

Chapter XI

Distributed Learning Environments and Social Software: In Search for a Framework of Design

Sebastian Fiedler

Zentrum für Sozial Innovation – Centre for Social Innovation, Austria

Kai Pata

Center of Educational Technology, Tallinn University, Estonia

ABSTRACT

This chapter discusses how the construction of an adequate design and intervention framework for distributed learning environments might be approached. It proposes that activity theory has some interesting concepts and perspectives to offer in this regard. In addition, it discusses the concept of affordance, understood as perceived possibilities for action, and its potential consequences for learning environment design. Furthermore, some current technical and conceptual challenges for the implementation and maintenance of distributed learning environments are addressed. The authors consider their text as a proposal for a necessary reorientation and a call for contributions to the search for an adequate design and intervention framework for distributed learning environments.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years higher-education systems are undergoing a considerable transformation process on various levels. The implementation of leader-

ship-, evaluation- and accreditation schemes that are mainly modelled after entrepreneurial solutions, are fundamentally re-shaping our higher educational institutions. This new regime also influences how communicative and productive

practices like teaching, facilitating, and collaborating are technologically mediated. Many educational institutions apply now strategies and policies that aim for the implementation of large-scale, homogeneous, and centrally administered technological landscapes of tools and services to support and manage teaching and studying activities. Thereby they largely ignore that disciplines or areas of study still differ to a considerable degree on how they relate to certain occupations and professions, the labour market in general, and on what educational traditions they have developed over time Bleiklie (2004). From an observer's point of view, all actors appear primarily as "residents" of such an institutional landscape of pre-selected and decreed sets of tools and services. Everyone is expected to perform all necessary mediated activities within its boundaries.

Apart from general communication systems, content repositories and digital library systems, institutional landscapes of universities are still dominated by Course Management Systems, that are often somewhat misleadingly named Learning Management Systems (LMS). These Course Management Systems are the prototypical technological expression or "flag ships" of the mainstream institutional strive for centralisation and control. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the ongoing development of these all-comprising platforms is driven by a continuous desire for expansion and assimilation of additional features and functionalities. At the same time very few of the Course Management Systems currently in use, provide interfaces for interaction and data exchange with a wider ecology of networked tools and services. The majority of these platforms rather operate as "closed clubs" and try to restrain all activities within their particular boundaries.

All these systems feature an unequal distribution of power and ownership with a clear distinction of roles (such as educational authority vs. participants) producing asymmetric relationships (Wilson *et al.*, 2006). Furthermore, they foster a general educational intervention approach that

seems largely based on the rather illusionary expectation that human change processes can, and indeed should be, modelled on the basis of simple cause-and-effect relationships. We would like to argue that the socio-technological practices that are encouraged by the majority of today's Course Management Systems in higher education demonstrate clearly that the majority of instructional design and educational intervention models are still conceptualising humans, or the social systems they form, as "trivial machines" (Foerster, 1999). It seems like decades of multi-disciplinary work on system theory (see e.g. Willke, 2005) constructivist theories of knowing (see e.g. Glaserfeld, 1995), second-order cybernetics (see e.g. Maturana & Varela, 1980), and aspects of self-direction (see e.g. Candy, 1991; Fischer & Scharff, 1998) and self-organisation (see e.g. Harri-Augstein & Thomas, 1991; Jünger, 2004) in education have simply been brushed aside or entirely ignored.

Instead of treating humans as systems of (self) organising complexity that develop particular qualities like operational closure (and thus self-referentiality and highly selective interaction patterns with their environments), technological mediation in higher education and its underlying (instructional) design is mainly based on the idea that human change processes, and the intentional interventions that are supposed to "cause" such changes, can be reduced to simple cause-and-effect relations, simple purpose and goal attribution, and simple sequential temporal patterns (Willke, 2005). Thus, many technologically mediated environments that follow a traditional instructional design approach are fostering almost exclusively the teaching of codified knowledge and skills. Emphasising a clear distinction between educational authorities and students and their respective responsibilities, expert instructional designers and course facilitators are responsible for guiding the participants through a sequence of pre-structured events and interactions with pre-selected materials, towards a set of pre-defined

12 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/distributed-learning-environments-social-software/21370

Related Content

Thinking in Virtual Spaces: Impacts of Virtual Reality on the Undergraduate Interior Design Process

Elizabeth Poberand Matt Cook (2019). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 23-40). www.irma-international.org/article/thinking-in-virtual-spaces/239896

Lessons Learned from the Design and Development of Vehicle Simulators: A Case Study with Three Different Simulators

Sergio Casasand Silvia Rueda (2018). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 59-80). www.irma-international.org/article/lessons-learned-from-the-design-and-development-of-vehicle-simulators/203068

Engaging Students in a Computer Diversity Course Through Virtual Worlds

Yvonne Pigattand James Braman (2023). *Research Anthology on Virtual Environments and Building the Metaverse* (pp. 145-169). www.irma-international.org/chapter/engaging-students-in-a-computer-diversity-course-through-virtual-worlds/316092

Mathematics in Virtual Knowledge Spaces: User Adaptation by Intelligent Assistants

Sabina Jeschkeand Thomas Richter (2008). *Virtual Technologies: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1582-1604). www.irma-international.org/chapter/mathematics-virtual-knowledge-spaces/31008

GLARE: An Open Source Augmented Reality Platform for Location-Based Content Delivery

Enrico Gandolfi, Richard E. Ferdig, David Carlyn, Annette Kratcoski, Jason Dunfee, David Hassler, James Blank, Chris Lenartand Robert Clements (2021). *International Journal of Virtual and Augmented Reality* (pp. 1-19). www.irma-international.org/article/glare/290043