Designing for Networked Learning in The Third Space

Gale Parchoma, Kristine Dreaver-Charles

University of Saskatchewan, gale.parchoma@usask.ca, kristinedreavercharles@usask.ca

Dorothea Nelson

University of Calgary, nelson@ucalgary.ca

Abstract

The focus of the argument in this paper is first situated in an allegory based on Van Gogh's Expressionist masterpiece, *The Yellow House*, in that, our argument shares Van Gogh's theme of looking for a home for a diverse community, engaged in a shared social movement, imagined and acted upon to evoke change. Our argument is fraught with commitments, investments, hopes, debates, rifts, and conflicts involved in the tentative, emergent nature associated with social movements. Within this diverse and contested context, networked learning praxis is set apart from mainstream e-learning and educational technology theories and practices. The problem of designing learning, in general, and designing for networked learning, in particular, is critically examined through a comparison of the projects, histories, and tenets of instructional design (ID) and learning design (LD). Associated notions of teacher-centred, learner-centred, and community/context-centred approaches to design are compared. Contrasts are drawn and commonalities are identified. The shared LD/ID claims that their projects are pedagogically neutral is interrogated. We then introduce Third Space theory as a way to open a dialogue between ID/LD researcher-practitioners. Third Space theory begins with abandoning aspirations for emergence of consensus from difference, arguably a practical stance to take when dealing with wide-ranging diversities across multicultural, interdisciplinary, international contexts. Having abandoned consensus, Third Space theory is directed toward 'multilogues' that promote boundary crossings and hybridisations, which can result in the emergence new "presences": newly co-constructed ways to identify and accomplish shared goals. If we conceptualise The Third Space as, an Expressionist social movement, then based on historical examples of earlier social movements, it is plausible to consider that this space too will likely be marked by some misunderstandings and incommensurabilities. Third space 'multilogues' will involve participants sometimes talking 'past each other' and other times talking 'with each other.' We can expect substantive disagreements and retreats to previously held positions prior to arriving at places of mutual recognition, and perhaps efforts directed toward reconciliation. The paper concludes with an invitation for LDs and IDs to enter a design Third Space with a view to finding varied, but sustainable, hybridised conceptualisations of design theories and practices that can contribute to designing future opportunities for networked learning across multicultural, multilinguistic, international, interdisciplinary contexts.

Keywords

Instructional design, learning design, networked learning, third space theory

The Allegory of the Yellow House

In the spring of 1888, Vincent Van Gogh rented four rooms in the right wing of Number 2 Place Lamartine, in Arles, France. During the 1880's, the exteriors of Place Lamartine buildings were painted bright yellow. In a letter to his brother, Theo, accompanied by the first sketch of *The Yellow House*, Van Gogh described the theme as "a hard one! But that was exactly why he wanted to conquer it," with "its setting under a Sulphur sun under a pure cobalt sky": one among a group of connected "yellow houses in the sun" and "the incomparable freshness of the blue" (Delphi Classics, Vincent's House in Arles, 2014, n.p.). Van Gogh's subsequent letters to his brother about how the sketch became a painting tell a story (Grant, 2014). As the story goes… Van Gogh's dream for his rooms in *The Yellow House* was that they would become a home "for a family of artists" (Grant, p. 150). This community would share ideas, hold debates, and develop new ways of putting paint and brush to canvas. Colour and composition would take on new meanings and be reified in new forms of expression that

captured images from people's daily lives, painted in broad expressionistic strokes and stark colours. Van Gogh's attempt to join the French Impressionism art movement failed spectacularly and he died a foreign outsider who had never sold a painting. His vision that colour and composition could take on new meanings and be represented in new forms of expression was neither realized during his time Arles, his lifetime, nor during the 19th century. Yet, Expressionism in its many forms: classic, 1905-1920; abstract, 1920 to the end of the 20th Century; and neo, 1980's, became a "powerful mode of social criticism" (The Art Story, 2017, Expressionism). The Expressionist challenge to Impressionism was a shift from viewing artistic representation as based on individual renditions of objective external forms to one where the artist's subjective, internal anxieties and hopes were central to the composition.

Networked Learning Praxis

Like the expressionists, networked learning researcher-practitioners reject notions of an objective external reality in need of being mirrored in theory and practice. For more than two decades, they have set their work apart from the broader comparable fields of e-learning, educational technology, the learning sciences, computer-supported collaborative learning, and technology enhanced learning via articulating a political-ethical stance and associated interests in "radical emancipatory and humanistic educational theories and approaches" (McConnell, Hodgson, & Dirckinck-Holmfeld, 2012, p. 15). The research and practice of networked learning is marked by engagement with critical, democratic, and experiential pedagogies, underpinned by socio-cultural perspectives on designing and facilitating technologically mediated opportunities for knowledge construction. From its outset, networked learning theorist-practitioners have made commitments to:

> critical and humanistic traditions of the likes of Freire (1970), Dewey (1916) and Mead (1967), including the belief in the importance of focusing on making sense from one's own personal experiences and view of the world—or indeed one's own practice. (Hodgson, McConnell, & Dirckinck-Holmfeld, 2012, p. 292)

Embedded in the philosophical/pedagogical principles of networked learning are the notions that connectivity and dialogue are key to the learning process, but knowledge is *not a transmissible property* that can be moved across a network from one person to another. Rather, knowledge is *emergent*: a socio-culturally influenced outcome of sense-making of experiences through relational dialogue, and/or collaborative interactions (Hodgson, et al., 2012). Knowledge emerges from learning processes rather than being a stable entity that is predetermined by powerful, objective experts.

This difference has long placed networked learning praxis at odds with behaviourist and cognitivist notions of knowledge that underpin substantive contributions to related literature in our broader field that either: (1) attempt to measure individual learning outcomes from a particular design (e.g., Williams et al., 2016) or (2) prescribe designs for learning with a view that generalizable knowledge is a transmissible entity that can be pre-determined and passed from an expert to a novice (e.g., Driscoll, 2005). The novice then comes to possess new-to-hers or new-to-his knowledge: a new attribute that can be indirectly observed and measured through the novice's improved performances of tasks or skills (Driscoll, 2005). In contrast, from a networked learning perspective, personal knowledge is dialogically co-constructed and based upon teachers and learners jointly and critically making sense of teaching and learning experiences and practices mediated by both peer-reviewed resources and socially constructed contemporary digital technologies. This difference democratizes design by making space for socio-culturally situated learners to contribute to a process that involves critical analyses of received wisdom from broader literature and co-construct dialogic knowledge that *acknowledges rather than challenges* diverse perspectives (Ferreday & Hodgson, 2008). In turn, acknowledged diversities contribute to both the teacher/designer's learning and individual students' learning and associated institutional practices for assessing student reifications of their learning (McConnell, 2006). Therefore, designing for networked learning opportunities differs from designing for efficient, effective, and standardised learning outcomes.

Instructional Design versus Learning Design?

There is often confusion and debate around whether there is a difference between instructional design and learning design, and if so, just what distinguishes one from the other. An example of that debate is a Research Gate thread, initiated by Sven Strickroth (2015) from Universität Potsdam. That thread garnered eleven responses from scholars from as many universities in several countries, and each response provided a quite different explanation. This ambiguity is worthy of further examination. We are situating our examination in

relation to Jones' (2015) discussion of direct and indirect design that draws on Goodyear's (2001) distinction and compares the history of instructional/direct design theory and practices with those of learning/indirect design.

Instructional/Direct Design

From its outset, the project of instructional design (ID) has been the use of empirical research-based systematic design procedures, combined with the use of media for instructional purposes, to ensure that instruction would be efficient, effective, and standardised for delivery to large numbers of learners. The premise of instructional design is that a well-designed programme, course, module, etc. can be expected to result in high levels of learner achievement. In short, expert designers can directly design optimal conditions (Koper, 2005) that will directly influence, and perhaps even determine, someone else's learning trajectory.

The origins of the field of instructional design can be traced back to the United States during World War II, where a fighter pilot training program was resulting in high failure rates (Dick, 1987). In response to this immediate need, the American government employed "a large number of psychologists and educators who had training and experience in conducting experimental research were called on to conduct research and develop training materials for the military services" (Reiser, 2001, p. 58). Thus, from the beginning ID emerged as excluding pre-existing pedagogical commitments. It was to be strictly research-based. Among the group of researchers employed to make this shift, Robert Gagné, Leslie Briggs, and John Flanagan came to exert considerable influence on the development of training materials, which were based on the development of "instructional principles derived from research and theory on instruction, learning, and human behaviour" (Reiser, p. 58). Skinner's (1958) contribution of programmed instruction focused on deconstructing a body of knowledge or skill set, then reconstructing it into small instructional segments, each of which would require learners to respond, and each response would be followed with feedback on the accuracy of the response. At their own pace, learners would sequentially work through small tasks until they had demonstrated mastery of the material.

> By analyzing and breaking down content into specific behavioral objectives, devising the necessary steps to achieve the objectives, setting up procedures to try out and revise the steps, and validating the program against attainment of the objectives, programmed instruction succeeded in creating a small but effective self-instructional system—a technology of instruction. (Heinich, 1970, p.123)

Skinner's notion that teaching could be automated via the use of computers and claim that computers could be programed to become 'teaching machines' (Skinner, 1958a), gave rise to an early information technology movement potentially comparable to contemporary massive open online courses. Throughout the remainder of the 20th century, the application of experimental psychology as the basis for developing models for mass instruction gained influence. In particular, Gagné's nine principles of instruction (Gagné, 1965) continued to influence the proliferation and development of instructional design models, most of which included "analyses of instructional problems, and the design, development, implementation and evaluation of instructional procedures and materials intended to solve those problems" (Reiser, 2001, p. 58). While instructional design models and practices were broadly adopted by the military and industry, they had much less influence in schools and universities (Burkman, 1987). By the late 1980's researchers, such as Merrill, Li, and Jones (1990), called for new models that could take advantage of computers' expanding interactivity capabilities. Further, in the following decade was marked by a shift in focus toward constructivist understandings of learning and models of teaching that required learners to:

> (a) solve complex and realistic problems; (b) work together to solve those problems; (c) examine the problems from multiple perspectives; (d) take ownership of the learning process (rather than being passive recipients of instruction); and (e) become aware of their own role in the knowledge construction process. (Driscoll, 2000)

As constructivism became more frequently adopted within the field of instructional design, philosophical/ theoretical divisions led to contentious debates about the nature of learning itself and associated design models. Designers with behaviourist/cognitivist pedagogical orientations contended that "learning can be described best as resulting from a process of reception," and therefore, "expositive instructional strategies" were "universally appropriate" (Rothwell, et al., 2016, p. 151). Designers with constructivist pedagogical orientations argued that "learning is best described as resulting from a process of learner discovery," and therefore, designs for learning

should be based on "experiential instructional strategies," such as inquiry-based and discovery-based approaches (Rothwell, et al., p. 152). Where 'traditional' behaviourist/cognitivist orientations have long been more the purview of military and industrial training sectors, and constructivist orientations have been more broadly adopted in the educational sector—especially within the higher education institutions where designers study their craft. Researchers with interests in the field of ID began to publish the results of studies that focused on the ethical and political dimensions of design practices, in relation to designers' struggles with and agencies for transforming higher education through encouraging faculty/tutors to think critically about learners' needs and experiences in the processes of developing courses and programmes (e.g., Schwier, Campbell, & Kenny, 2007). This cross-over point provides ID and LD researchers and practitioners with opportunities for dialogues on potentially shared conceptualisations on the purposes and remit of design research-based practices.

However, with the advent of the Internet and wide-spread use of personal computers in homes, workplaces, schools, and universities and with the rise of the knowledge economy, the quest for efficient, effective, and standardised learning for mass audiences of learners (recipients of instruction) has continued. In an economic climate where national governments are rapidly devolving fiscal responsibility for public higher education to local institutions and tuition increases are not making up shortfalls (Times Higher Education, 2014; Hook, 2015), and for-profit providers, such as Udacity and Coursera (both emerging from Stanford) and edX (an MIT and Harvard joint endeavour) (Liyanagunawardena, Adams, & Williams, 2013) are engaging in public-private partnerships for online learning provision, the rise of systematic instructional design within the public higher education sector remains not only plausible, but probable. As such, the standards used to evaluate online teaching and learning in higher education may become influenced by external agencies, such as the International Board of Standards for Training, Performance, and Instruction (IBSTPI ®), which already set standards for military and industrial training (Rothwell, et al., 2016). Therefore, a re-shifting to foci underpinned by behaviourist/cognitivist perspectives on objective, external knowledge as being predetermined by powerful experts, where learning results from a process of attentive reception that can be measured by automated assessment practices suitable for large-enrolment courses, could arguably become normalised in institutions of higher education.

Learning/Indirect Design

Learning design is a much newer field of study that emerged as we entered the 21st Century (Dalzeil, et al., 2016). From its outset, learning design was "a gently restful term" (Laurillard, 2016, p. vii), based on the metaphor of musical notation and focused on a relational approach to design. The metaphor of musical notation was used to conceptualize the iterative process of proposing and refining alignments that can lead to shared meaning-making opportunities among composers, directors, and musicians to deliver an inspiring performance as comparable to the relational work of researchers, designers, and teachers/tutors who thoughtfully and continually improve their praxis to support learners in achieving their own goals within the complexities of their home contexts and still meet the demands of programmatic and/or externally determined standards. Through constructing a shared score/language for researcher-designer-practitioners to design for and facilitate learning design focuses on context-based opportunities for the emergence of a continuum of varied strong to weak ties (Jones, 2008) among learners, teachers/tutors, and learning resources that can indirectly support but not attempt to directly predetermine a specific route toward successful learning outcomes. The practice of learning design does not focus on designing learning. Rather it focuses on creating conditions for effective (Conole, 2015), emergent (Hodgson, de Latt, McConnell, & Ryberg , 2014) learning opportunities. A salient difference here between instructional and learning design theory-based practice is both subtle and important to note, in that both learning and instructional design research-based practices are intended to be effective in supporting learners, but learning design research-practitioners acknowledge that their best efforts can only achieve effective, context-based designs for learning, but instructional design researcher-practitioners are tasked with creating designs that will be vetted for assurances that their designs will ensure successful learning outcomes among generalised populations of future learners.

The origins of learning design are in European teaching and learning scholarship and practices in higher education that arose as responses to the growth of the knowledge economy, the associated need to expand higher education to include more and more diverse students, and the advent of the digital era. In particular, two foundational projects: (1) Koper's development of Educational Modelling Language (EML) at the Open University of the Netherlands (Koper, 2001), and 2) the SoURCE project in the UK, which included "a diverse body of research on technology in higher education" (Dalzeil, et al., p. 6). The focus of this early work was highly focused on technological implementation and its early successes soon drew attention of Australian

researchers, who built upon EML and SoURCE insights with two linked studies: (1) "the Australian University Teaching Council's (AUTC) learning design project" and (2) the "Learning Activity Management System (LAMS)" (p. 6). The following decade saw a plethora of European Union, UK, and Australian-funded projects whose aims ranged from "providing advice to educators on adopting new teaching ideas," to sharing descriptions of online teaching methods, to adapting "existing technologies" for digital implementation, to provision of technology "to support reflection on the design of teaching and learning," and to developing principles for online "learning communities" and digital resource "repositories" (p. 7). Along with externally funded research and development projects, a series of conferences (LAMS, CETIS, and TenCompetence) brought scholars together to critically examine results and identify new research and development directions. This group of activities culminated in The Larnaca Declaration on Learning Design in 2012 (p. 1). Where the Larnaca Declaration explicitly states that the field of Learning Design is "pedagogically neutral" and "does not put forward a theory about how learners learn" or "how teachers should teach," its proclaimed neutrality comes with noteworthy caveats: (1) its intent to be descriptive rather than predictive, and therefore, to focus on strategic, reflective refinement of existing practices rather than prescribing or standardising future practices; (2) its goal to increase the effectiveness of diverse approaches to designing for learning; and (3) its allegiance to "learner-centred" designs (Larnaca Declaration, 2013, Part 3.1, para. 1-7). These three caveats (commitments and investments) distinguish Learning Design (LD) from instructional design (ID) in that from the outset LD embraced respect for diversity and existing practices where ID's initial project was to systematically replace previous, perceived unsuccessful practices with more efficient standardised ones. Further, while LD and ID both claim pedagogical neutrality, LD's commitment to learner-centeredness distinguishes it from ID's inclusion of both "teacher-centred" and "learner-centred" approaches.

A further difference is LD's framework (Dalzeil, et al., 2016, p. 17), which is constituted as a conceptual map that can be used as a touchstone for reflection, as well as a challenge posed to would-be teacher-designers to focus on creating local conditions for engaging learning experiences. The LD framework is underpinned with an assumption that it is impossible to design someone else's learning: the best we can hope for is to "design for learning" (Laurillard, 2016). In contrast ID models—while taking account of local conditions during the analysis phase—often tend to focus on systematically mediating local conditions in order to ensure predicable, scalable, standardisable learning activities and outcomes. Thus, ID models' propensities to prescribe (e.g., nine events of instruction) and assuredly predict can tend toward muting learners and their contexts.

Middle Ground

Yet, there are commonalities in the projects of ID and LD. Both projects emerged as responses to rapidly changing economic and socio-political conditions that required effective educational attention, both were initially funded by governmental institutions, both were directed at improving opportunities for learning, both were and continue to be innovators in recognizing the roles technologies can play in supporting learning. Both were first based in research and later that research was applied to changing practices. And both begin with internal alignments: (1) ID is rooted in the mid-20th century when positivistic research approaches were privileged and predictable results of applications of research to practice were expected, and (2) the origins of LD are associated with a change of millennium when certainties have become suspect and boundaries between research and practice are blurring. As we move from focusing on teaching and learning issues and anxieties that marked the beginning of the 21st century into a more situated understanding of the forms of associated design challenges, we are somewhat better positioned to critically reflect upon the major movements of the previous century and their linkages to current research and practice. In particular, we have a bit longer and potentially more reflexive perspective from which to examine the ID and LD projects: teacher-centred and learner-centred approaches to designing for learning. At various points in their separate trajectories, both ID and LD projects have also examined notions of virtual (ID) and online (LD) learning community-centred approaches. And both, if we look closely, are centrally concerned with designing conditions under which learners have a better chance to learn. Finally, a sub-set of ID scholars are deeply concerned about the ethical and political commitments that demark LD as a different approach to design.

Both ID and LD share the practices of undertaking initial analyses of what potential learners can be expected to know and/or to be able to do prior to entering a new learning experience, as well as the goals/general outcomes that these learners need to meet to be successful in a module/course and/or programme. Goodyear (2015) positions this work as an epistemic design stage. Both LD and ID share a concern for thoughtfully designing individual and/or group tasks that potential learners will undertake and rules, roles, and responsibilities that will guide teachers' and learners' work. This subsequent design phase socially situates the learning tasks (Goodyear,

ISBN 978-1-86220-337-2

2015). Both LDs and IDs choose tools (e.g., technologies) and artefacts (e.g. learning resources) for learners to use to accomplish module/course goals (Goodyear 2015; Koper, 2005) in order to shape the material context for learning. What remains is an epistemological difference where IDs are tasked with directly designing individual or group activities that will predictably lead to a prescribed series of outcomes for individual learners, but LDs are expected to acknowledge that where they can design tasks, actual learning activities will emerge from learner-learner, learner-teacher, and learner-material interactions (Hodgson, McConnell, & Dirckinck-Holmfeld, 2012). It is this middle ground that is the contested space between ID and LD practices.

Discussion

Networked learning exemplifies a commitment to a learner-/community-centred, socially situated learning environment with an emphasis on collaborations, connections, technology-mediated interactions. Not only is collaboration with others a critical factor in nurturing the development of diverse learning communities and sub-communities, but also, the emergence of larger and smaller collectives of situated learners' potential connections with peers, teacher/tutors, and learning resources offers opportunities for rich cross cultural and interdisciplinary, distributed collaborations that cannot be predicted within a design for learning. Therefore, it is important to consider the limits of any design for effective learning that will leave room for diverse learners to make sense of their own learning experiences. Klien et al. (2013) proposed a hybrid or third space where university knowledge is not privileged, but the relational roles and responsibilities of university-based researcher/teacher-tutor/designers and workplace-based practitioner-learners can be negotiated through dialogues. Foreman-Peck and Travers (2015) have suggested these negotiations are likely to begin with "multilogues" (p. 344), where the relations between research, practices, and standards for learner achievements become boundary objects that confront, deconstruct and reconstruct each other in an emergent design and facilitation processes. As these boundaries emerge, shift, and challenge the knowledge base for teaching and learning is continually renewed and restructured. This recognition of the social groundings of knowledge connects to Vygotsky's (1978) view of cognition as socially oriented in an understanding of how humans think. Therefore, it is worthwhile for designers to consider not only learners', but also researcher-teacher-tutors' social and cultural contexts as boundary objects that influence processes of inquiry (Garrison, 2015). McLoughlin and Oliver (2000) recommended that designers "plan activities where learning is a process of participation, communication and co-construction of knowledge…. [as] cultures have identifiable dimensions, goals, expectations… variations in learning styles, modes of communication and participation" (Conclusion and implications for practice, para 1) that affect learning. The notion of designing in a Third Space offers the potential for a designed learning environment in which these negotiated processes can unfold.

A culturally sensitive approach to design acknowledges and respectfully accommodates the ways of knowing of other cultures, their value systems, customs, thoughts, behaviours, traditions, modes of communication, understandings of reality, and institutions. Culturally sensitive designers locate commonalities between their culture and that of others while remaining conscious of their subjectivities and cultural biases (Ntseane, 2011). Third Space is a dialogic site-centred in cultural translation where the "site of in-betweenness becomes the ground of discussion, dispute, confession, apology and negotiation" (Bhabha, 2009, p. x). The third space is a problematic place, a place where centre / peripheral / margin binaries collapse allowing the emergence of the new (Cuenca, Schmeichel, Butler, Dinkelman, & Nichols, 2011). This in-between space is a place of difference in race, gender, class, values, culture, discipline, and so on. So, individuals within third spaces draw on a range of discourses to help them make sense of the world. Despite commonalities, the third space is not always a dialogical, collaborative space where individuals share values, meanings, and priorities; it may also be a site of antagonism, conflict, and incommensurability (Bhabha, 1994). These conflicts arise because people who under normal circumstances might never come together are brought together. Differences in culture, nationality, identity and education are not only brought to the environment but are also brought about within the environment. Third space theory is a tension filled messy site of cultural differences that is described as a fragile enterprise, neither easy nor quick, nor is it ever a completed project. Our misunderstandings/ incommensurabilities, however, offer a zone for negotiation and re-negotiation, a site of mediation where alternatives can be explored (Bhabha, 2009), and individuals in this zone can feel valued and are given agency (Rochielle & Carpenter, 2015). In a third space differences transform each other without reaching consensus, fusing or synthesizing, but by hybridising, arriving always at something new, revealing itself as both unity and multiplicity. Bhabha offered a uniquely sensitive perspective when he noted that the third space is a space of boundary crossings where "something begins its presencing" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 5). We propose that initiating dialogues among learning and instructional designers could signal a presencing where critical analyses of both research-based practices may lead to boundary crossings and perhaps lead to the construction of a pedagogical

hybrid. Within a Third Space, the ID/LD contentious middle ground can perhaps be negotiated and enacted via boundary crossing approaches to design.

Conclusions and Implications

As both postgraduate ID and LD programmes expand and become international and interdisciplinary, in terms of both faculty and student academic backgrounds and research interests, design itself, is becoming a boundary object: a research-based practice that is "doing the crossing" between different perspectives, that with the help of brokers, can fulfil "a bridging function" (Akkerman & Bakker, 2011, p. 133) between the underpinning philosophical differences and shared goals of LD and ID projects. In a design third space, LD and ID researcher-practitioners can engage with each other and play the "rich and variable role(s)" of brokers, and confront their mutual risks of "being seen on the periphery" (Akkerman & Bakker, p. 140) by their counterparts. Theorizing, practicing and teaching design is becoming an emergent and unstable series of boundary-crossing activities, where each activity is either explicitly or implicitly "characterised by ambiguity, surprise, interpretation, sense-making, and potential for change" (Engeström, 2009, p. 55). Within potential negotiations and re-negotiations, commonalities between ID and LD can be identified, differences and incommensurabilities can be acknowledged, and hybrids reflexively and critically considered. As long as the individuals involved are valued and given agency to make sense of their own experiences and disciplinary biases/perspectives, sites for hybridisation can become open to dialogue and provide room for current and future researcher-designers to at once preserve that which they cherish within their own identities, develop deeper awareness's of the complexities of the landscape of their professions, and adopt a critical appreciation of alternative views. With these new tools in-hand, both will be well positioned to advance the theories and practices of design in ways that align with the particularities of their home disciplines, cultures, languages, and professional/scholarly contexts. Multiple boundary crossings, such as these, may even be necessary to provide sustainable international, interdisciplinary routes toward dispersed third-space yellow houses where sub-community members undertake future work in the theory and practice of designing for networked learning. These ID/LD yellow houses could provide spaces for members to share ideas, negotiate, and develop hybrid design approaches that could be adapted for diverse teaching and learning cultures.

References

Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of educational research*, *81*(2), 132-169.

Art Story, The. (2017). Expressionism. Available: http://www.theartstory.org/movement-expressionism.htm

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Burkman, E. (1987). Factors affecting utilization. In R.M. Gagné (Ed.), *Instructional Technology: Foundations* (pp. 429–456). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Campbell, K., Schwier, R., & Kenny, R. F. (2007). The critical, relational practice of instructional design in higher education: An emerging model of change agency. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *57*(5), 645-663.

Conole, G. (2015). Theoretical underpinnings of learning design. In J. Dalziel (Ed.). *Learning design: Conceptualizing a framework for teaching and learning online*, (pp. 42-62). London: Routledge.

Cuenca, A., Schmeichel, M., Butler, B. M., Dinkelman, T. & Nichols, J. R. (2011). Creating a "third space" in student teaching: Implications for the university supervisor's status as outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(2011), 1068-1077.

Dalzeil, J. (Ed.). (2016). Learning design: *Conceptualizing a framework for teaching and learning on*line. London: Routledge.

Delphi Classics (2014). *Van Gogh*. (Kindle ed.). *Master of Art Series* (Version 2). Hastings, East Sussex, UK: Delphi.

Driscoll, M. P. (2005). *Psychology of learning for instruction* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Engeström, Y. (2009). Expansive learning: Toward an activity-theoretical reconceptualization. In K. Illeris (Ed.), Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists … in their own words (pp. 53-73). London: Routledge.

Fenwick, T. (2010). Workplace 'learning' and adult education: Messy objects, blurry maps and making difference. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, *1*(1-2), 79-95.

Ferreday, D., & Hodgson, V. (2008). The tyranny of participation and collaborating in networked learning. *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Networked Learning*, 640-647. Retrieved from http://www.networkedlearningconference.org.uk/past/nlc2008/abstracts/PDFs/Hodgson_640-647.pdf

ISBN 978-1-86220-337-2

Foreman-Peck, L. & Travers, K. (2015). Developing expertise in managing dialogue in the 'third space': Lessons from a participatory evaluation. *Evaluation*, *21*(3), 344-358. doi: 10.1177/1356389015592492
Gagné, R.M. (1965). *The conditions of learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston
George, G. & Lewis, T. (2011). Exploring the global/local boundary in education in developing countries: the case of the Caribbean. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(6), 721-734. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2011.57971Gherardi, S., & Perrotta, M. (2014). Between the hand and the head: How things get done, and how in doing the ways of doing are discovered. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, *9*(2), 134-150.
Goodyear, P., (2001). Effective networked learning in higher education: Notes and guidelines (Deliverable 9). Bristol, UK: Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC). Retrieved from: http://csalt.lancs.ac.uk/jisc/docs/Guidelines_final.doc
Goodyear, P. (2015). Teaching as design. *Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia*, *2*, 27-50.
Grant, P. (2016). *Reading Vincent van Gogh*. Edmonton, AB: Athabasca University Press.
Hodgson, V., de Latt, M., McConnell, D., & Ryberg, T. (2014). Researching design, experience and practice of networked learning: An overview. In V. Hodgson, M. de Latt, D. McConnell & T. Ryberg (Eds.), *The design, experience and practice of networked learning* (pp. 1-28). New York, NY: Springer.
Hodgson, V., McConnell, D., & Dirckinck-Holmfeld, L. (2012). The theory, practice and pedagogy of networked learning. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, & D. McConnell (Eds.), *Exploring the theory, pedagogy and practice of neworked learning*, (pp. 291-306). Springer, New York.
Jones, C. (2015). Design and indirect design. In *Networked learning: An educational paradigm for the age of digital networks*, (pp. 68-69). Springer International: Cham Heidelberg, Switzerland.
Jones, C., Ferraday, D., & Hodgson, V. (2008). Networked learning a relational approach: weak and strong ties. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24: 90–102. DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00271x
Klien, E. J., Taylor, M., Onere, C. Strom, L. & Abrams, L. (2013). Finding a third space in teacher education: creating an urban teacher residency. *Teaching Education*, *24*(1), 27-57. doi: 10.1080/10476210.2012.711305
Koper, R. (2005). An introduction to learning design. In R. Koper & C. Tattersall (Eds.). *A handbook on modelling and delivering networked education and training*, (pp. 3-20). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
Larnaca Declaration. (2012). Larnaca declaration on learning design. Larnaca, Cypress: LarnacaDeclaration.org Retrieved from: https://larnacadeclaration.wordpress.com/full-document/
Laurillard, D. (2016). Foreword. In J. Dalziel (Ed.) Learning design: Conceptualizing a framework for teaching and learning online, (p. viii). London: Routledge.
Liyanagunawardena, T. R., Adams, A. A., & Williams, S. A. (2013). MOOCs: A systematic
study of the published literature 2008-2012. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *14*(3). Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1455/2531
McConnell, D. (2006*). E-learning groups and communities*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
McConnell, D., Hodgson, V., Dirckinck-Holmfeld, L. (2012). Networked learning: A brief history and new trends. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, and D. McConnell (Eds.), *Exploring the theory, pedagogy, and practice of networked learning* (pp. 3-26). New York, NY: Springer.
McLoughlin, C. & Oliver, R. (2000). Instructional design for cultural difference: A case study of the indigenous online learning in a tertiary context. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, *16*(1), 58-72.
Ntseane, P. G. (2011). Culturally sensitive transformational learning: Incorporating the Afrocentric paradigm and African feminism. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *61*(4), 307-323. doi: 10.1177/0741713610389781
Rochielle, J. & Carpenter B. S. (2015). Navigating the third space. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, *12*(2), 131-133, doi: 10.1080/15505170.2015.1055412
Strickroth, S. (2015). Instructional design versus learning design: What is the difference? Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/post/Instructional_Design_versus_Learning_Design-Whats_the_difference
William, J., Rothwell, G.M., King, M., & King, S.B. (2016). Mastering the instructional design process: A systematic approach (5th ed.): Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ISBN 978-1-86220-337-2