RUTGERS
Graduate School of Education

Educational Psychology
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
10 Seminary Place
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1183

www.gse.rutgers.edu/ep
EP@gse.rutgers.edu

848-932-0846
Fax: 732-932-6829

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

15:295:580:90 Psychology of Learning
Spring 2015
Online
http://onlinelearning.rutgers.edu/ecollege

Instructor: Eli M. Silk	Email: eli.silk@gse.rutgers.edu
Office Phone: 848-932-0827	Office Location: GSE 321B
Office Hours: By arrangement	Prerequisites or other limitations: None
Mode of Instruction: ___ Lecture ___ Seminar ___ Hybrid _X_ Online ___ Other	Permission required: _X_ No __Yes Directions about where to get permission numbers: N/A

Rutgers University welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, a student with a disability must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentations: https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/documentation-guidelines. If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus's disability services office will provide you with a Letter of Accommodations. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible. To begin this process, please complete the Registration form on the ODS web site at: https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/registration-form.

Course Description

Learning Goals:

New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers (2014)[1]*:*

1: Standard One: Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

[1] http://www.state.nj.us/education/code/current/title6a/chap9.pdf

1.ii.(1): The teacher understands how learning occurs—how learners construct knowledge, acquire skills, and develop disciplined thinking processes—and knows how to use instructional strategies that promote student learning.

3: Standard Three: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

3.ii.(1): The teacher understands the relationship between motivation and engagement and knows how to design learning experiences using strategies that build learner self-direction and ownership of learning.

8: Standard Eight: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

8.ii.(1): The teacher understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (for example, critical and creative thinking, problem framing and problem solving, invention, and memorization and recall) and how these processes can be stimulated.

Council for the Accreditation of Education Professionals (2013)[2]*:*

Standard #1: Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Standard #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.

Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Course Catalog Description:

This course is an introduction to psychological theories of human learning, including behavioral, social, and cognitive theories of learning. Principles of learning, mediation, and transfer as deduced from these theories are covered. Applications to a variety of settings are considered, including classrooms and out-of-school settings.

[2] http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/final_board_approved1.pdf

RUTGERS

Introduction:

The purpose of this course is to introduce a psychological perspective to learning and instruction in classroom contexts. We will examine how people learn and how psychological principles of learning are applied to instruction. Over the course of the semester we will explore theories of learning that have been developed in the education and psychological literatures over time to explain how students learn and how teachers can teach effectively.

Goals:

This course is designed to help you acquire the following knowledge and skills related to learning and instruction:

Knowledge:

- Of empirical results on learning;
- Of theories of learning;
- Of effective instructional practices.

Skills:

- Diagnosing learning and instructional problems;
- Analyzing instructional situations;
- Predicting instructional outcomes;
- Designing instruction based on theory and research.

Required Texts:

There is no required textbook to purchase for this course. All of the required articles and chapters will be posted online on the class eCollege website. You must have a Rutgers NetID to use eCollege. If you do not have an account yet, it may take a few days to get one so it is important that you take care of this immediately.

Important Note: This syllabus, along with course assignments and due dates, are subject to change. It is the student's responsibility to check the class website each week for the assignment and for corrections or updates to the syllabus. Any major changes will be clearly noted in a course announcement and by email.

RUTGERS

Grading Policy

Evaluation of Written Work:

Grading Breakdown by Course Assignment:

1.	Discussions of Readings	25%	Weekly
2.	Discussions of Collaborative Problems	20%	Weekly
3.	Questions about Articles	5%	Weekly
4.	Instructional Analyses	20%	Due 2/23 and 4/13
5.	Article Analyses	20%	Due 3/16 and 5/4
6.	Reflection Paper	10%	Due 5/11

Grading Scale:

- A = 90-100
- B+ = 86-89
- B = 80-85
- C+ = 76-79
- C = 70-75
- F = Below 70

Academic Integrity:

Any violation of academic honesty is a serious offense and is therefore subject to an appropriate penalty. Refer to http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/integrity.shtml for a full explanation of policies.

Course Requirements

Website:

http://onlinelearning.rutgers.edu/ecollege

Attendance Policy:

Because this is an all-online course, there will be no mandatory face-to-face meetings. However, you will be expected to participate in various ways throughout every week of the course. In addition, you should feel welcome to contact me by email if you want set up a time to talk one-on-one either in person, on the phone, or virtually.

Features of this Online Course:

An online course differs from a traditional face-to-face course in a number of ways. In particular, for this class:

A. There is a strong emphasis on student-driven learning. The instructor role is of overall facilitator and coordinator.

B. You will be able to work at your convenience. But it is important to be seriously engaged at least five days during each and every week. This is quite different from a traditional course, in which it is perfectly fine to prepare the day before, go to class the day of class, and then not think about the course the other five days a week.

C. We focus on asynchronous rather than synchronous activities. This course will—officially—be all asynchronous. Depending upon interest, I am open to setting up a (completely optional) face-to-face meeting with our class as a whole.

D. Students do more of the integrative work than in a face-to-face class. This is likely to support long-term memory development.

Netiquette

This is drawn from Palloff and Pratt (1999, p. 101):

a. Check the discussion frequently and respond appropriately and on the subject.
b. Focus on one subject per message and use pertinent, informative, and not-too-long subject titles.
c. Capitalize words only to highlight a point or for titles. Capitalizing otherwise is generally viewed as SHOUTING.
d. Be professional and careful with your online interaction.
e. Cite all quotes, references, and sources.
f. It is inappropriate to forward someone else's message(s) without their permission.
g. Use humor carefully. The absence of face-to-face cues can cause humor to be misinterpreted as criticism or flaming (angry, antagonistic criticism). Feel free to use emoticons such as :-) or ;-) to let others know that you're being humorous.

Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (1999). *Building learning communities in cyberspace: Effective strategies for the online classroom* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Norms

This is an example of norms for participating in constructive controversies from Smith, Johnson, and Johnson (1981):

1. I am critical of ideas, not people.
2. I remember that we are all in this together.
3. I encourage everyone to participate.
4. I listen to everyone's ideas, even if I do not agree with them.
5. I restate what someone has said if it is not clear.
6. I try to understand both sides of the issue.
7. I first bring out all the ideas, and then I put them together.

Although written for younger students, these norms work well for online discussions among adults, too. At the same time, however, let's add these norms:

Critical to the advance of knowledge are:

8. Criticizing ideas, and having our ideas criticized by others.
9. Taking up criticism.
10. Exploring ideas without fully believing them, or without believing them at all.

Smith, K., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1981). Can conflict be constructive? Controversy versus concurrence seeking in learning groups. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *73*(5), 651–663. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.73.5.651

Weekly Schedule:

The asynchronous discussions require an extended time to reflect on what we have read. Here is a typical schedule:

Tuesday: Each weekly cycle begins. On this day, you will have already completed the readings for this week and emailed me questions about each of the readings (see Monday, below).

Tuesday through the following Monday: Participate in both categories of discussions – discussions of readings and discussions of problems. It is important to start contributing promptly each week to these discussions. I expect everyone to contribute to each discussion type on ***at least*** three different days in the weekly cycle: contribute early in the cycle (Tuesday through Thursday), contribute in the middle of the cycle (Friday or Saturday), and then contribute near the end of the cycle (Sunday or Monday). This is the best way to simulate a discussion since you will be able to generate new ideas, to respond to other people's ideas, and to follow through on discussions that are of particular interest to you.

Simultaneously as the discussions are going on for this cycle's readings, you should be reading the articles for the following cycle.

Monday: You should have completed the readings for the next cycle that begins the following day. By 10 p.m. on this day, email me questions about the next cycle's readings. These should be questions that you are interested in discussing as a whole class. I will aim to include some of these questions in the discussion questions.

To reiterate, it is important that you get onto the discussion threads and contribute on ***at least*** 3 different days spread out throughout the weekly cycle. And you should be making contributions on at least 3 different days to both the reading discussions and to the problem discussions.

In addition to assignments within the weekly cycle, you will have additional due dates for the major assignments. Major assignments are also usually due on the last day of the cycle (Monday evenings) as noted on the schedule.

Schematically, the weekly schedule looks like this:

RUTGERS

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		Discussions for current week **begin**. **Begin** next week's readings.	Continue to contribute to discussions. Continue next week's readings.	Continue to contribute to discussions. Continue next week's readings.	Continue to contribute to discussions. Continue next week's readings.	Continue to contribute to discussions. Continue next week's readings.
Continue to contribute to discussions. Continue next week's readings.	Continue to contribute to discussions. **Complete** next week's readings. Major assignments due. Submit discussion questions on next week's readings.	Cycle repeats in the next week.				

In this chart, "discussions" includes both (1) the main reading discussion threads about the papers we have read and (2) the problem discussion threads. As you will see when you get online, these are in different sections of the week's web pages.

Summary of Requirements

In summary, half of the requirements for the course will be the result of weekly participation around the readings (emailed questions, online reading and problem discussions). The other half of the requirements for the course will focus on major assignments in which you will analyze articles or instructional situations.

RUTGERS

Course Schedule by Week

Week	Topics	Readings	Assignments
1: 1/20 - 1/26	Introduction	No readings (but start Week 2 readings right away)	*Post self-introductions (instructions via email)*
2: 1/27 - 2/2	Theories of Learning I	Chinn (2011a) Chinn (2011b) Chinn (2011c) Chinn on Sweller and Chandler (1994) Rourke and Sweller (2009) Pool, Koolstra, and van der Voort (2003)	
3: 2/3 - 2/9	Prior Conceptions and Learning	Chinn (2011d) Chinn and Samarapungavan (2001) Swann (1997) Swann, Hixon, and De La Ronde (1992) Watson and Konicek (1990)	*[Optional] Due 2/9: Instructional Analysis I Proposal*
4: 2/10 - 2/16	Self-Regulated Learning	Chinn (2011e) Wineburg (1991) Zimmerman (1998)	
5: 2/17 - 2/23	Goals and Assessment	Chinn (2011f) National Research Council (2005) Wilson and Sloane (2000) [Optional] Furtak and Ruiz-Primo (2008)	*Due 2/23: Instructional Analysis I*
6: 2/24 - 3/2	Classroom Management; Motivation I	Chinn (2011g) Dweck (2010) Mueller and Dweck (1998) Yeager and Dweck (2012)	*[Optional] Due 3/2: Article Analysis I Proposal*
7: 3/3 - 3/9	Motivation II	Blumenfeld, Kempler, and Krajcik (2006) Chinn (2011h) Raphael, Pressley, and Mohan (2008)	

RUTGERS

Week	Topics	Readings	Assignments
8: 3/10 - 3/16*	Motivation III; Transfer I	Nokes and Belenky (2011) Patrick et al. (2001) Schunk (1991)	*Due 3/16: Article Analysis I*
Spring Break			
9: 3/24 - 3/30	Transfer II	Chinn (2011i) National Research Council (2000) Schwartz, Chase, and Bransford (2012)	*[Optional] Due 3/30: Instructional Analysis II Proposal*
10: 3/31 - 4/6	Transfer III	Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt (1992) Day and Goldstone (2012)	
11: 4/7 - 4/13	Constructivism	Chinn (2011j) Palincsar and Herrenkohl (2002) Rogoff et al. (2003)	*Due 4/13: Instructional Analysis II*
12: 4/14 - 4/20	Teaching Strategies	Chinn (2011k) Langer (2001) Stahl (1999)	*[Optional] Due 4/20: Article Analysis II Proposal*
13: 4/21 - 4/27	Collaborative Learning	Chinn (2011l) King (2002) Nussbaum and Edwards (2011)	
14: 4/28 - 5/4	Other Instructional Issues	Bain (2005) Czuchry et al. (1995) Stigler, Fernandez, and Yoshida (1998) Waggoner et al. (1995)	*Due 5/4: Article Analysis II*
15: 5/5 - 5/11	(None)	No readings	*Due 5/11: Reflection Paper*

** Because of Spring Break, you will not be required to participate in the online discussions that weekend (3/14-3/16), and are welcome to hand in your assignment early.*

Evaluation

Weekly Assignments

1. Discussions of Readings

Each week, you will discuss the readings within eCollege discussion threads. We will focus on:

- Clarifying understanding of the readings. For research articles, this includes the research question, what the method was, what the results were, and whether the authors' conclusions are appropriate.

- Discussing applications and implications of the ideas you have read about.

Discussions are places to explore and entertain ideas. There should be no presumption that discussants are firmly committed to positions that they are presenting arguments for.

Discussion contributions should adhere to normal rules of English usage, etc.

The minimum requirement for contributing to the discussion is **8 or more substantive entries** (including at least 4 responses to someone else's post) each week. Your contributions to the discussions plus the collaborative problems (explained below) should collectively indicate that you have read all the readings. I also expect that you will not simply stop at 9 contributions each week. I hope that your goal will be to participate in meaningful, interesting discussions.

Also, when you are contributing to the online discussions consider the length of your posts. Posts that are too short may not add much to the discussion (e.g., "Yes" or "I disagree"). Conversely, posts that are too long and wordy are not likely to be read fully. Sometimes it is okay and makes sense to make a long post or a short post, but for most posts try to put together a contribution that is about 2-3 sentences in length.

Evaluation will be based on the number of contributions, the quality of your contributions, and that you are contributing **at least 3 different times** throughout the week.

2. Discussions of Instructional Problems

Each week's discussions will also include discussions focused on practical instructional problems that require application of the ideas in the readings. You will work on these problems within eCollege discussion threads.

The minimum requirement for contributing to the problem discussions is **4 or more substantive entries each week** (including at least 2 responses to someone else's post). As with the discussions of readings, I expect that you will not just be counting contributions but rather be participating meaningfully in the discussion, and that you will consider the length of your posts.

Evaluation will be based on the number of contributions, the quality of your contributions, and that you are contributing **at least 2 different times** throughout the week.

3. Questions

Each week, by Monday at 10 p.m., email me discussion questions about the readings. The description of activities for each week will give you more specific instructions about how many questions to write and about which readings. These should be questions raised by the readings that you would like to discuss in our online forum.

Major Assignments

4. Instructional Analyses

The instructional analysis is an assignment in which you provide a detailed critique of a written lesson or unit plan or a video of instruction using ideas learned in the course. It is your responsibility to find the lesson, unit plan or video, and you may choose one that you are familiar with, or one that you find online or from some other source. Be sure that the plan for instruction is detailed enough to afford a substantive critique. After choosing your lesson, you will apply the ideas you have learned in the course (1) to explain what is strong and what is weak about the lesson or unit, and (2) to suggest how the lesson or unit might be improved. You will complete two instructional analyses over the course of the semester and each analysis should focus on different instruction. Specific guidelines on structure, format, and submission will be provided on the class website.

5. Article Analyses

The article analysis is an assignment in which you provide a detailed critique of a published empirical paper using ideas learned in the course. It is your responsibility to find the find the article, but I will provide guidance on selecting an appropriate article. After choosing your article, you will then apply the ideas you have learned in the course (1) to describe the key parts of the study, and (2) to explain what is strong and what is weak about the empirical study. You will complete two article analyses over the course of the semester and each analysis should focus on a different article. Specific guidelines on structure, format, and submission will be provided on the class website.

6. Reflection Paper

This final reflection paper will provide you an opportunity to reflect on what you learned throughout the course. Specific guidelines on structure, format, and submission will be provided on the class website.

Guidelines for the Major Assignments

Proposal – For most of the major assignments you will have the option to email me a proposal of what you would like to write about for the assignment. This will give you an opportunity to get some early feedback about your approach, the article or lesson you chose, or the ideas you want to apply. The proposals are optional and will be due two weeks prior to the due date of the full assignment.

APA Format – Each major assignment should be formatted using the formal standards articulated by the American Psychological Association (APA) for a manuscript. Those standards include, but are not limited to:

- Times New Roman, 12 point font
- One inch margins on all sides
- Page numbers
- Cover page that includes title, course, student, professor, date
- Left alignment with default spacing between words and letters
- Double spaced lines with only one hard return between indented paragraphs
- Proper in-text citations and a separate bibliography or reference section

Refer to the latest APA manual and/or: https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/

Conciseness – Try to write in a simple, clear, and non-repetitive way.

Completeness and depth – Present the necessary amount of detail to support your points. Write as though your audience is not an expert on your topic and in a way that demonstrates depth of analysis of the topic. Bring in psychological evidence and justify your view using psychology, not rumors or anecdotes.

Independent, balanced judgment – Go beyond the information presented by others. Be critical, seeing both strengths and weaknesses and support opinions with your own reasons.

Attention to professional style and ethics – Quotes must have appropriate references. When paraphrasing you still MUST acknowledge the original work. Plagiarism will be addressed in accordance with the University policy. Here's a thinking tool to help you decide whether you have quoted inappropriately. Imagine that Google had every word ever written on its servers (all published and unpublished writing, from all of history through this moment). Would a Google search on any extended phrase or clause in your document yield a hit? If so, there is likely to be a problem.

You can use the following format for references to the Chinn's unpublished work:

Chinn, C. A. (2011). Title of chapter or section (pp. x-x). Unpublished manuscript.

It is not acceptable to use a paper that you have used for another course. However, it is acceptable to do a paper on a similar topic (as long as you take a new perspective and the writing is all new). Please email me if you have questions about this issue.

Critical reading – are you evaluating strengths/weaknesses of the material you are reading? Are you being objective in your discussions of the material? If you choose options (b) or (c), your paper should show clear evidence that you are applying ideas from throughout the course.

On lateness – if you need an extension of time on an assignment please contact me well before the date when the assignment is due.

RUTGERS

Reading List

Four important notes:

1. Substitutions may be made for readings on this list. If substitutions are made, they will be announced before that week's readings begin. On the day when readings for a week begin, please double check course announcements to be sure that there have been no substitutions. Please check with me if you decide to read substantially ahead.

2. Shorter readings may be added to some weeks to address issues that arise in our discussions.

3. TBA (to be announced) denotes that a reading will be added to the list.

4. In some weeks, there are additional online sources posted on eCollege. Each week, be sure to check what is listed under the main activities for that week.

Week 1. Introductory Activities

Because you have not yet had time to complete any readings, we will spend the first week on introductory activities. Please note that discussion threads will be active this week, so plan on contributing throughout the week. Also, begin your readings for Week 2.

Week 2. Theories of Learning I: Behaviorism, Social Learning Theory, Information Processing Theory

Chinn, C. A. (2011a). Behavioral learning theory (pp. 1–11). Unpublished manuscript.

Chinn, C. A. (2011b). Social cognitive theory (pp. 11–19). Unpublished manuscript.

Chinn, C. A. (2011c). Theories of learning: Information processing theory (pp. 23–48). Unpublished manuscript.

Chinn summary and elaboration of: Sweller, J., & Chandler, P. (1994). Why some material is difficult to learn. *Cognition and Instruction, 12*(3), 185–233. doi:10.1207/s1532690xci1203_1

Pool, M. M., Koolstra, C. M., & van der Voort, T. H. A. (2003). The impact of background radio and television on high school students' homework performance. *Journal of Communication, 53*(1), 74–87. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2003.tb03006.x

Rourke, A., & Sweller, J. (2009). The worked-example effect using ill-defined problems: Learning to recognise designers' styles. *Learning and Instruction, 19*(2), 185–199. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2008.03.006

Week 3. Prior Conceptions and Learning

Chinn, C. A. (2011d). Students' prior conceptions and how they affect learning (pp. 58–109). Unpublished manuscript.

Chinn, C. A., & Samarapungavan, A. (2001). Distinguishing between understanding and belief. *Theory Into Practice*, *40*(4), 235–241. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4004_4

Swann, W. B. (1997). The trouble with change: Self-verification and allegiance to the self. *Psychological Science*, *8*(3), 177–180. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00407.x

Swann, W. B., Hixon, J. G., & De La Ronde, C. (1992). Embracing the bitter "truth": Negative self-concepts and marital commitment. *Psychological Science*, *3*(2), 118–121. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.1992.tb00010.x

Watson, B., & Konicek, R. (1990). Teaching for conceptual change: Confronting children's experience. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *71*(9), 680–685.

Week 4. Self-Regulated Learning

Chinn, C. A. (2011e). Complex cognitive strategies and self-regulated learning (pp. 110–162). Unpublished manuscript.

Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*(1), 73–87. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.83.1.73

Zimmerman, B. J. (1998). Academic studing and the development of personal skill: A self-regulatory perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, *33*(2-3), 73–86. doi:10.1080/00461520.1998.9653292

Week 5. Goals and Assessment

Chinn, C. A. (2011f). Assessment (pp. 174–195). Unpublished manuscript.

National Research Council. (2001). Assessment in practice. In *Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment* (pp. 221–260). Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved from http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10019/knowing-what-students-know-the-science-and-design-of-educational

Wilson, M., & Sloane, K. (2000). From principles to practice: An embedded assessment system. *Applied Measurement in Education*, *13*(2), 181–208. doi:10.1207/S15324818AME1302_4

[optional] Furtak, E. M., & Ruiz-Primo, M. A. (2008). Making students' thinking explicit in writing and discussion: An analysis of formative assessment prompts. *Science Education*, *92*(5), 799–824. doi:10.1002/sce.20270

Week 6. Classroom Management; Motivation I

Chinn, C. A. (2011g). Creating well-managed learning environments (pp. 1–34). Unpublished manuscript.

Dweck, C. S. (2010). What is school for? Mindset, motivation, and learning. *Instructional Leader*, *23*(5), 1–5.

Mueller, C. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Praise for intelligence can undermine children's motivation and performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*(1), 33–52. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.33

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist*, *47*(4), 302–314. doi:10.1080/00461520.2012.722805

Week 7. Motivation II

Blumenfeld, P. C., Kempler, T. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). Motivation and cognitive engagement in learning environments. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of The Learning Sciences* (pp. 475–488). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Chinn, C. A. (2011h). Creating motivating, engaging classroom communities (pp. 186–208). Unpublished manuscript.

Raphael, L. M., Pressley, M., & Mohan, L. (2008). Engaging instruction in middle school classrooms: An observational study of nine teachers. *The Elementary School Journal*, *109*(1), 61–81. doi:10.1086/592367

Week 8. Motivation III; Transfer I

Nokes, T. J., & Belenky, D. M. (2011). Incorporating motivation into a theoretical framework for knowledge transfer. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, *55*, 109–135. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-387691-1.00004-1

Patrick, H., Anderman, L. H., Ryan, A. M., Edelin, K. C., & Midgley, C. (2001). Teachers' communication of goal orientations in four fifth-grade classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, *102*(1), 35–58.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, *26*(3-4), 207–231. doi:10.1080/00461520.1991.9653133

Week 9. Transfer II

Chinn, C. A. (2011i). Promoting transfer (pp. 1–10). Unpublished manuscript.

National Research Council. (2000). Learning and transfer. In *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition* (pp. 51–78). Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved from http://www.nap.edu/catalog/9853/how-people-learn-brain-mind-experience-and-school-expanded-edition

Schwartz, D. L., Chase, C. C., & Bransford, J. D. (2012). Resisting overzealous transfer: Coordinating previously successful routines with needs for new learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *47*(3), 204–214. doi:10.1080/00461520.2012.696317

Week 10. Transfer III

Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1992). The Jasper Series as an example of anchored instruction: Theory, program description, and assessment data. *Educational Psychologist*, *27*(3), 291–315. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2703_3

Day, S. B., & Goldstone, R. L. (2012). The import of knowledge export: Connecting findings and theories of transfer of learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *47*(3), 153–176. doi:10.1080/00461520.2012.696438

Week 11. Constructivisim

Chinn, C. A. (2011j). Constructivism (pp. 48–57). Unpublished manuscript.

Palincsar, A. S., & Herrenkohl, L. R. (2002). Designing collaborative learning contexts. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(1), 26–32. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4101_5

Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R. M., Correa-Chávez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*(1), 175–203. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145118

Week 12. Teaching Strategies

Chinn, C. A. (2011k). Learning environments that promote self-regulated learning (pp. 1–46). Unpublished manuscript.

Langer, J. A. (2001). Beating the odds: Teaching middle and high school students to read and write well. *American Educational Research Journal*, *38*(4), 837–880. doi:10.3102/00028312038004837

Stahl, S. A. (1999). Different strokes for different folks? A critique of learning styles. *American Educator*, 1–5.

Week 13. Collaborative Learning

Chinn, C. A. (2011l). Collaborative learning (pp. 1–60). Unpublished manuscript.

King, A. (2002). Structuring peer interaction to promote high-level cognitive processing. *Theory Into Practice*, *41*(1), 33–39. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4101_6

Nussbaum, E. M., & Edwards, O. V. (2011). Critical questions and argument stratagems: A framework for enhancing and analyzing students' reasoning practices. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *20*(3), 443–488. doi:10.1080/10508406.2011.564567

Week 14. Other Instructional Issues

Bain, R. B. (2005). "They thought the world was flat?" Applying the principles of How People Learn in teaching high school history. In National Research Council, *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom* (pp. 179–213). Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved from http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10126/how-students-learn-history-mathematics-and-science-in-the-classroom

Czuchry, M., Dansereau, D. F., Dees, S. M., & Simpson, D. D. (1995). The use of node-link mapping in drug abuse counseling: The role of attentional factors. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, *27*(2), 161–166. doi:10.1080/02791072.1995.10471685

Stigler, J. W., Fernandez, C., & Yoshida, M. (1996). Cultures of mathematics instruction in Japanese and American elementary classrooms. In T. P. Rohlen & G. K. LeTendre (Eds.), *Teaching and Learning in Japan* (pp. 213–247). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waggoner, M., Chinn, C., Yi, H., & Anderson, R. C. (1995). Collaborative reasoning about stories. *Language Arts*, *72*(8), 582–589.

Week 15. Completing Paper

There are no readings in Week 15 to give you time to reflect on the course and to complete your Reflection Paper.