

PAPER

Reciprocal Kit-Build Concept Map: An Approach for Encouraging Pair Discussion to Share Each Other's Understanding

Warunya WUNNASRI^{†a)}, Jaruwat PAILAI[†], *Nonmembers*, Yusuke HAYASHI[†],
and Tsukasa HIRASHIMA[†], *Members*

SUMMARY Collaborative learning is an active teaching and learning strategy, in which learners who give each other elaborated explanations can learn most. However, it is difficult for learners to explain their own understanding elaborately in collaborative learning. In this study, we propose a collaborative use of a Kit-Build concept map (KB map) called “Reciprocal KB map”. In a Reciprocal KB map for a pair discussion, at first, the two participants make their own concept maps expressing their comprehension. Then, they exchange the components of their maps and request each other to reconstruct their maps by using the components. The differences between the original map and the reconstructed map are diagnosed automatically as an advantage of the KB map. Reciprocal KB map is expected to encourage pair discussion to recognize the understanding of each other and to create an effective discussion. In an experiment reported in this paper, Reciprocal KB map was used for supporting a pair discussion and was compared with a pair discussion which was supported by a traditional concept map. Nineteen pairs of university students were requested to use the traditional concept map in their discussion, while 20 pairs of university students used Reciprocal KB map for discussing the same topic. The results of the experiment were analyzed using three metrics: a discussion score, a similarity score, and questionnaires. The discussion score, which investigates the value of talk in discussion, demonstrates that Reciprocal KB map can promote more effective discussion between the partners compared to the traditional concept map. The similarity score, which evaluates the similarity of the concept maps, demonstrates that Reciprocal KB map can encourage the pair of partners to understand each other better compared to the traditional concept map. Last, the questionnaires illustrate that Reciprocal KB map can support the pair of partners to collaborate in the discussion smoothly and that the participants accepted this method for sharing their understanding with each other. These results suggest that Reciprocal KB map is a promising approach for encouraging pairs of partners to understand each other and to promote the effective discussions.

key words: collaborative learning, pair discussion, Kit-Build concept map, shared understanding

1. Introduction

Collaborative learning is an active teaching and learning strategy, which has been utilized in elementary, secondary, and higher education. It can contribute many advantages including improvement of interpersonal skill, development of critical thinking, problem solving, and content mastery etc. Various studies can be used to confirm that such collaborative learning is beneficial [1]–[3]. Therefore, the approach attracts many educators to utilize collaborative strategy in their classes and develop computer support system for in-

creasing learning achievement. Discussion is also one of the collaborative techniques for communicating and sharing knowledge. Nunan [4] noted that “A good give-and-take discussion can produce unmatched learning experiences as students articulate their ideas, respond to their classmates’ points, and develop skills in evaluating the evidence of their own and others’ positions.” This demonstrates that discussion can support people to improve their skills. After reviewing several studies, Slavin [5] concluded that “students who give each other elaborated explanations are students who learn most in cooperative learning.”

Nevertheless, it is not common for a learner to give an explanation in an actual class. In Mercer’s studies, he categorized talk in classroom discussion into three types, namely, exploratory talk, cumulative talk, and disputative talk [6]. He claimed that exploratory talk reveals the reasoning which is valuable for discussion. In addition to Mercer’s research, the value of exploratory talk also was confirmed, in terms of its ability to facilitate reasoning in social contexts and to lead to the generation of new knowledge and understanding [7]–[13]. However, from Mercer’s observations [6], [9], the exploratory talk is rare in classroom discussion.

The Kit-Build concept map (KB map) is a framework to realize automatic concept map assessment [14], [15]. Instant and automatic assessment of a learner-build concept map, realized in this framework, is referred to as the “Kit-Build method” (KB method). In this framework, the set of concept map’s components which is called “kit” are made by decomposing a concept map that is built by a responsible teacher. This map is called the “teacher-build map”. The responsible teacher is requested to build the teacher-build map as a criterion to assess a learner’s comprehension for a specific topic or teaching. Then, a learner is requested to build a concept map to express his/her comprehension on the topic. Because all components of the learner-build map are the same as the teacher-build map, an automatic assessment of a learner-build map is realized by comparing the learner-build map with the teacher-build map. KB map and assessment methods have already been practically used in classrooms in various schools, for example, in science learning in elementary schools [16], [17], geography in junior high schools [18], the learning of English as a second language [19], social science and computer science in university [20], [21]. Even KB map assessment method is an automatic assessment, it was examined the validity for eval-

Manuscript received December 28, 2017.

Manuscript revised April 26, 2018.

Manuscript publicized May 29, 2018.

[†]The authors are with Graduate School of Engineering, Hiroshima University, Higashihiroshima-shi, 739–8527 Japan.

a) E-mail: warunya@lel.hiroshima-u.ac.jp

DOI: 10.1587/transinf.2017EDP7420

uating learners' understanding [22], [23]. This investigation can suggest that KB map can support learners to express their understanding suitably.

This paper proposes a collaborative use of KB map called "Reciprocal KB map", which aims to encourage sharing understanding of each other in pair discussion. In Reciprocal KB map for a pair discussion, at first, the two participants of the pair discussion make their own concept maps expressing their comprehension each other. Then, they exchange the components of their maps and request each other to reconstruct their maps by using the components. The differences between the original map and the reconstructed map are diagnosed automatically as an advantage of KB map. Reciprocal KB map is expected to encourage pair discussion to recognize the understanding of each other and to create an effective discussion. In this paper, the results of an experiment where a pair discussion with Reciprocal KB map were compared with a pair discussion with traditional concept map. The comparison is analyzed in three viewpoints following: a discussion score, a similarity map score and questionnaires.

2. Related Work

2.1 Types of Talk

The analysis of classroom talk has received much attention in recent years. According to Mercer's proposed three types of talk [6], as mentioned above each type of talk has a specific and different characteristic, and these can be created classroom discussion. The definition of exploratory talk reflects its positive aspects. The talk has to be constructed with each other's ideas, include joint consideration, give reasoning, and contribute to critical knowledge. This category of talk contributes to efficiency for learning and reasoning [8]. Cumulative talk can be constructed from a common knowledge by accumulation. It is not as valuable as exploratory talk, but it is still part of collaborative talk. Disputative talk is the least valuable for achieving good discussions. There is a lot of disagreement in such talk and the atmosphere becomes competitive rather than cooperative. The concept of these three types of talk is accepted widely. Many researchers have confirmed the value of exploratory talk for encouraging critical thinking, reasoning and problem posing skills [7]–[13]. However, in an actual class, it is rare to achieve exploratory talk from children in a discussion. Hence, one way to promote the quality of discussion is to focus on increasing the chance of reaching exploratory talk.

2.2 Collaborative Learning in the Classroom

In a collaborative knowledge-building process, a step where collaborators share others' understanding is very important [24]. We aim to apply KB map in the shared understanding step. Each collaborator has to adjust their perspectives and awareness of the others' understanding, even if they do

not agree with the others' thinking. To make a shared understanding, several collaborative learning approaches were investigated. Advantages of collaborative learning are proposed in many researches, including increased measures of achievement, higher-level reasoning, increased frequency of new ideas, and situational transfer [25]. Additionally, a theory proposed by Resta and Laferriere, maintained that the social context can enhance creativity and learning [26].

Concept map were proved that it can help learners to significantly reduce their learning cognitive load because the concept map assists in the integration of knowledge and facilitates learners in their independent learning and thinking [27]. Due to these characteristics, the concept map is used to organize and represent knowledge extensively. To make the concept map helps learners to aware of and reflect on their understanding and misunderstanding [28]. However, most of the concept mapping studies concentrated on construction concept map by individual. Several studies have shown that to use concept mapping as a group task could receive significant learning gains and the learning outcomes were related to the quality of student's interaction [29]. In study of Boxtel et al. [30], the collaborative concept mapping was used to provoke and support their physics discourse. They requested pairs of students to construct concept map by using their provided concept list. The results showed that the collaborative concept mapping task could assist students in taking more responsibility for their own learning during the course and it encouraged students to use language for thinking and reasoning together.

Hence, to encourage the quality of discussion among collaborators, we focus on the collaborative approaches that emphasize shared understanding. Reciprocal teaching [31] is an approach which deals with a summarization of understanding. This collaborative approach requests collaborators to participate in four roles that contain summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting. These four roles really suit the discussion situation which aims to share understanding. Summarizing is a way to help collaborators to reconsider their understanding using for example, short-notes, mind maps, and concept maps. Hence, we can properly apply summarization with KB map because it uses the concept map as a representation of understanding. After summarizing, the next role of collaborators is questioning. This role requires collaborators to think about the topic and forces them to identify areas where they are confused and require clarification. Once collaborators have questions in their mind, the role of clarifying encourages them to point out confusing areas and to clarify these. The predicting role is a more advanced stage for contributing collaborative knowledge. The collaborators have to send out their idea regarding what can happen next in the comprehension that they have just learned. They have to utilize their imagination to think ahead. However, this last role, predicting, is not contained in our current approach, the aim of which is to encourage shared understanding. However, it is necessary for the next step which involves producing a creative idea from collaborative knowledge.

2.3 Kit-Build Concept Map and its Practical Use

The KB map framework is one of the automatic concept map assessment methods that use a teacher-build map to compare with the learner-build map by using exact matching at the propositional level. It is utilized in the form of a learning task or exercise for checking learners' comprehension of a topic that they have already learned. The task of the KB map is separated into two subtasks. The first is the segmentation task where a teacher is requested to prepare the teacher-build map, which is an expression of an eligible comprehension of the topic for the teacher. An example of the teacher-build map is illustrated in Fig. 1. After submitting the teacher-build map to the server, the teacher-build map is extracted to be the kit that contains a list of concepts and relationships from the teacher-build map. The kit from the teacher-build map in Fig. 1 is shown in Fig. 2. Moreover, this kit is provided for helping learners to reduce their cognitive load more than the traditional concept map, where they must create all components by themselves. Using the kit, the learners are not requested to create any component. They only have to recognize the provided components and connect them.

The second task is called the structuring task. Learners are given the learning task of reconstructing a concept map by using the kit, creating a map which is referred to as the learner-build map (Fig. 3). After the learner-build maps are uploaded to the server, the KB map will evaluate learner-build maps by exactly matching each learner's proposition with the teacher-build map's proposition. For example, the relationship between the concepts "Sugar" and "Sucrose" is checked. If the relationship is identified as "related to," the score for this learner-build map will increase by one point. In the case of the concepts "Sucrose" and "Glucose," if the learner connected them by using the relationship "is changed to," this does not exist in the teacher-build map. Following the teacher-build map, the relationship of this proposition should be "is made up of". Therefore, this proposition is not awarded any point from the system. This corresponds to the scoring by propositional level exact matching method. This method makes the KB map different from the manual concept map assessment methods (the manual methods) which allow learners to create their own linking words, preventing the learner-build map from being straightforwardly compared with the criteria map. The manual methods require time for considering the meaning of each proposition carefully. After checking the connections of the learner-build maps by the propositional level exact matching, the system will generate a score in a percentage format which is calculated via the number of correct links of learner-build map divided by the number of links of teacher-build map. For the example, the learner-build map in Fig. 4 will be given 25 percent score from one correct link "relate to" divided by four links from the teacher-build map.

Moreover, KB map also can generate the diagnosis results automatically. In Fig. 4, the comparison map is gen-




Fig. 1 Teacher-build map




Fig. 2 Kit




Fig. 3 Learner-build map




Fig. 4 Comparison map

erated by comparing the teacher-build map and the learner-build map. This map represents four types of link, which are same links, lacking links, excessive links, and leaving links. The same link, which is displayed as a double line is a link that exists in both teacher- and learner-build map. The lacking link, which is represented by a dashed line, is a link that exists in the teacher-build map but does not exist in learner-build map. The excessive link, which is shown as a solid line, is a link that occurs in learner-build map but does not occur in the teacher-build map. Lastly, a solid line that is not connected to any concepts in the learner-build map is the leaving link. The instructor can investigate learners' misunderstanding individually through this comparison map. After error link analysis, that is, lacking links, excessive links, and leaving links, the instructor can teach learners about the content that learners have not understood completely. Through an experimental use of KB map in classes, it has been confirmed that teachers can use the diagnosis




Fig. 5 Comparison of procedure between usual KB map and Reciprocal KB map.

results from KB map to design their feedback in classes effectively [32].

3. Research Methodology

In line with the objective to show that KB map can be used to achieve a productive discussion, we designed the experimental procedure. Firstly, participants were required to summarize their understanding and represent it in the form of the concept map by using the provided components. In this experiment, 12 labeled concepts, which relate to a reading article, were provided for all participants. This method which provides a concept list to learners is a regular strategy for limiting the scope of content [33], [34]. Next, the participants were expected to formulate questions on the parts that they could not understand. Participants were then required to ask or find the answers to their questions during the pair discussion. Lastly, they had to think about the understanding that they got from asking questions and discussing. This experimental procedure was designed answer two research questions:

1) Could KB map be utilized for sharing understanding with each other?

2) What is the difference between discussions that use a traditional concept map and those that use Reciprocal KB map?

3.1 Reciprocal Kit-Build Concept Map

The different procedures between the usual KB map and Reciprocal KB map are shown in Fig. 5. In the usual KB map, a teacher constructs a concept map reflecting ideal understanding of a topic. This concept map is called teacher-build map, and then the system generates the kit by decomposing

the teacher-build map. The kit is provided for the learners and they are requested to reconstruct a concept map by using the kit. In the framework of KB map, because the reconstructed map is also composed of the same components with the original one, the reconstructed map is automatically diagnosed by comparing with the original map. The result of the comparison is also represented as a map and it is called comparison map. In the comparison map, the different parts between the two maps specify the different understanding between the teacher and learner, and then, the same parts specify the same understanding between the teacher and learner. Based on the results the teacher gives feedback to the learners.

On the contrary, in Reciprocal KB map, two equal participants summarize their understanding in the form of the concept map at first, and then, their maps are decomposed to generate kits. Therefore, two maps and two kits are generated. The kit of a participant is provided for another participant (partner), and then, the partner is requested to reconstruct a map by using the kit. Therefore, two original maps and two reconstructed maps are generated. In the diagnosis phase, two comparison maps are generated. The participants are promoted to discuss their same/different understanding based on the two comparison maps that are provided by the KB map system.

3.2 Participants

The participants in this study were university students who were categorized by language into three groups. These three groups contained 16 international students who possessed a good level of English, 14 Japanese students and 48 Thai students. The total number of participants was 78 students who were volunteers from engineering fields. They were given

introductory training in concept maps before participating in the experiment. From these 78 students, they were divided into two groups as the Normal Concept Map (NCM) group to serve as a control group and the Reciprocal Kit-Build (RKB) group as the experimental group. The group division is shown in Table 1.

Three graduate students, who were familiar with the use of the concept map and understood the content of the experiment material well, were assigned as raters. They were responsible for scoring discussion and concept maps in their own expert/native language. Hence, one rater was assigned to scoring the concept map and analyzing the conversations of the learners for each of the language groups of English, Japanese, and Thai. The procedure of the concept map assessment method was explained to the raters and they were required to study the procedures carefully before scoring the discussion and concept maps. In this study, the English article “Hurricane” [35], which uses common explanatory words, was chosen for the learning process so the participants could understand it without bias. An English concept list, which contained 12 concepts, was prepared. These were translated into Japanese and Thai by native speakers that could use and understand English well.

Table 1 Numbers of student pairs in the experiment.

	NCM group	RKB group
International students	4 pairs	4 pairs
Japanese students	3 pairs	4 pairs
Thai students	12 pairs	12 pairs
Total of pairs	19 pairs	20 pairs

3.3 Experimental Procedure

The concept mapping tool was developed based on an original KB map and new functions were added for supporting the pair discussion. An overview of the experimental procedure is illustrated in Fig. 6.

The experimental procedure of the NCM group

The participants received the paper based article and they were allowed to underline and take short notes on the paper. After reading for 10 minutes, they had to construct the concept map by using the provided concept list in 10 minutes. In this step, they could freely create the linking words for specifying meanings of the relationships. The concept map constructed in this step is called “Before Self-Comprehension Map” (BSC map) for the individual, and “Before Partner’s Comprehension Map” (BPC map) for the partner’s concept map. After the participants had uploaded the concept map to the server, they were paired with other students randomly. They were then requested to discuss their understandings between each other, including why they thought differently. The participants in the NCM group were given 20 minutes for discussion which they could terminate at any point.

After the discussion step, they had to construct a concept map from the concept list in 10 minutes, but this time they had to construct the concept map following their understanding after the discussion. The concept map in this step is called “After Self-Comprehension Map” (ASC map) for the individual and “After Partner’s Comprehension Map” (APC map) for the partner’s concept map. When they had




Fig. 6 Overview of the experimental procedure.

completed the second concept map, they were requested to construct the last concept map in 10 minutes, which had to be constructed following their partner's understanding from their viewpoint that they had obtained from the discussion task. This map is called "Inference Partner's Comprehension Map" (IPC map). After they finished the last concept map, they were asked to complete the questionnaire.

The experimental procedure of the RKB group

The experimental conditions for RKB group were the same as the NCM group. The participants had 10 minutes for reading the article and they could also write on or underline the paper. They had to construct the concept map by using the provided concept list and they could create the label for each relationship freely in 10 minutes, in the same way as the NCM group. After they completed their BSC Map, they were paired with other students randomly and their concept maps were decomposed to form the "kit", which contained a list of concepts and a list of relation lines with linking words. After the kits were generated, these decomposed components were sent to the partner of the kit's owner. The participants had to use the kit to construct the concept map following their understanding in 10 minutes. Then the participants had 10 minutes to discuss with their partner any points where they had the same or different understandings, as well as the reason for any different understandings. In this discussion, they were provided an overlay of each other's maps for facilitating their discussion. The comparison map can represent three types of error link, namely, a lacking link, an excessive link, and a leaving link.

As with the NCM group, after the discussion, they had to construct the ASC Map and the IPC Map, for which they were allowed only 10 minutes for each step. They then had to also complete the questionnaire.

3.4 Preparation Before Analysis

To evaluate the similarity between two concept maps, the relational concept map assessment method (the relational scoring) is applied. This is a well-known manual concept map assessment method was claimed to have the highest reliability compared to the other five manual methods among those considered reliable [36]. This method scores the concept map by checking the possible relationship between each proposition, the suitability of the label between concepts of the proposition and the compatibility between label and the direction of the arrow or hierarchy between two concept maps. Hence, it can illustrate the similarity between two maps [34]. The raters awarded scores between zero and three points for each proposition based on the suitability of the meaning of the proposition. The relational scoring is proper to use to compare how the same/different meaning of each proposition between two concept maps. Because the procedure of this scoring method pays the attention of scoring to the meaning of linking words in propositional level, the relational scoring was selected to check the similarity of concept map of two collaborators in this study.

Table 2 The average relational scores between the Before Self-Comprehension and Before Partner's Comprehension maps

Language of Group	The number of participants	Average score	Variance
English students	16	31.72	12.97
Japanese students	14	40.04	13.97
Thai students	48	30.87	21.23

Note: The differences between three language groups in the scores was analyzed by using ANOVA single factor, and the result was not significant (p -values = 0.27).

In this experiment, we gathered the results of three groups of participants, that is, English used, Japanese used and Thai used group. In order to confirm that the understanding before discussion of each group was not much different, the relational scores that were calculated as the similarity between the BSC and BPC map of each participant. The result of ANOVA showed that their differences were not statistically significant. So, we combined the three groups together in the analysis of the experiment. The average of relational scores of each language groups were represented in Table 2. Based on this result, we combined the three groups together in the analysis of the experiment.

3.5 Questionnaires

The questionnaires were prepared for the NCM and RKB groups separately to examine their opinion about the discussion using the traditional concept mapping and Reciprocal KB map. These questionnaires also asked the participants about their activity during the discussion. These questions request the participants to evaluate both themselves and their partner. Lastly, the participants had to conclude their discussion by identifying where their understanding was the same and where it was different. If they had a different understanding, they had to give the reason, based on their discussion.

4. Experimental Results

4.1 Discussion Score

The experimental results show that discussions with the traditional concept map and with Reciprocal KB map are different. The discussion score was evaluated from the BSC map and the content of discussions from each pair of participants. The raters had to match each proposition with the conversation in the discussion, and then categorize that conversation to each type of talk [6] and the part of actual conversations in the experiment is displayed in Fig. 7. The raters had to consider each proposition of the concept maps and give a discussion score for each type of talk on the mentioned proposition. The raters counted a conversation as exploratory talk when the discussed cooperatively and shared the reasons for their statement/answer. For the cumulative talk, the raters counted conversations where the participants tried to share their understanding but they did not give a reasonable answer. Conversations where the participants just




Fig. 7 Conversations in each type of talk on the participant's proposition.




Fig. 8 The results of discussion score.

made their own decisions or which led to more competition than cooperation, were classified as disputative talk. Lastly, talk where the participants only read to their partner were scored as "Non-Contributed Discussion Talk." For these, the participants did not receive any critical discussion points.

Following these criteria, the results of the discussion score for each group are illustrated in Fig. 8. These pie graphs show the difference between the ratios of each type of talk from each participant group. In the experiment, most of the participants from the NCM group read their concept map for discussion. Their partner just checked the same and different parts and then asked a few questions and finished the discussion. Therefore, this process can produce all types of talk, but the Non-Contributed Discussion talk was more dominant than the others. This situation shows that the concept map can help participants to represent and organize their understanding, but it requires more features to encour-

age the participants to think about their propositions more deeply than just reading them. On the other hand, Reciprocal KB map requests that the participants reconstruct the kit of their partner, so they have to think deeply about their partner's understanding. Even if they cannot connect their partner's kit well, they can ask questions of their partner during the discussion. Because they have questions in their mind during the connecting of the kit, their questions have an inquiring characteristic regarding the form of the kit such as "Why did you connect like this? Why can I not connect your proposition? How do you think about this proposition?" In addition, during the connection of the kit, participants can arrange their questions in order to clarify their confusion.

In discussion phase, the comparison maps were displayed to the participants in RKB group. They could find the same- and different- understanding by using the comparison maps. Questions or explanations for the different

Table 3 The average relational score of each type of concept map

Average Score	NCM Group	RKB Group
Before Self-Comprehension map <i>and</i> Before Partner's Comprehension map	29.39 (S.D.=16.69)	35.83 (S.D.=20.30)
After Self-Comprehension map <i>and</i> After Partner's Comprehension map	49.04 (S.D.=32.08)	61.85 (S.D.=26.56)
Inference Partner's Comprehension map <i>and</i> After Partner's Comprehension map	46.57 (S.D.=29.52)	61.15 (S.D.=22.16)

+ Marginal difference between NCM and RKB groups (p-value < 0.1)

* Significant difference between NCM and RKB groups (p-value < 0.05)

parts in the comparison maps satisfy the conditions of exploratory talk. When the participants tried to explain their own conceptions, they gain a greater conceptual clarity for themselves [37]. Then, when participants had confidence about the different parts, and did not agree to change them, mentions about the different parts satisfy disputative talk. In contrast, in NCM group, participants were required to find such different parts from their concept maps by themselves. Regarding to cumulative talk, it appears when the participants are easily agree their partner's understanding and did not request the reason. In RKB group, because the same understanding parts were clearly displayed on the comparison maps so they did not much request to confirm these agreement parts. We think these are reasons that explanatory talk and disputative talk were more promoted and cumulative talk was not promoted in RKB group.

In terms of the number of proposition that the participants chose to discuss, the participants in the NCM group mentioned their proposition 255 times which was 34.45% (S.D. = 20.13) of the total number of propositions and they used an average discussion time of 6 minutes (S.D. = 3.30) from the 20 minutes provided, with many silent gaps during the discussion. The participants in RKB group brought up their proposition for discussion 347 times, which was 41.53% (S.D. = 16.18) of the total number of propositions and they used an average time of 8.7 minutes (S.D. = 1.59) from the ten minutes provided. This evidence suggests that Reciprocal KB can support the participants in discussing the topic more smooth compared to the traditional concept map because during the construction of their partner's kit, they had to think about the kit and their partner's understanding before formulating questions in their mind.

This behavior affected their discussion. The participants in the RKB group gave the questions to their partner regularly. They asked about the reason for their partner's proposition construction and answers were given in the form of an explanation. On the other hand, the participants in the NCM group tried to read the propositions to each other and they assumed that their partner could understand them. Since they used a short amount of time for finding their interesting proposition, it was rather difficult for them to achieve a smooth discussion. In addition, there were a lot of different propositions which they could not notice and they could not articulate the reasons for different understandings between each other.

From the different types of talk that the participants from the NCM and RKB groups produced, we can con-

clude that the Reciprocal KB map can encourage the participants to produce more exploratory talk, which is effective for discussion, compared to the use of the traditional concept map. This result corresponds to the second research question which was related to investigating the differences between discussions that used the traditional concept map and discussions that used Reciprocal KB map.

4.2 Similarity Map Score

During the experiment, the participants in the two groups were requested to construct the concept map three times. The first correspond to the BSC map, which represents their understanding before discussion. The second was the ASC map, which represents their understanding after discussion. The last map was the IPC map, which was constructed following the understanding gained from their partner. These three maps were paired and were scored by the relational scoring. The average score from each paired map and each group is represented in Table 3.

From the relational scoring, all participants in both the NCM and RKB groups had the same understanding after reading the article with no significant differences. After discussion, the participants in the RKB group could construct the same concept maps as their partner more than the participants in the NCM group, with this difference close to being statistical significant. This shows that the discussion can change some parts of their understanding to achieve a joint viewpoint. In addition, the participants in the RKB group constructed their IPC map to be the same as the APC map more effectively than the participants in the NCM group, with a statistically significant difference. These similarity map scores correspond to the first research question. This illustrates that Reciprocal KB map can encourage the participants to recognize their partner's understanding better than the traditional concept map. This ability will be a strong advantage for the next step of creating collaborative knowledge, as partners that can understand each other can better generate collaborative knowledge.

4.3 Results of the Questionnaires

Following describes each result.

Tools of discussion

In this experiment, two types of concept mapping tools were provided for participants. Questions in a questionnaire for a tool that a participant used are shown in Table 4. In the

Table 4 A part of the questionnaire regarding tools of discussion

No.	Statement	Group	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	I understand the article well.	NCM	19.15	46.81	25.53	8.51	0.00
		RKB	38.30	36.17	21.28	4.26	0.00
2	Building concept map that represents my understanding was easy.	NCM	17.02	44.68	23.40	14.89	0.00
		RKB	29.79	27.66	36.17	6.38	0.00
3	When I disagree or confused about my partner's understanding, I can request him/her to additionally explain that point clearly.	NCM	17.02	36.17	36.17	8.51	2.13
		RKB	31.91	29.79	31.91	6.38	0.00
4	During the discussion, (normal concept map <u>OR</u> comparison map) can support by guiding our discussion well.	NCM	29.79	38.30	25.53	6.38	0.00
		RKB	27.66	36.17	31.91	2.13	2.13
5	We can have a satisfying discussion about the same and different understanding on a topic by using (normal concept map <u>OR</u> Reciprocal Kit-Building).	NCM	34.04	36.17	23.40	6.38	0.00
		RKB	34.04	27.66	29.79	8.51	0.00
6	After the discussion, I can understand my partner's understanding well.	NCM	21.28	46.81	27.66	2.13	2.13
		RKB	27.66	42.55	27.66	2.13	0.00



results, the majority of participants in the both groups accepted the concept map (that is, normal concept map in NCM group and Reciprocal KB map in RKB group) as a useful tool to express their understanding and to promote their discussion. We could not find the difference between both maps as a way to express understanding.

In addition, from the open-ended question that requested them to share their opinion on this discussion method, most participants from NCM group noted that the concept map was a suitable tool for representing their understanding allowing them to further understand their partner's viewpoint. Some participants said it was harder to understand their partner's concept map compared to reading text and the improper propositions made them confused. It was also noted that the experimental process took a very long time.

The participants in the RKB group noted that Reciprocal KB map was a new thing for them. They stated that reconstructing the kit to concept map of their partner was fun and like playing a game, and that they could understand each other better from the discussion. Additionally, they stated that the 10 minutes provided time was not enough for the discussion. Some people found that it took a long time to create the concept map when they were requested to construct the ASC and IPC maps. However, these two maps were used only to confirm the assumptions in the experiment and are not required in the general application of the approach.

Collaborating during discussion

In the questionnaire, participants were also required to check the actions during the discussion of both themselves and their partner. A total of 31.25% of participants from the NCM group evaluated themselves and their partner in the same way as not breaking the interim silence by introducing a possible topic for consideration. This means they did not discuss a topic continuously. In contrast, most of the partici-

**Fig. 9** A part of the questionnaire about collaboration of NCM group.**Fig. 10** A part of the questionnaire about collaboration of RKB group.

pants from the RKB group identified that they and their partner tried to explain their understanding to each other clearly and tried to introduce their interesting or confusing topic as much as they could, but the time provided was not enough. The parts of results from self- and peer assessment questionnaire on collaboration during discussion is illustrated in Figs. 9 and 10 for the NCM and RKB groups, respectively. Moreover, in the part of the questionnaire which asks about identification of the same/different understanding, the participants from the NCM group recognized areas where they had same understanding as their partner but they had some confusion about where their understanding

differed. For example, the NCM group participants filled out the different understanding field in the questionnaire but their partner completed that topic in the same understanding field. Additionally, they could not give clear reasons for their different understandings. This situation may indicate that the participants were still confused after the discussion. In contrast, the RKB group participants could identify the same/different understanding and they could give reasons for this. In addition, the pairs of participants who changed their proposition on the map tried to explain the reason why they changed their understanding.

4.4 Summary of Experiment Results

From the experimental results, we can answer the two research questions posed in Sect. 3. The similarity score between the IPC and APC maps indicates that Reciprocal KB map can support the participants in understanding each other. Additionally, the difference between the ratios of each type of talk in the NCM and RKB groups can answer the second research question, related to the difference between discussions using the traditional concept map and Reciprocal KB map. The participants from the RKB group who had to reconstruct their partner's kit were encouraged to produce exploratory talk more than the participants from the NCM group. These advantages over the traditional concept map can contribute to generating high quality collaborative knowledge through better understanding of each other.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

Kit-Build concept map (KB map) is an automatic concept map assessment framework which is utilized in the form of a learning task or exercise for checking learners' comprehension of a topic that they have already learned. Usually, it is used for confirming understanding between a teacher and learners in a class and it has previously been investigated in terms of its ability to support learners in expressing their understanding. This research proposes the utilization of KB map with a collaborative approach for encouraging shared understanding in pair discussion. The experiment was designed to compare discussions using a traditional and Reciprocal KB concept map. The results are separated into three parts: (1) the discussion score, (2) the similarity map score, and (3) the questionnaire. For the similarity map score, the concept map of participants was evaluated for similarity using several viewpoints. The most important aspect is represented by the similarity between the IPC and APC map, which showed that the participants from the RKB group could recognize their partner's understanding better than the participants from the NCM group. This was because during reconstruction of the concept map using the provided components from Reciprocal KB map, the participants had to consider their partner's understanding more deeply than just reading the concept map or just checking the same/different understanding, as was the case for most participants from the NCM group. The similarity map score and the results

of the questionnaire correspond to the first research question. They indicate that the Reciprocal KB map can contribute to pair discussions for sharing understanding. Additionally, in the discussion score, the participants from the RKB group produced more exploratory talk, which is valuable for contributing to effective discussion, compared to the participants from the NCM group. Most of the participants in NCM group just read their concept map to check their understanding with their partner. Therefore, the discussion score answers the second research question and indicates that Reciprocal KB map is useful for encouraging pair discussion and producing the effective discussions which can contribute to creating high quality collaboration more effectively better than the traditional concept map. However, because the topic of discussion is guided by the kit, the creative discussion might be reduced. Evaluation of Reciprocal KB map from viewpoint of creativity is our important future work.

The results of this experiment confirm that the Reciprocal KB map can encourage collaborators to engage in high quality discussion and to share their understanding, the relation between the quality of discussion and the method by which they changed and shared their comprehension after discussing was not be investigated in this study. A deeper analysis of aspect is reserved for future work. Additionally, we will attempt to use Reciprocal KB map for practical application in a classroom, and to evaluate the products of discussion. The use of different topics and ages of collaborators is also an interesting focus for future work, in order to confirm the efficiency of Reciprocal KB map. In addition, to expand this research, Reciprocal KB map will be designed for supporting group discussion. After completing the supporting aspects for sharing understanding within pairs, we plan to promote collaborators to create creative discussion continuously. This next step of Reciprocal KB map will support its use in various discussion tasks.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 17H01839 and 15H02931.

References

- [1] E.F. Barkley, K.P. Cross, and C.H. Major, *Collaborative learning techniques: a handbook for college faculty*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 2005.
- [2] D.W. Johnson and R.T. Johnson, *Learning together and alone: cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning*, Allyn and Bacon, Massachusetts, 1999.
- [3] D.W. Johnson, R.T. Johnson, and K.A. Smith, "Cooperative learning returns to college: What evidence is there that it works?," *Change: the magazine of higher learning*, vol.30, no.4, pp.26–35, 1998.
- [4] N. David, *Collaborative Language Learning and Teaching*, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, New York, 1993.
- [5] R. Slavin, "Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol.21, no.1, pp.43–69, 1996.
- [6] N. Mercer, "The quality of talk in children's collaborative activity in

- the classroom," *Learning and Instruction*, vol.6, no.4, pp.359–377, 1996.
- [7] M. Barnes, "Cumulative and exploratory talk in a collaborative learning classroom," *Proc. of 22nd Conf. of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia*, pp.53–59, 1999.
 - [8] X. Haiyan, "“When the water flows, a channel is formed”: professional learning and practice innovation through district research lesson study in the context of China’s new curriculum reform," Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Leicester, 2015.
 - [9] N. Mercer, "Sociocultural discourse analysis: analysing classroom talk as a social mode of thinking," *J. Apply Linguistics*, vol.1, no.2, pp.137–168. 2004. DOI: 10.1558/japl.v1i2.137
 - [10] N. Mercer and L. Dawes, "The value of exploratory talk," *Exploring talk in school*, pp.55–71, 2008.
 - [11] S. Rojas-Drummod, V. Pérez, M. Vélez, L. Gómez, and A. Mendoza, "Talking for reasoning among Mexican primary school children," *Learning and instruction*, vol.13, no.6, pp.653–670, 2003.
 - [12] P. Webb and D.F. Treagust, "Using exploratory talk to enhance problem-solving and reasoning skills in grade-7 science classrooms," *Research in Science Education*, vol.36, no.4, pp.381–401, 2006.
 - [13] S. Knight and N. Mercer, "The role of exploratory talk in classroom search engine tasks," *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, vol.24, no.3, pp.303–319, 2015.
 - [14] T. Hirashima, K. Yamasaki, H. Fukuda, and H. Funaoi, "Kit-Build concept map for automatic diagnosis," *Proc. 15th of Artificial Intelligence in Education 2011, Auckland, New Zealand*, pp.466–468, 2011.
 - [15] T. Hirashima, K. Yamasaki, H. Fukuda, and H. Funaoi, "Framework of Kit-Build concept map for automatic diagnosis and its preliminary use," *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, vol.10, no.1, pp.1–21. 2015.
 - [16] K. Sugihara, T. Osada, S. Nakata, H. Funaoi, and T. Hirashima, "Experimental evaluation of Kit-Build concept map for science classes in an elementary school," *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computers in Education 2012, Singapore*, pp.17–24, 2012.
 - [17] K. Yoshida, K. Sugihara, Y. Nino, M. Shida, and T. Hirashima, "Practical use of Kit-Build concept map system for formative assessment of learners’ comprehension in a lecture," *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computers in Education 2013, Bali, Indonesia*, pp.906–915, 2013.
 - [18] T. Nomura, Y. Hayashi, Y.T. Suzuki, T. and T. Hirashima, "Knowledge propagation in practical use of Kit-Build concept map system in classroom group work for knowledge sharing," *Proc. Int. Conf. on Computers in Education Workshop 2014, Nara, Japan*, pp.463–472, 2014.
 - [19] M. Alkhateeb, Y. Hayashi, T. Rajab, and T. Hirashima, "Comparison between Kit-Build and Scratch-Build concept mapping methods in supporting EFL reading comprehension," *The Journal of Information and Systems in Education*, vol.14, no.1, pp.13–27, 2015.
 - [20] Y. Hayashi and T. Hirashima, "Kit-Build Concept Mapping for Being Aware of the Gap of Exchanged Information in Collaborative Reading of the Literature," *Proc. Int. Conf. on Human Interface and the Management of Information, Greece*, pp.31–41, 2014.
 - [21] Y. Hayashi and T. Hirashima, "Analysis of the Relationship Between Metacognitive Ability and Learning Activity with Kit-Build Concept Map," *Proc. Int. Conf. on Human Inter-face and the Management of Information, United States*, pp.304–312, 2015.
 - [22] W. Wunnasri, J. Pailai, Y. Hayashi, and T. Hirashima, "Reliability investigation of automatic assessment of learner-build concept map with Kit-Build method by comparing with manual methods," *Proc. 18th Int. Conf. on Artificial Intelligence in Education, Hubei, China*, pp.418–429, 2017.
 - [23] W. Wunnasri, J. Pailai, Y. Hayashi, and T. Hirashima, "Validity of Kit-Build Method for Assessment of Learner-Build Map by Comparing with Manual Methods," *IEICE Trans. Inf. & Syst.*, vol.E101-D, no.4, pp.1141–1150, 2018.
 - [24] G. Stahl, "A model of collaborative knowledge-building," *Proc. 4th Int. Conf. on the Learning Sciences*, pp.70–77, 2000.
 - [25] D. Mesch, D.W. Johnson, and R. Johnson, "Impact of positive interdependence and academic group contingencies on achievement," *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol.128, no.3, pp.345–352, 1988.
 - [26] P. Resta and T. Laferrière, "Technology in support of collaborative learning," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol.19, no.1, pp.65–83, 2007. doi:10.1007/s10648-007-9042-7
 - [27] M.L.M. Hu and M.H. Wu, "The effect of concept mapping on students’ cognitive load," *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education*, vol.10, no.2, pp.134–137, 2012.
 - [28] P.B. Horton, A.A. McConney, M. Gallo, A.L. Woods, G.J. Senn, and D Hamelin, "An investigation of the effectiveness of concept mapping as an instructional tool," *Science Education*, vol.77. no.1, pp.95–111, 1993.
 - [29] C. van Boxtel, J. van der Linden, and G. Kanselaar, "Collaborative learning tasks and the elaboration of conceptual knowledge," *Learning and instruction*, vol.10, no.4, pp.311–330, 2000.
 - [30] C. van Boxtel, J. van der Linden, E. Roelofs and G. Erkens, "Collaborative Concept Mapping: Provoking and Supporting Meaningful Discourse," *Theory Into Practice*, vol.41, no.1, pp.40–46, 2002.
 - [31] A.S. Palincsar, K. Ransom, and S. Derber, "Collaborative research and development of reciprocal teaching," *The Journal of Educational Leadership*, vol.46, no.4, pp.37–40. 1988.
 - [32] J. Pailai, W. Wunnasri, K. Yoshida, Y. Hayashi, and T. Hirashima, "The practical use of Kit-Build concept map on formative assessment," *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, vol.20, no.12, pp.1–23, 2017.
 - [33] J.D. Novak and A.J. Cañas, Technical report IHMC CmapTools, Institute for Human and Machine Cognition, Florida, 2008.
 - [34] J.R. McClure and P.E. Bell, Effects of an environmental education related STS approach instruction on cognitive structures of pre-service science teachers, State University, Pennsylvania, 1990.
 - [35] ReadWorks, "Earth Science: Hurricanes," <https://www.readworks.org/article/Earth-Science-Hurricanes/7bb94583-4566-48e4-98ce-a8a0a92a6724>, accessed Dec. 4. 2017.
 - [36] J.R. McClure, B. Sonak, and H.K. Suen, "Concept map assessment of classroom learning: reliability, validity, and logistical practicality," *J. Research in Science Teaching*, vol.36, no.4, pp.475–492, 1999.
 - [37] W. Damon and E. Phelps, "Critical distinctions among three approaches to peer education," *International journal of educational research*, vol.13, no.1, pp.9–19, 1989.



Warunya Wunnasri received the B.S. degree in Computer Science from Thammasat University and M.S. degree in Engineering from Sirindhorn International Institute of Technology, Thammasat University in 2011 and 2013, respectively. She is currently a Ph.D. student in the Graduate School of Engineering, Hiroshima University.



Jaruwat Pailai received the B.S. and M.S. degrees in Computer Science from Thammasat University in 2011 and 2013, respectively. He is currently a Ph.D. student in the Graduate School of Engineering, Hiroshima University.



Yusuke Hayashi is an associate professor of Department of Information Engineering, Graduate School of Engineering, Hiroshima University since 2012. He received Ph.D. from Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University, Japan, in 2003. He was research associate of the school of Knowledge Science, Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (JAIST) from 2003 to 2005, an assistant professor of the Department of Knowledge Systems, the Institute of Scientific and Industrial

Research (ISIR), Osaka University from 2005 to 2010 and an associate professor of the Information Technology Center, Nagoya University from 2010 to 2012. He has been engaged in research on Knowledge modeling, Ontological engineering, Learning engineering.



Tsukasa Hirashima received his B.E., M.E. and Ph.D. from Osaka University in 1986, 1988, and 1991 respectively. He worked at The Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research, Osaka University as a research associate and lecturer from 1991 to 1997. During 1997–2003, he worked in Graduate School of Information Engineering at Kyushu Institute of Technology as an associate professor. He has been a professor of Graduate School, Department of Information Engineering, Hiroshima University since 2004.

Learning Engineering is his major research field. He has received international awards as the Outstanding Paper Award of EDMEDIA95, the Best Paper Award of ICCE2001 & 2002, Honorable Mention Award of AIED2009, and APSCE Distinguished Researcher Award in 2009.