502

Computer-Mediated Learning Groups

Charles R. Graham Brigham Young University, USA

Melanie Misanchuk

University of Guelph, Canada

INTRODUCTION

Online learning has seen tremendous growth over the past decade in both the corporate and higher education sectors of society. This has been facilitated by rapid increases in the availability of computer- and networkbased technologies for communication and sharing of information. The U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics (2003) recently reported that for the 2000-01 academic year, 2- and 4-year institutions offered over 127,000 different distance education (DE) courses and had over three million enrollments. Of the institutions offering DE courses, 90% reported using the Internet and asynchronous communication as an instructional delivery mode (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2003). In the corporate sector, the American Society for Training & Development reported record levels technology-mediated training (or e-learning) accompanied by slight decreases in face-to-face classroom training (Thompson, Koon, Woodwell, & Beauvais, 2002). At the same time, there has been an increased awareness among distance educators and researchers regarding the importance of human interaction in the learning process. These two trends have driven the study of computer-mediated communication (CMC) and computer support for collaborative learning (CSCL). Groupwork has long been an important instructional strategy used in face-to-face learning environments and is now being explored in computermediated environments. This article will define critical aspects of computer-mediated groupwork and outline benefits and challenges to using computer-mediated groups as an instructional strategy. Additional details for the research presented in this article can be found in fulllength publications by the authors (Graham, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Graham & Misanchuk, 2003).

BACKGROUND

The first step to understanding the challenges and benefits of using computer-mediated learning groups is understanding the term itself. There are three important concepts embedded in the term *computer-mediated learning groups* that will be addressed in this section of the article. First is understanding what groups are and the role of interdependence in groupwork. Second is understanding the differences between *computer-mediated* groups and face-to-face groups. Lastly is the difference between *learning* groups and other types of groups such as *work* groups, an often overlooked distinction that has important implications for learning.

Interdependence in Groups

In a learning environment, there is a wide range of instructional strategies that emphasize interaction between individuals involved in the learning process. Interdependence can be defined *as the level of dependence between group members required to accomplish the desired learning outcome*, and is one of the most important characteristics defining the nature of the group interaction. Figure 1 depicts the spectrum of interdependence and some examples of different groups across that spectrum. At the low end of the spectrum, there is independent learning, which involves little or no interaction or dependence on others in the learning process. At the high end of the spectrum, instructional activities are highly dependent on collaborative interactions between group members.

Discussion groups appear at the lower end of the spectrum because participants are usually assessed based on their individual contributions and insights rather than the ability of the group to negotiate and come to a consensus or a common understanding of the discussion topic. Cooperative groups also have a lower level of interdependence than collaborative groups because they tend to divide the work into chunks that can be accomplished independently. There may be a high level of interaction at the administrative level in chunking and assigning tasks, but the majority of the work is done individually and then pieced together at the end, which also leads to a sense of individual accountability. Groups working collaboratively are more interdependent than cooperative groups. Rather than assigning individual tasks in a "divide and conquer" approach, they work through each of the tasks together as a group. Each

Figure 1. Different levels of interdependence in learning environments



participant's learning success depends on all other group members' efforts. Paulus (2004) asserts that students often default to a cooperative framework unless explicitly instructed to employ collaborative ways of working (Hathorn & Ingram, 2002; Kitchen & McDougall, 1999). This default behavior is mirrored in learning groups versus work groups, as explained in the following section.

Computer-Mediated vs. Face-to-Face Groups

The most common model of groupwork is in a face-to-face situation, whether it be in the workplace, classroom, committees, clubs, or other organizations. Indeed, many people have trouble envisioning successful interaction when group members are not co-located. However, the use of computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools to facilitate work has become more and more common in global business ventures, and is gaining acceptance in educational settings as well. Table 1 lists several of the most common tools used by distributed groups for communicating.

Groups may not necessarily need the most "enriched" mode of communication: often, a telephone conversation can accomplish as much as an elaborate videoconference.

Learning Groups vs. Work Groups

Much of the research literature related to computermediated groupwork looks at *work* groups as opposed to *learning* groups. There are important differences between the two that have an impact on how we understand

Table 1. Communication tools used by groups working at a distance

	Synchronous		Asynchronous
٠	telephone (including multi-party calls)	•	email or listservs
•	instant messaging or other computer-	•	voice mail messages
	mediated text (or voice) chat	•	electronic bulletin boards/ discussion
•	two-way videoconferencing		forums
•	electronic white-board tools	•	commenting on documents using word
			processor tracking features
		•	WebLogs (Blogs)

Table 2	Differences	hetween	typical	work	and	learnino	groups
Tuble 2.	Dijjerences	Derween	iypicai	WOIK	unu	ieurning	groups

	Work Group Characteristics		Learning Group Characteristics
•	Hierarchical leadership structure	•	Flat leadership structure
•	Clear role definitions	•	No role definitions
•	Cooperation maximizes productivity	•	Collaboration maximizes learning
•	Goals are product-oriented	•	Goals are learning-oriented
•	Team members take on tasks that reflect	•	Team members may accept tasks to gain
	skills and strengths already acquired		skills they have not already acquired in
٠	Focus is on the product or outcome		order to learn
		•	Focus is on the process or learning

4 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/computer-mediated-learning-groups/14287

Related Content

Knowledge Strategy and Its Role in the Organization: An Exploratory Study

Joseph E. Kasten (2010). Information Resources Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications (pp. 1387-1402).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/knowledge-strategy-its-role-organization/54549

Using DSS for Crisis Management

Sherif Kamel (2001). Annals of Cases on Information Technology: Applications and Management in Organizations (pp. 292-304). www.irma-international.org/article/using-dss-crisis-management/44622

A Comparison and Scenario Analysis of Leading Data Mining Software

John Wang, Xiaohua Hu, Kimberly Hollisterand Dan Zhu (2009). Selected Readings on Information Technology Management: Contemporary Issues (pp. 192-210). www.irma-international.org/chapter/comparison-scenario-analysis-leading-data/28669

Up In Smoke: Rebuilding After an IT Disaster

Steven C. Ross, Craig K. Tyran, David J. Auer, Jon M. Junelland Terrell G. Williams (2005). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology (pp. 31-49).* www.irma-international.org/article/smoke-rebuilding-after-disaster/3146

Application of an Extended TAM Model for Online Banking Adoption: A Study at a Gulf-region University

R. P. Sundarrajand Nick Manochehri (2011). *Information Resources Management Journal (pp. 1-13).* www.irma-international.org/article/application-extended-tam-model-online/49641