Round Table Session Information and Template.

A round table session provides an opportunity for participants to get together and explore issues related to networked learning in an informal yet structured setting.

Interested in hosting a round table?

You need to submit your round table topic in advance so that the round table topics can be presented in the conference program. This way participants can choose to attend your topic and engage in the conversation.

The round table will be facilitated by the topic host and will last as long as the scheduled session time in the program. Please provide a brief explanation to your topic by way of background information. Outline the goals you have for this session and make sure the participants have the opportunity to engage in the discussion.

There will be no projection or other technology provided to support your round table during these sessions. Please prepare and bring materials for your session if needed.

Round table Submission Template:

- Host name: Mike Johnson
- Round table title: A Networked Learning Disposition?
- Elevator pitch:
Productive networked learning is somewhat contingent on the learner's *disposition*. This round table discussion will explore, evaluate and determine this proposition and any implications for networked learning design, research and practice.
  Introductory questions -
  * What is *disposition*?
  * What is a *networked learning disposition*?
  * What are the practical implications of this for design, research and practice?

- Goal: Illustrate what you would like to achieve as a collective outcome:
I would like to give time to a collective reflection of this topic to:
  * Promote participatory scholarly deliberation upon a core theme of the conference amongst delegates, deepening our shared apprehension of networked learning.
  * Uncover different dimensions of a networked learning disposition and distinguish salient ones.
  * Gather participants' contributions with a view to distil discourse suitable for a collaborative scholarly publication. To this end I would like to make an audio recording of the event, with the consent of delegates.

- How to engage the participants into the discussion:
Not knowing how many delegates will attend, I have outline plans for three group sizes.
Timing: 105 minutes (adaptable).

Materials: (provided by me)

    Flipchart paper and marker pens (blutac?) Flipchart#1 for sources, to record them as they arise – author/date with a brief word of why relevant.

    Note paper and pens

    Bowline laminated guide and 8x3m lengths of rope.

    Activites One and Two typed up on paper copy.

    Audio recorder (digital)

Plan A: 2-8 Delegates in One Group

Timings

-105 Welcome – names and brief introductions, invited to explain interest in the workshop.

-95 Introduce session plan/aim and concept focus: networked learning disposition (MJ)

    Define 'networked learning'.

    Define 'disposition'

-80 Activity One (more abstract than Activity Two): consider a recent time you engaged in, designed or researched networked learning. What was the explicit or implicit theory of how learning would be productive? What is the role of disposition?

<div align="center">AND/OR</div>

-80 Activity Two: How would we learn or design networked learning to tie a bowline knot (employing all kinds of aspects of learning: kinesthetic, tacit, etc.)? or learn the difference between Heidegger and Husserl's 'reduction'? What is the role of disposition?

-50 Comfort break

-35 Re-convene to gather everyone's opinion through writing privately answers to the following:

    How are you disposed towards participating in networked learning? Can you list examples to illustrate this?

    How does this disposition influence the usefulness of networked learning for you?

-25 Share and compare in turn.

-10 MJ offers/invites synthesis.

Plan B: 8-20 Delegates in Small Groups (each group of 4-5)

Undertake the above but

-80 Divided into groups.

-25 Groups would be invited to share their deliberations with the wider group.

-10 MJ offers/invites synthesis.

Plan C: 20+ Delegates using the Fishbowl Technique

-105 Organise the room for the fishbowl discussion.

-95 Introduction to the topic by MJ.

-80 Invite initial participants to the central discussion chairs and begin the debate until no further questions or contributions arise.

-10 MJ offers/invites synthesis.

Disposition and networked learning

Michael Gallagher (2018) discussed the case of Amira, a fictional student, at the previous Networked Learning Conference. Amira demonstrated skill and fluidity in negotiating various hurdles and exploiting opportunities of mobility. Amira seemed caught up in a web of connections, spun from different contexts of life, many mediated electronically, which conditioned the way she negotiated life. Accordingly, mobile learning needed to account for various capacities: material, deliberate/intentional, and dispositional, the latter being, "what she does largely as a reflexive response to her systems of mobility." (2018, p.195) The dispositional is not the intellectual, it is implicit or tacit. Earlier in the paper, Gallagher aligns disposition with *habitus* (Bourdieu 1977), following Kress and Pachler's (2007) adaptation of the term, agreeing that disposition is the 'evolving personality structure of the individual' (Gallagher 2018, p.192). Taking 'evolution' here as a metaphor is problematic given the long-ages usually required for change to occur. The implication seems to be that dispositional change is at least a life-wide project. Kress and Pachler illustrate their position from Böck's (2004) visual essay to highlight a kind of dispositional digital divide, where individual's worlds are '*im*mobile' or 'highly mobile', 'stable' vs. 'fluid', and of knowledge 'canonicity' vs. 'provisionality'. Similarly, while admitting a flawed dichotomy, Lankshear and Knobel (2006) present two 'mindsets'. Mindset 2 is said to be amenable to 'new literacies' (see Table 1, below). Many other such terms (see https://mm.tt/1307147654?t=X7bIAL5E06) are used to delineate something essential, if not immutable, about a person which will impact the accomplishment of productive networked learning. If Amira enacts a disposition of mobility, and mobile learning emerges from that, it may be possible to say that networked learning emerges from a network disposition (see https://mm.tt/1418683213?t=IoQAgKhdOA).

Table 1: Some dimensions of variation between the mindsets (Lankshear and Knobel 2006)

Mindset 1	Mindset 2
The world basically operates on physical/ material and industrial principles and logics. The world is "centered" and hierarchical.	The world increasingly operates on non-material (e.g., cyberspatial) and post–industrial principles and logics. The world is "decentered" and "flat."

• Value is a function of scarcity
• Production is based on an "industrial" model
  • Products are material artifacts and commodities
  • Production is based on infrastructure and production units and centers (e.g., a firm or company)
    • Tools are mainly production tools
• The individual person is the unit of production, competence, intelligence
• Expertise and authority are "located" in individuals and institutions
• Space is enclosed and purpose specific
• Social relations of "bookspace" prevail; a stable "textual order"
	• Value is a function of dispersion
	• A "post-industrial" view of production
	  • Products as enabling services
	  • A focus on leverage and non-finite participation
	  • Tools are increasingly tools of mediation and relationship technologies
	• The focus is increasingly on "collectives" as the unit of production, competence, intelligence
	• Expertise and authority are distributed and collective; hybrid experts
	• Space is open, continuous and fluid
	• Social relations of emerging "digital media space" are increasingly visible; texts in change

Learning may be considered from the perspective of the dimensions of change expected in the learner: deeper or shallower, lasting or transient, etc. How much of the most beneficial deeper and long-lasting effects can be attributed to the learner's disposition? Is dispositional change possible? As Gallagher (2018) acknowledges, the related concept of *habitus* is accused of determinism, negating individual agency to change, but he also points out that this critique can be diluted when viewed through recent posthuman theories, such as assemblage and actor-network theory, where agency is distributed. Nonetheless, disposition, as fundamental to human being, appears to remain a factor in the practice, design and research of networked learning. This round-table discussion aims to explore this and other related questions.

References

Böck, M. 2004. Family Snaps: Life-Worlds and Information Habitus. *Visual Communication* 3(3), pp. 281–293. doi: 10.1177/1470357204045783.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. 1st Edition edition. Goody, J. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gallagher, M. 2018. Amira's complexity and cosmopolitanism: the role of disposition in mobilities and mobile learning. In: Badic, S. et al. eds. *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on networked learning*. Zagreb, pp. 189–196.

Kress, G.R. and Pachler, N. 2007. Thinking about the 'm' in m-learning. In: Pachler, N. ed. *Mobile Learning: towards a research agenda*. London: Institute of Education

Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M. 2006. Sampling 'the New' in New Literacies. In: Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M. eds. *New Literacies: Changing Knowledge in the Classroom*. 2nd ed. Open University Press, pp. 1–24.