



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Celebrating the Tenth Networked Learning Conference

Looking Back and Moving Forward

de Laat, Maarten; Ryberg, Thomas

Published in:
Networked Learning - reflections and challenges

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.1007/978-3-319-74857-3_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74857-3_1)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
de Laat, M., & Ryberg, T. (2018). Celebrating the Tenth Networked Learning Conference: Looking Back and Moving Forward. In N. Bonderup Dohn, S. Cranmer, J-A. Sime, M. de Laat, & T. Ryberg (Eds.), *Networked Learning - reflections and challenges* (pp. 1-20). Switzerland: Springer. *Research in Networked Learning* https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-74857-3_1

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

material underpinning the presented graphs were created using the text- and data-mining tool Voyant Tools¹. Voyant Tools is an open source web-based text reading and analysis environment where all PDF-versions of the conference proceedings were uploaded and processed. Voyant Tools can - amongst other things - be used to count for example how many times particular words or phrases occur in a body of text. In the analysis presented in this chapter each conference proceeding featured as a data point creating a timeline presentation showing the development or decline of networked Learning research trends over the years.

In this introduction we have expanded the trend analysis initially presented at the Networked Learning Conference held in 2016 in Lancaster and discuss the findings we see from analysing the textual material. We will reflect on the limitations of our approach, the value and biases of statistical treatment of word occurrences, and what we can meaningfully draw from such analyses. For example our analysis suffer from an inability to meaningfully explore the concept of 'networked learning' itself as it occurs so often in the proceedings (e.g. in headers and footers) that it is rendered meaningless. Similarly it proved difficult to generate socio-graphs to map social interaction or author networks based on paper publications around the identified topics.

In this chapter we present our findings grouped into a number of themes, representing the areas in which Networked Learning has had most traction.

¹ <https://voyant-tools.org/>

We start with theoretical perspectives that have been used to understand and frame networked learning practices. We then reflect on the dominant research methods that have been used, followed by various modes of delivery or designing for networked learning and we wrap it up with a presentation of the technological devices that have dominated networked learning research over the years. Within each of these themes we discuss in more depth how we have approached the analysis and our rationale for the words chosen where after we provide an analysis and reflection and ponder what the findings might suggest in terms of moving forward.

As an initial caveat we should say that we do not ourselves consider our analysis an authoritarian analysis or solid, sturdy anchoring point from which we can say that we have attained a 'god's eye' overview of the past and future of networked learning. We see the analysis as a first attempt to provide a preliminary analysis of trends in a manner that we do not think has previously been attempted within networked learning. In the spirit of recognising the limitations and preliminary nature of this analysis and approach we lay our material open for others to explore as open data sets, so that other researchers - within or outside the networked learning community - can consult and work with the data to debate, dismiss or enrich the findings of our analysis. Thus, we see the analysis as a first preliminary attempt to understand the field of networked learning through the lenses and techniques of data-mining and textual analysis of corpora.

The field of Networked Learning

Networked learning is learning in which information and communications technology (ICT) is used to promote connections: between one learner and

other learners, between learners and tutors; between a learning community and its learning resources. (Goodyear et al. 2004, p. 1)

The quote above is the often-used definition for networked learning as proposed initially by Goodyear et al. (2004). It stresses the importance of both human and digitally mediated interactions through the notion of ‘connections’, and underlines that interactions with technologies and resources in isolation are not sufficient to constitute networked learning.

At the first Networked Learning Conference in 1998 the aim was to bring networked learning research and praxis together and there was a strong focus on lifelong learning, professional development and implications for educational theory and the current paradigm shift from traditional learning to distributed and distance learning (Banks, Graebner & McConnell, 1998) - in fact the proceedings were titled ‘Networked Lifelong Learning’. This early broad orientation of networked learning is visible in figure 1 below, but over the years it has become clear that a lot of the research has been driven by exploring particularly the potential of networked learning for higher education.




Figure 1: Focus of Networked Learning Research

In figure 1 one can see how frequently the words ‘higher education’, ‘professional development’, and ‘lifelong learning’ have been used in the networked learning conference papers over the years. From this, it becomes quite clear that the predominant focus has developed to become the area of Higher Education. The attention to lifelong learning and professional development has always been present with a pronounced peak in 2012 for ‘professional development’ when the conference was hosted in Maastricht in the Netherlands. The interest in lifelong learning seems to be gradually fading, which perhaps is part of a wider trend, as the same pattern holds true if one looks up ‘lifelong learning’ in Google Trends (from 2004 to 2017 there is a decline in interest from index 100 to approximately 30).

From the beginning of the conference series there was a very broad understanding of networked learning, and the *space of possibilities for networked learning was seen as vast*² (Jones et al., 2001). This is still true today, as illustrated in Goodyear, Carvalho & De Laat (2016) where a number of cases from different domains are presented. But it is also clear that the conference series bends strongly towards higher education and professional development, over for example primary or secondary education or informal learning (these were all terms we searched for, but they returned only a few results). This, of course, is hardly surprising as the conference has always been understood and promoted as a conference addressing higher education, professional development and lifelong learning (but has always been open to incorporating papers lying outside of this scope. While we were not surprised, that higher education features prominently over the years, we were a bit surprised to see the comparatively smaller uptake in ‘professional development’. This, as we believe it will increasingly become an area of political interest and one where the field of networked learning has a lot to contribute to in terms of critical, dialogical and collaborative perspectives over a more individualised trajectory of micro-degrees.

With the domain of inquiry being firmly settled within higher education and to some extent professional development, we were also interested in looking further into what constitutes the field of networked learning more broadly. We have therefore made searches into particular neighbouring research fields such as Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL), Computer

² <http://csalt.lancs.ac.uk/jisc/definition.htm>

Supported Collaborative Learning (CSCL), Learning Analytics and Knowledge (LAK), and more broadly Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and e-learning. The results can be seen from Figure 2.




Figure 2: Related areas of research

What is immediately notable from Figure 2 is the gradual rise of interest in the term ICT with a steep decline in 2012 and 2014. This, most likely, does not suggest that the interest in ICT's have waned, but probably that the term ICT is gradually and more broadly being replaced by other terms e.g. digital technologies. Again a Google Trends search for ICT does seem to confirm that this term is losing traction over the years from 2004 till now.

Quite interestingly the term ‘e-learning’ seems to live a bumpy life, peaking at some conferences (2004, 2008 & 2010) and being almost non-existing at other times (2000, 2006, 2012). There is no immediate good explanation for this, other than the term ‘e-learning’ in general is a broader (and less precise) term than networked learning, which would therefore often be the term chosen at NL-conferences over e-learning.

We further queried into specific fields of research, such as TEL, CSCL and Learning Analytics. In general, as we shall return to in the concluding chapter, the area of learning analytics seems little explored within the networked learning community, which does not seem to reflect a wider trend within educational technology. The term had a small surge in 2012 and has been explored further - though to a lesser degree - in 2014 & 2016. Comparing to Google Trends this is markedly different from the broader interest, as since 2012 the interest in Learning Analytics has risen (from index 11 in 2012 to nearing a 100 in 2017). In contrast the use of the term TEL has risen since 2008 in the NL conferences, and it seems that this is generally a term that has become increasingly popular amongst national governments, the EU and other funders (which has also provoked criticism of the term e.g. (Bayne, 2015, Hayes, 2016)). Finally, we queried into the term CSCL, which has gathered a relatively stable amount of interest within networked learning over time, though with a slight decline in the recent years. As argued by Jones, Ryberg and De Laat (2015) there are strong overlaps between CSCL and networked learning, as well as some areas where they follow different paths:

“Networked learning has a close relationship with computer-supported collaborative learning

(CSCL), in that both fields have a keen interest in collaborative orchestrations of learning. However, CSCL tends to focus on smaller groups, including dyads, whereas networked learning extends to medium- to large-scale groupings. Also CSCL has a strong connection with formal learning in education, whereas networked learning has been picked up in a wider context, for example, lifelong learning, professional development, and organizational learning.” (Jones, Ryberg & de Laat, 2015, p. 2)

CSCL when compared to networked learning has a stronger anchorage in education more generally including a strong presence in primary and secondary schools, whereas networked learning, as illustrated in figure 1, extends further into professional development and lifelong learning; although this to a lesser degree than we had actually expected (see figure 1).

Theoretical perspectives - Theory and focus of NL research

Within the area of networked learning it seems particularly worthwhile to understand what theoretical perspectives are underpinning ideas of networked learning. As several authors have explored Networked Learning is not a unison theoretical perspective, but rather is a theoretical perspective that is composed by or underpinned by a range of other theoretical outlooks (Hodgson, De Laat, McConnell, & Ryberg, 2014, Jones, 2015, Jones, Ryberg & De Laat, 2015).

In analysing these trends it is important to understand that the mention in a paper of a theoretical perspective does not necessarily translate to a positive stance towards or preference for that theory. Just as much as citation counts in isolation do not show that an author or perspective is agreed upon, popular or found worthwhile. For example, one might find - within the networked learning literature - quite a few references to Prensky (2001), but the majority of those might be critical to or debate the notions of 'digital natives' proposed initially by Prensky (e.g. Bennett, Maton & Kervin, 2008; Kennedy et al., 2008). Likewise, people might mention activity theory, but disagree with or dismiss it. Therefore, what follows from the trends analysis cannot, in isolation, be taken to mean that authors subscribe to the theory. Establishing just an approximation of positivity or negativity towards the theory mentioned would require a substantially more complex and detailed data-mining technique looking e.g. for adjacent words in sentences that could unearth positive or negative stances. This goes far beyond our capabilities and intentions, so we should remind the reader that the trend mapping merely signals attention/awareness. However, that a theory merits attention and is on the radar of the community is also an important measure of its impact on a community, whether for good or bad, it does show that it is or has been a topic of interest.

We should also mention that different words may often be used for the same theory. For example some differ between social constructivism and constructivism whereas others take it for the same. Likewise the term social constructionism is a term that has also featured in the conference over the years, and one that should not be confused with constructionism. Another term that is frequently used in this context is social constructivism.

Both terms follow a similar curve over the years (see figure 3 below). Although these terms have a slight different meaning they have also been used in substitution of one another.




Figure 3: Social constructivism and social constructionism

Actor-Network-Theory might be spelled in a number of ways, with or without hyphens, and might more recently be phrased as a sociomaterial perspective (or perhaps socio-material or social material) and for example activity theory could also be referred to as socio-cultural, sociocultural or cultural historical perspective. These ambiguities or even little differences in spellings (dash or no-dash) make it difficult to assess the occurrence of a theoretical perspective.

In the following we discuss the selection of the overall concepts we have chosen to include. The main concepts we have explored are: Cognitivism, Constructivism, Communities of Practice, Social Learning, Actor-Network Theory, and Activity theory.

While, from an experiential point of view, we did not expect there would be strong mentions of ‘cognitivism’ we included this perspective nevertheless, as it is often positioned as an overarching learning theoretical perspective together with behaviourism and constructivism (Jones, 2015). As networked learning is more often associated with relational, social and non-dualists views of learning we expected that cognitivism, understood as particularly associated with cognitive science/psychology or cognitive theory would be a more fringe perspective within networked learning. This is not to say that a cognitive perspective is strange to networked learning, indeed Peter Goodyear (e.g. 2002) has explored this topic extensively, and in Chapter 2 by Gale Parchoma in this volume she explores the notion of distributed cognition. However, the work grounded in cognitive science/cognitive psychology seems less pronounced in Networked Learning as Jones puts it:

“For networked learning the influence of cognitivism has been limited but there are some elements that have a continuing relevance. Firstly there is a concern with the thinking and intentions of learners. Networked learning still has an interest in what happens in the brain and an interest in what can be called the mind

(Goodyear and Carvalho 2014 ; Ellis and Goodyear 2010).” (Jones, 2015, p. 52)

The notion of constructivism was included as it is often positioned as an overarching learning theoretical perspective along with e.g. behaviourism and cognitivism. It is a term that has broad meanings, but usually refers to the idea that knowledge is constructed by the learners, rather than being transmitted to the learner by e.g. a teacher:

“The central ideas of constructivism are that knowledge is created by people, either as individuals or as part of groups, through experiencing the world and reflecting upon those experiences. In this view knowledge is constructed by the knower and as a consequence it does not exist externally and independently of the knower(s) and knowledge cannot simply be transmitted and received.” (Jones, 2015, p. 52-53)

Under the hood of constructivism, however, a number of different theories are often subsumed e.g. Piaget and Vygotsky, as well as ideas such as radical constructivism and constructionism. So, constructivism is a rather broad term that can cover quite a spectrum of different meanings. Finally, we have added three theoretical frameworks that we know/assumed from experience might be widely adopted (activity theory, actor network theory and community of practice), as well as the broader term ‘social learning’.




Figure 4: Theoretical perspectives within networked learning

Looking at the graph (figure 4) we see that the broad label of ‘constructivism’ has generally featured quite extensively throughout the years, with a steep rise around 2002, but seems to have gradually lost popularity in the recent years (from 2010 until now). Similarly, the notion of community of practice has been extensively popular and rising for every conference peaking at 2010, whereafter the term seems to decrease in popularity quite significantly from 2010 and onwards. Similarly, it seems that the notion of social learning follows a similar pattern to that of ‘communities of practice’. This could be explained by the fact that since 2004 Wenger began more intensively to refer to Communities of Practice (CoPs) as a ‘social theory of learning’. This term was mentioned in Wenger (1998), but be-

came more widespread with the publication of the research agenda 'Learning for a small planet' (Wenger, 2004). The decline in the number of mentions of CoPs from 2010 and onwards could indicate that the popularity of the theory maybe has started to 'wear out', but it is also interesting, as there have been a number of discussions (and critiques) of the notion of community. For one thing the notion of 'community' (not necessarily community of practice) has been critiqued to ignore the darker sides of hierarchy, oppression or 'the tyranny of participation' (Fox, 2005; Roberts, 2006; Ferreday & Hodgson, 2008) and also there have been discussions of communities versus networks and what the ideas of community might overlook (e.g. the strength of weak ties - Granovetter, 1973) (Wenger, Trayner & De Laat, 2011; De Laat, Schreurs & Nijland, 2014; Vrieling, Van den Beemt & De Laat, 2016). Thus, the notion of community has always played the role of both an ideal, as well as a contentious, problematic notion within networked learning and this double role might also be an explanation of why it has held such a strong role as a topic of discussion. It is also well worth noting that the interest in 'communities' within networked learning preceded the popularity of Communities of Practice as a distinct concept. The interest in community oriented and collaborative forms of learning has always been strong within networked learning; in fact it is probably because the notion of Communities of Practice resonate well with the foundational ideas of Networked Learning that is has become so pervasive.

For the other theories we have highlighted the trends are less pronounced. This might have to do with the semantic difficulties of capturing those

frameworks, whereas 'Communities of Practice' is a more easily encapsulated concept, activity theory and actor-network-theory could equally be referred to by many other names as stated earlier. However, from the graphs it seems that activity theory was more popular 2004-2006 and then has gradually diminished to have a bit of a renaissance in 2016. In relation to this it is interesting to see the interest in actor-network-theory gradually gaining traction from particular 2008 to peak in 2014. In 2014 it seems to have displaced activity theory - experiencing a surge in 2014, where actor-network-theory is peaking and an inverse relationship in 2016 where there is an almost equal amount of interest. We should, however, as previously written be careful in granting too much explanatory power to the graphs or deduce larger trends.

It does seem fair, though, to state that networked learning seems overwhelmingly underpinned by theories that take a broader social, cultural and relational view of learning, rather than for instance a more specific cognitive or neural perspective. Again, this is not entirely surprising and is also well-established in the networked learning literature - particularly this has also been argued in the book series, that summarises general trends in the area of networked learning.

Methods

Apart from querying into the theoretical underpinnings, we found that it would be relevant and interesting to look further into methods and methodologies adopted within networked learning. We initially queried into the broad distinction between 'qualitative' and 'quantitative' and incorporated also the more recently popularised idea of 'mixed-method' (see figure 5)




Figure 5: Overarching research orientations within networked learning

Figure 5 clearly illustrates that networked learning is a field leaning more towards qualitative methods than quantitative. From our experience with the conference and reading through many papers, this did not come as a surprise to us, though it is a bit surprising to see that between 2002-2008 there - apparently - was more quantitative work present, but that its volume seems to have diminished somewhat since then. Interestingly, mixed-methods, which seems to have become a very popular approach within many areas of research, had in the past few years an early start in the networked learning community and seems to live a quiet, but stable life outside the spotlight of hundreds of mentions. However, we should again be careful attributing too much explanatory power to the graphs, even one paper discussing quantitative vs qualitative and mentioning these concepts often could contribute heavily to a peak.

Adding more detail to the very broad query into methods, we decided to be more specific and query into terms such as: Interview, Survey, Observation, Discourse Analysis, Social Network Analysis and Data Mining (Figure 6) as well as Phenomenography, Ethnography, Design Based Research, and Grounded Theory (figure 7).




Figure 6: Data collection methods used in Networked Learning

Figure 6 more or less confirms the overall impression of networked learning leaning more towards the qualitative side. Interviews are by far the most mentioned method, followed by survey and observation (noting that observation could also occur as a regular word not affiliated with the method observation, just as one can make a survey of the literature). Somewhat surprisingly discourse analysis is quite rare. We had expected this would be a more prominent method, as often authors have analysed forum interactions or policy texts from a critical perspective. In this vein, it

could be interesting in a future analysis to identify the types of qualitative textual analysis networked learning researchers engage in.

From figure 5 we can further see that from 2004 social network analysis is beginning to take a place as a method that is adopted within networked learning research, whereas data mining remains a method rarely adopted or mentioned (though it should be mentioned that some forms of social network analysis rely on data mining).




Figure 7: Qualitative methodologies in Networked Learning

In figure 7, which can be seen as an extension of the previous figure (5) we can see how qualitatively oriented methodologies hold a central place in

networked learning research (although many forms of phenomenography and early grounded theory also entails quantitative aspects). Ethnography, often associated with observation and interviews, holds a stable - yet modest - place, whereas both grounded theory and phenomenography are more common. This most probably has to do with the nature of networked learning, as much networked learning occurs online making it more amenable to textual analysis of interviews, forum transcripts and so forth than perhaps sustained observations in the 'field' (though online ethnography or multi-sited ethnography is a blooming field within online educational research more broadly speaking). From the graphs one can see that both phenomenography and grounded theory have been gaining traction over the years (though mentions of grounded theory seem to be waning), and a peculiar observation is that there seems to be a strange inverted relationship between phenomenography and grounded theory. For example in 2010 mentions of grounded theory peaks, whereas phenomenography is absent and the inverse for 2012 where phenomenography peaks and the mentions of grounded theory plummet (and a somewhat similar pattern on a smaller scale can be seen in 2004 & 2006). Finally, we can see how the concept of Design Based Research seems to be on the rise since 2004 - a methodology that also seems to be gaining more attention within educational research at large.

In summary, it is notable that networked learning research leans broadly towards qualitative research, yet also including surveys, social network analysis and phenomenography and grounded theory, that in some interpretations include aspects of quantitative methods. Equally it is worth noting that approaches such as data mining seem to be completely absent

from networked learning research, which in many ways is not surprising, but perhaps worth reflecting on whether there is a need to pay more attention to such fields and methods, as much attention now seems to be directed towards ‘big data’, ‘analytics’, ‘algorithms’ and so forth.

Networked Learning Delivery modes

In this section on Networked Learning Delivery modes we look into three different dimensions moving from the more general modes of delivery (e.g. online, f2f) to more specific technological learning environments and social media infrastructures.

In figure 8 we have queried into different overarching modes of delivery i.e. F2F, distance, online, blended, hybrid, and open. It should be noted that several of these are difficult to assess, as words such as online, distance, and open could equally refer to ordinary usage of the words, rather than delivery modes per se.




Figure 8: Delivery modes for networked learning

From figure 8 it seems that there is little work referring to F2F (face-2-face) work, which is perhaps not surprising, considering that networked learning traditionally has been strongly associated with various form of ‘online’ or ‘distance’ learning - two concepts that also feature more prominently in the graphs. However, a caveat here could be the potentially many ways of expressing face-to-face in terms of variations of spelling or expressing ‘physical’ formats in education. Having said that, it is noteworthy that there are quite a few occurrences of blended-learning, which can entail a mixture of online and face-to-face, and the same for ‘hybrid’ (though both of these terms have many meanings).

In the past few conferences, it has become apparent that there is now a greater interest in delivery modes that are not only online, such as

blended/hybrid or understanding how students and teachers use educational technologies as part of on-campus teaching. Here it is particularly worth noting how ‘place’ and ‘mobility’ has entered as particular fields of interest (Carvalho, Goodyear & De Laat, 2017; Gourlay & Oliver, 2017; Gallagher, Lamb & Bayne, 2017) in contrast to students sitting at home participating in online conferences via a desktop computer (Goodyear, Carvalho & Dohn, 2016):

At the risk of over-simplifying, one might say that people involved in networked learning were generally assumed to be experiencing remote interaction with others: while sitting down, using a desktop computer or terminal; [...] Twenty years later, changes in technology, media habits and expectations mean that this sedentary, exotic, keyboard-tethered image of networked learning is no longer tenable. Mobile, personal, voice-enabled multifunctional devices such as laptops, tablets and smartphones have made it possible to participate in networked learning 24/7 from almost any location, including in workplaces, the home, the bus and the street. (Goodyear, Carvalho & Dohn, pp. 97-98)

We return to these issues in the final discussion in this book as these changes also have an impact on how we can understand the notions of ‘network’ in networked learning.

A final remark in relation to Figure 8, is the increasing interest in the notion of ‘open’ which is now nearing occurrences of the even more generic

term 'online'. This could for one thing be associated with Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), but more widely probably also reflects an interest in 'open' as 'open educational resources' and increasing interest in moving courses beyond the confines of a singular university module or course.

Learning Environments:

In terms of learning environments (see figure 9) we have queried it into four quite broad categories: Learning management system / virtual learning environment (LMS/VLE), MOOCs, Virtual Worlds, Clouds. Apart from LMS/VLE there are few occurrences of any of these words prior to 2008, which might not be very surprising in terms of concepts such as MOOCs and Cloud are terms that have only surfaced or become more widely popular around 2008-2010. Virtual Worlds (second life) seem to have been represented in the Networked Learning field only very marginally and with few occurrences over the years - it really shows no clear trend that was taken up in this research community. To the contrary the terms LMS/VLEs (i.e. Blackboard, Firstclass, WebCT, Moodle, Fronter) began an upwards trend after 2000, to peak around 2008, and then start to decline somewhat rapidly in the years following.




Figure 9: Learning environments featuring networked learning research

Most noticeably, is obviously the appearance of MOOCs that seem to follow a wider cultural trend of becoming excessively popular after 2012 following the rise of platforms such as Coursera, EdX and the whole MOOC-craze taking off at that time - but it should be noted that the earlier MOOCs (e.g. developed by Siemens and Downes) also received some attention in the Networked Learning Conference around 2010. It is, however, quite striking with this explosive interest in MOOCs happening between 2012 & 2014 showing a steep rise in mentions from around 25 to 450 (a graph that we could perhaps dub the ‘Nessie graph’ as it looks a bit like the ‘Loch Ness monster’ rearing its head). Whether MOOCs become a ‘Loch Ness monster’ lurking in the deep waters of Higher Education remains to be seen. On the one hand MOOCs have been subject to criticism,

on the other hand MOOCs are globally seen as a pathway for higher education institutes to offer courses online to attract students in the global higher education marketplace. The interest in MOOCs reflects of course the wider cultural and political interest in the MOOC-phenomenon. However, since the Networked Learning Community often praises itself for its critical and distanced stance to ‘boosterism’ and technological determinism (Jones, 2015), it would be interesting to dive deeper into an analysis of how the MOOC phenomenon was addressed in the papers from the 2014-2016 conferences.

To understand what might be the more concrete technologies that are adopted for learning we queried into some more generic types of tools (forum, blog, wiki), as well as particular services (Facebook, Twitter and YouTube).




Figure 10: Tools and social media use within networked learning

From this graph (figure 10) we can see that ‘forums’ were of increasing interest from 1998 until around 2008 where the use of the term ‘forum’ starts to decline. The interests in forums are hardly surprising for a field particularly interested in dialogue and collaboration as ‘forums’ were one of the dominant ‘technologies’ to support asynchronous dialogue at the time.

This is also reflected in a steeply growing interest in blogs and wikis, that were often portrayed as some of the paradigmatic ‘web 2.0 technologies’ (Dohn, 2009) within education; and it also follows the general interest in web 2.0 that started to take off around 2004-2005. What is interesting to see is how these terms also seem to be wearing off and be replaced by an interest in social networking sites and services such as Twitter & Facebook, and to a much lesser degree, Youtube. In relation to YouTube, it is somewhat puzzling that a platform, which is so pervasive in the broader

cultural landscape, seems to hold such a little space within Networked Learning

Technological infrastructure:

Regarding the use of technological devices and infrastructure by learners we were interested in querying into broad categories such as ‘computer’, ‘mobile’, ‘laptop’, ‘phone’ and ‘tablet’ to see if there were any trends that might be interesting (see figure 11). In relation to this, and which is perhaps not surprising is that the term ‘computer’ is slowly declining, whereas terms such as phone, tablets and laptop were on the rise, but most noticeably the word ‘mobile’ shows a clear upward trend since 2006 and exceeding ‘computer’ around 2014. This change follows the more general trend where over time we have become more specific about the type of computer technologies we are using.




Figure 11: Technological devices used for networked learning

Rounding off

Celebrating the tenth anniversary of networked learning conferences covering a period of almost 20 years of research in the area is a great opportunity to reflect and look back. Some clear patterns have emerged and although not always that surprising it provides a good summary of what happened over the years and where the focus of attention has been. What seems evident is that the field of Networked Learning is strongly linked to research within higher education, but equally professional development and lifelong learning are areas of interest. However, it is worth mentioning that there have certainly been numerous papers addressing also other contexts e.g. informal learning, upper secondary schools, museums. We believe that the field should always be open and inviting to papers and thoughts that do not necessarily emanate from studies in a higher education

context provided they contribute to advancing and developing our understanding of networked learning.

From a theoretical perspective it seems clear that networked learning is strongly associated with theories that emphasise social, relational and cultural aspects of learning, be they ANT, Activity Theory, Communities of Practice, socio-material, social constructionist or constructivist perspectives. It is a field interested in community oriented and collaborative forms of learning, but equally social learning in more loosely tied, diverse, complex networks increasingly exploring movements across online and 'physical' places. Methodologically, it leans strongly towards qualitative methods, but with noticeable interest in quantitative methods as well or methodologies involving aspects of quantification (social network analysis, grounded theory). It is a field that – being interested in digital technologies – also reroutes its interest or object of study as the technological landscapes and trends change. For example following the wider political and cultural interest in MOOCs, but also we see how there seems to be shift in focus from the VLE/LMS towards social media, such as Twitter and Facebook – or from institutional technologies to technologies and services that reside outside the technological infrastructures of Higher Education institutions.

In relation to this, it is also interesting to note that we might be experiencing a growing interest in forms of learning that are social in a different way than suggested by collaborative learning, communities or Communities of Practice.

The next 'wave' in educational technology and networked learning research might involve a growing interest in the importance of being networked in the sense of personal, social networks in a global learning landscape, where the core is not necessarily learning communities and group learning, but rather a greater attention to the degrees of freedom and choice that social networks and learning relationships provide – as well as the challenges of such personalised, social networks to central networked learning values such as community and collaboration. In this light social theories of learning, social network analysis and actor network theory may be used to understand the socio-material relationships that shape our learning and where (if it all still relevant) this learning takes place. Through their connectivity and use of mobile devices learners become even more aware that they are learning all the time, and that they through their contributions are not only consumers of knowledge but indeed creators of knowledge. Using Twitter, Facebook and other social media, a lot of our learning takes place in the 'wild' and therefore increasingly outside of traditional educational institutions. In this regard phenomena such as MOOCs - or more importantly – being able to connect with learners on a global scale can be seen as truly disruptive and something that will fuel future discussions within the networked learning research community. However, it is also clear that this 'global wild' is not necessarily a 'democratic' utopian realisation of the 'global village', but equally a 'wild' that is heavily guided by commercial platforms driven mainly by the desire for profit. In this 'wild' it will be increasingly important for the networked learning research community to critically ask: what should be the role of dialogue, community and collaboration and how we can sustain and promote central values such as widening access to education, and supporting democratic

processes, diversity and inclusion. These are questions that were foundational in the establishing of the networked learning research community and are equally valid – if not more important – in the years to come.

References:

- Banks, S., Graebner, C. and McConnell, D. (Eds.). (1998). *Networked Lifelong Learning : Innovative Approaches to Education and Training Through the Internet*. Proceedings of the International Conference, University of Sheffield, April 1998. DACE, University of Sheffield.
- Bayne, S. (2015). What's the matter with "technology-enhanced learning"? *Learning, Media and Technology*, 40(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2014.915851>
- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The 'digital natives' debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British journal of educational technology*, 39(5), 775-786.
- Carvalho, L., Goodyear, P., & de Laat, M. (2016). Place, Space and Networked Learning. In L. Carvalho, P. Goodyear & M. de Laat (Eds.), *Place-based spaces for networked learning* (1-10). Sydney: Routledge.

- De Laat, M., Schreurs, B., & Nijland, F. (2014). Communities of practice and Value Creation in networks. In R.F. Poell, T. Rocco, & G. Roth. (Eds.). *The Routledge Companion to Human Resource Development* (pp. 249-257). New York: Routledge.
- Dohn, N. B. (2009). Web 2.0-Mediated Competence--Implicit Educational Demands on Learners. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 7(2), 111-118.
- Hayes, S. (2016). Learning from a Deceptively Spacious Policy Discourse. In T. Ryberg, C. Sinclair, S. Bayne, & M. de Laat (Eds.), *Research, Boundaries, and Policy in Networked Learning* (pp. 23-40). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31130-2_2
- Jones, C., Asensio, M., Goodyear, G., Hodgson, V., & Steeples, C. (2001) *Final Report on the Field Studies. Networked Learning in Higher Education Project (JISC/CALT)*. Lancaster: CSALT (The Centre for Studies in Advanced Learning Technologies), Lancaster University.
- Jones, C. (2015). *Networked Learning - An Educational Paradigm for the Age of Digital Networks*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Fox, S. (2005). An actor-network critique of community in higher education: implications for networked learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(1), 95-110.
- Gallagher, M. S., Lamb, J., & Bayne, S. (2016). The sonic spaces of online, distance learners. Place-based Spaces for Networked Learning. In L. Carvalho, P. Goodyear & M. de Laat (Eds.), *Place-based spaces for networked learning* (87-99). Sydney: Routledge.

Goodyear, P. (2002). Psychological foundations for networked learning. *Networked learning: Perspectives and issues*, 49-75.

Goodyear, P., Banks, S, Hodgson, V., & McConnell D. (Eds.). (2004). *Advances in Research on Networked Learning*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Goodyear, P., Carvalho, L., & De Laat, M. (Eds.). *Place-based spaces for networked learning*. London: Routledge, 2016.

Goodyear, P., Carvalho, L., & Dohn, N. B. (2016). Artefacts and Activities in the Analysis of Learning Networks. In T. Ryberg, C. Sinclair, S. Bayne, & M. de Laat (Eds.), *Research, Boundaries, and Policy in Networked Learning* (pp. 93–110). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31130-2_6

Gourlay, L., & Oliver, M. (2017). Students' physical and digital sites of study: making, marking and breaking boundaries. In L. Carvalho, P. Goodyear & M. de Laat (Eds.), *Place-based spaces for networked learning* (73-89). Sydney: Routledge.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American journal of sociology*, 78(6), 1360-1380.

Hodgson, V., Laat, M. de, McConnell, D., & Ryberg, T. (Eds.). (2014). *The design, experience and practice of networked learning*. New York: Springer.

- Kennedy, G. E., Judd, T. S., Churchward, A., Gray, K., & Krause, K. L. (2008). First year students' experiences with technology: Are they really digital natives?. *Australasian journal of educational technology*, 24(1).
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
- Roberts, J. (2006). Limits to communities of practice. *Journal of management studies*, 43(3), 623-639.
- Ryberg, T., Sinclair, C., Bayne, S., & de Laat, M. (Eds.). (2016). Research, boundaries, and policy in networked learning. [S.l.]: Springer.
- Vrieling, E., Van den Beemt, A., & De Laat, M.F. (2016). What's in a Name: Dimensions of social Learning in Teacher Groups. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 22(3), 273-292.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice - Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2004). Learning for a small planet - a research agenda. Retrieved from <http://learninghistories.net/documents/learning%20for%20a%20small%20planet.pdf>
- Wenger, E., Trayner, B., & De Laat, M. (2011). *Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: A conceptual framework*. Heerlen: Ruud de Moor Centrum.