Preparing Students for an Interdependent World: Role of Cooperation and Social Interdependence Theory

Karl A. Smith
Purdue University & University of Minnesota
ksmith@umn.edu – http://www.ce.umn.edu/~smith/links.html

Chapter for *Small group learning in higher education: Research and practice*
Edited by James Cooper & Pamela Robinson

Abstract

Tom Boyle of British Telecom describes our current era as the "age of interdependence;" former U.S. President Bill Clinton asked the question in his 2002 Los Angeles Times editorial, "will interdependence be good or bad for humanity?"; a popular business advertisement states "Collaborate or Die!;" and *The World is Flat* author Tom Friedman argues that we have to move to a more horizontal – connect and collaborate – value-creation model. If, as these pundits claim, interdependence is the current coin of the realm, then what can we do to help prepare students for an interdependent world? What are the skills and competencies that students need and how can we ensure that they gain these skills and competencies?

Several studies and initiatives – AAC&U *College Learning for the New Global Century*, Boeing and RPI's *The Global Engineer*, NAE's *Engineer of 2020*, and many others – have begun to articulate the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind that are needed. The question posed in this chapter is "What roles can cooperation and social interdependence theory play in informing the design and practice of preparing graduates for living and working in an interdependent world?" The examples will come predominantly from engineering, the discipline with which I am most familiar.

Cooperative learning and its underlying theoretical framework, social interdependence theory, have been systematically studied in higher education for over 50 years. In engineering, for example, the first study was conducted at MIT in 1948. Engineering faculty began embracing cooperative learning shortly after it was introduced in engineering education conferences and journals in 1981 and its use continues to grow.

This chapter provides a brief summary of the theory, extensive empirical evidence, and implications for practice of cooperative learning, and hopes to start a dialogue on the question, "How can we prepare students for an interdependent world?"

Introduction – State of the World

The world is changing and we are facing many global challenges, including, poverty, education, health, innovation, climate change, human rights, resource availability and utilization, etc. These concerns are not new; however, as they have been documented for decades by organizations such as the Worldwatch Institute, whose annual publication, *State of the World* articulates our

interdependence. Until recently the predominant design approach used in engineering was "cradle to grave" and most things were designed to be thrown away. The concept of "away" was described in an interesting way as the "toilet assumption" by Bennis and Slater (1968) in their book *The Temporary Society.*

There is a significant rise in international collaborations around education and especially research. For example, the Large Hadron Collider at CERN (a collaboration of 20 countries) is coming online in September 2008. The Global Colloquiums on Engineering Education is one effort to bring people together to address global issues and opportunities. Furthermore, the engineering design paradigm is slowing changing from "cradle to grave" to "cradle to cradle." The idea of "cradle to cradle" was developed and championed by the international collaboration of Michael Braungart, a German chemist, and William McDonough, a U.S. architect (McDonough and Braungart, 2002).

The term 'global' popularized by writers such as Thomas Friedman, shows up in many conversations about engineering and engineering education as well as in prospective outcomes for engineering graduates. The notion of global first became clear to me and many of my generation on December 24, 1968 when Apollo 8 circumnavigated the moon. As the image of the earthrise was transmitted and showed up on TV screens around the world, CBS News Commentator Walter Cronkite said:

> I think that picture of the earthrise over the moon's horizon, that blue disk out there in space, floating alone in the darkness, the utter black of space, had the effect of impressing on all of us our loneliness out here. The fact that we seem to be the only spot where anything like humans could be living. And it, the major impression I think it made on most of us was the fact, how ridiculous it is that we have this difficulty getting along on this little lifeboat of ours floating out there in space, and the necessity of our understanding each other and of the brotherhood of humankind on this floating island of ours, made a great impression, I think, on everybody.

This was an extremely poignant and defining moment for me although I didn't recognize and fully appreciate it at the time. You can see the Cronkite segment and read more about what was described as his **A Call for Harmony on Lifeboat Earth** on the American Experience program on Apollo 8 (PBS American Experience, 2008).

Recently several world leaders, such as British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, call for global interdependence aimed at solving international problems such as terrorism, poverty, and climate change (Lavoie, 2008). During his talk at the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in April, 2008, Brown said "We urgently need to step out of the mindset of competing interests and instead find our common interests, and we must summon up the best instincts and efforts of humanist in cooperative effort to build new international rules and institutions for the new global era." Tom Boyle of British Telecom describes our current era as the "age of interdependence" and he argues that one's Network Quotient (NQ) is more important than their IQ (Cohen & Prusak, 2001). Former U.S. President Bill Clinton asked the question, "will interdependence be good or bad for humanity?" in his 2002 *Los Angeles Times* editorial, Living in an Interdependent

World (Clinton, 2001). *The World is Flat* author Tom Friedman (2007) argues that we have to move to a more horizontal – connect and collaborate – value-creation model. Friedman argues that Curiosity Quotient (CQ) plus Passion Quotient (PQ) is more important than Intelligence Quotient (IQ). John Seely Brown, former Chief Scientist of Xerox and Director of its Palo Alto Research Center (PARC) argues that social/emotional intelligence (EQ) and communication intelligence (CQ) are equally as or more important than IQ (Brown & Adler, 2008; Brown, 2008). If, as these pundits claim, interdependence is the current coin of the realm, then what can we do to help prepare students for and interdependent world? What are the skills and competencies that students need and how can we ensure that they gain these skills and competencies?

Before proceeding too far down the collaboration path, let me reassure those who argue that competition is the be all and end all that I agree there is a role for competition and we have an obligation to help develop students' skills for competing. There are several occasions where competition is the norm; sports contests, of course, are the most common, but there is also proposals and hiring. My sense is that we've emphasized competition far more than cooperation and haven't helped students develop skills for cooperating. Buckminster Fuller argued that "cooperation is pragmatically necessary" and W. Edwards Deming (1993) made the following compelling case for the importance of cooperation and interdependence in his book *The New Economics for Industry, Government, Education.*

> We have grown up in a climate of competition between people, teams, departments, divisions, pupils, schools, universities. We have been taught by economists that competition will solve our problems. Actually, competition, we see now, is destructive. It would be better if everyone would work together as a system, with the aim for everybody to win. What we need is cooperation and transformation to a new style of management. . . Competition leads to loss. People pulling in opposite directions on a rope only exhaust themselves: they go nowhere. What we need is cooperation. Every example of cooperation is one of benefit and gains to them that cooperate (p. xi, 90).

The United States has been guided recently by calls for increasing competitive advantage and in this brief paper I argue for increasing emphasis on global collaborative advantage and developing the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind that support developing collaborative approaches to challenges and opportunities. The idea of global collaborative advantage was framed by Lynn and Salzman (2006, 2007) and they argue in a series of articles that we need to prepare graduates for developing global collaborative advantage. For example, Lynn and Salzman argue in their 2006 *Issues in Science and Technology article*, Collaborative Advantage, "The United States should move away from an almost certainly futile attempt to maintain dominance and toward an approach in which leadership comes from developing and brokering mutual gains among equal partners. Such 'collaborative advantage,' as we call it, comes not from self-sufficiency or maintaining a monopoly on advanced technology, but from being a valued collaborator at various levels in the international system of technology development." (p. 76). Among their three goals for the United States they argue that "the United States needs to develop a science and technology education system that teaches collaborative competencies rather than just technical knowledge and skills." (p.81). Their research indicates that cross-boundary skills

(working across disciplinary, organizations, cultural, and time/distance boundaries) are needed more than technical skills.

Another group of researchers providing strong support for the centrality of interdependence are those studying complexity and complex adaptive systems (Axelrod & Cohen, 2001; Miller & Page, 2007). Page (2009) claims that a "system can be considered complex if its agents meet four qualifications: diversity, connection, interdependence, and adaptation." (p.4) and "the attributes of interdependence, connectedness, diversity, and adaptation and learning generate complexity." (p. 10). Furthermore, Page (2009) notes that "interdependence refers to whether other entities influence actions, whereas connectedness refers to how many people a person is connected to." (p.11). Preparing students with a deeper understanding of complex systems is essential, since complex systems (1) are often unpredictable and can produce large events as well as withstand trauma, (2) produce bottom-up emergent phenomena, and (3) produce amazing novelty (Page, 2009).

Cooperative learning and its underlying theoretical framework, social interdependence theory, can provide many insights into preparing students to work with others to synthesize common goals and then attain common purposes, which are essential for developing collaborative advantage and navigating complexity.

Cooperative Learning and Social Interdependence Theory in Engineering Education

Cooperative learning has been part of the landscape of engineering education for the past almost 30 years. The conceptual cooperative learning model was introduced to the engineering education community in 1981 (Smith, Johnson, & Johnson, 1981a, 1981b) and was continually refined and elaborated for engineering educators (Felder, 1995; Prince, 2004; Smith, 1995; Smith, Sheppard, Johnson, & Johnson, 2005) and higher education faculty in general (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991; Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998; Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 2000, 2006, 2007; MacGregor, Cooper, Smith, & Robinson, 2000; Millis & Cottell, 1997; Smith, 1996, 1998; Smith, Cox, & Douglas, 2008). The influence of foundational work on cooperative learning can be seen in the University of Delaware Problem Based Learning model (Allen, Duch, & Groh, 1996 ; Duch, Groh, & Allen, 2001), the SCALE-UP model at North Carolina State (Beichner, Saul, Allain, Deardorff, & Abbot, 2000), the Technology Enhanced Active Learning (TEAL) model at MIT (Dori & Belcher, 2005; Dori, et.al, 2003) and many others.

Social interdependence theory is at the heart of the cooperative learning model. In our 1981 journal of *Engineering Education* article "Structuring learning goals to meet the goals of engineering education" David and Roger Johnson and I introduced social interdependence theory to the engineering education community and elaborated on the two types of social interdependence – positive and negative – posited by Deutsch (1949a, 1962b). *Positive interdependence* exists when there is a positive correlation among individuals' goal attainments; individuals perceive that they can attain their goals if, and only if, the other individuals with whom they are cooperatively linked attain their goals. *Negative interdependence* exists when there is a negative correlation among individuals' goal achievements; individual perceive that they can obtain their goals if and only if the other individuals with who they are competitively linked fail to obtain their goals. No interdependence or individualistic efforts exist when there is

no correlation among individuals' goal achievements; individuals perceive that the achievement of their goals is unrelated to the goal achievement of others.

In addition to his pioneering theory building work, Deutsch (1949b) conducted the first systematic study of cooperative learning in engineering education at MIT in 1948.

David and Roger Johnson (2005) recently summarized the state of social interdependence theory and provide excellent insight into the latest thinking, and provide detailed insights into social interdependence theory.

The empirical and theoretical evidence supporting cooperative learning is vast and I'll only provide a brief summary. During the past 90 years, over 350 experimental studies have been conducted in college and adult settings comparing the effectiveness of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic efforts. These studies have been conducted by a wide variety of researchers in different decades with different learner populations, in different subject areas, and in different settings. More is known about the efficacy of cooperative learning than about lecturing, the fifty-minute class period, the use of instructional technology, or almost any other aspect of education. From this research you would expect that the more students work in cooperative learning groups the more they will learn, the better they will understand what they are learning, the easier it will be to remember what they learn, and the better they will feel about themselves, the class, and their classmates. The multiple outcomes studied can be classified into three major categories: achievement/productivity, positive relationships, and psychological health. Cooperation among students typically results in (a) higher achievement and greater productivity, (b) more caring, supportive, and committed relationships, and (c) greater psychological health, social competence, and self-esteem. Please see Johnson & Johnson (this volume); Smith, Sheppard, Johnson and Johnson (2005) and Johnson, Johnson & Smith (1998, 2007) for details.

Details on the key research-based elements of cooperative learning – positive interdependence, individual and group accountability, face-to-face promotive interaction, teamwork skills, and group processing – as well as implementation of the three main types of cooperative learning – Informal Cooperative (Active) Learning, Formal Cooperative Learning and Cooperative Base Groups – are available in Smith, Sheppard, Johnson & Johnson (2005) and in extensive detail in Johnson, Johnson & Smith (2006).

Preparing for Participation in an Interdependent World

The AAC&U (2007) *College Learning for the New Global Century* report as well as several studies of engineering – Boeing and RPI's *The Global Engineer* (Boeing, 1997), NAE's *Engineer of 2020* (2005), Purdue Future Engineer (Jamieson, 2007), *The 21st-Century Engineer* (Galloway, 2007), *Engineering for a Changing World* (Duderstadt, 2008) and *Creating a Culture for Scholarly and Systematic Innovation in Engineering Education: Ensuring U.S. engineering has the right people with the right talent for a global society* (Jamieson & Lohmann, 2009) – have begun to articulate the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind that are needed for students to perform satisfactorily in an interdependent world.

The AAC&U *College Learning for the New Global Century* study included the results of an employer survey conducted by Peter D. Hart and Associates (2006). Several of the top six outcomes reported by business respondents emphasize interdependence as show in Table 1.

Table 1. Proportion Of Employers Who Say Colleges And Universities Should Place More Emphasis Than They Do Today On Selected Learning Outcomes

Selected Learning Outcomes	%
Concepts and new developments in science and technology	82
Teamwork skills and the ability to collaborate with others in diverse group settings	76
The ability to apply knowledge and skills to real-world settings through internships or other hands-on experiences	73
The ability to effectively communicate orally and in writing	73
Critical thinking and analytical reasoning skills	73
Global issues and developments and their implications for the future	72

The *Desired Attributes of Global Engineer*[1] list is especially interesting and insightful considering that it was crafted more than ten years ago. Many of the desired attributes (out of thirteen) emphasize interdependence:

- A multidisciplinary, systems perspective, along with a product focus
- A basic understanding of the context in which engineering is practiced, including:
    - Customer and societal needs and concerns
    - Economics and finance
    - The environment and its protection
    - The history of technology and society
- An awareness of the boundaries of one's knowledge, along with an appreciation for other areas of knowledge and their interrelatedness with one's own expertise
- An awareness of and strong appreciation for other cultures and their diversity, their distinctiveness, and their inherent value
- A strong commitment to team work, including extensive experience with and understanding of team dynamics
- Good communication skills, including written, verbal, graphic, and listening
- High ethical standards (honesty, sense of personal and social responsibility, fairness, etc)
- An ability to think both critically and creatively, in both independent and cooperative modes
- Flexibility: the ability and willingness to adapt to rapid and/or major change
- Curiosity and the accompanying drive to learn continuously throughout one's career
- An ability to impart knowledge to others

[1] A Manifesto for Global Engineering Education, Summary Report of the ***Engineering Futures Conference***, January 22-23, 1997. The Boeing Company & Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

The Carnegie Preparation for the Professions project provides several interesting parallels to work on cooperation and civic engagement. Sullivan (2005) in his overview of professionalism in America highlights the problem of negative interdependence (p. 170) and advocates a shift of thinking toward making interdependence work through civic professionalism. Sullivan's proposed framework for renewing professional education is through three apprenticeships – the head, the hand, and the heart. The first apprenticeship, the head, focuses on intellectual or cognitive development. The second, the hand, focuses on the tacit knowledge and skills practiced by competent practitioners. The third, the heart, is focused on the values and attitudes shared by the professional community.

Engineering education stresses the first apprenticeship (intellectual development), places a little emphasis on the second (skill development), and is silent or at least not too explicit about the third apprenticeship (the heart). The third apprenticeship, which embodies what it means to be an engineer, that is the habits of mind and the modes of thinking, is crucial for preparing the 21st Century engineer. Cooperative learning is an excellent way to increase the focus on "learning to be" as acknowledged in *Educating Engineers: Designing for the Future of the Field* (Sheppard, Macatangay, Colby & Sullivan, 2008).

Brown and Adler (2008) argue for a social view of learning where understanding is socially constructed. In contrast to the Cartesian view of learning (I think therefore I am) where knowledge is viewed as substance and pedagogy is seen as knowledge transfer, the social view of learning (we participate therefore we are) not only emphasizes "learning about" the subject matter but also "learning to be" a full participant in the field. They argue that "viewing learning as a process of joining a community of practice … allows new students to engage in "learning to be" even as they are mastering the content of the field." (p. 20) Furthermore, they claim that emphasizing "learning to be" encourages the practice of what John Dewey called "productive inquiry" – that is, seeking knowledge when it needed for addressing a pressing question or to accomplish a task.

Redish and Smith (2008) claim that we must look beyond content in the skill development for engineers, and argue that integrated content-assessment-pedagogy design approaches and active and cooperative learning are essential.

State of Cooperative Learning for Preparing Students for an Interdependent World

Cooperative learning is now embraced my many engineering faculty and its use is increasing by faculty at large as indicated by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute Survey of Faculty as shown in Table 1 (DeAngelo and others, 2009).

Table 1. The American College Teacher: National Norms for 2007-2008

Methods Used in "All" or "Most" Classes	All Faculty 2005 - %	All Faculty 2008 - %	Assistant – 2008 - %
Cooperative Learning	48	59	66
Group Projects	33	36	61
Grading on a curve	19	17	14

Term/research papers	35	44	47

Fairweather (2008) argues in his summary report on the Board of Science Education Workshop, Evidence on Promising Practices in Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education, "… although faculty in STEM disciplines vary substantially on a broad array of attitudinal and behavioral measures (Fairweather & Paulson, 2008) careful reviews of the substantial literature on college teaching and learning suggest that the pedagogical strategies most effective in enhancing student learning outcomes are not discipline dependent (Pascarella and Terenzini, 2005). Instead, active and collaborative instruction coupled with various means to encourage student engagement invariably lead to better student learning outcomes irrespective of academic discipline (Kuh et al., 2005, 2007). The assumption that pedagogical effectiveness is disciplinary-specific can result in "reinventing the wheel," proving yet again that pedagogies engaging students lead to better learning outcomes (p. 4-5)."

Seely Brown (2004) has great hope for social software tools and hopes we can "transform the internet into the platform of life-long learning and social construction, so that we can understand story telling and knowledge sharing." He also emphasizes the ability to **listen with humility**, which he argues that "This skill underlies the art of collaboration and is increasingly important as we interact with partners all over the globe. But it also underlies the art of innovation, listening not only to your customers but also to the world at large" and the **ability to see –** "If you want to excel in innovation, especially socially responsible innovation, then learn how to look around with unbiased eyes." (Brown, 2005).

Continual learning, flexibility and adaptability are paramount among the skills that are essential for functioning in an interdependent world. Seely Brown's emphasis on "listening with humility" is also central. Purposeful and thoughtfully structured cooperative learning groups can provide many opportunities for students to observe, model, learn, refine and practice essential skills for functioning in an interdependent world.

Conclusion

In closing, I return to 1962 and President John Kennedy's Global Declaration of Interdependence and his famous "moon" speech. A few months later, June 10, 1963, President Kennedy gave the commencement address at American University, in which he stated:

> "If we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity."

We did, of course, go to the moon, but we still have lots of work to do to embrace global interdependence and to "make the world safe for diversity." Harlan Cleveland (2002) argues that "the required solvent for civilization is respect for differences. The art is to *be different together* … Civilization will be built by cooperation and compassion, in a social climate in which people of different groups can deal with each other in ways that respect their cultural differences." (p. 91). Finally, complexity theorist, Scott Page (2007) provides detailed support for the claim, "Diverse perspectives and tools enable collections of people to find more and better solutions and contribute to overall productivity" (p. 13).

References

Allen, D. E., Duch, B. E., & Groh, S. E. 1996. The power of problem-based learning in teaching introductory science courses. In Wilkerson, LuAnn & Gijselaers, Wim H. (Eds.) Bringing problem-based learning to higher education: Theory and practice. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning. San Francisco*: Jossey-Bass.

Axelrod, R., & Cohen, M. D. 2001. *Harnessing complexity: Organizational implications of a scientific frontier.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Beichner, R. J., Saul, J. M., Allain, R. J., Deardorff, D. L., & Abbot, D. S. 2000. Introduction to SCALE-UP : Student-Centered Activities for Large Enrollment University Physics. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Engineering Education, St. Louis.

Bennis, W.G. and Slater, P.E. 1968. *The temporary society*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boeing. 1997. A Manifesto for Global Engineering Education, Summary Report of the ***Engineering Futures Conference***, January 22-23, 1997. The Boeing Company & Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Brown, John Seely. 2004. Commencement Speech. Claremont Graduate University. May 15, 2004. http://www.johnseelybrown.com/CGU.pdf (accessed 9-9-08)

Brown, John Seely. 2005. Commencement Speech. University of Michigan. May 30, 2005. http://www.johnseelybrown.com/UM05.pdf (accessed 9-9-08).

Brown, John Seely. 2008. Learning 2.0: The big picture. http://www.johnseelybrown.com/learning2.pdf (accessed 9-10-08)

Brown, John Seely & Adler, Richard P. 2008. Minds on fire: Open education, the long tail, and learning 2.0. *Educause Review, 43*(1), 17-32.

Cleveland, Harlan. 2002. *Nobody in charge: Essays on the future of leadership*, Jossey-Bass.

Clinton, William J. 2000. Living in an interdependent world. *Los Angeles Times*, January 13, 2000.

Cohen, Don & Prusak, Laurence. 2001. *In good company: How social capital makes organizations work.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

DeAngelo, L., Hurtado, S., Pryor, J.H., Kelly, K.R., and Santos, J.L. 2009. *The American college teacher: National norms for the 2007-2008 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Deutsch, Morton. 1949a. A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations*, 2, 129-152.

Deutsch, M. 1949b. An experimental study of the effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. *Human Relations*, 2, 199-231.

Deutsch, M. 1962. Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In M.R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation* (pp. 275-319). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dori, Y. J., & Belcher, J. 2005. How Does Technology-Enabled Active Learning Affect Undergraduate Students' Understanding of Electromagnetism Concepts? *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, 14(2), 243-279.

Dori, Y. J., Belcher, J., Bessette, M., Danzinger, M., McKinney, A., Hult, E. 2003. Technology for Active Learning. *Materials Today*, 6(12), 44-49.

Duch, B. J., Groh, S. E., & Allen, D. E. 2001. *The Power of Problem-Based Learning: A Practical "How To" for Teaching Undergraduate Courses in Any Discipline*. Sterling Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

Duderstadt, James. 2008. *Engineering for a Changing World A Roadmap to the Future of Engineering Practice, Research, and Education.* Ann Arbor, MI: The Millennium Project. http://milproj.dc.umich.edu/

Fairweather, J. "Linking Evidence and Promising Practices in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Undergraduate Education: A Status Report." Commissioned Paper for the Board of Science Education Workshop, Evidence on Promising Practices in Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education. Retrieved December 12, 2008, from http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/PP_Commissioned_Papers.html

Fairweather, J., and Paulson, K. 2008. The Evolution of Scientific Fields in American Universities: Disciplinary Differences, Institutional Isomorphism. In J. Valimaa and O. Ylijoki (eds.). *Cultural perspectives in higher education* (pp, 197-212). Dordrecht: Springer.

Felder, R. M. 1995. A Longitudinal Study of Engineering Student Performance and Retention. IV. Instructional Methods and Student Responses to Them. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 84(4), 361-367.

Friedman, Thomas. 2007. *The World is Flat, Release 3.0*. New York: Picador.

Galloway, P. D. 2007. *The 21st-Century Engineer: A Proposal for Engineering Education Reform.* American Society for Civil Engineering.

Jamieson, L. 2007. Experiencing engineering. Main Plenary. ASEE Annual Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii. http://www.asee.org/conferences/annual/2007/Highlights.cfm#main (accessed December 7, 2007).

Jamieson, L.H. & Lohmann, J.R. 2009. *Creating a Culture for Scholarly and Systematic Innovation in Engineering Education: Ensuring U.S. engineering has the right people with the right talent for a global society*. Washington, DC: American Society for Engineering Education.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T. 2005. New developments in social interdependence theory. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 131*(4), 285-360.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. 1991. *Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity*. ASHE-ERIC Reports on Education, 30(4).

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. 1998. Cooperative Learning Returns to College: What Evidence is there that it Works? *Change*, 30(4), 26-35.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. 2006. *Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom* (3rd ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. 2007. The State Of Cooperative Learning In Postsecondary And Professional Settings. *Educational Psychology Review*, 19(1), 15-29.

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J., Bridges, B., & Kayek, J. 2007. *Piecing together the student success puzzle: Research, propositions, and recommendations*. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J., & Witt, E. 2005. *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lynn, L., & Salzman, H. 2006. Collaborative Advantage: New Horizons for a Flat World. *Issues in Science and Technology*, Winter 22(2), 74-82.
*www.nsf.gov/attachments/105652/public/**Collaborative-Advantage**-1205.pdf* (accessed 9-9-08)

Lynn, L., & Salzman, H. 2007. The Real Global Technology Challenge. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 39(4), 8-13.

MacGregor, J., Cooper, J., Smith, K, and Robinson, P. (Eds.) 2000. Strategies for Energizing Large Classes: From Small Groups to Learning Communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 81*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, J., & Page, S. E. 2007. *Complex adaptive systems: An Introduction to Computational Models of Social Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

McDonough, W. and Braungart, M. 2002. *Cradle to cradle: Remaking the way we make things.* New York: North Point Press.

Millis, B. J., & Cottell, P. G. 1997. *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty*. Phoenix: Oryx Press

National Academy of Engineering. 2005. *Educating the engineer of 2020: Adapting engineering education to the new century*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Page, S. E. 2007. *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, teams, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Page, S.E. 2009. *Understanding complexity*. The Great Courses. Chantilly, VA: The Teaching Company.

Pascarella, E., and Terenzini, P. 2005. *How college affects students: A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

PBS American Experience. 2008. Apollo 8. http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/moon/peopleevents/e_earthrise.html (accessed 9-9-08)

Peter D. Hart Research Associates. 2006. *Report of Findings Based on Focus Groups among Business Executives.* Washington, DC: Peter D. Hart Research Associates
.

Prince, M. 2004. Does Active Learning Work? A Review of the Research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *93* (3), 223-231.

Redish, E. F., & Smith, K.A. 2008. Looking Beyond Content: Skill Development for Engineers. *Journal of Engineering Education* Special Issue, 97(2), 295-307.

Sheppard, Sheri D., Macatangay, Kelly, Colby, Anne and Sullivan, William M. 2008. *Educating Engineers: Designing for the Future of the Field*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, K. A. 1995. Cooperative Learning: Effective Teamwork for Engineering Classrooms. IEEE Education Society/ASEE Electrical Engineering Division Newsletter, March, pp. 1-6.

Smith, K.A., Cooperative learning: Making "groupwork" work. 1996. In C. Bonwell & T. Sutherlund, Eds., Active learning: Lessons from practice and emerging issues. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning 67*, pp. 71-82, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, K. A. 1998. Grading Cooperative Projects. In B. Anderson & B.W. Speck, Eds., Changing the Way We Grade Student Performance: Classroom Assessment and the New Learning Paradigm. New Directions for Teaching and Learning (pp. 78, 59-67). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, K. A., Cox, M., & Douglas, T. C. 2009. Supportive Teaching and Learning Strategies in STEM Education. In Baldwin, R. (Ed.), Improving the Climate for Undergraduate Teaching and Learning in STEM Fields, *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 117*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, K. A., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. 1981a. The use of cooperative learning groups in engineering education. In L.P. Grayson and J.M. Biedenbach (Eds.), *Proceedings Eleventh Annual Frontiers in Education Conference*, Rapid City, SD, Washington: IEEE/ASEE, pp. 26-32.

Smith, K. A., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. 1981b. Structuring Learning Goals to Meet the Goals of Engineering Education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 72(3), 221-226.

Smith, K. A., Sheppard, S. D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. 2005. Pedagogies of Engagement: Classroom-Based Practices. *Journal of Engineering Education* Special Issue on the State of the Art and Practice of Engineering Education Research, 94(1), 87-102.

Sullivan, William M. 2005. *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*, 2nd edition. Stanford, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.