

Chapter 2.1

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.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-60566-208-4.ch011

INTRODUCTION

In recent years higher-education systems are undergoing a considerable transformation process on various levels. The implementation of leadership-, 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. Glasersfeld, 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 instructional goals (Kerres, 2007). In general this creates rather sheltered and non-challenging environments that offer only a limited amount of prescribed interaction patterns and forms of expression. This predominant institutional approach to technological mediation of teaching and studying appears to be rather incompatible with a variety of contemporary conceptualisations of how human- and social systems evolve and function and what this implies for intervention and intentional change. Apart from this conceptual incompatibility the status quo in

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/39734

Related Content

Young Immigrants' Internet Political Participation in Germany: Comparing German East Europeans and German Turks

Viktoria Spaiser (2013). *International Journal of E-Politics* (pp. 1-17).

www.irma-international.org/article/young-immigrants-internet-political-participation/76892

Facebook as a Marketing Tool: An Analysis of the 100 Top-Ranked Global Brands

Antonio Chamorro-Mera, F. Javier Miranda and Sergio Rubio (2014). *International Journal of Virtual Communities and Social Networking* (pp. 14-28).

www.irma-international.org/article/facebook-as-a-marketing-tool/132866

Digital Energy: Clustering Micro Grids for Social Networking

Mikhail Simonov, Marco Mussetta and Riccardo Zich (2010). *Social Computing: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 2263-2279).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/digital-energy-clustering-micro-grids/39854

Online Social Networking Behavior and Its Influence Towards Students' Academic Performance

Maslin Masrom and Selisa Usat (2019). *Advanced Methodologies and Technologies in Media and Communications* (pp. 477-487).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/online-social-networking-behavior-and-its-influence-towards-students-academic-performance/214576

Impact of Technological Innovations and Online Social Capital on Education

Blessing Foluso Adeoye (2023). *Social Capital in the Age of Online Networking: Genesis, Manifestations, and Implications* (pp. 113-127).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/impact-of-technological-innovations-and-online-social-capital-on-education/328399