

## Gameplaying for maths learning: cooperative or not?

**Fengfeng Ke and Barbara Grabowski**

*Fengfeng Ke is currently working on her PhD at the Learning and Performance Systems Department of Pennsylvania State University. Barbara Grabowski is Professor of Education in the Instructional Systems Program at the Pennsylvania State University. She has published widely in the area of distance education and educational technology. Address for correspondence: 425 Waupelani Dr. Apt# 502, State College, PA, 16801, USA. Tel: +1 814-8610678; email: fjk100@psu.edu*

### **Abstract**

This study investigated the effects of gameplaying on fifth-graders' maths performance and attitudes. One hundred twenty five fifth graders were recruited and assigned to a cooperative Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), interpersonal competitive or no gameplaying condition. A state standards-based maths exam and an inventory on attitudes towards maths were used for the pretest and posttest. The students' gender, socio-economic status and prior maths ability were examined as the moderating variables and covariate. Multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) indicated that gameplaying was more effective than drills in promoting maths performance, and cooperative gameplaying was most effective for promoting positive maths attitudes regardless of students' individual differences.

### **Introduction**

The problem of low achievement in American mathematics education has been discussed in numerous policy reports (Mathematical Sciences Education Board, 2004). Educational researchers (eg Ferrini-Mundy & Schram, 1996) and administrators (eg Brodinsky, 1985), for years, have appealed for mathematics-education reform and proposed various solutions to foster mathematics learning.

Amongst these propositions were computer games as powerful mathematical learning tools with great motivational appeal and multiple representations of learning materials (Betz, 1995; Malone, 1981; Moreno, 2002; Quinn, 1994). Researchers reported (eg Ahl, 1981; Bahr & Rieth, 1989; Inkpen, 1994) that a variety of computer games have been used in classrooms to support learning of basic arithmetic and problem-solving skills.

Other researchers (Amory, Naicker, Vincent & Adams, 1999; Papert, 1980) contend that computer games need to be carefully aligned with sound learning strategies and

conditions to be beneficial. Consistent with this proposition, the incorporation of computer games within a cooperative learning setting becomes an attractive possibility. Cooperative learning in mathematics has been well discussed by Davidson (1990): group learning helps to remove students' frustration; it is not only a source for additional help but also offers a support network. Empirical research (Jacobs, 1996; Reid, 1992; Whicker, Bol & Nunnery, 1997) verifies the importance of cooperative learning in mathematics education.

Hence, the potential benefit of combining computer games with cooperative learning in mathematics warrants a field investigation. Specific research on the cooperative use of computer games is limited. Empirical study of this technique is especially sparse.

Therefore, the purpose of this research was to explore whether computer games and cooperative learning could be used together to enrich K-12 mathematics education. Employing a pretest–posttest experimental design, the study examined the effects of cooperative gameplaying on fifth-grade students' maths performance and maths attitudes when compared to the interpersonal competitive gameplaying and control groups.

### **Literature review**

#### *Computer games and cooperative learning*

The use of computer games in education is widespread. Several researchers (eg Amory *et al*, 1999; Betz, 1995; Malouf, 1988; McDonald and Hannafin, 2003) have conducted empirical research on computer games as an instructional tool. Dempsey, Rasmussen and Lucassen (1996) reviewed some 100 papers related to instructional gaming. These authors found contradictory results concerning their educational effectiveness. In addition, in their metaanalysis of 68 gaming studies, Randel, Morris, Wetzel and Whitehall (1992) found that most or 36 reported no learning advantage to using games, 22 reported students using games outperformed their classmates in the traditional group, whilst 3 studies found differences favouring traditional instruction. Such diverse results may be because gaming researchers have used different configurations of games, such as networking or being competitive, or examined different outcomes such as exam performance or learning attitudes. Thus, a study examining the effects of different configurations of gameplaying on different types of learning outcomes is warranted.

Cooperative learning occurs in small groups of students who work together to maximise their own and each other's learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). Mathematics literature has acknowledged the positive effects of cooperative learning in improving achievement, attitudes, higher-order thinking skills and self-concept outcomes (Davidson, 1990; Jacobs, 1996; Reid, 1992; Whicker *et al*, 1997).

Despite the large number of studies about the use of instructional games and cooperative learning alone, studies combining these two variables are very limited. A recent review revealed only four related investigations (Leemkuil, de Jong, de Hoog and Christoph, 2003; Levy, 1990; Strommen, 1993; Tanner & Lindquist, 1998). Only two

addressed the issue in K-12 maths-education settings. Closely related to the current study was Strommen's (1993) investigation, which examined 28 pairs of fourth graders using a cooperative- and competitive-educational computer game. In the cooperative condition, two students sat before one computer and played the game against the computer. In the competitive condition, each person had one computer and played the game against each other. The cooperative environment resulted in more correct answers to the questions within the game than the competitive environment. There was no control group.

#### *Teams-games-tournament cooperative learning technique*

Different from Strommen's research (1993), cooperative learning in this study was anchored in a cooperative learning technique known as Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) (DeVries & Slavin, 1976), not previously researched in either metaanalyses by Dempsey *et al* (1996) or Randel *et al* (1992). According to DeVries and Slavin (1976), TGT has three basic elements: (1) *teams*—students are assigned to three-member teams randomised on equivalent achievement levels whose membership remains intact throughout the cooperative learning process, (2) *games*—skill exercises are played during weekly tournaments, (3) *tournament*—students represent their teams and compete individually against students from other teams. The winnings are brought back to their teams. Total winnings are tallied across teams and team champions are announced.

As Slavin (1995) suggested, TGT is a cooperative learning technique that has been widely investigated. Research (eg Ben-Ari, 2001; Okebukola, 1985; Slavin, 1995) indicates that TGT enhances students' academic achievement and attitudes towards the subject matter. However, most of these studies have incorporated TGT in traditional, face-to-face games rather than computer-assisted ones. Recently, Tanner and Lindquist (1998) investigated the application of the board game Monopoly as the context of TGT cooperative learning for college accounting majors. The nonexperimental, descriptive findings indicated students' attitudes were very positive towards accounting learning and perceived achievement. Therefore, a replication of early experimental studies of TGT in a new setting—education computer gaming for mathematics learning—should make a valuable contribution to understanding this cooperative learning technique.

#### *Confounding factors in cooperative learning and computer-game application*

Although cooperative learning theory suggests individuals, regardless of gender and ability, should experience enhancements in learning and attitudes towards a subject, there is evidence that the level of enhancement may vary across moderating factors (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). For instance, Johnson, Johnson and Taylor (1993) determined experimentally that low and middle achievers benefited more from cooperative learning than high achievers. The same results occurred with computer-game applications. De Jean, Uptis, Koch and Young (1999) compared the reactions of junior-high boys and girls to the same computer game and found that more boys were engaged in cooperative gameplaying and group problem solving. They also found that girls had trouble recognising the embedded maths elements in the game. Similarly, Moreno (2002) reported that students with low prior knowledge and computer experience were

helped most by the visual representations in the gaming situation. His finding on the role of computer experience points to another potential mediating variable—socio-economic status (SES). SES has been related to computer-experience level (Campbell, 1983), and hence may also mediate the effects of gaming.

### **Research design**

Employing a pretest–posttest experimental design, the study examined the effects of gaming (TGT cooperative gaming, interpersonal competitive gaming, and no gaming) on two criterion measures (standards-based maths exam performance and attitudes). Students' gender and SES were considered as moderating variables, whilst continuous-scaled maths ability was used as covariate. Specifically, the researcher's expectations were that:

1. TGT cooperative gaming would result in significantly greater maths performance and maths attitudes than with competitive gaming, and both would perform significantly better than the no-gaming group.
2. Gaming would result in significantly greater performance and more positive maths attitudes for boys than for girls, and for economically disadvantaged students than economically normal students in the control group.

### **Method**

#### *Participants*

One hundred twenty-five participants were drawn from six fifth-grade public-school classes in central Pennsylvania. Participants varied by gender (46% female), SES (45% economically disadvantaged) and race (8% minority). All participants knew basic computer skills and had hands-on gaming experiences in or out of class. Participation was voluntary. All students elected to participate, although absences during the pretest or posttest contributed to mortality (four and five participants missed the maths exam and the attitudes inventory respectively).

#### *Materials*

ASTRA EAGLE, a series of web-based computer games developed by the Centre for Advanced Technologies, was used in this study. The games were designed to reinforce academic standards for mathematics required by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), a standards-based, criterion-referenced assessment required by all public schools in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Four mathematics games within the ASTRA EAGLE targeted for fifth-grade students were selected (see: <http://eagle.aasdc.com>). They were single-user 'strategy games' that relied on thinking and problem solving (Crawford, 1984). These games contained a variety of problems, including measurement, comparing whole numbers, solving simple equations and mapping  $x$  and  $y$  coordinates. Most problems were contextualised in real-life stories relevant to school students. For example, in a game called Up, Up, & Away, gamers need to travel by balloon. One problem they met was to estimate travelling speed, eg 'If your balloon was traveling at 14 miles per hour and then sped

up by a factor of 2 and then added another 1 mile per hour, how fast would it be traveling?’ Each game had multiple levels. To ‘conquer’ a lower level and ‘bump up’ to higher-level one, students need to answer all questions of that level correctly. The more levels one conquered, the higher score he/she earned.

#### *Instruments*

A web-based, 30-item, multiple-choice Game Skills Arithmetic Test (GSAT) was researcher-developed based on the PSSA. It measured maths skills that the games reinforced, including ‘adding and subtracting measurements’, ‘comparing quantities and magnitudes of numbers’ and ‘locating and identifying points on a coordinate plane’ (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2004). A panel of fifth-grade maths teachers from the sampled school district vetted its content validity. The GSAT was piloted with 548 fifth-grade students during the previous academic semester. K-R 20 reliability was 0.80.

Tapia’s Attitudes Towards Maths Inventory (ATMI) was modified for a fifth-grade audience (Tapia & Marsh, 2004). This web-based, 5-point Likert scale inventory contained 40 items investigating students’ self-confidence, value, enjoyment and motivation towards mathematics. This inventory reliably measured maths attitudes with a Cronbach alpha of 0.97. Sample items include ‘I am able to solve mathematics problems without too much difficulty’ (self-confidence), ‘Mathematics is important in everyday life’ (value), ‘I am happier in a maths class than in any other class’ (enjoyment) and ‘I plan to take as much mathematics as I can in school’ (motivation).

#### *Procedure*

Age, gender, race, SES and previous PSSA maths-section percentile scores were collected prior to the treatment. The teachers administered the GSAT and ATMI as a pretest. Participants were randomly assigned by intact classes to one of three groups: TGT cooperative gameplaying, interpersonal competitive gameplaying or no gameplaying.

Participants of the two gameplaying groups took two orientation sessions (40 minutes each), during which they read the guidelines and tried each web-based game. They were then required to play one maths game during two 40-minute sessions each week for 4 weeks. Participants were seated in their own classrooms, each with an Internet-connected laptop. The teachers administered the treatments, setting up in-class gameplaying sessions and monitoring the participants’ activities. The teachers also had a 1-hour training session and were given administration job-aids. The researchers observed most gameplaying sessions.

For the TGT cooperative gameplaying, a close simulation of the TGT structure was used. Specifically, students were stratified by their maths-ability level and gender, and then randomly assigned to a four-member team. At the beginning of each game session, students collaborated for 10 minutes in pairs, practicing with the game, discussing questions and solutions and correcting each other’s misconceptions. For the remainder

of the 30 minutes, class teams then competed against one another; each team member held a laptop and was assigned to a tournament table to play against representatives of the other teams. At any tournament table, the students were roughly comparable in achievement level. At the end of every two gaming sessions, the players at each table compared their gaming scores to determine their rank order which was then converted into points. The points that the players earned were added to compute a team score. The individual and team scores were ranked and listed in a newsletter, and distributed to the class at the beginning of every treatment week. In the newsletter, individuals were identified by pseudononyms (IDs) known only to themselves and their teammates, which was intended to ensure the *individual accountability* in cooperative learning (by having each team be aware of its members' contribution), whilst avoiding interpersonal competition (by hiding individual performances from the public) (DeVries & Slavin, 1976).

During interpersonal competitive gameplaying, students were seated at their own desks and played games against the computer. At the end of every two gaming sessions, individual scores were compared against others in the class. Their individual percentile ranks, identified by their own names (so everyone could compare him/herself with other individuals), were announced in a newsletter every week.

In the controlled no-games group, participants took two 40-minute maths-drill sessions each week for 4 weeks. During the maths-drill session, participants completed paper-and-pencil maths drills that targeted the skills taught in ASTRA EAGLE. Finally, at the end of the 4-week experiment, all participants took the post-GSAT and ATMI.

## Results

A  $3 \times 2 \times 2$  multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted on the post-GSAT and ATMI scores to determine the effects of gameplaying (cooperative, competitive and none) and the mediating influences of gender and SES (economically disadvantaged and normal). Pretest scores and participants' previous PSSA maths-section percentile scores (as the index of maths ability) were used as covariates. Analyses of variance between groups on the pretest and PSSA scores indicated that there were no significant group differences at the pretest comparison. Two prerequisites, homogeneity of variances and the correlations between the two dependent variables, were confirmed before the MANCOVA was used.

The MANCOVA test showed an overall significant effect of gameplaying on participants' maths performance and maths attitudes ( $F = 4.395$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1.

### *Hypothesis 1*

Hypothesis 1: TGT cooperative gameplaying would result in significantly greater maths performance and maths attitudes than competitive gameplaying, and both would perform significantly better than the no-gaming group.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for maths performance and maths attitudes

	Control		Competitive		Cooperative		Total	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
N	36		41		43		120	
<b>Pretest</b>								
Performance	61.2	14.4	56.6	13.2	56.7	14.3	58.0	14.0
Attitudes	77.5	9.38	74.7	12.4	74.1	12.6	75.3	11.6
<b>Posttest</b>								
Performance	58.2	15.2	57.7	13.7	59.5	14.6	58.5	14.4
Attitudes	74.2	12.0	75.0	13.5	78.5	12.4	76.0	12.7
<b>Adjusted means<sup>a</sup></b>								
Performance	55.3	—	59.9	—	61.2	—		
Attitudes	72.3	—	74.6	—	79.1	—		

<sup>a</sup> Adjusted means using pretests and maths ability as covariates.

This hypothesis was partially supported. A main effect for gameplaying was found on both GSAT ( $F = 3.81, p = 0.025$ ) and ATMI scores ( $F = 6.81, p = 0.002$ ). Results from a post hoc pair-wise comparison on the adjusted posttest means showed that no significant difference was found for maths performance between cooperative gameplaying and competitive gameplaying ( $M_{\text{coop}} = 61.2; M_{\text{comp}} = 59.9; p = 0.543$ ), but both performed significantly higher than the control group ( $M_{\text{cont}} = 55.3; p_{\text{coop}} = 0.009; p_{\text{comp}} = 0.050$ ). Pair-wise comparison of attitudes indicated that cooperative gameplaying ( $M = 79.1$ ) promoted significantly more positive maths attitudes than both the competitive gameplaying ( $M = 74.6, p = 0.019$ ) and control groups ( $M = 72.3, p < 0.0001$ ). No significant differences were found between the competitive gameplaying and the control group ( $p = 0.239$ ).

### Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2: the effects of gameplaying on students' maths performance and maths attitudes would be mediated by gender and SES.

This hypothesis was partially supported. The multivariate tests indicated no significant interaction effect between the treatment (gameplaying) and gender ( $F = 0.518, p = 0.723$ ) on either maths performance or attitudes, nor was there statistical evidence indicating a significant interaction between the treatment and SES ( $F = 2.251, p = 0.065$ ). Additionally, there were no indications of the main effects of gender ( $F = 1.161, p = 0.317$ ) or SES ( $F = 1.927, p = 0.151$ ).

However, the univariate tests did indicate a significant interaction between the treatment and SES on maths attitudes ( $F = 3.415, p = 0.037$ ). As Table 2 reveals, economically disadvantaged students in cooperative gameplaying showed more positive maths attitudes than those in the other two conditions ( $M_{\text{coop}} = 81.5; M_{\text{comp}} = 72.1; M_{\text{cont}} = 73.3$ ). For economically normal students there were no significant differences between the two gaming situations in promoting positive maths attitudes.

Table 2: *Adjusted posttest means of maths performance and maths attitudes by socio-economic status*

		<i>Adjusted posttest means</i>		
		<i>Control</i>	<i>Competitive</i>	<i>Cooperative</i>
Performance	Normal	54.8	56.7	59.3
	Disadvantaged	55.7	63.1	63.1
Attitudes	Normal	71.2	77.2	76.8
	Disadvantaged	73.3	72.1	81.5

## Discussion

The findings showed that maths gameplaying did promote test-based cognitive learning achievement. Additionally, gameplaying context (TGT cooperative or interpersonal competitive) played a significant role in moderating the effect of educational gaming on affective learning outcome.

### *TGT cooperative versus interpersonal competitive learning*

A host of research was conducted on the relative effects of cooperative and competitive modes of learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1994). Many researchers reported the superiority of the cooperative mode on learning outcomes, such as students' self-esteem (Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 1986), productivity (Johnson, 1981) and test achievement (Mevarech, Stern & Levita, 1987). Differently, this study, conducted with computer games, found that the relative advantage of cooperative over competitive gameplaying on maths performance was not statistically significant.

On the other hand, the findings supporting the advantage of the TGT cooperative technique in promoting positive maths attitudes did confirm Slavin's (1995) claim that cooperative learning methods should provide both group rewards and individual accountability. In this study, the newsletters in TGT cooperative group carried both team and individual scores: the teams' ranks were known to the whole class, whilst the individual scores (matched with pseudo-IDs) were only known by individuals themselves and their own team. This arrangement thus offered both group rewards and individual accountability. Hence it was not surprising to find that TGT cooperative gameplaying was favoured over competitive gameplaying and the control group in terms of encouraging positive maths attitudes.

### *Computer games' instructional effectiveness*

Rieber (1996) stated that play performs important roles in a child's psychological, social and intellectual development. Consistent with this proposition, many studies have demonstrated the instructional effectiveness of computer games (Dempsey *et al*, 1996). The findings of this study support these previous works. On the whole, gameplaying promoted test-based maths-learning achievement more than the no-gaming traditional practice.

Computer games can motivate learners through fantasy, being contextually relevant and appropriately difficult (Keller, 1987; Malone, 1981). In this study, TGT cooperative gameplaying and competitive gameplaying shared the first two motivational features (fantasy and relevance), hence this would engage learners more than in the no-gaming group. As for difficulty appropriateness, peer cooperation and tutoring in the TGT cooperative group may have made the maths 'appropriately difficult', whilst interpersonal competition provided no such support. The TGT group had 10-minute peer tutoring at the beginning of each gaming session, which may have helped to maintain gameplaying as challenging but attainable. In competitive gameplaying, such group support was missing. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that, in comparison to no gameplaying, the TGT cooperative gameplaying promoted both cognitive and affective learning outcomes, whilst the competitive gameplaying facilitated only cognitive achievement but not learning attitudes. It was because a key motivation component (appropriate difficulty level) may have been absent in the competitive gameplaying.

#### *Individual differences and games application*

This study showed that there were neither significant main effects of gender nor evident interaction effects between the treatment and gender on maths performance. This finding contradicted the report of De Jean *et al* (1999) that gender played a key role in learning effectiveness of the computer games.

Generally, not enough evidence was found on SES' main effects on maths performance for a definitive conclusion. However, univariate-tests data showed that students of differing SES may respond to gameplaying conditions differently. Specifically, cooperative gameplaying helped socio-economically disadvantaged students more in terms of facilitating positive maths attitudes. This is a new finding that has not been discussed in previous research.

#### *Implications and further research*

This study provides an argument for combining the two teaching techniques, computer games and cooperative learning, to improve maths education. The findings suggest that, regardless of gender, cooperative gameplaying is an effective strategy to promote students' maths learning, both cognitively and affectively. Another implication is that gameplaying conditions, beyond the games themselves, yield significant effects on maths performance. Consistent with McDonald and Hannafin (2003), this paper recommends that educational practitioners use gaming within meaningful learning environments or tasks to promote learning.

Additionally, this study provides helpful findings on using TGT technique within a maths-learning setting. TGT cooperation is more effective than interpersonal competition in facilitating positive maths attitudes, but not in promoting maths performance. This discovery sheds light on one major controversy on cooperative learning—whether cooperative intergroup competition is advantageous over interpersonal competition (Reid, 1992).

Finally, in this study, although the influence of SES was not statistically significant in general, a potential trend showing the economically disadvantaged students in cooperative gameplaying scoring higher in maths attitudes than those in the other two conditions was evident. This is an interesting trend deserving of further exploration.

Continued research on gaming configurations can involve individual students who play by themselves. This enables a comparison of non-cooperative and noncompetitive conditions with the cooperative and competitive ones.

## References

- Ahl, D. (1981). Computer games in mathematics education. *Mathematics Teacher*, 74, 8, 653–656.
- Amory, A., Naicker, K., Vincent, J. & Adams, C. (1999). The use of computer games as an educational tool: identification of appropriate game types and game elements. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 30, 4, 311–321.
- Bahr, C. & Rieth, H. (1989). The effects of instructional computers games and drill and practice software on learning disabled students' mathematics achievement. *Computers in the Schools*, 6, 3–4, 87–101.
- Ben-Ari, M. (2001). Theory-guided technology in computer science. *Science and Education*, 10, 5, 477–484.
- Betz, J. A. (1995). Computer games: increases learning in an interactive multidisciplinary environment. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 24, 195–205.
- Brodinsky, B. (1985). *Improving math & science education: problems & solutions*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Campbell, P. (1983). *Computers in education: a question of access*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, QC, Canada.
- Crawford, C. (1984). *The art of computer game design*. Berkeley, CA: Osborne/McGraw-Hill.
- Davidson, N. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning in mathematics: a handbook for teachers*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- De Jean, J., Upitis, R., Koch, C. & Young, J. (1999). The story of "phoenix quest": how girls respond to a prototype language and mathematics computer game. *Gender and Education*, 11, 2, 207–223.
- Dempsey, J. V., Rasmussen, K. & Lucassen, B. (1996). *Instructional gaming: implications for instructional technology*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Nashville TN.
- DeVries, D. & Slavin, R. (1976). *Teams-games-tournaments: a final report on the research (report no. 17)*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.
- Ferrini-Mundy, J. & Schram, T. (Eds). (1996). *The recognizing and recording reform in mathematics education project: insight, issues, and implications*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Inkpen, K. (1994). "We have never-forgetful flowers in our garden": girls' responses to electronic games. *Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching*, 13, 4, 383–403.
- Jacobs, D. L. (1996). Effects of a cooperative learning method on mathematics achievement and affective outcomes of students in a private elementary school. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29, 4, 195–202.
- Johnson, D. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive, and individualistic goal structures on achievement: a metaanalysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89, 1, 47–62.
- Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1994). *Learning together and alone: cooperation, competitive, and individualistic* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Johnson, D., Johnson, R. & Taylor, B. (1993). Impact of cooperative and individualistic learning on high-ability students' achievement, self-esteem, and social acceptance. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133, 6, 839–844.

- Johnson, R., Johnson, D. & Stanne, M. (1986). Comparison of computer-assisted cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23, 3, 382–392.
- Keller, J. M. (1987). The systematic process of motivational design. *Performance & Instruction*, 26, 1–8.
- Leemkuil, H., de Jong, T., de Hoog, R. & Christoph, N. (2003). KM quest: a collaborative internet-based simulation game. *Simulation & Gaming*, 34, 1, 89–111.
- Levy, B. N. (1990). A MATHCAD exploration: hunting for hidden roots. *Mathematics Teacher*, 83, 9, 704–708.
- Malone, T. W. (1981). What makes computer games fun? *Byte*, 6, 258–277.
- Malouf, D. (1988). The effect of instructional computer games on continuing student motivation. *Journal of Special Education*, 21, 4, 27–38.
- Mathematical Sciences Education Board. (2004). On evaluating curricular effectiveness: Judging the quality of K-12 mathematics evaluations. *MSEB Publications*. Retrieved November 1, 2004, from [http://www7.nationalacademies.org/mseb/MSEB\\_Publications\\_List.html](http://www7.nationalacademies.org/mseb/MSEB_Publications_List.html)
- McDonald, K. K. & Hannafin, R. D. (2003). Using web-based computer games to meet the demands of today's high-stakes testing: a mixed method inquiry. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 35, 4, 459–472.
- Mevarech, Z., Stern, D. & Levita, I. (1987). To cooperate or not to cooperate in CAI: that is the question. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80, 3, 164–167.
- Moreno, R. (2002). *Who learns best with multiple representations? cognitive theory implications for individual differences in multimedia learning*. Paper presented at World Conference on Educational Multimedia, Hypermedia, & Telecommunications. Denver, CO.
- Okebukola, P. (1985). The relative effectiveness of cooperativeness and competitive interaction techniques in strengthening students' performance in science class. *Science Education*, 69, 4, 501–509.
- Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: children, computers, and powerful ideas*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Pennsylvania Department of Education. (2004). *Academic standards for mathematics education*. Retrieved January 12, 2004, from [http://www.pde.state.pa.us/stateboard\\_ed/cwp/view.asp?a=3&q=76716&stateboard\\_edNav=%7C](http://www.pde.state.pa.us/stateboard_ed/cwp/view.asp?a=3&q=76716&stateboard_edNav=%7C)
- Quinn, C. N. (1994). Designing educational computer games. In K. Beattie, C. McNaught & S. Wills (Eds), *Human-computer interaction—proceedings of INTERACT '90*. (pp. 93–99). North Holland, The Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Randel, J., Morris, B., Wetzel, C. D. & Whitehall, B. (1992). The effectiveness of games for educational purposes: a review of recent research. *Simulation & Gaming*, 23, 3, 261–276.
- Reid, J. (1992). *The effects of cooperative learning with intergroup competition on the math achievement of seventh grade students*. Retrieved November 14, 2001, from ERIC database (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355106).
- Rieber, L. P. (1996). Seriously considering play: designing interactive learning environments based on the blending of microworlds, simulations, and games. *Educational Technology, Research, and Development*, 44, 1, 43–58.
- Slavin, R. (1995). *Cooperative learning: theory, research and practice*. Needham Heights, MA. Simon & Schuster Company.
- Strommen, E. F. (1993). “Does yours eat leaves?” cooperative learning in an educational software task. *Journal of Computing in Childhood Education*, 4, 1, 45–56.
- Tanner, M. & Lindquist, T. (1998). Using monopoly and teams-games-tournaments in accounting education: a cooperative learning teaching resource. *Accounting Education*, 7, 2, 139–162.
- Tapia, M. & Marsh, G. E. (2004). An instrument to measurement mathematics attitudes. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 8, 2. Retrieved August 15, 2004, from <http://www.rapidintellect.com/AEQweb/cho25344l.htm>
- Whicker, K. M., Bol, L. & Nunnery, J. A. (1997). Cooperative learning in the secondary mathematics classroom. *Journal of Educational Research*, 91, 1, 42–48.