Chapter XLII Supporting Decision Making in Using Design Languages for Learning Designs and Learning Objects

Eddy Boot TNO Defence, Security and Safety, The Netherlands

Luca Botturi Università della Svizzera italianavia, Switzerland

> Andrew S. Gibbons Brigham Young University, USA

> **Todd Stubbs** Brigham Young University, USA

ABSTRACT

In developing modern instructional software, learning designs are used to formalize descriptions of roles, activities, constraints, and several other instructional design aspects and learning objects are used to implement those learning designs in instructional software. Central in both constructs is the use of design languages to support structuring a design task and conceiving solutions. Due to a lack of standardized design languages that are shared between designers, producers, and other stakeholders, the application of learning designs and learning objects is often unsatisfactory for three reasons: (a) different instructional and technical structures are often not meaningfully organized; (b) different levels of detail are mixed together; and (c) different expressions are used in a nonstandardized manner. A decision model is introduced—the 3D-model—that supports better selection and application of design languages. Two studies show that the 3D-model contributes to a better information transition between instructional designers and software producers.

INTRODUCTION

Developing instructional software is becoming increasingly complex. Besides many recent *pedagogical innovations* such as holistic wholetask approaches as found in case-based learning or problem-based learning (van Merriënboer & Kirschner, 2007), developers have to pay attention to recent *technical innovations* as well. Amongst others, recent technical efforts are directed at modularization, reusability, and interoperability (Parrish, 2004). Finally, *organizational innovations* that emphasis the integration of working and learning by means of blended combinations of face-to-face learning, distance learning, and on-the-job learning (Cantoni & Botturi, 2005; Jochems, van Merriënboer, & Koper, 2004) complicate the situation even more. As a result, developing modern instructional software requires often iterative development processes and prototype-testing, involving multidisciplinary teams with many different members, including managers, producers, instructors, and subject matter experts (Bates, 1999; Botturi, Cantoni, Lepori, & Tardini, 2006).

In many cases, instructional designers are placed in charge of the instructional design and of managing the subsequent development process. They face the challenge of negotiating and communicating this design, with all its pedagogical, technical, and organizational implications, to all of the stakeholders, who often have a different

Kind of	Types of Stakeholder Activities	Examples of Concerns
stakeholders		
Project Leader	Manage the whole ISD process	Optimal transfer of information and product
		during the ISD process
Subject Matter	Validate the domain content	Impact on work floor
Experts		
Instructors	Validate the didactical model	Impact of instructional design on their
		teaching (e.g., classroom based, coaching in
		practice)
Managers	Approve the instructional design	Impact of instructional design on their
		organization (e.g., financial, roles,
		infrastructure)
Producers	Translate instructional design into	Impact of instructional design on production
	technical specifications (often conduct	process (e.g., selection of tools and media,
	their own type of analysis and design)	programming, interfacing, usability)
Implementers	Use the instructional design as	Impact of instructional design on
	guidelines	infrastructure, roles, school management, etc.
Learners	Participate in usability studies, interface	Personal preferences and impact of
	design studies, and other formative	instructional design on their learning processes
	evaluation activities.	
Evaluators	Use the objectives set in the	Impact of instructional design on assessment
	instructional design as evaluation	process
	criteria	

Table 1. Concerns of different stakeholders in the ISD process

16 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/supporting-decision-making-using-design/20916

Related Content

A Study of the Relationship between Gender and Online Social Presence

Chih-Hsiung Tu, Cherng-Jyh Yenand Michael Blocher (2011). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design (pp. 33-49).*

www.irma-international.org/article/study-relationship-between-gender-online/55546

Online Role-Based Learning Designs for Teaching Complex Decision Making

Robert McLaughlanand Denise Kirkpatrick (2009). *Handbook of Research on Learning Design and Learning Objects: Issues, Applications, and Technologies (pp. 295-311).* www.irma-international.org/chapter/online-role-based-learning-designs/20888

Responding to COVID-19: Teaching of EAP to Non-Native Postgraduates of Performing Arts

Eric Hoand Sammy S. M. Ming (2022). *Cases on Teaching English for Academic Purposes (EAP) During COVID-19: Insights From Around the World (pp. 132-154).* www.irma-international.org/chapter/responding-to-covid-19/308947

Effective Use of Learning Objects in Class Environments

David Lake, Kate Lowe, Rob Phillips, Rick Cummingsand Renato Schibeci (2009). *Handbook of Research on Learning Design and Learning Objects: Issues, Applications, and Technologies (pp. 493-514).* www.irma-international.org/chapter/effective-use-learning-objects-class/20898

Expanding Learning Opportunities for Graduate Students with HyFlex Course Design

Mariam Mouse Matta Abdelmalakand Julia Lynn Parra (2016). *International Journal of Online Pedagogy and Course Design (pp. 19-37).*

www.irma-international.org/article/expanding-learning-opportunities-for-graduate-students-with-hyflex-course-design/162681