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Singapore’s Learning Sciences Lab: Seeking Transformations in ICT-Enabled Pedagogy

by Chee-Kit Looi, David Hung, Jeanette Bopry, and Thiam-Seng Koh

The landscape of education and learning is increasingly challenged by the rapid changes through technological advancements and the impending knowledge society. In Singapore, we recognize that her people are her key resource, and thus, education is integral to her development.

Increasingly, the traditional pedagogies commonly practiced in the schools are waning in the context of progressive changes in meeting the challenges of the knowledge-driven economy. With information and communications technology (ICT) as a key driver in the flux of change and progress, advanced technologies such as ubiquitous computing, mobile and wireless devices, 3-D environments, augmented and virtual reality, and others are beginning to be commonplace in work and homes.

Since 1997, several new initiatives have been implemented in the Singapore education system. These include National Education, the Masterplans for Information Technology (IT) in Education, Thinking Programme, and Project Work. These initiatives aim to prepare students for the knowledge-based economy of the 21st century and to achieve the vision of Thinking Schools, Learning Nation. This is a vision for a total learning environment, including learners, teachers, parents, workers, companies, community organizations, and the government. “Schools must develop future generations of thinking and committed citizens, capable of making good decisions to keep Singapore vibrant and successful in future” (MOE, 1997a).

Singapore’s Masterplan for IT in Education lays out a comprehensive strategy for creating an IT-based teaching and learning environment in every school. It will be one of her key strategies for equipping the young with the skills that are critical for the future—creative thinking, effective communication, and the ability to learn independently and continuously. The government spent S$2 billion from 1997 to 2002 to put IT into all the schools to enhance teaching and learning (MOE, 1997b). At the closure of Masterplan I in 2002, it had managed to equip teachers with basic IT skills so that they could use digital resources and tools to enhance their teaching. The impact of the first Masterplan is evident in the way pupils have made use of technology to explore new boundaries of learning; in
the professional growth of the teachers; in the development of supportive school ICT culture; and in the enhanced relationship between schools and the community.

In order to sustain the momentum gathered and make better use of technology to stimulate thinking and creative endeavour among learners, the Ministry of Education (MOE) launched IT Masterplan II, a five-year plan for schools spanning 2003–2007. A key area of this plan is to use IT to enhance the connections between the curriculum, instruction, and assessment methods. Another key area is the use of ICT to stimulate pupils to think and experiment independently and creatively. These are fundamental learning objectives for an innovation-based era. In essence, Masterplan II focuses on getting learners to use IT for engaged learning (MOE, 2002).

Thus IT MasterPlan I put in place the necessary ICT infrastructure in schools and provided adequate training of teachers to support basic integration of IT into the curriculum. IT MasterPlan II focuses on the use of ICT by teachers to bring about engaged learning for students within and outside the schools. Curriculum and assessment are poised to provide a learner-centered emphasis where the teacher plays a pivotal role in facilitating learning. Such a transformation toward learner centeredness can be accelerated through the role of ICT as a catalyst. Through such a change, schools become more innovative, while they keep up with technological advances. Learners become more creative and critical thinkers.

Goals of the Learning Sciences Lab

The realization based on the past few years of implementation of Masterplans I and II is that for effective transformation of learning to take place enabled by ICT, educators need to go back to the basics of understanding learning from scientific and interdisciplinary perspectives. At the National Institute of Education (NIE), we are setting up the Learning Sciences Lab (LSL) to transform pedagogy, enabled by ICT in the schools. The LSL is proposed as an experimental lab where ideas and concepts related to learning interactions and teaching pedagogies can be prototyped and implemented in classrooms and schools. Through a continuous spiral process of experimentation and exposing school leaders, teachers, and students to workable ideas and developed prototypes, LSL provides those individuals with experiences that can transform mindsets toward empowered learning and lifelong learning. Thus the LSL:

1. Disrupts traditional pedagogical mindsets and spurs individuals to innovative thinking and life-long learning.
2. Fosters experimentation with emerging technologies to transform learning and pedagogy in the future.
3. Engages in transformative capacity building and empowerment while translating experimentation to curriculum redesign and education at the NIE and in schools.

Learning Science Research Initiatives

The LSL is grounded on six key research initiatives in ICT—the outcomes of an ICT-in-Education retreat held in March 2004 and attended by key stakeholders from MOE and NIE, with representation from the National University of Singapore:

1. **Epistemologies of teachers toward the use of ICT:** Teachers’ current prevalent epistemologies are holding back their effective appropriation of ICT for education. We at LSL want to know their current state of belief, and how it can foster a change toward more comprehensive views of meaning and knowledge, thereby leading to a better appropriation of ICT.

2. **Student meaning-making with ICT:** How do we facilitate learners toward the construction of meanings and interpretation, with ICT as mediating tools? No one can steal the experience of learning and construction from students—experiencing the territory for themselves is different from memorizing or knowing the map, well-epitomized by the saying that “the Map is not the Territory” (Hung, Looi & Koh, in press; Korzybski, 1941).
3. Teachers’ design of learning activities with ICT: Beyond epistemologies, teachers need to have the skills and confidence in designing ICT-based learning activities that facilitate learner-centered construction, personal experiences, and interpretation.

4. Design of learning technologies: ICT-enabled learning technologies can play a crucial role in the learning process. At LSL, we are interested in the kinds of tools and environments that local teachers can appropriate with skill and confidence.

5. Scalability and sustainability: How can educators scale up the adoption of ICT in the schools for teaching and learning? The principles of scalability and sustainability need to be understood and applied across the local system without taking away the experience of each school, teacher, and learner to “walk on the path laid out by walking.” No set of rules or representations can replace the actual experience of journeying through the phenomena, however, travelers can learn from the reported mistakes and attempts of others.

6. School practices and policies: Should be aligned based on Tenets 1–5. Rewards systems play important intrinsic and extrinsic roles here. At LSL, we also recognize that unless we seriously consider multiple assessment and evaluation modes, efforts in reform will be difficult.

A unifying framework must be synthesized to encompass research efforts as well as motivating and driving future research. The initial theoretical framework is enactive cognition, which provides a warrant for approaches to research and instructional practice, such as situated cognition and communities of practice. We at LSL are particularly interested in drawing on the literature and practices associated with situated cognition, and are encouraged that enaction will provide a means whereby we can assess the internal consistency of our work.

A consistent framework for our considerations can be formulated based on three sets of related pairs of issues:

1. Epistemologies of teachers is coupled with designing for learning (teachers’ perspective).
2. Meaning-making for learners is coupled with learning technologies (students’ perspective).
3. Scalability and sustainability is coupled with school policies and practices (schools’ perspective).

We have started to consider an over-arching theoretical framework to underpin the directions. This theoretical understanding provides us with a consistent degree of understanding ICT, learning, and the role of design and instruction.

Proposed Theoretical Framework to Ground Research Work—Enaction

The objective of LSL is to synthesize a unifying framework to encompass our research efforts as well as motivating and driving future research. A theoretical framework is needed to avoid implementing strategies and processes without an adequate understanding of their theoretical grounding, which may lead to internally contradictory practices and the end result that strategies and processes may not be effective. Even if they work, researchers may not understand how they work. Further, although they understand in broad general terms that they want to promote creativity, critical thinking, and engaged learning, they need a framework that provides direction to help make these things happen.

For Singapore to have an international impact, research and practice must be applicable to other contexts; they must not be seen as just local phenomena. There is a need for consistency in theory and practice—to walk the walk, not just talk the talk. A theoretical framework will provide a common lens to view practice. The framework we are proposing is enactive cognition, which was formalized in the early 1990s, although its components have been around much longer (Varela, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991). Enaction is a general framework in much the same way as representational realism: It provides a warrant for approaches to research and instructional practice. This framework has borne fruit in a number of fields: education, sociology, law, family therapy, and cognitive science to mention a few. Enaction provides a warrant for approaches to practice such as situated cogni-
tion and communities of practice (Bopry, 1999). At LSL, we are particularly interested in drawing on the literature and practices associated with situated cognition, and are encouraged that enaction will provide a means whereby we can assess the internal consistency of that work. We have found, in the literature, descriptions of situated cognition that closely conform to the enactive framework and descriptions of situated cognition that are inconsistent with it. This is a common problem when approaches are not tied to specific theoretical frameworks.

In selecting enaction as a framework we are taking the directives about creativity, innovation, and engagement very seriously. It is apparent that the representational framework with its emphasis on received knowledge is not a framework that promotes these objectives. Creativity, innovation, and engagement flow naturally from the enactive position. Where the primary metaphor of the representational framework is the computer gestalt, the primary metaphor of enaction is the conversation. Enaction holds that the primary way we relate to our world is by interacting with it rather than processing representations of it. Enaction is remarkable in that it is the first framework to use a metaphor of mind that is backed by biological rather than technological evidence. Cognition has begun to be considered a legitimate biological problem. Enaction is also unusual in that it is grounded in a combination of Eastern and Western philosophy.

Certain commonsense ideas that are regularly ignored by those operating in the representational framework are important to enactivists. For example, the map is not the territory, and its variation, anything said is said by someone. Within the enactive framework, descriptions and maps belong to observers of phenomena and not to the phenomena themselves. Further, observers must always be accounted for, because their observations are part of their experience, not a part of the experience of those being observed. If we accept that anything said is said by someone, then we understand that there is no such thing as a detached third person perspective. Everything that an observer sees or hears is an interpretation that resides within his or her own experience. Everyone is part of the first person experience of some other. It is in this manner that enaction is able to account simultaneously for the social and the cognitive, another of its unique characteristics: self and other are brought together in experience.

Levels of Experience: Phenomena, Observations, and Descriptions

How can educational practitioners profit from a perspective of enaction? One possible source is the fact that the framework suggests three non-intersecting levels of experience:

1. Description—reflective.
2. Observation—reflective.

To understand this organizer, reflect on your own experience. Much of our daily experience as humans remains tacit at the phenomenal level unless we actively attempt to bring it to the surface of consciousness at the observational level. We can observe ourselves or we can observe some other phenomenon. Our observations, however, cannot be equated with the experience we observe, nor do they encompass that experience. Observation is a different form of experience. It depends on, but does not intersect with, the phenomenal experience that is being observed. We also engage in communication about our observations at the description level. Once again, our conversations about observations do not capture our observations or the phenomenal experiences observed. These descriptions only allow us to talk about the experiences in such a way that another observing the same phenomenon could converse with us about it.

Jean Lave provided an interesting example to which we can apply this organizer (Lave, 1997). A three-week module on multiplication and division was given to an elementary class in mathematics. The teacher began the module with a pretest, provided the requisite instruction

1 Organizer is used here in the sense of a conceptual organizer, something short of a model, that helps organize thinking or perception.
and practice, and then gave the students a post-test. The results were baffling: Scores on the pre-test were distributed in a regular manner; on the posttest however, scores were clustered near the highest score on the pretest but none exceeded it.

Lave’s colleagues were asked to try to explain this unusual distribution, and a variety of explanations were offered, from “poor teaching” to “poor students.” During this period, an ethnographer was present in the classroom who observed students working in groups around large tables and actively engaged in mathematical activity. However, student activity was unrelated to the procedural instructions given by the teacher. The students had largely ignored the teacher’s instructions. Instead they used strategies they already knew, and supplemented these with tables found in the back of their texts. They discovered, for example, that by using multiplication tables backward they could solve division problems. Information received by a student from the teacher was quickly shared with the others. Students hid the strategies they used by carefully handing in written work in the form that the teacher expected; she accepted the written work as evidence that they were following the procedures that she had prescribed. These students were able to deceive their teacher by communicating with her in her domain of descriptions. She mistook this ability to use the same symbols and structures she used for an ability to engage in the procedures that she expected.

Because the teacher was unaware of the procedures the students were actually using (i.e., she did not observe their actual practice), she could not explain the unusual distribution of scores on the posttest. The students had created a community of practice in the classroom that allowed them to engage in effective action relative to the constraints of the classroom (i.e., the subject matter and the instructor).

Implications of Enaction

The story given above underscores the importance of the three levels of experience. More importantly, it shows that we cannot expect instruction in the form of descriptions to translate well into phenomenal experience; at the level of description it is easy to deceive and be deceived by others. A presentation of this organizer to Finnish teachers participating in the Comenius distance project (December 11, 1998, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland) resulted in critical evaluation of the types of experience available to students in the distance environment and how this would affect the kinds of subject matter that it was appropriate to teach in such an environment. Although the Lave story provides an opportunity to use the organizer to analyze a problem, the Finnish teachers used it to constrain their design efforts.

We in the LSL draw some implications of enaction for the kinds of design we want to implement there:

- Do not steal experience from students. Provide opportunities for interaction with subject matter. Designers have a tendency to engage with subject matter and then describe the results to students. For students to be engaged, they may need to interact with subject matter themselves. ICT provides an important medium that links students together, and provides the affordances of information persistence, relevant contexts, and supporting resources, to support the learning conversations of students.

- Provide opportunities for meaningful observations for both learners and teachers. When interaction with a subject under study is impossible, consider observation of the subject. Observation is a common means whereby apprentices learn their craft, often required before they are allowed to interact with the tools of the trade. This suggests that students be exposed to modeling by teachers and others from whom they learn. Teachers can improve their understanding of the learners in their charge simply by closely observing and listening to them. This is difficult to do if one is speaking all or most of the time. It is more easily accomplished if the students are engaged in active interaction. Three types of listening skills are useful for teachers in interaction with learners: (a) evaluative, (b) interpretive, and (c) hermeneutic (Davis, sumara, & Kieren, 1996). ICT provides means for
recording online various forms of student interaction, thus providing a window for teachers to observe various levels of interaction. Give opportunities for students to describe their own action and the actions of others in multiple modalities (Hedberg, 2003). Students should be encouraged to develop skills in a variety of symbol systems used for communicating experience. Different knowledge domains have different dominant modes of communication. Entry into these communities often depends on an ability to converse and make sense with their members (Freebody, Hedberg, & Gou, 2003). ICT can play an important role by providing different forms of representations and modalities (e.g., text, visuals, diagrams, models) to support student expression and articulation of their own understandings.

The following additional examples of practice are also cognizant of the three levels of experiencing phenomenon:

- Howard Gardner (1999) provided an example of the Reggio Emilia preschool where curriculum was determined on the fly, based on thick descriptions of learner activities and interests. Volunteers made note of everything students did, and the teachers used these notes to make curriculum decisions. The decisions were drawn directly from the activities of learners, and changes were made very quickly, making the curriculum maximally flexible.

- Howard Barrows (1994) designed a problem-based curriculum for medical school where students interacted with patients from the very beginning of their medical education. Medical students were brought into the community of practice by giving them authentic diagnostic problems using actual medical records. Early in the program, they began to take on the identity of apprentice physician.

In considering creating an example of how the enactive framework might be employed in the Singapore context, these two cases kept coming to mind. In Singapore, trainees might be engaged as ethnographers in classrooms from an early stage in their training. The possible advantages are many: The material gathered could be used by teachers for curricular purposes; it could be used for research purposes; and the engagement in the classroom would bring trainees into the community of practice in the schools well before they began their practicum experiences.

We have thus begun our exploration of a theoretical framework to undergird our various research themes. Situated cognition, as one of the prevailing, and still leading, learning frameworks, is congruent to and can perhaps be seen as a particular instantiation of enactive cognition. In pursuing the major research themes laid out previously, it is necessary to constantly iterate between research practice and theory so as to ground the research.

Translating Research into Practice in Schools

The key role of the LSL is to engage in research and experimentation in relation to the ICT initiatives, resulting in several actionable goals:

- To undertake research that explores and transforms teachers’ epistemological beliefs toward knowledge and learning, and the design, cognitive, social, and emotive contexts of technology-supported learning.

- To examine the interrelationships between management, technology, resources, and strategies in technology-based learning environments.

- To exploit existing technologies, and develop and evaluate tools that both embody current theory and support innovative multimodal constructive learning with emerging technologies.

- To develop and evaluate prototypes, and demonstrate their viability, so that local industry can follow up and exploit them commercially.

LSL will provide an environment that brings together various researchers in NIE and practitioners from the schools and Educational Technology Division (ETD) of the MOE who have good conceptual ideas on learning design to bring their ideas to fruition. LSL is meant as a conducive environment for translating good
ideas into useful artefacts, and for designing and evaluating learning technologies. The environment comprises both the infrastructure and the development resources, such as hardware, software, and software designers. LSL will provide a research and development program where it facilitates continued growth in terms of professional development in the learning sciences among the staff members of NIE. LSL completes the research to development cycle in realizing ICT-enabled transformation in the schools. The current tight collaboration with ETD would facilitate this translation to schools and practice. LSL’s goals of research and development, emerging technologies, and professional development are closely aligned with the goals of ETD.

Based on the learning sciences research foci, the agenda of the LSL is to exploit the findings of research, and translate ideas and concepts into tangible processes, tools, and technologies that would be used in a sustainable way in the schools. LSL will engage in (a) “upstream to downstream” research and development, (b) exploitation of off-the-shelf technologies for learning, and (c) provision of test beds for emerging technologies for learning.

The outputs and deliverables include design products, models of cognition, practice-models, pedagogic-models, virtual learning environments, and models of online learning.

Some of the initial potential projects that may be pursued in LSL are (a) supporting problem-based learning for integrated science using collaborative learning with multimodal representations, (b) understanding and transforming teacher attitudes toward use of ICT in education, and (c) exploring the use of virtual reality graphical environments for student learning.

International Benchmarks

In the United States, the National Science Foundation (NSF) will start to fund major Science of Learning Centers (2003). Their program offers awards for large-scale centers that will extend the frontiers of knowledge on learning and create the intellectual, organizational, and physical infrastructure needed for the long-term advancement of learning research. Centers will be built around a unifying research focus, and will incorporate a diverse, multidisciplinary environment involving appropriate partnerships with academia, industry, all levels of education, and other public and private entities (NSF).

Singapore has an opportunity to define a niche in the learning sciences—and that can have real impact in the classroom. Whereas LSL researchers tend to do design research—working in a few classrooms—the challenge now is to scale up, to move from a few classrooms to whole schools. Working in close collaboration with schools and the MOE, LSL hopes to carry out these types of scaled-up, learning-sciences-based research. The LSL will collaborate with leading professors and centers of learning sciences in the United States, Canada, and Europe to conduct research studies with the aim of heightening local and international awareness of transformations in learning through ICT.

Potential Contributions of LSL to the International Arena

Singapore’s LSL is the first center for the learning sciences in the Asia-Pacific. There are unique dimensions of ICT adoption and cultural underpinnings in this part of the world. The first distinction we at LSL recognize as unique to the region is the learning epistemologies held by largely Asian cultures, which are oriented toward family and social values and traditions. Undergirding these assumptions are strong impartation-of-knowledge assumptions within the Asian culture and context compared to Western traditions. Are there fundamental distinctions and contributions to the learning sciences based on these cultural distinctions? The LSL is designed to tackle issues of ICT mindset that are rooted in cultural and contextual issues as indicative of situated cognition. It is hoped that LSL can take the lead on research in learning and cognition in the region.

Second, we at LSL hope to collaborate with the emerging centers for the science of learning set up in the United States and, potentially, in various other parts of the world. We envisage that when these centers mature and take on
firmer grounding, a steering executive committee overseeing the macrolearning sciences activities can be formed to synergize the efforts of the individual centers. With various centers arising, more strategic foci that build on the capabilities of various efforts in different parts of the world are warranted. The field of learning sciences seems to be emerging with emphasis in the United States; Canada and Europe are engaged in similar work.

Third, relating particularly to the readers of this journal, there is an increasing convergence in the fields of learning sciences and instructional systems. Drawing too many distinctions between the two fields or communities may be unnecessary. However, it has been useful to understand how the two communities have emerged since their conception. Recognizing that some historical developments in the learning sciences can be traced to cognitive science and artificial intelligence may not be too comforting for traditional instructional designers. The reality is that, in their current states of development, the two communities are convergent, especially for both learning science and instructional systems researchers who have kept up to date in the fields. The methodologies used by both communities are increasingly similar. For example, there is convergence in the importance placed on design experiments with respect to the belief that well-reputed journals are looking for submission of such research studies.

Finally, it is our hope at LSL to balance the perspectives of learning sciences and instructional systems. Learning sciences are concerned with issues of context, cognition, design, theory, and methodology. Learning sciences cultivate a disposition for expansive thinking about learning, whereas instructional systems provide the methodologies, tools, and strategies for affecting actual teaching and learning. The learning sciences field can benefit from the how-to of instructional systems, which includes evolving strategies and pedagogies applied to learning contexts. The challenge is to bring theories of situated cognition to the level of practitioners and teachers without reducing situated cognition to a procedure-rule level. Unless we at LSL can achieve such an end, we may remain only academics in the ivory tower.

Conclusion

This has been a discussion of the rationale of setting up the LSL as a mechanism to help the MOE and the NIE in Singapore make significant headway in the use of ICT in education in the schools. The LSL is envisaged to effectively marry innovation in pedagogy and practice, enabled by technologies, to come up with new concepts that will enable schools to transform their pedagogies to meet the challenges of education in a rapidly changing technological environment.
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Although drafted by the authors, the synthesis of ideas in this piece is the result of the work of a number of colleagues who attended a retreat in Bintan in March 2004. We wish to thank our colleagues from NIE and the MOE. In particular, we wish to thank John Hedberg, Seng Chee Tan, Cher Ping Lim, S. Gopinathan, and Yam San Chee.

References

Lave, J. (1997). The culture of acquisition and the practice of understanding. In D. Kirshner & J. A. Whitson (Eds.), Situated cognition: Social, semiotic, and...
Acts of Inquiry in Digital Dramas: A Study of Student-Generated Questions in a Global, Telecollaborative Learning Activity

by R. W. Burniske

In this case study, I examine student interactions in a global, telecollaborative learning activity, investigating the importance of student-generated questions and the cultivation of an online community-of-inquiry. The findings suggest that exploratory discourse, fundamental to shared inquiry, requires a dialogical approach to the design, coordination, and collaboration of online learning activities that involve an international community of learners playing multiple roles within improvised, digital dramas.

Background

Studies of educational telecomputing often celebrate the idea of a distant audience without demanding authentic interaction among participants. For example, in their groundbreaking investigation of the influence that a foreign audience had on student writing, Cohen and Riel (1989) examined the work of students who were informed that their writing would be sent to readers overseas, but never actually interacted with them. Meanwhile, early adopters of online learning activities frequently appropriated designs that valorized “information” more than interaction, embracing impoverished forms of telecomputing rather than inventing robust forms of telecollaboration that would “share the labors of learning at a distance” (Burniske & Monke, 2001, p. 12). Consequently, many telecomputing activities have established narrow objectives, limiting student exploration of ideas and the possibility of engagement with distant peers in open-ended inquiry, perpetuating what Freire (Freire & Faundez, 1989) described as a “castration of curiosity.”

Because of such precedents, many online learning activities become demonstrative rather than exploratory exercises. The former occurs when students investigate a close-ended question through activity structures that Harris (1998) has categorized as interpersonal exchanges, information collections, and problem-solving activities. In such cases, students pursue a single, “correct” answer and attempt to demonstrate its veracity. It is the latter model, however, the exploratory learning activity, that offers an antidote to traditional forms of distance education. As others have noted, open-ended inquiry and dialogue are not only absent from conventional correspondence courses, but discouraged by the undertaking’s design and implementation (Barker, Frisbie, & Patrick, 1989).

The groundwork for this study was a set of global, telecollaborative learning activities created and coordinated from 1995 through 2000. While engaged in this series of activities as one of the project coordinators, I discovered that students’ questions were critical to the success or failure of the projects as a whole. Consequently, I wanted to examine the relationship between inquiry acts and discourse in such online interactions. I realized that examining student questions would not tell the whole story, because inquiry is conducted through a variety of syntactic forms, not just questions. However, student questions may provide hints about their inquiry practices because, as Lindfors (1999) pointed out, although questions (interrogative forms) and inquiry acts (such as seeking information or confirmation) are different, they often