

Chapter 6.3

Interaction and Context in Service–Oriented E–Collaboration Environments

Christoph Dorn

Vienna University of Technology, Austria

Schahram Dustdar

Vienna University of Technology, Austria

Giovanni Giuliani

HP Italiana SRL, Italy

Robert Gombotz

Vienna University of Technology, Austria

Ke Ning

National University of Ireland, Ireland

Sébastien Peray

*European Microsoft Innovation Center,
Germany*

Stephan Reiff-Marganiec

University of Leicester, UK

Daniel Schall

Vienna University of Technology, Austria

Marcel Tilly

*European Microsoft Innovation Center,
Germany*

INTRODUCTION

As it has been observed in the recent decade, collaborating teams become ever more unstable, less tightly coupled and more distributed and mobile. Workers participate in multiple teams that pursue different goals that need not be related in any way. This radical way in which the workplace is changing for the individual and the team requires highly adaptable groupware and intelligent support for the individual in order to minimize

the time lost for management and coordination when switching between different teams, different workspaces, and different contexts. Thus, a service-oriented approach seems promising to provide individual, context-aware building blocks for adaptable groupware.

To achieve this goal, we start by analyzing patterns of human interaction. Together with a context meta-model, such patterns enable effective selection, adaptation, and invocation of services.

BACKGROUND

Many context frameworks target specific groups such as mobile users (Tang et al., 2001; Bardram & Hansen, 2004) or small mobile groups (Pokraev et al., 2005) acting independently of others. More generic frameworks try to cover a wider area but hence lack explicit support for things like group interaction. Exemplary tools focusing mostly on context and hardly on the interaction between people on a broader scope are CASS (Fahy & Clarke, 2004), CoBra (Chen, Finin, & Joshi, 2003), CORTEX (Biegel & Cahill, 2004), Gaia (Roman et al., 2002), Hydrogen (Hofer, Schwinger, Pichler, Leonhartsberger, & Altmann, 2002), and SOCAM (Gu, Pung, & Zhang, 2004). An overview of these and additional frameworks can be found in Baldauf et al. (2006).

On the other hand, groupware systems such as the file-orientated BSCW (Bentley, Horstmann, Sikkil, & Trevor, 1995), virtual office-like Groove (www.groove.net), or the process-aware ad hoc collaboration tool Caramba (Dustdar, 2004) focus on collaborative functions while taking context only to some extent into account. Moreover, highly synchronous collaboration tools such as coediting neglect long-term team interactions.

Most teamwork tools are tightly integrated applications, whereas a service-oriented collaboration architecture reflects the notion of scoped functions wrapped as services that are provided, described, published, found, invoked and aggregated. Hence, a SOA oriented approach to context awareness (Gu et al., 2004) and collaboration (Jørstad, Dustdar, & van Do, 2005) seems

to be very promising, but the notion of context as proposed by Dey and Abowd (1999), needs to be extended beyond involved services (Dorn & Dustdar, 2006) to explicitly include teams as a first order entity.

The exhaustive review of current literature by Powell, Picolli, and Ives (2004) reveals that research efforts have merely focused on distributed teams as a whole without analyzing the internal interaction. Hence, three interaction patterns provide the basis to improve our understanding of e-collaboration requirements.


INTERACTION PATTERNS

The term *interaction pattern* refers to a common, reoccurring interaction scenario between actors. The term *relation* refers to a tie or link between two actors within a pattern. We take three initial interaction patterns that are well known in the domain of software engineering (SE) and apply them to the domain of human collaboration.

PROXY PATTERN

Originally, the Proxy pattern was introduced by Gamma, Helm, Johnson, and Vlissides (1994, p. 207) as a structural pattern in software design. The intention for using a proxy is “to provide a surrogate or placeholder for another object to control access to it.” Besides forwarding the clients’ requests and sending back the response, a proxy can do pre- or post-processing depending on its

Figure 1. Proxy pattern



8 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/interaction-context-service-oriented-collaboration/8858

Related Content

Project Management Issues in IT Offshore Outsourcing

Kathy Stewart Schwaig, Stephen H. Gillamand Elke Leeds (2006). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 53-73).

www.irma-international.org/article/project-management-issues-offshore-outsourcing/1951

Information Technology Adoption by Groups Across Time

Vicki L. Sauter (2010). *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on E-Collaboration: Emerging Trends and Applications* (pp. 231-253).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/information-technology-adoption-groups-across/41553

Gender Differences and Cultural Orientation in E-Collaboration

Yingqin Zhong, Zhen Wangand John Lim (2008). *Encyclopedia of E-Collaboration* (pp. 301-307).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/gender-differences-cultural-orientation-collaboration/12441

Aesthetic Assessment of Packaging Design Based on Con-Transformer

Wei Li (2023). *International Journal of e-Collaboration* (pp. 1-11).

www.irma-international.org/article/aesthetic-assessment-of-packaging-design-based-on-con-transformer/316873

Social Capital, Social Networks, and the Social Web: The Case of Virtual Volunteering

Dhrubodhi Mukherjee (2010). *Handbook of Research on Social Interaction Technologies and Collaboration Software: Concepts and Trends* (pp. 110-120).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/social-capital-social-networks-social/36023