.164)	(.788)	(.096)	(.765)	(.478)

Correlations (Pe	earson r and p) be	tween the conte	ent-based meas	ures and underst	anding
	# of inquiry threads/themes contributed to	# of notes contributing personal ideas	# of notes identifying deeper problems	# of notes incorporating new resources	# of notes using evidence
Depth of understanding	034	.365	.582**	.403	.260
	(.879)	(.095)	(.004)	(.063)	(.242)
Breadth of understanding	1.000***	.288	.296	009	.056
	(.000)	(.193)	(.182)	(.970)	(.806)
<u>Note</u> . ** <u>p</u> <.01,	*** <u>p</u> <.001				

Correlations (Pe	arson r and	p) between th	e Lexical Mea	asures and Dept	h of
Understanding		.,			
	Total wor	ds Total	Unique	% of the	% of the 1st
	written	domain words	domain words	academic w	ords1,000 word
Depth of	.646**	.660**	.458*	.506*	646**
understanding	(.001)	(.001)	(.032)	(.016)	(.001)
Breadth of	.250	.218	.594**	.226	302
1 . 1	(262)	(329)	(004)	(313)	(172)

Characterizing Productive Knowledge Building

- Active contribution to the community knowledge space, indicated through the number of notes and words written;
- Awareness of contributions developed through note reading;
- Idea-centered, progressive discourse; and
- Collaborative and distributed engagements, achieved through actively building on to the efforts of various members and forming into dynamic teams.

Thank you!

Emails:

- jzhang1@albany.edu
- ysun@albany.edu