



Memòria justificativa de recerca de les convocatòries BCC, BE, BP, CTP-AIRE, DEBEQ, FI, INEFC, NANOS i PIV

La memòria justificativa consta de les dues parts que venen a continuació:

- 1.- Dades bàsiques i resums
- 2.- Memòria del treball (informe científic)

Tots els camps són obligatoris

1.- Dades bàsiques i resums

Nom de la convocatòria

BE

Llegenda per a les convocatòries:

BCC	Convocatòria de beques per a joves membres de comunitats catalanes a l'exterior
BE	Beques per a estades per a la recerca fora de Catalunya
BP	Convocatòria d'ajuts postdoctorals dins del programa Beatriu de Pinós
CTP-AIRE	Ajuts per accions de cooperació en el marc de la comunitat de treball dels Pirineus. Ajuts de mobilitat de personal investigador.
DEBEQ (Modalitat A3)	Beques de Cooperació Internacional i Desenvolupament
FI	Beques predoctorals per a la formació de personal investigador
INEFC	Beques predoctorals i de col·laboració, dins de l'àmbit de l'educació física i l'esport i les ciències aplicades a l'esport
NANOS	Beques de recerca per a la formació en el camp de les nanotecnologies
PIV	Beques de recerca per a professors i investigadors visitants a Catalunya

Títol del projecte: ha de sintetitzar la temàtica científica del vostre document.

Entorns col·laboratius virtuals asíncrons basats en Web i enfocats en la gestió del coneixement
Web-based Asynchronous Collaborative Environments Focused on Knowledge Management

Dades de l'investigador o beneficiari

Nom	Cognoms
Santi	Caballé Llobet

Correu electrònic
scaballe@uoc.edu

Dades del centre d'origen

Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC) - Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (N3)





Número d'expedient

2007BE-1 10025

Paraules clau: cal que esmenteu cinc conceptes que defineixin el contingut de la vostra memòria.

Entorns col·laboratius virtuals

Activitat en grup

Aprenentatge col·laboratiu formal i informal

Anàlisi de les interaccions

Extracció de coneixement per a propòsits de consciència, feedback (retorn) i monitorització

Data de presentació de la justificació

30/09/2008

Santi Caballé Llobet

Nom i cognoms i signatura
del/de la investigador/a

Vistiplau del/de la responsable de la
sol·licitud





Resum del projecte: cal adjuntar dos resums del document, l'un en anglès i l'altre en la llengua del document, on s'esmenti la durada de l'acció

Resum en la llengua del projecte (màxim 300 paraules)

Resum en anglès (màxim 300 paraules)

Communities of Learning Practice is an innovative paradigm focused on providing appropriate technological support to both formal and especially informal learning groups who are chiefly formed by non-technical people and who lack of the necessary resources to acquire such systems. Typically, students who are often separated by geography and/or time have the need to meet each other after classes in small study groups to carry out specific learning activities assigned during the formal learning process. However, the lack of suitable and available groupware applications makes it difficult for these groups of learners to collaborate and achieve their specific learning goals. In addition, the lack of democratic decision-making mechanisms is a main handicap to substitute the central authority of knowledge presented in formal learning.



Resum en anglès (màxim 300 paraules) – continuació -.

From the literature, the provision of specific support to these specific learning groups has been little investigated. To fill this gap, an ongoing work is presented that will result in a democratic web-based groupware learning system especially designed to provide support for specific groups in both formal and informal collaborative learning over the Internet. Moreover, an important purpose of this software is to provide advanced mechanisms of information management from the group activity for its further use in extracting and providing effective knowledge on interaction behavior. Indeed, this issue represents a fundamental requirement for current collaborative learning environments in order to adequately regulate the learning process as well as to enhance learning group's participation by means of providing appropriate awareness and feedback. This work describes the main guidelines that conducted the requirements and design of this application as well as introduce the underlying groupware platform, called CoPE, that provides the essential functional support for democratic groupware.

2.- Memòria del treball (informe científic sense limitació de paraules). Pot incloure altres fitxers de qualsevol mena, no més grans de 10 MB cadascun d'ells.

This working report consists of 4 documents, which are the following:

- 1- Main report: Web-based Asynchronous Collaborative Environments Focused on Knowledge Management and Distributed Infrastructure (DocumentMemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf). Extension: 18 pp.
- 2- CoLPE Specification and analysis (Annex1MemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf): Extension: 45 pp
- 3- CoLPE Design (Annex2MemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf): Extension: 122 pp.
- 4- CoLPE Evaluation and results (Annex 3MemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf). Extension: 7pp

The first document (FormulariMemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf) provides the general research report and also serves to link the rest of the documents. In overall, about 200 pages of technical information were generated.

The following is the index of the main report (Document #1). Please find enclosed the complete document as well as the rest of the documents.

INDEX

1. Introduction
2. Background: Democratic support for collaborative work
3. Methodology: Support for Knowledge-based Communities of Learning Practice Environments
4. Evaluation and Results
5. Conclusions and Further Research
6. Results of the Research Stay
7. References



SANTI CABALLE LLOBET

Web-based Asynchronous Collaborative
Environments Focused on Knowledge
Management

BARCELONA
September, 2008

A report conducted by Santi Caballé Llobet as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Research Grant for a sojourn (BE) at the University of California at Berkeley with file number 2007 BE-1 10025 granted by the Agency for Management of University and Research Grants (AGAUR)

INDEX

1. Introduction

2. Background: Democratic support for collaborative work

3. Methodology: Support for Knowledge-based Communities of Learning Practice Environments

4. Evaluation and Results

5. Conclusions and Further Research

6. Results of the Research Stay

7. References

1. Introduction

Over the last years, collaborative e-Learning needs have been evolving accordingly with more and more demanding pedagogical and technological requirements [1]. On the one hand, modern pedagogical approaches targeting formal education include advanced learning techniques based on some form of collaborative consensus-building mechanism, such as learning by discussion and problem-based learning [2]. To this end, a great deal of software packages in the form of Learning Management Systems (LMS) have recently appeared in the marketplace to support those communities of learning practice formed during the formal learning process, which typically involves all students in a classroom. These tools enable the management of educational content and also integrate tools that support many of the groupware needs, such as e-mail, discussion forums, chat, virtual classrooms, and so on [3].

On the other hand, informal collaborative learning typically involves a small number of students who meet each other informally after classes in small study groups to carry out specific learning activities assigned during the formal learning process. These groups of people also form communities of learning practice where an important part of both individual and group learning process takes place and whose members are often separated geographically and have the need to meet asynchronously.

In all cases, collectives of students who are separated by geography and/or time form communities of learning practice where an important part of both individual and group learning process takes place asynchronously. However, the lack of suitable and available groupware applications makes it difficult for these groups of learners to collaborate and achieve their specific learning goals. In addition, current collaborative learning applications and sophisticated learning management systems do not conveniently address the support to learning groups who are chiefly formed by non-technical people and who lack of the necessary resources to acquire such systems, especially in informal learning.

In particular, in on-line collaborative learning environments, the discussion process forms an important social task where participants can think about the activity being performed, collaborate with each other through the exchange of ideas arising, propose new resolution mechanisms, and justify and refine their own contributions and thus acquire new knowledge [4]. The lack of technological support for democratic decision-making mechanisms is however a main handicap to both achieve a consensus in a discussion process by means of voting and substitute the central authority of knowledge in small study groups. Furthermore, current collaborative applications provides poor support for the representation and analysis of group activity interaction as an essential feature to sustain a collaborative learning discussion, in terms of coaching, monitoring, and evaluation [5], [6]. Indeed, a large amount of information data is generated from the actions performed by the participants during the discussion process, which includes complex issues of the collaborative work and learning process (e.g., group well-being as well as self, peer and group activity evaluation). This information is then use in extracting and providing effective knowledge on interaction behavior to adequately regulate the learning process as well as to enhance learning group's participation by means of providing appropriate awareness and feedback.

This report presents and summarizes how by boosting these entire approaches one step further resulted in the introduction of a new collaborative learning tool called CoLPE, which was developed to support and enhance the discussion process encountered in many on-line courses and also in those informal study groups in the form of on-line discussions. This system implements many of the approaches described so far and the first results drawn from real collaborative learning for higher education in the Open University of Catalonia

show very promising benefits for students in a real context of learning and in education in general.

This report is organized as follows. Section 2 presents an existing groupware system called CoPE developed at ICSI¹ that provides informal support for collaborative work. Section 3 presents the main requirements that conducted the development of CoLPE by extending CoPE to the learning domain and incorporating essential functionalities regarding the management of information and knowledge about group activity. The experience and the evaluation results of using this application in a real learning context are reported in Section 4. Section 5 summarizes the main aspects of the contributions presented in this report. Finally, Section 6 presents the overall results achieved in this research stay. In addition, together with this report, several technical documents come attached presenting the whole development of the CoLPE application. In overall, this research effort have provided the Open University of Catalonia with more powerful tools that enhance and improve the on-line collaborative learning experience. Moreover, it completed Santi Caballé's PhD thesis.

2. Background: Democratic support for collaborative work

CoPE [7], [8] is a web-based collaborative system aiming at providing formal and informal cooperative work over the Internet to non-technical people or those who lack of the necessary resources to acquire such systems. As such, CoPE provides most of the functionality expected from an asynchronous Computer-Supported Collaborative Work (CSCW) [9] application, such as information management and communication facilities.

CoPE is designed to enable a specific type of collaboration²; a subset of CSCW that has not been adequately addressed so far. Specifically, this involves sets of individuals who share a need or desire to engage in collaborative production. The object of this production is something that can be codified in documents. CoPE is targeted to individuals who do not already have a formal workflow for this collaboration or who are seeking to improve upon inefficient workflows. CoPE also envisions enabling collaboration among individuals who are part of organizations with formal collaboration mechanisms, but whose mechanisms are limited to intra-organization collaboration. Finally, CoPE is designed to enable collaboration, not management, and thus envisions “democratic” collaboration.

There are many examples of sets of individuals around the world who have a need or desire to collaborate but lack the resources, knowledge, or institutions to do so. Consider, for example, public school teachers, social workers, and community action groups (where the group and its peer groups are the “individual”). Often these individuals are separated by geography and/or time and can be too distant from one another to organize face-to-face meetings. They also could be unable to meet due to scheduling constraints or differing work hours. Such individuals may already be part of existing organizations but the “peers” with whom they wish to collaborate are in different organizations. CoPE is especially targeted to

¹ The International Computer Science Institute (ICSI) is a pioneer non-profit research center located in Berkeley, USA, which is affiliated with the University of California at Berkeley. ICSI maintains ongoing basic research projects of the highest standard in selected areas of computer science and engineering. ICSI currently has significant efforts in four major research areas: Internet research, including Internet architecture and related theoretical questions; theoretical computer science, including applications to bioinformatics; artificial intelligence, particularly for applications to natural language understanding; and natural speech processing. The areas of concentration are chosen for their fundamental importance and their compatibility with the strengths of the Institute and UC Berkeley faculty.

² The CoPE project is part of a broader goal to enable users without specific computing expertise to establish and maintain content in a web environment. CoPE is a joint effort between BCIS, the Central Valley Partnership, and researchers from several departments at UC Berkeley.

these individuals and organizations who lack substantial technical expertise or the resources to acquire such expertise.

CoPE was developed for the needs of a certain type of user forming the CoPE User Community. The system interface design makes assumptions based on the characteristics of such users, whose type is referred to as “General User.” The following assumptions motivate this definition:

- users do not have specialized (information/computing) technical skills,
- users possess a basic skill set for computer and internet usage,
- users possess the ability to learn a new (information/computing) skill set of this same basic technical level,
- users are willing to learn a new (information/computing) skill set of this same basic technical level,
- users do not already share a sophisticated and/or long-used method for electronic collaboration.

There are several features and mechanisms of the implemented CoPE system that support collaborative work and in particular group discussions:

- hierarchical threaded discussion of documents to serve as a core for group consideration of material of any kind, which can include arbitrary additional material where the coordinator typically posts a document for discussion and also intervenes in the ongoing dialog when appropriate.
- support for the production of joint projects by subgroups of participants by easily setting up subgroups so that the work of each group is kept private from the others, but is visible to the coordinator.
- allow the coordinator of a CoPE site to customize much of the form and content of the material without programming and a range of choices on discussion and voting methods are provided enabling coordinators without IT expertise to customize their discussion environments.

CoPE is built by modifying and taking advantage of Plone/Zope’s [10] powerful content management capabilities, such as information management, document workflow, and so on. CoPE modifies Plone appropriately to achieve the desired functionality.

3. Methodology: Support for Knowledge-based Communities of Learning Practices

The extension of CoPE to learning is called Communities of Learning Practice Environment (CoLPE) [11], [15] which relies heavily on CoPE, and in turn on Plone, for most of the mentioned functionality that intersects CSCW and collaborative learning paradigms. However, specific behavior has to be aggregated to facilitate both the construction of knowledge among learners and the development of cognitive-acquisition skills, such as problem-solving abilities as well as the provision of an adequate multi-support framework so that tutors and peers can provide a suitable scaffolding when needed, as key aspects that distinguish CSCL from CSCW. CoLPE pursue these objectives by means of seeing discussion as a medium through which the building and distribution of cognition is effected.

This sections presents the collaborative learning requirements that motivated the CoLPE development and the main guidelines that conducted its design. The ultimate aim is to

provide full support to both formal and informal learning groups by means of the collaborative discussion process. See attached document presenting the whole development of CoLPE.

3.1 General requirements³ and pedagogical background

CoLPE's requirements include support to the essential types of generic contributions found in any discussion process, namely specification, elaboration and consensus [4]. Specification occurs during the initial stage of the process carried out by the tutor or group coordinator who contributes by defining the group activity and its objectives (i.e. statement of the problem) and the way to structure the group activity in sub-activities. Elaboration refers to the contributions of participants (mostly students) in which a proposal, idea or plan to reach a solution is presented. The other participants can elaborate on this proposal through different types of participation such as questions, comments, explanations and agree/disagree statements. Finally, when a correct proposal of solution is achieved, the consensus contributions take part for its approval (this includes different consensus models such as voting); when a solution is accepted the discussion terminates.

A fundamental requirement to sustain collaborative learning applications is the representation and analysis of group activity interaction to facilitate coaching and evaluation [2] as well as awareness and feedback about what is happening during the collaboration. To this end, in extending CoPE to e-Learning a primary requirement is a throughout management and provision of information and knowledge in terms of task performance, group functioning and scaffolding [6]. The ultimate goal is to enhance and improve group activity by constantly keeping users aware of what is going on in the system (e.g. others' contributions, new documents created, etc.). In addition, monitoring participants' performance allows tutors to identify problems that participants may encounter during the assignments. These findings can then be used to provide both real-time and asynchronous support to students (i.e., help students who are not able to accomplish the tasks on their own).

Finally, in a discussion process, participants perform a role according to their profile (e.g., coordinator, member, guest, etc.), have personal preferences (e.g., language) and set up environment features (e.g., sound or visual effects, text or voice warnings, etc.) according to their personal characteristics. Participant needs are not static and they evolve as the discussion moves forward.

3.2 The design of the application⁴

CoLPE design aims at providing specific support to the essential types of generic contributions in a discussion process identified in the requirements, namely specification, elaboration and consensus. In CoLPE, these different types of generic contributions are managed by the three essential aspects existing in any collaborative learning application, namely coordination, collaboration and communication [9]. Coordination involves the organization of groups to accomplish important objectives to perform a discussion, such as workspace organization, group structure and planning. Collaboration lets group members share any kind of resources while communication represents the basis of the whole discussion process since it enables coordination and collaboration to be achieved by providing them with low-level communication support. Based on these three areas of

³ The complete list of CoLPE's requirements and their analysis are found in the working document *Annex1MemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf* that is attached to this report.

⁴ The entire design of CoLPE is found in the working document *Annex2MemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf* attached to this report.

cooperation, the main guidelines in designing the generic types of contribution is as follows:

- Specification phase is mainly based on coordination which involves the organization of groups such as workspace organization and group structure and planning, so as to accomplish group objectives.
- Elaboration is the main phase in the discussion, which relies on both collaboration and communication allowing students to share any kind of resources (e.g., participation spaces, documents, etc.) as well as exchange ideas by posting messages to a discussion space. To this end, this phase is mainly structured in CoLPE by means of folders, which hold the discussion threads and other subfolders forming the whole discussion as a learning assignment or activity. A discussion thread in turn holds a document or text page, which will head the rest of the comments of the same thread. A subfolder may contain others in order to organize the workspace more effectively or for the purpose of storing additional resources (see Fig. 1. Please note this figure and the following contain Spanish and Catalan text due to they are extracted from a real learning experience carried out in Barcelona, Spain. See Section 4 for more information).

Figure 1. Discussion thread formed by the head of the thread and the follow-up comments. Red flags provide feedback at thread level informing where the news is

During the elaboration phase, a key issue in CoLPE is that before a participant sends a new contribution to a discussion thread, this contribution is to be categorized by a predefined list of labels or categories, such as request for information, opinion, clarification, elaboration, etc.; inform in terms of extension, suggestion, explanation, justification, illustration, etc.; problem, which may be found as statement, solution, etc; greetings, motivation, among others (see Fig. 2 and also Table 2 for a complete list of labels). The purpose of these categories is to classify the intention of the contribution. Not all categories are always made available since depending on where the discussion is found just a subset of them are made available. These categories represent the information source to eventually present complex feedback to users in terms of participation impact and user profile (see further in this section for details).




Figure 2. A list of tags to qualify a contribution

Depending on the pedagogical model and objectives pursuit in the discussion, a discussion thread may start by submitting a proposal, a solution of a problem, etc., which is to be later on discussed by the participants by means of sending contributions to the thread. Eventually, based on the cognition level achieved during the discussion, participants may vote on the initial proposal submitted so as to approve/disapprove it. On approval the proposal may be archived while on disapproval it may be also revised and resubmitted to be discussed again. Therefore, a discussion thread follows a workflow with several states, from draft to approval or rejection (see [7] for more information). The functionality is addressed to the tutors who can manually change the state of the thread.

- The consensus phase in the discussion process is also based on collaboration by which a voting system is shared by the group members to choose the best proposal arisen during the discussion. To this end, several voting modes are available in ColPE to meet different consensus needs (see Fig. 3).




Figure 3. Several voting modes are available

In order to equip CoLPE with an appropriate knowledge management from the users' interaction data analysis, a great advantage was taken of a generic, reusable service-oriented, component-based platform called Collaborative Learning Purpose Library (CLPL) [12], [13], [14]. This platform enables a complete and effective reutilization of its generic components for the construction of specific collaborative learning applications. The CLPL is made up of five components in all handling user management, security, administration, knowledge management and functionality (see [13] for an exhaustive description of each component). The aim is both to map the essential elements involved in any collaborative learning application and provide specific support for interaction data analysis as explained in Section 1. To this end, this library is mainly performed by the two components, namely *CSCL Knowledge Management* and *CSCL Functionality*, which form the core of the CLPL in the construction of collaborative learning applications. They are briefly described here:

- The *CSCL Knowledge Management* component is made up of two subsystems, namely *CSCL Activity Management* and *CSCL Knowledge Processing* so as to support the first two stages of the information and knowledge management. The first subsystem manages the system log files made up of all the events occurring in a certain workspace over a given period of time. This event information is then correctly classified according to a complete and tight hierarchy of events based on the mentioned three types of collaborative activity proposed in the previous section. The second subsystem performs the statistical analysis event information as well as the management and maintenance of the knowledge extracted by that analysis.
- The *CSCL Functionality* component implements the last stage of the information and knowledge management process, that is the presentation of the knowledge generated to users in terms of immediate awareness (see Fig. 1) and constant feedback (see Fig. 4) of what is going on in the system. In order to provide the essential awareness information to support collaboration, communication and coordination effectively, this subsystem defines three generic entities respectively, namely *resource state*, *user status* and *group memory*. Each of these abstractions acts as a vehicle so that awareness information can be classified and presented to users in the correct form depending on the type of activity involved. Finally, feedback information is achieved by defining certain generic entities such as *history*, *pool* and *diagram* and functions such as *sorting*. Based on these abstractions it is possible to dynamically gather and store a great amount of history data and statistical results from group activity. For the purposes of presentation format, this component defines a *flag* as a single abstraction supporting the presentation of awareness information to users through the user interface as well as a *chart* for the presentation of complex information in the appropriate diagrammatic format (e.g., pie chart, histograms, plain text, etc.).

site map accessibility contact

ColPE UOC MGPI Aula 2

search

home

you are here: home → debat 2

fvs's folder my folder preferences message coordinator log out

Folder - DEBAT 2 (shared)

DEBAT 2

↳ Up one level

Espai per desenvolupar el segon debat de l'Aula MGPI2.

add thread

	title	created by	news	last by	most by	yours	state
<input type="checkbox"/>	La Gestió dels Canvis: Necessitat o virtut?	scodola	0/0	--	--	0/0	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Peticions de canvi - Registre obligatori	fvs	0/3	amendoza	solivem 1/3	0/3	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Acceptem o no els canvis	toni_camps	3/10	rffarref	mserrago 2/10	1/10	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Necessitat d'una eina per introduir els canvis en un manteniment	solivem	0/1	amendoza	amendoza 1/1	0/1	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Els canvis, tipus i seves conseqüències	olgaferro	0/1	alexm	alexm 1/1	0/1	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Al món ideal no hi ha gestions del canvi	jnavasca	1/4	jmartinezsaez	mserrago 1/4	0/4	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Una proposta de gestió de canvis	mviladrichg	2/2	jmartinezsaez	solivem 1/2	0/2	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Una valoració d'impacte acurada i una bona comunicació amb el client	alexm	0/2	alexm	mserrago 1/2	0/2	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	La gestió de canvis com a oportunitat	mpalopf	0/0	--	--	0/0	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Inviabilitat d'aplicar política de "Canvi Zero"	jcampre	1/3	mviladrichg	amendoza 1/3	0/3	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Els canvis, tipus i seves conseqüències	jmrc000	0/0	--	--	0/0	submitted
<input type="checkbox"/>	Los cambios, son una realidad y debemos tratarlos	mnoval	2/2	fsanze	solivem 1/2	0/2	submitted
total folder		scodola	9/28	rffarref	mserrago 5/28	1/28	

copy

Action - (No action has been selected)

comments

(Comments are not allowed for folders)

View all comments

December 2007

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

votable items [+]

No items are currently votable.

All recent votable items.

Sitiros de confianza | Modo protegido: desactivado 100%

Figure 4. Partial feedback at folder level presented to all participants. The yours indicator allows students to compare their own quantitative performance to the rest of the contributors.

Personal features of the discussion group participants (their role, collaboration preferences and so on) were taken into account and a user and group model were designed so as to allow participants to add new services whilst their needs evolve as the discussion moves forward. All these user features were included by the *CSCL User Management* component through the user profile management subsystem, providing a solid support for building and maintaining the user and group model.

Therefore, CoLPE supports a complete discussion process through the realization of three generic contribution types and an open user and group model. Furthermore, this application constitutes a valuable resource to greatly improve essential features of a discussion process such as awareness of participant contributions and enhance the abilities of users by increasing their knowledge of each other in terms of motivation, interaction behaviour and so on.

4. Evaluation and Results⁵

In order to evaluate the prototype of CoLPE and analyze its effects in the learning experience, and in particular the discussion process, the real on-line learning context of the Open University of Catalonia⁶ was used. 43 graduated students enrolled in the course Methodology and Management of Computer Science Projects were involved in this experience.

⁵ The complete evaluation and results of CoLPE is found in the working document *Annex3MemoriaSantiCaballe_BE110025.pdf*, that comes attached to this report.

⁶ The UOC is located in Barcelona, Spain, and offers full distance higher education in different languages through the Internet since 1995. The virtual campus supports currently about 47,000 students, and 2,000 lecturers and tutors who are involved in some of the 600 on-line courses available from 23 official degrees and other PhD and post-graduate programs. The UOC is found at <http://www.uoc.edu>

4.1 Experiment procedure

The experience consisted in a discussion assignment (“Change management: necessity or virtue?”) with the aim of discussing how a project manager can deal with the problem of changing the requirements of those software projects which are already in advanced phases of their development because of demanding and urgent needs of the clients.

The procedure was the following: students were free to open zero, one or several discussion threads (i.e., head of threads) where they proposed strategies, ideas, etc., to appropriately deal with the topic of the discussion. During the discussion, any student could contribute in both own and any other discussion thread as many times as needed, as well as start extra threads to provide new argumentations or approaches with regards to the issue addressed. The only requirement was to make at least one post either head of thread or comment.

4.2 Results and analysis

The results of this experiment are provided by means of statistical analysis. A structured and qualitative report was also conducted at the end of the discussion addressed to all participants who were asked to both assess the prototype and compare it to the standard well-known discussion tool they had already used in previous courses at the UOC.

A statistical analysis of the results of the discussion is shown in Table 1. Note that the discussion took place at the end of the course and even though the number of potential participants was 43 (i.e., students enrolled in the course), roughly 40%⁷ of them had already made the decision to give up before the assignment started and as a result they did not pay attention nor contribute to the discussion. So, the number of active participants who participate in the discussion actively or passively was 26.

Statistics	CoLPE
Number of students enrolled	43
Number of students actually participating	26
Number of heads of thread	17
Number of comments in threads	93
Total posts	110
Mean number (posts /thread)	M=6,4 SD=4,5
Mean number (posts /student ⁸)	M=4,2 SD=3,8

Table 1. Basic statistics about participation.

From the results of Table 1, the SD statistic for the posts/thread mean appears to be high, which proves the heterogeneity of the discussion involving threads of very different length and also that actual discussion was generated and as a result the contributions became highly structured and specific. In addition, the posts/student mean rates high (the requirement was 1 post per student) and shows a general interest in the discussion.

On the other hand, the SD statistics for posts/student is also high meaning that some students participated a lot (more than 10 posts) while a few tried to fulfill the assignment’s requirement and provided single, monolithic points of view. It could be argued that at the end of the course students are lack of time though more experimentation have to be undertaken to confirm these results.

⁷ Currently, the drop-out average at the Open University of Catalonia is about 50%.

⁸ Students who participated in the discussion.

Exchange moves	Contribution categories	# Tagged contributions
<i>support</i>	Greeting	3
	Motivation	0
<i>request</i>	REQUEST-Information	1
	REQUEST -Elaboration	0
	REQUEST -Clarification	3
	REQUEST -Justification	0
	REQUEST -Opinion	20
	REQUEST -Illustration	0
	INFORM-Extend	17
<i>inform</i>	INFORM-Lead	0
	INFORM-Suggest	8
	INFORM-Elaboration	0
	INFORM-Explain/Clarification	17
	INFORM-Justify	1
	INFORM-State	0
	INFORM-Agree	21
	INFORM-Disagree	6
	PROBLEM-Statement	16
<i>set-up-an-issue</i>	PROBLEM-Solution	1
<i>provide-solution</i>	PROBLEM-Extend solution	0

Table 2. Distribution of the tagged contributions

Table 2 shows the most frequent categories used to tag the contributions. Although the choice of the category appears to be mostly correct they could indeed be more precise. The permanent availability of all possible categories did not help participants to choose carefully. In future iterations, only those categories which are possible (i.e., make sense) at a certain point of the discussion will be shown, thus facilitating the choice a great deal.

Table 3 shows the results of a structured and qualitative report conducted at the end of the discussion addressed to the CoLPE users who were also asked to compare it to the standard well-known tool they had already used in previous courses at the UOC. This report shows the technical problems faced due to the server where CoLPE was installed (Linux SuSE 2.4.21-99 machine, Intel Pentium 4 CPU 2.00 GHz, 256MB RAM) performed poorly and it was unable to conveniently handle both the demanding hardware requirements of Zope and the participants' concurrency.

Selected questions	Average of structured responses (0 – 5)	Excerpt of students' comments
Asses the CoLPE application	4	“Despite technical problems with the server I found CoLPE very useful due to the distribution of posts into threads and also be aware of where the news was” “I liked the categorization as it helped me understand others' contributions and reply being more confident on my contribution” “The notification of news was useful” “CoLPE is more suitable to support this type of discussion than the UOC's forum” “Certain functions are missing in CoLPE: subscription to your thread, advanced search function, ...”
Evaluate how CoLPE fostered your active participation	2	
Did CoLPE help you acquire knowledge on the debate's issue?	2	
Compare CoLPE to the UOC campus' standard forum tool	3	

Table 3. Excerpt of the questionnaire filled out by the students

5. Conclusions and Further Research

This report describes a promising approach for enhancing communities of learning practice by means of an innovative tool that contributes to the improvement of the discussion process occurring in both formal and informal collaborative learning settings. To this end, the experience of using this prototype in a real context of on-line learning has been reported, though the results are not conclusive due to its exploratory nature. However, from the analysis of the results it has been proved to promise significant benefits for students in the context of collaborative learning, and in education in general.

More powerful hardware is used in the current experiments [14] so as to overcome the poor server performance issue. Moreover, a decentralized distributed infrastructure is intended to be added to the CoLPE prototype in order to meet certain important non-functional requirements that may influence the learning process a great [16], such as performance, scalability, fault-tolerance, and interoperability. For instance, the gain in fault-tolerance might help enhance the effectiveness of complex collaborative learning processes (e.g., by avoiding a central point of failure). It is planned to explore further these interesting possibilities in the next iterations of the CoLPE design.

6. Results of the Research Stay

This research stay has resulted in the following achievements:

- Santi Caballé's Ph.D. in Information and Knowledge Society at the Open University of Catalonia (UOC) in September 17, 2008 (awarded with Excellent Cum Laude by unanimity).
- Five publications:
 - i. Conference paper: Caballé, S. and Feldman, J. *CoLPE: Communities of Learning Practice Environment*. Proceedings of Tools for Participation: Collaboration, Deliberation and Decision Support. 21st Symposium on Directions and Implications of Advanced Computing; Conference on Online Deliberation (DIAC / OD 2008). University of California, Berkeley. June 2008. ISBN: 0-96678-185-6.
 - ii. Workshop paper: Caballé, S., Xhafa, F., Daradoumis, Th., Abraham, A. *Efficient Interaction Analysis for an Effective Provision of Knowledge about the Discussion Process to CSCL Practices*. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Collaborative E-Learning Using Computational Grid (CeGrid 2008). Ostrava, The Czech Republic. June 2008. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN: 978-0-7695-3184-7.
 - iii. Workshop paper: Caballé, S., Feldman, J., Thaw, D. *Supporting Communities of Learning Practice by the Effective Embedding of Information and Knowledge into Group Activity*. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Collaborative E-learning Systems and Applications (CESA 2008). Barcelona, Spain. March 2008. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN: 0-7695-3109-1/08.
 - iv. Book chapter: David Thaw, Jerome Feldman, Joseph Li, and Santi Caballé. *CoPE: Democratic CSCW in Support of e-Learning*. Book: Intelligent Collaborative e-Learning Systems and Applications. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag. 2008. To appear in 2009.
 - v. Book chapter: Caballé, S., Feldman, J., Thaw, D. *CoLPE: Support for Communities of Learning Practice by the Effective Embedding of Information and Knowledge about Group Activity*. Book: Intelligent Collaborative e-Learning Systems and Applications. Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag. To appear in 2009.

- On-going research collaboration between the Open University of Catalonia (UOC) and the International Computer Science Institute (ICSI) in Berkeley, USA. Conducted by Dr. Santi Caballé (UOC) and Dr. Jerry Feldman (ICSI). The achievements and purpose of this collaboration is both:
 - i. Incorporate the research results into the project CAMPUS of the UOC based on free software so that UOC students can be benefited both inside and outside the new virtual campus.
 - ii. To keep working on the underlying platform, called CoPE [8] by incorporating an exhaustive knowledge management approach about group activity. The aim is to meet the needs of those informal and social groups from the Bay Area of California formed by non-technical people and who lack of the necessary resources to acquire such systems.

7. References

- [1] Pankatrius, V., Vossen, G., Towards E-Learning Grids: Using Grid Computing in Electronic Learning. Proceedings of IEEE Workshop on Knowledge Grid and Grid Intelligence, Halifax, New Scotia, Canada, (pp. 4-15), 2003.
- [2] Dillenbourg, P. Introduction; What do you mean by “Collaborative Learning”? In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), Collaborative learning. Cognitive and computational approaches (p. 1-19). Oxford: Elsevier Science, 1999.
- [3] Caballé, S. On the Advantages of Using Web & Grid Services for the Development of Collaborative Learning Management Systems. In Proceedings of the 3PGIC’07.Vienna. Austria, 2007.
- [4] Salomon, G. No distribution without individual’s cognition: a dynamic interactional view. In G. Solomon (Ed.), Distributed cognitions (pp. 111–138). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press., 1993.
- [5] Zumbach, J., Hillers, A. & Reimann, P. Supporting Distributed Problem-Based Learning: The Use of Feedback in Online Learning. In T. Roberts (Ed.), Online Collaborative Learning: Theory and Practice. Hershey, PA: Idea, 2003, pp. 86-103.
- [6] Daradoumis, T., Martinez, A., & Xhafa, F. A Layered Framework for Evaluating Online Collaborative Learning Interactions. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies. Special Issue on Theoretical and Empirical Advances in Groupware Research”, Volume 64, Issue 7 (pp. 622-635). Academic Press: Elsevier Ltd, ISSN: 1071-5819, July 2006
- [7] Feldman, J., Lee, D., & Thaw, D., 2006. Communities of practice environment. In The Internet Society II: Advances in Education, Commerce & Governance, K. Morgan, C.A. Brebbia, J.M. Spector, Eds., WIT Press.
- [8] Thaw, D., Feldman, J., Li, J. (2008). CoPE: Democratic CSCW in Support of e-Learning. In proceedings of the International Workshop on Collaborative E-learning Systems and Application (CESA 2008). pp. 481-486. Barcelona, Spain. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN: 0-7695-3109-1/08.
- [9] Bentley, R., Appelt, W., Busbach, U., Hinrichs, E., Kerr, D., Sikkell, S., Trevor, J. & Woetzel, G., 1997. Basic Support for Cooperative Work on the World Wide Web, Int. Journal of Human-Computer Studies 46(6), 827-846.
- [10] Aspeli, M. (2007). Professional Plone development. PACKT publishing.
- [11] Caballé, S., Feldman, J., Thaw, D. (2008). Supporting Communities of Learning Practice by the Effective Embedding of Information and Knowledge into Group Activity. In proceedings of the International Workshop on Collaborative E-learning Systems and Application (CESA 2008). pp. 493-498. Barcelona, Spain. IEEE Computer Society. ISBN: 0-7695-3109-1/08.
- [12] Caballé, S., Daradoumis, Th., Xhafa, F. (2006). A Model for the Efficient Representation and Management of Online Collaborative Learning Interactions. Proceedings of e-Challenges 2006. Barcelona, Spain. Cunningham and M. Cunningham (Eds.), Building the Knowledge Economy: Issues, Applications and Case Studies. IOS Press, Amsterdam, Netherlands. ISBN: 1-58603-682-3.
- [13] Caballé, S., Daradoumis, Th., Xhafa, F., (2007) A Generic Platform for the Systematic Construction of Knowledge-based Collaborative Learning Applications. Architecture Solutions for e-Learning Systems. Idea. Group Inc (IGI). ISBN: 1599046334. Chapter. XII, pp. 219-242.
- [14] Caballé, S., Xhafa, F., Daradoumis, Th., Abraham, A. (2008). Efficient Interaction Analysis for an Effective Provision of Knowledge about the Discussion Process to CSCL Practices. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Collaborative E-Learning Using Computational Grid (CelGrid 2008). Ostrava, The Czech Republic. IEEE Computer Society. 978-0-7695-3184-7.
- [15] Caballé, S. and Feldman, J. CoLPE: Communities of Learning Practice Environment (2008). In proceedings of Tools for Participation: Collaboration, Deliberation and Decision Support. 21st Symposium on

Directions and Implications of Advanced Computing; Conference on Online Deliberation (DIAC / OD 2008). University of California, Berkeley. ISBN: 0-96678-185-6.

[16] Caballé, S., Xhafa, F., & Daradoumis, T. (2007). A Service-oriented Platform for the Enhancement and Effectiveness of the Collaborative Learning Process in Distributed Environments. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, LNCS 4804. (pp. 1280-1287). Heidelberg-Berlin: Springer-Verlag. ISBN: 978-3-540-76835-7.
