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Executive Summary

This work package firstly functions as a data-gathering activity, to explore and deepen the results, and questions, raised by the earlier research activities and it provides knowledge exchange to engage a wider spectrum of stakeholders to further validate the Links-up outputs. Two phases of the Learning Dialogues involve representatives of the 20 cases studied in WP2. In the first phase these events are considered to serve as data gathering in the host countries represented by the Links-up consortium. The second phase involved action research experiments and was combined with the Workpackage focused on Validation. The first Dialogues took place in the framework of two conferences, involving not only the direct target group of the project but a group of international experts to explore the possible bottlenecks of the project aims. In the second phase it is intended to run the Learning Dialogues using the Action Learning Set methodology (Pedler, 1997) with selected case studies involved in WP2. Action Learning Sets involve ‘small group work’ with groups representing key actors and stakeholders. Group work is co-ordinated by a facilitator in order to generate practical learning by reflecting on experiences of Links-up in a structured way. A distinctive feature of the Action Learning Set methodology is its emphasis on exploring how different groups interact; the underlying ‘visions’ and value systems that shape this interaction, and the possible tensions that may arise through conflicts between these visions and values. This is particularly suited to understanding the barriers that may militate against the application of Learning 2.0 approaches to inclusive learning, since the methodology focuses on how social interactions operate.

The Learning Dialogues are intended to explore and deepen the results of case study analysis and to emulate knowledge exchange by engaging a wider spectrum of stakeholders that in the WP2 stage to validate project outputs. The concept of was first tested at the Plymouth e-Learning Conference (PeLC) 2011. The first ‘real’ Learning Dialogue was transformed into a model Learning Dialogue event with international experts at the EDEN 2010 Annual Conference. Based on the experiences of the model event, the second Learning Dialogue event involving case study representatives and took place in Austria, in the framework of the EduMedia Conference at the end of June 2010. Based on the positive feedback from participants of the first two events, it was proposed to record interviews and short video-statements with stakeholders and to publish them as part of the Innovation Laboratory online. This idea was implemented during the Third Learning Dialogue with 5 experts, and the videos were published on Youtube and on the project website. Additionally, based on the positive feedback of the Final Conference in September 2011, a Learning Dialogue Webinar was organized in October 2011 with 4 language moderators, featuring the final results of the project. The following report contains detailed descriptions of all Learning Dialogues and reports on the feedback received.
1. Methodology: Action Learning Sets

1.1 Aims and objectives
This work package firstly functions as a data-gathering activity, to explore and deepen the results, and questions, raised by the earlier research activities on how marginalization works. Secondly, it provides a Knowledge Exchange to engage a wider spectrum of stakeholders from the ‘lifeworlds’ in which the pilot research actions are carried out in the problems and issues raised by the project. Thirdly, through Stakeholder Panels, it will further validate the Links-up outputs. The Panels also have a ‘foresight’ role, in identifying emergent issues likely to shape future agendas – for example the emergence and use of Web 3.0 technologies. The Dialogues will be run using an Action Learning Set methodology (Pedler, 1997). Action Learning Sets involve ‘small group work’ with groups representing key actors and stakeholders. Group work is co-ordinated by a facilitator in order to generate practical learning by reflecting on experiences of Links-up in a structured way. A distinctive feature of the Action Learning Set methodology is its emphasis on exploring how different groups interact; the underlying ‘visions’ and value systems that shape this interaction, and the possible tensions that may arise through conflicts between these visions and values. This is particularly suited to understanding the barriers that may militate against the application of Learning 2.0 approaches to inclusive learning, since the methodology focuses on how social interactions operate.

1.2 Methodological approach
The overall approach to the Learning Dialogues is based on ‘action research’, using ‘Action Learning Sets’. Definitions of action research vary considerably as it is not located within a single discipline but has rather emerged over time from a broad range of fields and historical sources. Similarly action research is applied in multiple initiatives ranging from organisations, industry, education, development, to social and political movements. It is variously described as a research method, a process, an approach, an orientation to inquiry, a learning tool, or a technique to enable interventions and social change.

Action research is seen to offer a dual approach to both ‘understanding’ and also ‘promoting change’: as detailed by Rapoport (1970) it is a merger of academic social science with practice considering ‘both the practical concerns of people in immediate problematic situations and the goals of social science by joint collaboration’ (Ibid: 1). The term ‘action research’ was first used by Kurt Lewin (1946), within his formation of cycles of planning, acting, observing and reflecting, however this has expanded into extremely diverse meanings and applications. For example, Stenhouse (1975, 1978) perceives AR as more of an accessible learning tool that contributes to the theory of education and the practice of teaching. According to Carr and Kemmis (1986) improvement and involvement are central to the term ‘action research’, which endeavours to achieve both an improved understanding of a practice, improved understanding of a situation and the improvement revision of practice. Collaboration between researchers and practitioners is seen as central to the action research process (Whyte, 1986), and the participation of users and local communities is a highly embedded:
‘Action research is a participatory democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes, grounded in a participatory worldview which we believe is emerging at this historical moment. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities.’ (Reason & Bradbury, 2001:1).

The participatory nature of action research is seen as a method of empowering users, by facilitating their ‘access to research proposals, programmes and findings’, and ensuring that the research process seriously considers their needs (Heller, 1986). Correspondingly a central purpose of action research is to produce practical knowledge that is useful to people in their everyday lives, and therefore it has ‘emancipatory’ intentions: as described by Reason and Bradbury (2001) ‘action research is about working towards practical outcomes and also about creating new forms of understanding, since action without reflection is blind, just as theory without action is meaningless’ (Ibid:1). Kemmis and McTaggart (2008), move towards reconceptualising research as social practice, which is related to Habermas’s notion of the public sphere as a way of extending the theory and practice of action research. AR differs from other forms of social inquiry as it integrates more clearly its political and methodological intentions. Due to the diverse nature of action research some authors (such as Reason and Bradbury) assert that it is ‘an orientation to inquiry rather than a methodology’. Considering its diverse origins and applications, these authors argue that action research is an approach rather than a coherent technique or method that can be easily classified: rather it ‘has different purposes, is based in different relationships and it has different ways of conceiving knowledge and its relation to practice’ (2001 106:).

Action Learning is defined as follows:

“Action Learning is an approach to the development of people in organisations which takes the task as the vehicle for learning. It is based on the premise that there is no learning without action and no sober and deliberate action without learning. The method...has three main components – people, who accept the responsibility for taking action on a particular issue; problems, or the tasks that people set themselves; and a set of six or more colleagues who support and challenge each other to make progress on problems”


There are number of key elements in Action Learning:

- The participants must understand the system within which the problem resides
- They will examine the nature of the value system of the person and the system as a whole
- They will examine the external system which affects the decision being made, and the internal system in which the manager works.

The starting point for learning is action. In Action Learning, participants will continually check their expectations with what should be happening against what is actually happening. Members of Action Learning Sets will reflect on experience with the support of others,
followed by further action, in order to change – rather than simply repeat – previous patterns. Learning is the reason for the Action Learning Set. Legitimacy and formalisation of the Set over an extended period of time with a consistent Set membership – as well as explicit discussion of learning processes and achievements – serve to reinforce the learning intention. The Action Learning programme will help create the ability to learn how to learn in a number of ways. For example, time will be scheduled for learning reviews at each meeting. Members review the projects, their own learning process, and relevant issues that emerge from group dynamics and the work of others. Members might keep learning logs, or negotiate personal development plans and learning agreements.

In the Action Learning Sets, participants will also need to reflect on assumptions and beliefs that shape practice. Critical reflection can be powerful because attention is directed to the root of the problem and transforms perspectives. People recognise that their perceptions may be flawed because they are filtered through views, beliefs, attitudes and feelings inherited from one’s family, school, professional training and society. Flawed perception distorts one’s understanding of problems and situations. Critical thinking brings real issues to the fore and subjects them to scrutiny – allowing participants to call into question the rationale underlying their actions and to examine problems from multiple perspectives. Reformulation of the presenting problem will occur when people uncover misperceptions, norms and expectations that are often hidden. Critical reflection will also go beyond the individual participants, underlying assumptions and will lead specifically to the examination of organisational norms. The group dynamics of Action Learning Sets will be valuable learning points because participants will need skills in running meetings and in collaborative decision-making.

1.3 Implementation

Learning Sets may be constructed in a number of ways. Sets can be composed of people from the same level of seniority, same professions or discipline, same organisation, department or unit, or they can be drawn from different organisations, departments and units. The former may be useful for groups with strong allegiances. The latter will be useful for greater cross-fertilisation of ideas from one part of the organisation to another.

An outside facilitator can facilitate learning Sets in the short or long term, or they may be self-managed with a member taking up a coordinating role.

Two phases of the Learning Dialogues will be carried out. Phase 1 will involve a series of ‘Stakeholder Panels’ to review of the first phase of the Links-up outputs, i.e. the Literature Review and Case Studies. These Panels will be held in the host countries represented by the Links-up consortium. The second phase involves the five action research experiments in another review of what has been learned through the pilot experiments and how it can be applied in their initiatives.

In practical terms, for Links-up the workshops could involve a group of stakeholders in critically reviewing the model and tools produced in Phase 1, through ‘story-boarding’ how the model and tools could be implemented. In Phase 2, the emphasis will be on reviewing what has been learned through the pilot experiments.
**Aim**

To apply ‘an ‘action learning set’ approach to evaluate the LINKS-UP model, approach and tools.

**Approach**

Essentially, the Action Learning approach is designed to get workshop participants to play a particular ‘role’. In this case, the three roles are:

- Users – users are defined as the ‘end users’ of Links-up tools and support services.
- Intermediaries – intermediaries are defined as people who provide a ‘bridge’ between the learning environment and the ‘external’ world. For the purposes of this workshop, they include: professionals providing learning services; managers of NGOs; multipliers.
- Policy makers - people who are responsible for designing, developing and delivering ‘Learning 2.0’ initiatives.

The task for all three groups (roles) is to critically review the Links-up model and tools and to recommend improvements – from the point of view of the three groups.

What workshop participants need to think about:

1. The kinds of roles different actors play within their own environment and how these are transferred to a ‘shared’ space (i.e. the learning environment)
2. The kinds of values related to these roles
3. The ways in which ‘communication’ and ‘practices’ are developed and managed between groups within their environment and within the shared space
4. The meanings attached to these communications and practices
5. How these shape how ‘effectiveness’ is interpreted and determined
6. How these can be situated and worked with to create recommendations for reform

*How the Action Learning Set Works*

**Stage 1: Set up**

The workshop (Stakeholder Panel) is given its primary task:

- In Phase 1, to critically review the Links-up outputs and recommend further improvements
• In Phase 2, to review what has been learned in the pilot experiments and make recommendations to further improve the Links-up method and tools.

The workshop divides into four groups:

• 3 ‘Resource’ groups
• 1 ‘Assessors’ group

The three Resource Groups are divided into:

• One group that takes on the ‘client’ role (i.e. user)
• One group that takes on the ‘intermediary’ role (i.e. intermediary)
• One group that takes on the ‘provider’ role (i.e. policy maker)

The Assesors Group is comprised of one appointed representative of each of the three Resource Groups.

The tasks of the Resource Groups are:

• To clarify its primary purpose and what it seeks to change
• To identify who the change is for (for whom it seeks to make a difference)
• To identify how the change can be implemented (by developing a revised model and tools)

The tasks of the Assessors Group are:

• To work with a Resource group to develop an assessment of that group; what its needs are; the obstacles it faces in collaborating
• To report back to the Assessor Group on the assessment
• To deliver a ‘message’ to the Resource Group

Stage 2A: Group work

Each Resource Group has to:

• Appoint a member of the Assessors Group
• Discuss and decide on its primary purpose and the main change it seeks to make
• Identify who the change is for (for whom it seeks to make a difference)
• Identify the drivers and needs that shape the need for change
• Identify the main challenges to change
• Identify the principles and ‘ideal scenario’ for change
• Identify the actions needed to implement change

Stage 2B (in parallel with Stage 2A)

The Assessors Group to:
• Decide on which of its members will work with which Resource Group
• Design an action plan for their collaboration with the Resource group
• Work in dialogue with each Resource Group to. The aim is to build a picture of that group. The picture should consist of:
  o characteristics of the group (its sense of purpose; mission; role)
  o the resources of the group
  o the values of the group
  o how it works together
  o its view of the other Resource Groups
• Return to the Assessors Group.
• Each representative goes back to his/her own group and give a report on what the picture of its Resource Group is. Each Assessor then has to produce a ‘message’ for its Resource Group. It is entirely up to each Assessor what that message should be. The message should say something about:
  o the overall picture the group projects
  o the unconscious dynamics that underlie its interaction and behaviours
  o some ways in which the group could change its ‘picture’ – particularly on how it sees the roles of other groups in implementing the Links-up model and tools

Stage 3: Assessment and analysis

• Each Resource Group elects a representative to give its Report on the results of its tasks
• Each Assessor presents his/her message to its Group

Stage 4: Reflection (Plenary Discussion)

The groups come back together as a whole. Open discussion about what has been found, and what has been learned. The expected outcomes are recommendations for further improvement of the Links-up approach, method and tools.

Learning Dialogues have been conceptualized along the action learning line methodology in a participatory way. The method of observe – interact – create change is mirrored in the workshop formats of the Learning Dialogues. These Learning Dialogues have been channelling information and creating communication channels between grass-root projects and researchers, between practitioners and policy-makers. The online platform of the project was built along this logic as well. It is an application for collaborative learning. It is learning 2.0 and makes us think together by inviting us to do three things:

1. Give observations;
2. Provide reflections;
3. Create advice.

Observations are the basic building block of the Learning Dialogues. In the Dialogue they are Cases, Validation experiments, existing initiatives running. They come from the real world. They tell us about what works and what doesn’t work. They get us close to the ground, all over Europe. The quality of their description makes us feel what it means to be involved in web 2.0. On the Links-up website writers of observations are real people: they are the practitioners that work in projects, that teach, think up projects, run them day by day and know in and out what makes them tick. These observations were created during the Validation Experiments and constituted the core themes of the face-to-face International Learning Dialogue workshops.

An observation is a description of what works. Of what doesn’t work. Of what keeps you up at night around a project. An observation is not an opinion. They are carefully selected and carefully phrased. It provides the community with what they need: real activity in real situations with real people. Every observation is aimed to inspire better projects and policy. They are situations and issues that allow people to reflect and create advice.

Reflection takes real life observations and turns them into knowledge. Reflections are created to point out, explain, connect, generalize and remark. They rethink practical experiences and show us the underlying reasons, the possible lessons to be learned, and point to the patterns between observations in different situations and different countries. They make us aware of new developments and new directions and form the basis for new advice to be created.

During the face-to-face Learning Dialogues, the researchers/experts/policy makers had the chance to reflect on the observations pointed out in the first part of the event and on the observations coming from the local initiatives participating in the project. They were grouped according to thematic/research questions and with the help of moderators, reflected on the specific issue putting themselves in the role of those who offered the observation. On the website, writers of reflections are experienced professional practitioners and researchers that are able to put things into context. Their reflections aim to understand and develop.
Advice takes observations and reflections and turns them into suggestions for new and better practice. It tells us what to do better, how to create success.

During a face-to-face Learning Dialogue, participants summarized their reflections and created advices on the spot for the problems raised by an observation. These advices have been then summarized and fed back to the validation process.

On the website, writers of advice are professional practitioners, researchers and policy makers that are able to identify new opportunities in observations and reflections and describe them in a way that create inspiration and new practical applications.

Face-to-face Learning Dialogues were organised in every year of the project, thus repeating the process as the project results emerged. These events have been an integral part of the research as well as the dissemination processes.
3. Learning Dialogues Implemented

3.1 Presentation at the Plymouth e-Learning Conference 2010

Figure 1: 5th Plymouth e-Learning Conference (PeLC) 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom, 08 & 09 April 2010

Authors: Thomas Fischer & Thomas Kretschmer (Innovation in Learning Institute (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg), Joe Cullen (Arcola Research LLP)

Presentation: Thomas Fischer (Innovation in Learning Institute (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg)

Looking to the future of Learning 2.0 and 3.0

3.1.1 Summary

The concept of the Learning Dialogues of Links-up have been discussed and validated firstly with the participants of the Learning Plymouth eLearning Conference (PeLC), April 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom (see http://www2.plymouth.ac.uk/e-learning/).

The Learning Café organised of 90 minutes length aimed at British academics. With a small audience, the discussion after the initial presentation (as contained in Deliverable 3 and on the Links-up website) was rather vivid. The main feedback received on the project activities was that the project goals and activities were quite interesting for them, however challenging and very hard to sustain.

3.1.2 Abstract

The use of second generation Internet technologies – what O’Reilly introduced as Web 2.0 and what today is extended to related terms such as Learning 2.0, Enterprise 2.0 and Quality 2.0 – such as web logs (blogs), video logs (vlogs), wikis, pod-casting, tagging, ‘folksonomies’ (as opposed to taxonomies), ‘peer-to-peer’ (P2P) networks, RSS Newsfeeds, ‘Open Source Software’ (OSS), social software and computing as well as virtual worlds, is seemingly opening up innovative, bottom-up and direct possibilities for innovative learning as well as for social and e-Inclusion.

Advocates of Web 2.0 furthermore suggest that the Internet is substantially moving from passive publication to active participation; that the Internet is one of the major knowledge repositories for personal knowledge acquisition and learning, may it be acquired formally, non-formally or informally.
It is furthermore increasingly argued that Web 2.0 applications can empower resistant learners and excluded groups by offering them new opportunities for self-realisation through collaborative learning, and by changing the nature of education itself.

Personal learning environments are expected to gradually complement, enhance and probably replace formal educational and training arrangements, with no separation between, school, home and work anymore, thus in increasingly pervasive and ubiquitous ways. Yet the evidence base for these conclusions is still fragmented and contested. There is for example also counter evidence that Web 2.0 can reinforce exclusion and reduce learning outcomes.

The European R&D project ‘Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society – Understanding the Picture (LINKS-UP)’ aims at exploring therefore three main issues:

- Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning (LLL)?
- Can isolated e-Inclusion experiments be mainstreamed?
- Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?

LINKS-UP will build on the results of what has been done so far; create synergies and collaborative working between currently isolated innovations in the field, and valorise state of the art to produce and test new pedagogic approaches and tools to support inclusive lifelong learning.

The proposed Learning Café will therefore first present the results of an in-depth study undertaken for the ‘Institute for Prospective Technological Studies’ (IPTS), a ‘Joint Research Centre’ (JRC) of the European Commission highlighting success factors and barriers of Learning 2.0 and Inclusion. Secondly an interactive prospective Learning Café will follow looking firstly at the transitions from Learning 1.0 to Learning 2.0 and will secondly draw a roadmap into the future of Learning 3.0. The Learning Café will utilise scenario planning techniques helping to identify future driving forces and developing two extreme, nevertheless continual scenarios: a best-case and a worst-case assessment of the future of Learning 2.0 and Inclusion. The Learning Café will finally contribute to the ‘Learning 2.0 Innovation Laboratory’, where the discussions can be followed up online.

3.1.3 Presentation:

3.2 Model Learning Dialogue at the EDEN Annual Conference 2010

The first model Learning Dialogue has been conducted during the 2010 Annual Conference of the European Distance and E-Learning Network (EDEN), June 2010, Valencia, Spain (see http://www.eden-online.org/eden.php?menuid=485). Please find the the related presentations in Annex 2.

![Media Inspirations for Learning](image)

**Figure 2:** EDEN Annual Conference 2010, Valencia, Spain, 09 – 12 June 2010

**Organisation:** European Distance and E-Learning Network (EDEN)

**Workshop Organisers:** Thomas Fischer (Innovation in Learning Institute (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg), Joe Cullen (Arcola Research LLP), Davide Calenda (PIN S.c.r.l - Polo Universitario "Città di Prato"), Martijn Hartog (eSociety Institute, The Hague University of Applied Sciences), Eva Suba (European Distance and E-Learning Network (EDEN))

**Workshop ‘Is it all Just Twitter? Can Learning 2.0 Deliver the Goods on e-Inclusion?’**

The Consortium decided to combine WP5 Validation from methodological point of view and implement the Action Learning sets and with sound case study basis. To screen the stakeholders needs and expectations the first Learning Dialogue was implemented as a model Learning Dialogue with an international panel of researchers to involve further target groups into the stakeholder group. This event was held in the framework of the 2010 EDEN Annual Conference as a workshop within the programme of the conference.

3.1.1 Summary

It is increasingly argued that Web 2.0 can empower resistant learners and excluded groups by offering them new opportunities for self-realization through collaborative learning, and by changing the nature of education itself. Personal learning environments will replace formal education, with no separation between, school, home and work. Yet the evidence base for these conclusions is fragmented and contested. There is also counter evidence that Learning 2.0 can reinforce exclusion and reduce learning outcomes.

Participants in this workshop had the opportunity to gain an understanding of the emerging landscape of Learning 2.0 for social inclusion; its main concepts as well as the present gaps in the knowledge base. Based on the research of the European project ‘Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society - Understanding the Picture’ (LINKS-UP), the workshop provided participants with the opportunity of work with other experts and practitioners to exchange
knowledge and good practices. The workshop format – using a ‘Learning Dialogue’ model – combined presentations, discussion and interactive working on three research themes:

- Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning?
- Can isolated Learning 2.0 experiments be mainstreamed?
- Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?

3.1.2 Objectives

- To introduce the LINKS-UP project, and in particular its key research questions, to Conference participants
- To share some of the project’s emerging, and forthcoming, results on Learning 2.0 for an inclusive knowledge society
- To get critical feedback on the project approach, particularly how it should address its key research questions

3.1.3 Agenda

Session 1: Project Presentations (see for separate files containing the presentations)

1.1 Welcome to LINKS-UP
(Thomas Fischer, Institute for Innovation in Learning [ILI], Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany, 10 minutes)

This presentation will introduce the key research questions the project is addressing alongside and present the applied methodology to answer the research questions. The three major research questions of LINKS-UP are: 1. Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning (LLL)?; 2. Can isolated experiments and case studies be mainstreamed?; 3. Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?

1.2 Emerging Results
(Davide Calenda, PIN - Servizi Didattici e Scientifici per l’Università di Firenze, Italy, 10 minutes)

This presentation will set out what has been done so far in relation to the research questions, present the landscape of Learning 2.0, highlight the gaps in our knowledge, and how the workshop can contribute to helping us fill the gaps and answer the research questions.

1.3 Building a Learning 2.0 Innovation Laboratory
(Facilitator: Martijn Hartog, eSociety Institute, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands, 10 minutes)

This presentation will outline the vision now technologies can support inclusion, the initial specifications and foreseen interactive services of the online co-laboratory of LINKS-UP for Learning 2.0, Innovation and Inclusion.

Session 2: Learning Cafes: Review of the Research Question
(Introduction to the Methodology: Thomas Fischer, Institute for Innovation in Learning [ILI], Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, 5 minutes)
(15 minutes for each Learning Café)
This takes the form of 3 interactive discussion groups involving the workshop participants. Participants rotate to join each group.

**Review of the Research Questions**

The aim of this round is to critically review the research questions and how the project is approaching them. Contribute to expanding our knowledge of what is the current state of the art in the field, building on participants’ own experiences. Each of the three groups is assigned to one Research Question i.e.:

- **Group 1:** Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning?
  
  *(Facilitator: Davide Calenda, PIN - Servizi Didattici e Scientifici per l’Università di Firenze, Italy)*

- **Group 2:** Can isolated experiments and case studies be mainstreamed?
  
  *(Facilitator: Thomas Fischer, Institute for Innovation in Learning [ILI], Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg)*

- **Group 3:** Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?
  
  *(Facilitator: Martijn Hartog, eSociety Institute, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands)*

**Session 3: Plenary Session (15 minutes)**

Following the interactive group work, the three groups will integrate into a whole group discussion to review the results of the Learning Cafés and formulate a ‘consensus’ view on the outcomes.

### 3.1.4 Methodology

The three introductory presentations (of approx. 10 minutes) were firstly aiming at setting the scene and secondly at ‘animating’ a lively debate during the following three Interactive Learning Cafés on Web 2.0, Learning 2.0 and (e-)Inclusion. After the short introductory presentations the participants were divided into three groups or in three thematic Learning Cafés according to the three major research questions of LINKS-UP are: Group 1: Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning (LLL)?; Group 2: Can isolated experiments and case studies be mainstreamed?; Group 3: Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?

The Learning Cafés are centred on open dialogue and productive brainstorming of interdisciplinary stakeholders as well as the elaboration of preliminary conclusions. The chosen format of Learning Cafés allows synergy and interaction, provides and documents new ideas and concerns as well as inputs for future planning within the addressed themes. During the Learning Cafés small groups of participants gather around one table or flip chart, which represent one theme. The discussions around each theme are moderated and documented by a facilitator. After a discussion interval of approx. 15 minutes the participants change themes and will be introduced by the facilitators to the outcomes of the discussions of the previous group. By these means the participants are able to build upon the insights and ideas of the previous group. Learning Cafés are therefore a powerful interactive and joyful method to stimulate the existing wisdom and creativity of participants and to collaboratively create knowledge by avoiding redundancies and repetitions.
During each session, each round table discussed the Research Question introduced by the facilitator. The discussion was 'animated' by the facilitators. Each discussion was documented on the flip chart. The documentation procedures were free: anyone could write, there was no requirement for the format of the documentation either i.e. mind mapping technique, bullet points, drawings, or just writing words and sentences.

After three rounds of Learning Cafés (i.e. each group discussed each Research Question) the main statements and/or key messages from the Learning Café were presented by the facilitators and due to a lack of time only briefly finally discussed during the concluding plenary session. The final results of each Learning Cafés will be summarised and further analysed by the facilitators and a short report will be made available to all interested participants on the LINKS-UP portal.

3.1.5 Preliminary Findings from the Learning Cafés

Learning Café 1: Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning

Inclusion is a multifaceted and stratified process

- Social exclusion offline reproduces online: Web 2.0 is a “middle class staff...I work in Scotland with people excluded from web 2.0 technologies. Not way to access”.
- Dynamics of social exclusion found in web 2.0 environments.
- Inclusion should be addressed in primary school and not so much in university (priorities emerge...).
- Formal and informal learning is a difference that still is important: it is easier to work on inclusion in formal learning then in informal learning, at least because you can see where and how exclusion works: there is an “invisible” risk of exclusion in web 2.0.
- Contraction between integration goal and informal groups. Web 2.0 is good to contact people but what is produced in terms of inclusion is online is another stuff.

Un-linked offline and online worlds

- There is not a linear relationship between the two concepts.
- The two processes can be connected in several ways and at least converge in some cases, but when we look at the structures behind learning processes we see differences: “Learning in a web 2 world means a huge range of activities but not in the University or schools”.
- There are many isolated projects “we don’t know how to put in a common institutional frame”.
- In learning 2.0 the weak actor is the formal education system.
- There is not enough attention on good instruction, quality, including interactions.
- The role of intermediaries is undervalued; it is matter of trusting experts also.
- Intermediaries can be students: “for a student managing a system is more motivating then just contributing to a forum!”
- Web 2.0 means that we will have more competition as educational system.
In the last two years we have had an explosion of technology in UK University but I feel (Open UK representative) we don’t know how to make sense of all these technologies and how to manage changes. We don’t have the time to reflect and this is urgent now!

Evidences of Web 2.0 impact on learning are lacking and this is one of the reason why many educators and formal institutions are sceptical.

Contradictory E-learning

Learning 2.0 basis on Web 2.0 tools and platforms and there are commercial interests behind and this produce consequences: “we have platforms that were born for other purposes then e-learning, i.e. Second life it is not easy to use in general and for e-learning. Furthermore, there are rights such as accessibility for disable people that are not contemplated in commercial platforms”.

In our school we have many women; they are not likely to use pc and the Internet for learning but at the same time they are hard users of social networks such as Facebook. When I ask them to explain this contradiction, they answer that there is not contradiction because Facebook is for fun and socialization purposes and not for learning.

Learning in the work place still not widely accepted by employers; employers don’t like their workers using these technologies in the working time. We need a change in how working time is perceived by employers. We have the same problem is in schools and universities regarding the access to Facebook or mobile phones. We should understand that these technologies can be useful for learning.

E-learning has a natural linkage with Life Long Learning

Does learning 2.0 mean learning through having fun by doing things? These technologies bring a fun factor into serious learning. When I have fun I can learn more...

LLL for me is to keep interested and curious into things that happen in my life, is a life style….. situations in life change over time. So learning 2.0 is one element of LLL, the most important component are motivation and curiosity.

Life is learning….we come back to the definition of Education, so LLL can be together with formal education. Formal learning was established because people realize that it was necessary for the society. It was a social purpose. And now it is the same, but the purpose is more inclusive because education systems now have to recognize the impotence of informal learning, let’s say, learning 2.0!

We need to define what is Life Long Learning today. We can see Web 2.0 as a set of technologies that have a lot to do with life long learning because the increase accessibility for instance. So there is a natural connection between Web 2.0 and LLL. In our university we have LLL and people have many problems to come continuously in the classroom and web 2.0 would make it easier. The consequence would be to take them out of our direct supervision. This is our challenge.

Learning Café 2: Can isolated experiments and case studies be mainstreamed?

Stay realistic

Direct up-scaling practices to from policies is difficult
• Direct jump from practice to policy is too big
• Lack of policy impedes experimentation on the ground
• Change takes time
• Some isolated experiments can not be scaled up and mainstreamed at all

Respect the characteristics of the setting
• Conservative environments and settings
• Resistance and inertia
• Privacy and security concerns e.g. Facebook banned from schools in the UK
• Must be in line with strategic goals of organisation
• Inclusion of Learning 2.0 requires new business models e.g. for educational institutions

Adaptation is crucial
• Linear transferability is a myth
• But provide analogies from one field to another field of application
• Usage and adaptation of best practices

Involve all levels of actors and stakeholders
• Always address the next level of the hierarchy and/or decision making first
• Use advocates, mediators, ‘boosters’
• Use intermediaries
• Involve professional bodies and associations e.g. educational committees
• Involve responsible person in pilot
• Organise personal contact between people concerned and policy makers

Let them tell their story
• Visual accounts e.g. video statements more convincing than text
• Own words more convincing than reading
• Provide compelling evidence (from bottom-up) to organize support from policy (from top-down, above)
• Find evidence, show proofs and provide analogies etc

Find the super case study, starlet case study
• Promote and market the case

Granularity of approaches is essential
• Target group of excluded citizens and groups at risk is too big and manifold in its characteristics
• No homogeneity between and within excluded groups e.g. prisoners – persons with disabilities, elderly persons → homogeneity and linear transferability is an illusion
• Focus on specific interventions for specific target groups

Take into account the often ambiguous role of technology
• Role of basic and specific ICT skills
• Technologies are facilitating inclusion
• Stuck with technology → decrease of motivation → drop out
• Learning 2.0 resources need to be based on design principles and embedded in pedagogical concepts
• English is the dominant language of Web 2.0 → Lack of individualization
• Easy production of Learning 2.0 resources can help to keep languages and heritage alive e.g. worldwide Gaelic language learning network with own production of videos

**Learning Café 3: Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?**

**Approach**

For this part of the workshop there was chosen for a phased approach, containing three steps:

• Define learning 2.0;
• Realizing learning 2.0 in non-formal environments;
• Changes in the way we learn / lifelong learning.

**Findings**

It seemed difficult to define learning 2.0 in non-formal environment, which is a result on its own, but had a counter effect in processing the three step approach. Nevertheless, the three groups provided three interesting perspectives in the usage of learning 2.0 as a lifelong learning aspect as well as learning 2.0 in non-formal environments.

**Overall perspective**

The opinions of the participants in the learning café provided key information concerning the third research question of Links-Up. Namely, it is plain difficult to determine a definition that obtains al possible factors of using web 2.0 tools in learning, also in combination with lifelong learning. You should more or less see it as incidental possibilities that may occur and be generalised for the purpose of reaching a large group as possible with the same amount of success.

During the discussion the three groups resulted in three different perspectives.

**Group 1**

• Learning 2.0 is learner driven, mobile, based on experience(s), about sharing / collaboration / participation / creating knowledge and entails social interaction which is combined with web 2.0 tools.
• Difficulties: is has no structure, no fixed frame. It is difficult to reflect upon. What to do with business influences of web 2.0 tool suppliers?
• If you want to use these defines in an operational way you have to define the core issue and the way you are going to reach the target group.
• How to reach? Sense of urgency? What do the need? Basic needs?
• The way you intervene in issues/problems and a larger group of people in non-formal environments determines the instruments you may choose to reach the target group as well as how you should be able to reach them.
• In addition some participants noted that you can reach people, even those who are hard to reach, by offering personal advice using mobile phone as well as local TV.
• In example for unemployment issues.

Group 2
• In this particular group we had a fierce discussion about the origin and meaning of learning 2.0. The phrase that was emphasized the most: Learning 2.0 finds its base, its core, in the developments made in technology which enables mobile learning and co-production.
• But then the following questions rose: But do 2.0 tools really consistently deliver user generated content? Most of the web 2.0 tools are ways to use and fun to play/experiment with, but is having fun learning?

Two highlighted issues:
• The constructivism of collaborating for an better live means co-producing as a team where trust is the core element of success and achieving the main goal.
• You must offer some sort of a structured and guided top-down format of using web 2.0 to benefit social inclusion, otherwise the effect will be marginal and it can’t follow a sort of optimal process.

Group 3
The third group discus whether web 2.0 tools can be related to educational environments, with questions like:

• Where are we using it for?
• Why are we using it?
• How are we using it?

We finished the workshop session concluding that it is difficult to estimate how learning 2.0 technologies and methods are applied in individual circumstances situated, within non-formal environments so it offers/realises and gains social inclusion. The participants saw the need to have a moderator who functions as a ‘key’ or ‘bridge’ between the (social inclusion) needs of people, the learning 2.0 tools and what certain institutions and methods can contribute/achieve. So a) the right information is distributed between the stakeholders and b) to ensure collaboration with the target group to achieve the highest possible rate of success.
3.3 1st Learning Dialogue with Case Study Representatives at the EduMedia Conference 2010

Figure 3: EduMedia Conference 2010, Salzburg, Austria, 23 June 2010
Organisation: Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft (SRFG)
Workshop Organisers/Moderators: Wolf Hilzensauer & Sandra Schaffert (Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft)
Documentation: Markus Winkler & Sandra Schaffert (Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft)

Lerncafé ‘Lernen mit Web 2.0 zur Inklusion’ (i.e. Learning Café ‘Learning with Web 2.0 for Inclusion’)

3.3.1 Summary

Shortly after the model event, the Austrian Learning Dialogue took place during the EduMedia Conference in June 2010 in Salzburg, Austria (see http://edumedia.salzburgresearch.at/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=210&Itemid=188). The main idea of the workshop was on the one hand to introduce the idea and concept of the Links-up. The related conference paper can be found in Annex 3.

The main idea of the workshop was on the one hand to introduce the idea and concept of the Links-UP project and on the other hand to gain experience in-depth from 8 experts in the area of learning and inclusion with Web 2.0 in Austria and Germany.

The workshop aimed at collecting and presenting experiences of projects with the topic “Web 2.0 to inclusion”, such like integration of unemployed, school drop outs, educationally disadvantaged migrants. Therefore, observations within the diverse projects of the participants were collected and reflected. Very concrete observation, as the selection of a special tool (Facebook) for networking with different target group were discussed and shared. Building on this, it was tried to develop a first list or recommendation for future project initiators and policy. Nevertheless, there was a big request to discuss these
recommendation, but due to time restrictions, we only have this preliminary version to discuss in further steps of LINKS-UP.

3.3.2 Background: Setting

The workshop was implemented in the course of the EduMedia conference, the annual conference of the Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft in Salzburg with more than 150 participants. The workshop was scheduled at the 2010-06-23 (10:00-12:00 h).

3.3.3 Agenda

- Presentation of the project Links-UP: Aims and activities.
- Introduction of the participants
- First discussion: Web 2.0 for Social inclusion – Observations
- Second discussion: Web 2.0 for Social Inclusion – Reflections
- Third discussion: Web 2.0 for Social Inclusion – Advice.
- Final discussion

3.3.4 Methods

The workshop was implemented on the base of the three main issues of the project:

Observation – Reflection – Advice

![Figure 4: First Results of the Learning Café ‘Learning with Web 2.0 for Inclusion’](image)

After the presentation of the project, the participants introduced themselves according to their background and answered to the following questions: a) Inclusion in my working fields means...? b) Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...?

In the second part of the workshop, the participants were asked to go through the prepared forms and collect and reflect their experiences. For this, the participants were asked to
reflect on positive as well as negative experiences of inclusion strategies with the help of web 2.0 technologies. The participants were asked to fill in the forms on the base of:

a) Observaiton: What was implemented? What was the result?

b1) Reflection: Why did it work?

b2) Reflection: Why did it not work?

c) Advice: Suggestions for People, who are about to plan and implement projects in this area

3.3.5 Participants’ Profiles

Please note that the answers of the workshop participants have been anonymised.

**Figure 5:** Working on Observation – Reflection – Advice during Learning Café ‘Learning with Web 2.0 for Inclusion’

**Person A**

Institution Bildungsnetz Salzburg

*Position/Background*

IT Support

*Inclusion in my working fields means...*

Currently getting an intensive contribution to the participation of the leaders on the school management system

Creating awareness of the risks of Web 2.0

*Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...*
OLCP, Wikipedia, Wikis; examination of multiplex capabilities (moodle, facebook, twiter, xing); wasting time; benefit: fast, uncomplicated (straightforward) data exchange; Drawbacks:

web access by device, dependency

**Person B**

*Institution:*

Padagogische Hochschule NO, Baden

*Position/Background*

Interested person in regarding integration of juvenile migrants and women in the society and world of employment

*Inclusion in my working fields means...*

Considering different points of views, learning persons with special needs; not getting scared by using Web 2.0, to support teenagers with migration background;

*Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...*

It's a must in the 21th century and a great chance of worldwide networking and understanding/communication (problems, risks/ and negative aspects) → digital divide;

**Person C**

*Institution*

PRISMA – Zentrum fur Ausbildung und Beruf

*Position/Background*

project management and development in the field of educational-unprivileged women, learning and Web 2.0

*Inclusion in my working fields means...*

giving educational-unprivileged (with a learning gap) women the chance in participating in knowledge society, and show them ways, how they can self-directed learn and qualify (formal, informal)

*Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...*

Exciting; With the target group 19-24 years of age of educational-unprivileged women, it didn't work. Now she attempts the older generation. The difficulty is to show the benefit for business of using web 2.0. It is difficult, because of the lack of the digital social network.
Person D

Institution
Mittelschule, Dornbirn

Position/Background
Headmaster (Director)

_Inclusion in my working fields means..._

The new secondary school attempts to balance the disadvantages of parental home, language, background (educational free). Inclusion of all members of the school community (children with individualized personal instruction support, migrants, learning gaps, behaviour disorders)

_Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means..._

Opportunity to practice internal differentiation. Expansion in the field of parental homes/social work.

Person E

Institution
Trigon Entwicklungsberatung

Position/Background
Project management, human resources development

_Inclusion in my working fields means..._

Making people curiously about Web 2.0 and show them opportunities of Web 2.0

_Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means..._

Interactive, learning in real-time, self-explanatory, self-paced, free zone (space)

Person F

Institution
Brainy-Games

Position/Background
Creating learning games

_Inclusion in my working fields means..._
Software which facilitate education standards and supports everyone individual. Software is kind of connective link between groups and school types

*Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...*

Opportunity with a high potential and risks. Focus?

**Person G**

*Institution*

Die Wiener Volkshochschulen VHS Meidling

*Position/Background*

Project manager (adult education program) learning in open education settings

*Inclusion in my working fields means...*

inclusion of educational-free persons; inclusion in the society dimension; second course of education and adult education; to facilitate educational attainment; to facilitate diversity in education; individual learning;

*Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...*

Tying up; to interfere e-competence;

**Person H**

*Institution*

BIMS – Bildung Innovaton Migraton Soziale Exzellenz

*Position/Background*

Creating seminars, which includes the usage of Web 2.0 tools

*Inclusion in my working fields means...*

self organisation of learning offers;

*Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...*

It’s the crucial key, which enables educational offers

**Person I**

*Institution*

Padagogische Hochschule Niederosterreich

*Position/Background*

teacher
Inclusion in my working fields means...

Possibilities of participation through the internet

Web 2.0 – Learning 2.0 means...

Multimodal methods and materials, available in a flexible form and structure.

3.3.6 Preliminary Findings: Positive & Negative Experiences

The workshop participants were asked to first an observation about Learning 2.0 and secondly reflect why the above was successful or not successful i.e.: 

1. Observation: What was implemented?; What was the result? (target, target group, methods, tools, setting, space of time,...)

2. Reflection: Why was it successful?

Experience 1

Observation

• Webinar attendance (about 1.5 hours)

Reflection: Why was it successful?

• Technology worked correctly, moderation and lecture: different roles

Experience 2

Observation

• target: self-learning-competence and self-expression with e-portfolio, presentation of skills
• target group: participants in lectures of method: offer for different platforms
• setting: course + telecourse
• space of time: two years

Reflection: Why was it successful?

• participants had a high level of e-competence
• self-learning part was demanded as assessment
• participants were able to use their self-presentation for private cases and for the job market
• topic was close to technology
• participants were well networked
Experience 3

Observation

- Contact and getting to know a taboo; debriefing session on facebook

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Chance for a better communication

Experience 4

Observation

- Participants 40+ should get in contact with facebook; friend explain how to use it for a reason; (about 3hours)

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Concrete reason → own motivation; support from real person (via chat, skype teamspeak); learning by doing

Experience 5

Observation

- Introduction to the program „English Without Frontiers“ (part of „Barrier-Free Language Learning“ project) Linguer Project! www.englishwithoutronters.com

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- At this point unpredictable; students were interested in the (learning-) materials, they hopefully think, that they ware useful; especially the possibility to edit the materials is quite interesting;

Experience 6

Observation

- Creation and development of materials for learners with special needs;

- target: basic knowledge of the language English (in everyday usage)

- tools: www.toolsforeducators.com www.esl-kids.com

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Students of the university of education think that the tools are very useful for the creation and development of materials for the E-Lessons. No success verification of working with pupils (students)
Experience 7

Observation

- Coaching of an migrant via Skype for the exam for the vocational maturity certificate

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Face to face communication wasn’t possible, because of the long distance. The migrant passes the exam.

Experience 8

Observation

- Project Socrates-Web (introduction to the new school administration sofware in Salzburg)

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Participation of many women (especially project managers) enabled different views to the problem definition, problem analyse and solution; working method changed, open communication (also with Web 2.0 elements, Moodle Blogs);
- Project close-out was a quite good finish (hadn’t been before in this form with appreciation of all involved persons) At this point some leaders/instructors work already with it; next summer term all will work with the system

Experience 9

Observation

- Give older people in a transitional course an understanding of Web 2.0 / internet. Introduction into tools like doodle, skype, google docs,...

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Usage of Skype and email for private purpose; security aspects were very interesting (used in everyday life);

Experience 10

Observation

- Time restrictions are sometimes forcing self-organisation

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- In time troubles participants could use moodle at home; communication/exchange by themselves. Email was a quite good way to communicate problems
Experience 11

Observation

- Initiation and creation of an blog for the first school classes up to the 8th school level; target group: all school partners;
- Class log book/diary, task collection, parent information, picture& photo collection, content of teaching and content of learning retrievable; repetition for pupils with learning gaps; learning during number of work days lost due illness

Reflection: Why was it successful?

- Start at the beginning of this school year; up to now quite successful; many parents got convinced of the advantages;

Experience 12

Observation

- Formation of master-women tried to communicate (organization of seminars, informal contact) via Web 2.0 tools and processed an large training program with Web 2.0 elements.
- Some companies polices internal organization principles worked (Google Calender,..)

Experience 13

Observation

- learning to learn
- target group: educational-unprivileged women (drop outs, apprenticeship drop outs)
- tools: training, learning progress moderation e-tools: moodle, gmail-google docs
- approach: using moodle to support learning arrangement and to initatie communication/exchange between the participants

Reflection: Why was it NOT successful?

- Learning platform was to complex, confusing; own initative was absent; the benefit of Web 2.0 was not clear, because it wasn’t important and there was no technology at home or for private use accessible, or unintelligible how the same tool (MySpace) can be used for learning
Experience 14

Observation
?

Reflection: Why was it NOT successful?

• Learning world wasn't exciting enough for using many tools (it wasn't necessary/useful)

Experience 15

Observation

• using google docs to collaborate in the project coordination
• target group: project management staff members
• method: how to use google docs
• tool: iGoogle – Google Docs and phone
• space of tme: 1-3 months
• Examples: web.de Address,...

Reflection: Why was it NOT successful?

• Willingness to check out something new

Experience 16

Observation

• Every pupil/student can use Facebook

Reflection: Why was it NOT successful?

• Everyone uses always; inhibition?

Experience 17

Observation

• Wiki

Reflection: Why was it NOT successful?
Experience 18

Observation

?  

Reflection: Why was it NOT successful?

- At first of the training there was an massive resistance about the innovation → congestion (overloading)

3.3.7 Preliminary Findings: Experiences: A Summary

- Together with the participant, all the experiences had been discussed and reflected and the following points where mentioned as possible key factors for successful projects:

- It seems to be important, that the project initiators are opinion leaders in a organization and additionally highly motivated and personally involved in Web 2.0 (e.g. having an own Weblog)

- It seems to be helpful, when the expected outcomes are not overestimated and euphoric, as Web 2.0 may be helpful, but it is not a key driver on its own. The concrete opportunities can be very “small” but sustainable and are not a mater of course.

- Privacy seems always in important point, from different point of views.

- “Web 2.0 and inclusion” does not work on its own. There should be always a goal of an initiative or project with an (additional) value.

- Important seems the possibility and availability of support and tutoring by peers.

- Tools as Facebook or Youtube are not always generally a curse or blessing, this depends highly on the settings of the intervention. Facebook for example may disturb lectures in schools or is infecting privacy topics.

- A positive effect of Web 2.0 projects is, that normally more materials are produced and available and may be shared for documentation and dissemination of project results.

- Crucial seems e-competence and media competence in general (even if this is not the topic of the project itself). Surprisingly, it was harder to come up with general remarks about not successful projects, only one points was mentioned and gets (big) consensus.

- A practical, but important factor which limits the success can be the technology in general (usability), always very time consuming and a A BIG BARRIER are especially and first logins and passwords.
3.3.8 Preliminary Findings: Advices for Project Initiators

- Building on our discussion of experiences of the participants we changed the perspective.
- Within the next and last part of the workshop lists of advices should be developed.
- Explore the target group (the CONCRETE target group)
- Do not underestimate the workload for the teacher: his/her role changes, but there will be more workload, be prepared!
- Identify benefit of the usage of tools
- Include „the world“, especially peers of the target group
- Just use one or just a few tools! (not more as important)
- Access to Internet, Tools etc. have to be organised
- Trainers and Experts should be „cool“ for the target group.

The discussion shows, that it was hard to find „special“ advices for project initiators, which are not common aspects of good plans for projects in the field of education or inclusion in general. Controversially discussed was the point, if or that a clear operationalisation of goals is needed. Web 2.0 project very often comes to surprisingly outcomes and effects that cannot be foreseen. An operationalisation may limit such windows of opportunities. Nevertheless it seems to be important, to get a clear understanding of the reasons of the usage of Web 2.0.

3.3.9 Preliminary Findings: Advices for Policy Makers

Advices and/or recommendations for policy makers were short and clear:

- Create access of Web 2.0 for everybody, even outsides the project space
- Better financial support
- Rising own media experience (just a limited knowledge of Web 2.0)
- Above this, experiences shown that there seems to be no „special“ policy advices for inclusion and Web 2.0 – but general advices to enhance the structure and financing of projects in the field of inclusion, especially long-term and adequate payment.

3.3.10 Additional Questions

Last, we discussed some general questions of the project LINKS-UP. Here are the questions and answers – short, but clear.
Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive life-long learning?

Yes, if:

- technology, professional competence
- acceptance
- benefit
- personal relevance
- blended learning

Can isolated experiments be mainstreamed?

Yes, because of social focus
3.4 2nd International Learning Dialogue at the EDEN Annual Conference 2011

![EDEN 2011](image)

**Learning and Sustainability**

**Changing Ecosystems of Innovation and Knowledge**

19-22 June 2011

**Figure 6:** EDEN Annual Conference, Dublin, Ireland, 19 – 22 June 2011

**Organisation:** European Distance and E-Learning Network (EDEN)

**Workshop Organisers:** Thomas Fischer (Innovation in Learning Institute (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg), Joe Cullen (Arcola Research LLP), Wolf Hilzensauer (Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft), Davide Calenda (PIN S.c.r.l - Polo Universitario "Città di Prato"), Martijn Hartog (eSociety Institute, The Hague University of Applied Sciences), Eva Suba (European Distance and E-Learning Network (EDEN))

**Workshop ‘Social Software for Social Inclusion. Successes or Failures?’**

**Summary**

The second international Links-up Learning Dialogue with stakeholders and policy experts took place during the EDEN Annual Conference entitled “Learning and Sustainability – The new ecosystem of Innovation and Knowledge” at the premises of University College Dublin, on 19-22 June 2011. The aim of the 2011 EDEN conference was to highlight different ways and approaches, in order to integrate better the concept of responsible and sustainable development within learning, in its widest sense.

The Learning Dialogue took the form of a workshop as part of the Conference’s official programme. The format followed the Learning Dialogue design of 120 minutes as seen in 2010 at the Valencia Learning Dialogue. This Links-up Learning Dialogue built upon the results and follows up the successful workshop ‘Is it all just Twitter? Can Learning 2.0 deliver the Goods on e-Inclusion?’ held at last year’s EDEN Annual Conference 2010 in Valencia, Spain. The focus of this Learning Dialogue was the validation experiments as a point of reference for policy makers and researchers. The basis of the discussion was the publication ‘Case study report on inclusive Lifelong Learning’ published earlier in print and online (with over 1400 views on SlideShare). The series of ‘action research experiments’, collaborating with ‘live pilot’ projects working in the field evaluated the added contribution Web 2.0 can make to practices that use learning to support social inclusion.
The workshop format combined again presentations, discussions and interactive working on the following thematic areas of Links-up:

- **Target Groups**: How to reach them and how to keep them committed?
- **Practices**: What works with whom under which conditions?
- **Policies**: Which are the challenges to mainstream bottom-up initiatives and sustain top-down programmes?

The first session with short presentations informed participants of the current state-of-the-art alongside with first evidences from the action research experiments, while the second part in turn with interactive Learning Cafés provided opportunities to work with other experts and practitioners to exchange knowledge and good practices.

As a result of the Learning Dialogue, five leading research experts and policy makers were interviewed and these video-interviews have been posted on the web to stimulate discussion and inspire policy-advice. The expert testimonials have been published on YouTube, and on the LINKS-UP website. Furthermore, one of the keynote speakers of the EDEN Conference has been invited to the Final LINKS-UP Conference.

The event was posted in the Conference’s official website, on Links-up’s official webpage and on the partners’ website. An invitation was posted via direct mailing to partners’ contacts, to EDEN mailing lists and to the EDEN Conference registered delegates prior to the conference. The event was featured in the project’s second Newsletter, posted in May. It was announced on social web media channels of the project. A short video documents the event on the project’s Slideshare account with over 380 views.

**Context**

The links between sustainability and the world of learning and education are numerous and natural. Embedding learning as a critical factor in the diversity of socio-economic settings plays an important and acknowledged role in strategic viability and impact. We can visualize the relationship between sustainability and learning in many contexts. E-learning, learning innovation, open learning, ICT enhanced learning, so called atypical learning forms: all are modernization factors enhancing the ecological consequences of technical development. The Links-up Learning Dialogue in the context of the EDEN Conference set the scene for a real learning dialogue among experts, researchers and stakeholders of learning for a change for a more sustainable society. The participants of the conference could not only take part at the workshop, but received the flyer of the project as well as the copies o the printed Case Study analysis to ground research questions and validation experiment results with grass-root initiative’s real-life experiences.
The Learning Dialogue took place in the midst of the analysis of Validation Experiments, thus while preliminary results could be discussed, the focus of the event could be easily shifted towards introducing a research result-driven policy advice discussion.

**Agenda & Learning Café Methodology**

**Session 1: Presentations** (40 minutes in total)

- Welcome, Workshop Format & Introduction to LINKS-UP
  *Thomas Fischer, Institute for Innovation in Learning (ILI), University of Erlangen-Nuremberg (10 minutes)*

- The Policy, Conceptual & Practice Landscape of Learning 2.0 for Inclusion
  *Joe Cullen, Arcola Research LLP, United Kingdom (10 minutes)*

- Innovative Use of Web 2.0 for inclusive Lifelong Learning: Problems Encountered, Lessons Learnt & Recommendations for Future Work
  *Wolf Hilzensauer, Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft, Austria (10 minutes)*

- Reports from the Ground: The LINKS-UP Validation Experiments
  *Davide Calenda, PIN, University of Florence, Italy (10 minutes)*

**Session 2: Thematic Interactions** (15 minutes for each Learning Café)

- Learning Café 1: Target Groups: how to reach them and how to keep them committed?
  *Facilitator: Martijn Hartog, eSociety Institute, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands*
• Learning Café 2: Practices: What works with whom under which conditions?  
 FACILITATOR: THOMAS FISCHER, INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATION IN LEARNING (ILI), UNIVERSITY OF ERLANGEN-NUREMBERG, GERMANY

• Learning Café 3: Policies: Which are the challenges to mainstream bottom-up initiatives and sustain top-down programmes?  
 FACILITATOR: DAVIDE CALENDA, PIN, UNIVERSITY OF FLORENCE, ITALY

Session 3: Plenary Session: Consensus Building (15 minutes)  
Moderator: Joe Cullen, Arcola Research LLP, United Kingdom

The Learning Cafés are centred on open dialogue and productive brainstorming of interdisciplinary stakeholders as well as the elaboration of preliminary conclusions. The chosen format of Learning Cafés allows synergy and interaction, provides and documents new ideas and concerns as well as inputs for future planning within the addressed themes. During the Learning Cafés small groups of participants gather around one table or flip chart, which represent one theme. The discussions around each theme are moderated and documented by a facilitator. After a discussion interval of approx. 15 minutes the participants change themes and will be introduced by the facilitators to the outcomes of the discussions of the previous group. By these means the participants are able to build upon the insights and ideas of the previous group. Learning Cafés are therefore a powerful interactive and joyful method to stimulate the existing wisdom and creativity of participants and to collaboratively create knowledge by avoiding redundancies and repetitions.

Impact

Expert Video Testimonials

• Prof. Aharon (Roni) Aviram, Chair of the Center for Futurism in Education at Ben-Gurion University, Educational futurist.  
Link to his interview (89 views)

• Steve Wheeler, Associate Professor at the University of Plymouth and Edublogger  
Link to his interview (686 views)

• Ingeborg Bo, Member of the Board of Trustees of the ICDE (International Council for Open and Distance Education)  
Link to her Interview (49 views)

• Graham Attwell, Director of Welsh independent research institute Pontydysgu, Associate Fellow at University of Warwick, UK and University of Bremen, Germany  
Link to his Interview (106 Views)

• Maruja Gutierrez-Diaz, Advisor to the Director, Education and Culture, European Commission; Former Head of Unit Innovation and Transversal Policies, European Commission  
Link to her interview (49 Views)
Communication Channels of the Learning Dialogue

Online:

- [Event site at Links-up homepage](#);
- [Event site at EDEN web](#);
- EDEN Circulars: As part of the web-campaign for the Learning Dialogue, the invitation to the Learning Dialogue was posted via e-mail to partner contacts. EDEN sent out regular circulars to all conference participants (ca. 450 registered delegates), a special Newsflash to its Members and wider contact lists (ca 13,000 e-mail addresses) featuring the Learning Dialogue at the Conference;
- Presence in social media:
  - [Links-up Facebook Page](#) (Impressions varying 40-130 per Update),
  - [Links-up Slideshare Profile](#) with the video documenting the event (383 Views as of 31 10. 2011), [Case Study publication](#) viewed over 1400 times
- [EDEN Twitter account](#),
- Personal Linkedin Profiles,
- [Elearningeuropa.info](#) (2359 Visits)
- [Expert Testimonials](#) - Video Interviews with 5 Stakeholders shot during the event
- A [short video](#) documenting the atmosphere
- The programme of the Conference and useful information is available [here](#).
- [Second Newsletter](#) covering the topics of the Learning Dialogue and the event
- [Third Newsletter](#) announcing the Expert Testimonials
- [All 3 Newsletters posted on issuu.com](#)

Offline:

The second Links-up Flyer was inserted to the conference delegates’ Conference Bags (ca 400 copies), as well as the Case Study Analysis printed copied were distributed on site.
3.5 Final Learning Dialogue Webinar 2011

Figure 11: Links-up Webinar, 24 October 2011
Organisation: The Links-up Partnership with technical assistance of the Otava Folk High School (OFHS), Finland

Summary
The Links-up project partners and their local contacts offered this webinar to all practitioners with presentations downloadable in four languages (English, German, Dutch and Italian). During the webinar, participants could interact in oral as well as in written form with the help of 4 expert moderators in all four languages.

The project presented via this Webinar its results of two years research with Austrian, English, Italian, Dutch and German local projects engaged on various fields of social inclusion. This Webinar served also a ‘Learning Dialogue’ aiming to bring together stakeholders to review and debate the results. It covered the policy and practice map of the project; a summary analysis of 24 case study examples of the use of Web 2.0 to support ‘inclusive learning’, and the evaluation of six ‘action research’ experiments, which applied what was learned during the project.

Participants in this Webinar had the opportunity to find out about interesting activities related to Web 2.0 for inclusive learning and to explore what works in practice in different countries and discuss challenges remain to be addressed. After the presentation of the project results, this webinar provided participants with the opportunity to work online with other experts, practitioners and project partners to exchange knowledge and good practices as well as to discuss the three main research themes of LINKS-UP: a) Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning? b) Can isolated Learning 2.0 experiments be mainstreamed? c) Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?

This was an open Webinar, thus participation was free of charge and was open to all interested.

Being the final Webinar of the Project, the focus was less on interactivity, and more on formulating the conclusion of the project. Learning Dialogues have been an integral part of the project and offered a great way to rerun the process of action learning sets with researchers and policy makers creating thus valuable reflections and advices.

Technical Background
This Webinar was streamed in Adobe Connect. To see how it works and what participants needed, to do to use it, a preparation video guide was circulated before the Webinar:
Thanks to the Final Conference in September, a sister project offered their Adobe Connect webinar room, thus no technical implications needed to be extra implemented.

**Related Dissemination Actions**

The invitation to the Learning Dialogue was posted via e-mail to partner contacts in four languages. EDEN sent out circulars to all final conference participants (ca 70 contacts), a special Newsflash to its Members and wider contact lists (ca 13.000 e-mail addresses) featuring the Invitation to Learning Dialogue. Partners sent the invitation to their contacts on their own languages including representatives from all 24 case studies and five validation experiments.

The Links-up Facebook Page contains updates on the Learning Dialogue, as well as the EDEN Twitter and Page. The invitation was loaded to project’s Slideshare account, and was published on issuu.com

**Communication Channels of the Learning Dialogue Webinar**

- Event site at Links-up Homepage
- Event site at EDEN web
- EDEN circulars: Invitation sent to EDEN Members list to 1200 contacts, and to EDEN wider contact list (ca 13.000 contacts) in Members’ Newsflash;
- Links-up UP Facebook Page (Impressions varying 40-130 per Update),
- Links-up Slideshare Profile
- English Links-up webinar presen... 178 views
- Deutsche Links-up Webinar Prese... 85 views
- Dutch webinar presentation Link... 110 views
- Italian Links-up Webinar Presen... 88 views
- Invito Webinar Links-up 24 Ottob... 22 views
- Invitation to the Final Webinar... 29 views
- Uitnodiging voor Links-up Webin... 22 views
- EDEN Twitter account,
- Personal Linkedin Profiles
- Invitation on issuu.com
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2010 Plymouth e-Learning Conference - Learning Without Limits: Facing the Challenges
8 - 9 April 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom
Workshop Agenda

• Introduction to LINKS-UP (5 min)
• Looking at Learning 2.0 for Inclusion (10 min)
• Methodology of the Prospective Learning Cafés (5 min)
• Prospective Learning Cafés (20 min each; if necessary split in groups; two rotations)
  → Phase 1: Criticism
  → Phase 2: Utopia
  → Phase 3: Realisation
• Plenary Session: Concluding Remarks & Ways Forward (10 min)
What is LI NKS-UP about?

- Social Software, Web 2.0 …
- (e-)Learning, Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL), Learning 2.0 …
- (e-)Inclusion, quality of life, active citizenship …
- Bridging practice and policies …
- Exchange, transfer, community and capacity building …

→ What works with whom under which conditions?

→ From Bench-Marking (*statistics, ‘descriptors’) to Bench-Learning (*case studies, ‘explanators’) to Bench-Action (*intervention [planning]*)
Main Research Questions of LINKS-UP

1. Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning (LLL)?

2. Can isolated e-Inclusion experiments be mainstreamed?

3. Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?
Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society –
Understanding the Picture

ongoing dialogue

understanding the real complexity

‘learning by doing’ = ‘practice’

inventory / description / experiences

analysis / reflection

‘policy’

2010 Plymouth e-Learning Conference - Learning Without Limits: Facing the Challenges
8 - 9 April 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom

Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society –
Understanding the Picture

Lifelong Learning Programme
Education and Culture DG

R&D Activities of LINKS-UP

- WP 1: Scoping & Methodology
- WP 2: Intensive Case Studies
- WP 3: Learning Dialogues
- WP 4: Learning 2.0 Innovation Laboratory @ www.links-up.eu
- WP 5: Validation Experiments
- WP 6: Production & Dissemination, WP 7: Quality Plan & Project Internal Evaluation, WP 8: Exploitation & Sustainability Actions, WP 9 Project Management & Coordination
Social Computing & Innovation in Learning

- New ways of **collaborative creation, identification, aggregation and exchange of learning content and metadata**;
- New forms of **interconnection, communication and interaction amongst stakeholders and actors** (vs. digital isolation);
- More **personalized and learner-centred environments** (e.g. individual documentation of activities, knowledge and competencies);
- New forms of **blended learning scenarios** (formal/informal; classroom/distance; intra-/extra-institutional; mixed learning scenarios & pedagogical approaches);
- **Motivational advantages** by active, joyful, discovery-based learning approaches and learner's **sense of ownership** of produced content.

Learning 2.0: Success Factors & Barriers

- Reasonable use and meaningful integration of Web 2.0 tools;
- Well-structured online environments respecting the needs of the target group of users (e.g. navigation, clear structure, not too many distractions, user-interface, terminology);
- Regular up-dates of the online environment (i.e. new content) and critical mass of users/content;
- Adequate and stable technological infrastructure (for organisations and learners at home);
- Continuous motivation of all involved groups of people (special barrier: digitally disadvantaged groups);
- Concerns about (scientific) quality of user-generated and peer produces content;
- Increasing awareness about possible problems around identity, privacy, ownership of data.
Learning 2.0: Knowledge, Skills & Competence Development

- Developing **subject specific, but at the same time higher order skills** (e.g. reflective thinking, learning-to-learn, self-organisation);
- Training **basic and more complex ICT** (depending on users' initial digital literacy) and **multimedia skills** (e.g. production of audio-visual or three-dimensional content);
- Fostering specific **communication skills; networking skills**;
- Enlarging **multi-tasking skills and complexity management**;
- Increasing **meta-cognitive and quality management skills**;
- Issue of assessment and formal certification of Web 2.0 experiences and knowledge gained by these means.
Benefits of Online (Learning) Communities

- Enables **different ways for and of learning** (e.g. narratives, discovery, experimentation, observing, reflection);
- Encourages **social support for learning** (e.g. peer support, situated learning, social knowledge management);
- Supports **new ways to access and organise learning** (linking communities to learning and education in new ways);
- Important element of many people lives with the potential to become a key tool for Lifelong Learning inside and outside educational systems;
- **Personalised approach for learning in social environment** and versatile tools for productive activities can nurture creativity and skills for innovation.

Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society – Understanding the Picture

Lifewide, Lifelong & Inclusive Learning Societies

Learning Communities

Learning Individuals

Learning Landscape

Learning Organisations

Learning Territories
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The Social Theory of Learning 2.0 (for Inclusion)

- **Meaning**: to experience our life and the world as meaningful;
- **Practice**: the shared historical and social resources, frameworks, and perspectives;
- **Community**: the social configurations in which our lives are take place and in which we participate
- **Identity**: the personal history of becoming (learning) in the context of our communities.

→ **Critical Tension**: “Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in a Digital Age” (Viktor Mayer-Schönberger)

The Spectrum of Learning 2.0 for Inclusion

→ Critical Tension: “The Ungoogable Man” vs. “No Citizen left Behind”!
The Boundaries of Learning 2.0 for Inclusion

**NON-USERs**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voluntary non-use</th>
<th>Involuntary non-use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESISTERS (35%)</td>
<td>EXCLUDED (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REJECTERS (25%)</td>
<td>EXPELLED (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Had access in past

Never had access

% from German data, Krings & Riehm (2006)
Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society – Understanding the Picture

**Measuring Learning 2.0 for (e-)Inclusion**

- **Structural** incl. age, gender, ethnicity, geography, economic background, health, disabilities and educational attainment levels;
- **Technological** incl. e-Access, e-Accessibility, e-Affordability, e-Security and e-Usability;
- **Individual & Social** incl. skills and competences, motivation, user needs, coping capabilities, trust and confidence, intentions and perceived impact, experience;

→ Social Participation, Active Citizenship, Quality of Life, Employment, Growth, Productivity, Social Cohesion.
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A (Very) Speedy & Prospective Learning Café Dialogue → Looking at the Future 2.0 (!) and 3.0 (?)

- **General Principles** (developed in the 1970ies; see Jungk, R. & Müller, N.R. [1994])
  - Everything is possible
  - Everything is important
  - Everybody should contribute
  - Everything will be recorded
  - It is about consensus,
A (Very) Speedy & Prospective Learning Café Dialogue → Looking at the Future 2.0 (!) and 3.0 (?)

- **General Effects**
  - Democratisation of decision making by respecting different needs, perspectives, wishes, dreams, hopes, fears
  - Individual, group, community and societal learning i.e. project-based, goal oriented, mutual beneficial, respecting different social backgrounds
  - Using creativity to solve problems
  - Increasing motivation, active participation through transfer to real life worlds
  - Building synergies i.e. building confidence in a joint future
A (Very) Speedy & Prospective Learning Dialogue → Looking at the Future 2.0 (!) and 3.0 (?)

- **Phase 1: Criticism** *(the present)*
  - identifying the most critical issues at stake
  - ranking and clustering problematic areas
  - critical analysis basis for changing and shaping the future
  - identifying the most crucial issues

**Guidelines:**
- Formulate anger, frustrations and disappointments about the present situation
- No valuation, no judgements, no reviews
- No meta-criticism
- No proposal of solutions
A (Very) Speedy & Prospective Learning Dialogue II

• Phase 2: Utopia *(the future)*
  → mirroring critical issues with a fantastic or utopian vision of the future

**Guidelines:**
- Fantasy rules
- Think the unthinkable
- Be open for strange, weird and crazy ideas
- Stay unbiased
- No valuation, no judgements, no reviews, no backseat driving, no killer phrases (“that’s really stupid”, “this will never work”)
A (Very) Speedy & Prospective Learning Dialogue III

• Phase 3: Realisation (from the present the future, connecting today and tomorrow)
  ➔ short and mid-term planning of concrete and realistic steps (what, when, where, with whom, where)
  ➔ long-term roadmap/gangway towards the future

Guidelines:
- grounded in realism, not in pessimism
- open and flexible approaches
- define barriers and suggest ways how to overcome them
- establish alliances, discuss strategies, plan actions

2010 Plymouth e-Learning Conference – Learning Without Limits: Facing the Challenges
8 – 9 April 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom
Join the LI NKS-UP Community @
www.links-up.eu

Contact
Thomas Fischer
E-Mail: thomas.fischer AT fim.uni-erlangen.de
Institute for Innovation in Learning (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany
www.fim.uni-erlangen.de

Joe Cullen
E-Mail: jcullen AT arcola-research.co.uk
Arcola Research LLP, United Kingdom
www.arcola-research.co.uk
The (2nd) LI NKS-UP Learning Dialogue:

Is it all just Twitter? Can Learning 2.0 deliver the Goods on e-Inclusion?

Thomas Fischer, Institute for Innovation in Learning (ILI), University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany

Davide Calenda, PIN, Servizi Didattici e Scientifici per l’Università di Firenze, Italy

Martijn Hartog, eSociety Institute, The Hague University of Applied Sciences, The Netherlands

EDEN 2010 Annual Conference - Media Inspirations for Learning - What makes the impact?
9 - 12 June 2010, Valencia, Spain
Workshop Agenda

• Welcome to LINKS-UP (*Thomas Fischer, 10 min*)
• Emerging Results (*Davide Calenda, 10 min*)
• Building a Learning 2.0 Innovation Co-Laboratory (*Martijn Hartog, 10 min*)
• Learning Cafés: Review of the Research Questions (*15 min each*)
  ➔ Group 1: Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning? (*Facilitator: Davide Calenda*)
  ➔ Group 2: Can isolated experiments and case studies be mainstreamed? (*Facilitator: Thomas Fischer*)
  ➔ Group 3: Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape? (*Facilitator: Martijn Hartog*)
• Plenary Session (*15 min*)
What is LI NKS-UP about?

• Social Software, Web 2.0 …
• (e-)Learning, Technology Enhanced Learning (TEL), Learning 2.0 …
• (e-)Inclusion, quality of life, active citizenship …
• Bridging practice and policies …
• Exchange, transfer, community and capacity building …

Æ What works with whom under which conditions?
Æ From Bench-Marking (statistics, ‘descriptors’) to Bench-Learning (case studies, ‘explanators’) to Bench-Action (intervention [planning])
R&D Activities of LINKS-UP

• WP 1: Scoping & Methodology
• WP 2: Intensive Case Studies
• WP 3: Learning Dialogues
• WP 4: Learning 2.0 Innovation Laboratory @ www.links-up.eu
• WP 5: Validation Experiments
• WP 6: Production & Dissemination, WP 7: Quality Plan & Project Internal Evaluation, WP 8: Exploitation & Sustainability Actions, WP 9 Project Management & Coordination
Social Computing & Innovation in Learning

- New ways of **collaborative creation, identification, aggregation and exchange of learning content and metadata**;
- New forms of **interconnection, communication and interaction amongst stakeholders and actors** (vs. digital isolation);
- More **personalized and learner-centred environments** (e.g. individual documentation of activities, knowledge and competencies);
- New forms of **blended learning scenarios** (formal/informal; classroom/distance; intra-/extra-institutional; mixed learning scenarios & pedagogical approaches);
- **Motivational advantages** by active, joyful, discovery-based learning approaches and learner's **sense of ownership** of produced content.
Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society – Understanding the Picture

Lifewide, Lifelong & Inclusive Learning Societies

Learning Communities

Learning Individuals

Learning Landscape

Learning Organisations

Learning Territories
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The Social Theory of Learning 2.0 (for Inclusion)

- **Meaning**: to experience our life and the world as meaningful;
- **Practice**: the shared historical and social resources, frameworks, and perspectives;
- **Community**: the social configurations in which our lives are taken place and in which we participate;
- **Identity**: the personal history of becoming (learning) in the context of our communities.

→ **Critical Tension**: “Delete: The Virtue of Forgetting in a Digital Age” (Viktor Mayer-Schönberger)

The Spectrum of Learning 2.0 for Inclusion

→ **Critical Tension:** “The Ungoogable Man” vs. “No Citizen left Behind”!
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9 - 12 June 2010, Valencia, Spain
The Boundaries of Learning 2.0 for Inclusion

NON-USERS
- RESISTERS (35%)
  - Never had access
- REJECTERS (25%)
  - Had access in past

INVoluntary non-use
- EXCLUDED (20%)
  - % from German data, Krings & Riehm (2006)
- EXPELLED (20%)
Measuring Learning 2.0 for (e-)Inclusion

- **Structural** incl. age, gender, ethnicity, geography, economic background, health, disabilities and educational attainment levels;
- **Technological** incl. e-Access, e-Accessibility, e-Affordability, e-Security and e-Usability;
- **Individual & Social** incl. skills and competences, motivation, user needs, coping capabilities, trust and confidence, intentions and perceived impact, experience;

→ Social Participation, Active Citizenship, Quality of Life, Employment, Growth, Productivity, Social Cohesion.

Main Research Questions of LINKS-UP

1. Is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive Lifelong Learning (LLL)?

2. Can isolated e-Inclusion experiments be mainstreamed?

3. Is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?
Join the LI NKS-UP Community @ www.links-up.eu

Contact

Thomas Fischer
E-Mail: thomas.fischer AT fim.uni-erlangen.de
Institute for Innovation in Learning (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany
www.fim.uni-erlangen.de

Joe Cullen
E-Mail: jcullen AT arcola-research.co.uk
Arcola Research LLP, United Kingdom
www.arcola-research.co.uk

EDEN 2010 Annual Conference - Media Inspirations for Learning - What makes the impact?
9 - 12 June 2010, Valencia, Spain
something is happening: tomorrow is today

drivers
policy: Lisbon Agenda
society: employability | flexible labourmarket
learning: life long learning

the old world
competition
competences
reproductive
linear

the new world
empowerment
resilience
transformative
non linear
the dynamic
transforming empowerment into inclusion

the old world
lisbon agenda
incremental
adaptive
driven by the market

the new world
changing change
radical
creative
driven by society
the question
linking two worlds

the old world

the new world

learning 2.0: a creative process driving change
learning 2.0 | a political issue

Davide Calenda | University of Florence
learning from learning 2.0 pilots
a ‘co-laboratory’
martijn hartog
3 step co-laboratory

III

II

analysis / reflection

inventory / description / experiences

ongoing dialogue

‘learning’

understanding the real complexity

III

‘policy’
online co-laboratory

“True stories are not the best medicine, but they are nutritious and sustaining. They feed the mind with information and the heart with hope and strength.”

Philip Pullman

People’s stories: see, hear and read their experiences...

Welcome

Healthtalkonline is the award-winning website of the DIPEx charity and replaces the website formerly at dipex.org. Healthtalkonline lets you share in other people’s experiences of health and illness. You can watch or listen to videos of the interviews, read about people’s experiences and find reliable information about conditions, treatment choices and support.

The information on Healthtalkonline is based on qualitative research into patient experiences, led by experts at the University of Oxford. These personal stories of health and illness will enable patients, families and healthcare professionals to benefit

inviting design
theme based:

inclusion

technology

funding

project setup

‘10 things you can learn…’
dialogue
  experts observing, reflecting, advising

what do you get?
  inspiring examples: what works and doesn’t
  resulting advice for policy
  new relationship between real life and policy

how to do it:
  participate online:
  write observations, reflections, advice
learning from learning 2.0 pilots
a ‘co-laboratory’
martijn hartog
Abstract: There are several initiatives and projects trying to support inclusion through learning with Web 2.0. In order to get an overview, there is a need for a collection of results and lessons learnt. The project LINKS-UP, co-financed by the European Commission, aims at bringing together experiences and to provide recommendations for better projects and policies. In the following contribution, we want to present the project LINKS-UP in short and give an overview of exemplary projects that try to initiate and foster inclusion through so-called “learning 2.0”.

1 Inclusion through learning and Web 2.0

‘Inclusion’ is a complex concept, not least, because it is intimately associated with its opposite number – exclusion. As Glass (2000) observes, there is frequently a confusion in the literature between trying to measure social exclusion and trying to measure the effects of policies aimed at eliminating it. The elimination of exclusion – inclusion – needs to address complex multi-dimensional phenomena. As the European Commission (2004) defined it, exclusion is ‘a process whereby certain individuals are pushed to the edge of society and prevented from participating fully by virtue of their poverty, or lack of basic competencies and lifelong learning opportunities, or as a result of discrimination. This distances them from job, income and education opportunities as well as social and community networks and activities. They have little access to power and decision-making bodies and thus often feeling powerless and unable to take control over the decisions that affect their day to day lives’.
The growing ubiquity of ICTs in recent years, as a result of the burgeoning ‘Knowledge Society’, has attracted the attention of initiatives and projects aiming at harnessing technologies to address exclusion and support inclusion. This has especially been the case with regard to “Web 2.0”, and ‘social networking’ technologies, with their potential to support far greater social interaction than before. As range of studies have demonstrated (see Redeker, 2008); the Web offers a lot of possibilities for self-expression and people are able to participate, e.g. to gain information, to communicate and to collaborate in many different ways. For example, with the use of web 2.0 technologies, blind people are able to participate by using a braille display, a device which transforms the information on the screen into embossed printing. Also, migrants with low language skills can stay in touch with news and policies within their native language by using the Web and additionally are able to use tools and networks in order to enhance their second language abilities with informal learning activities. Nevertheless, the “digital divide” between better-educated and higher-status groups and involuntary off-liners or people with low digital literacy still exists and limits the possibilities of participation. A recent (2008) report by Oxford Internet Institute observed that: “technological forms of exclusion are a reality for significant segments of the population, and that, for some people, they reinforce and deepen existing disadvantages” (Helsper, 2008). There is strong evidence to suggest that significant numbers of people remain at the margins of the ‘knowledge society’ – not least because the complexity and diversity of their lives, and their roles in a ‘technologically rich’ society, remain poorly understood (Facer & Selwyn, 2007). Digital inclusion itself is therefore a new field for inclusion initiatives, concerning e.g. the accessibility of web resources or digital literacy of people at (the risk of) exclusion.

Against this background, a number of initiatives have been established to support the application of ICTs – particularly Web 2.0 – to inclusion. In tandem, a range of initiatives aimed at awareness-raising and dissemination of good practices in the field have been implemented, including, several awards schemes. For example, the European e-Inclusion Award was established in 2008 in the following categories: ageing well, marginalised young people, geographic inclusion, cultural diversity, digital literacy, e-accessibility, and inclusive public services. Altogether 469 European institutions had applied for the e-Inclusion Award in 2008. To build an overview of the results and lessons learnt in the projects, the European Commission initiated a study (Osimo, De Luca & Codagnone; 2010) on projects and initiatives in the whole field of inclusion by private and non-profit European organisations. The majority of case studies are in the field of e-accessibility (ibid, p. 10). Another study, published in 2008, gives an overview about the different fields of action and examples of e-inclusion in Austria (The Federal Chancellery 2008). Furthermore the eLearning Papers Nr. 19, a publication of clearningeuropa.info, has published a document with different articles on inclusion and digital technologies (eLearning Papers, 2010).

Learning through and with technologies is to be seen as a key driver for inclusion. It is increasingly argued that Web 2.0 can empower resistant learners and groups at the risk of exclusion by offering them new opportunities for self-realisation through collaborative learning, and by changing the nature of education itself. This owes much to a notion that has come to the fore in recent thinking on learning – the idea that education is now focusing on ‘new millennium learners’ (NML), and that the

4 http://www.e-inclusionawards.eu/ [2010-04-20]
future of learning is inextricably bound up with these learners. NML – those born after 1982 – are the first generation to grow up surrounded by digital media, and most of their activities dealing with peer-to-peer communication and knowledge management are mediated by these technologies (Pedró, 2006). For example, it is easier to take part in open learning initiatives, profit from open educational resources and new tools that allow easy communication and collaboration for learners. There seem to be fewer boundaries to take part in these opportunities compared with formal education settings, where social milieu, family background, healthiness, socio-economic possibilities and the accessibility of educational institutions as well as the geographic junction e.g. urban areas, are still the most important factors for (non) participation.

Yet, as noted above, the evidence base for these conclusions is fragmented and contested. There is also counter evidence that Web 2.0 can reinforce exclusion and reduce learning outcomes. For example, it seems that people with better education and socio-economic backgrounds profit more from the new learning and participation opportunities than others. This effect – those who have more will get more – is called Matthew’s effect based on a popular citation from the bible. Therefore, a sceptic view on projects within this field is needed. Critical questions comprise: Is learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive life-long learning? Can isolated experiments be mainstreamed and is learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?

Until now, there have only been a few studies that bring together experiences in this field. For example, the aim of the project “E-learning 4 E-inclusion” is “to build a community for those with valuable expertise regarding the use of eLearning for digital inclusion” (Casacuberta, 2007, 1).

Another contribution which focuses on inclusion projects dealing with learning and Web 2.0 is called “e-learning 2.0” (Downes, 2005) or in short “learning 2.0”: As a part of a bigger project about learning 2.0 projects and their effects on innovation (see Redecker, Ala-Mutka, Bacigalupo, Ferrari & Punie, 2009) a study based on case studies of eight projects on learning 2.0 for inclusion was implemented by Cullen, Cullen, Hayward, & Maes, 2009). Within this study, the described initiatives focus on learners ‘at risk’ of exclusion from the knowledge-based society. For example, the alternative online-school “Not-school”⁶. focused on young people for whom ’school does not fit’. Another example is “MOSEP”⁷, which developed training materials for trainers using the e-portfolio method, addressed the growing problem of adolescents dropping-out of the formal education system around Europe (Hilzensauer & Buchberger, 2009). The study delivered an overview about approaches and experiences within eight case studies concerning the innovativeness, the barriers and success factors of the initiatives.

Building on the results of the above mentioned study by Cullen et al. (2009), a new project was funded in the Lifelong Learning Programme of 2009. The project called “LINKS-UP” tries to collect the experiences of selected European projects in the field of inclusion through learning and Web 2.0. The project aims at delivering recommendations for better projects and policies in the special field of inclusion through learning 2.0. In the following sections, we will outline the project concept,

---

⁶ http://www.notschool.net [2010-04-20]
⁷ http://mosep.org [2010-04-20]
the project consortium as well as planned activities in order to give an impression of existing projects in the field of inclusion through learning and Web 2.0.

2 Finding recommendations for better projects and policies: The European project LINKS-UP

The aim of a new project called “LINKS-UP” is to link the experiences and observations of existing projects in the field of inclusion with learning 2.0 for better future projects and policies. One project goal is to develop an “Innovation Laboratory” for “Learning 2.0 for inclusion” which will e.g. support knowledge-sharing between different existing initiatives. Furthermore, the project will develop new approaches and tools using gathered expertise and will finally test the main findings and success factors in five learning experiments in order to better explore whether and in what ways they improve the efficiency and effectiveness of current learning 2.0 approaches for inclusion. The main outcomes are policy recommendations; design principles; good practices; benchmarks; pedagogic and technical tools to support learning 2.0 for inclusion.

LINKS-UP is a two year project which started in November 2009. It is co-financed by the Lifelong Learning programme of the European Commission and consists of an international project team. Co-ordinated by the University of Erlangen (DE), the partners are Arcofa Research LLP (UK), University of the Hague (NL), Servizi Didattici e Scientifici per l’Università di Firenze (IT), European Distance and eLearning Network (UK) and Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft (AT).

From a methodological point of view, the recommendations coming from LINKS-UP will be derived through a four-step-process. First of all, the project consortium will describe case studies of existing projects in the field of inclusion through learning 2.0 with the help of a very detailed tool-kit for case studies. Additionally, in five “innovation laboratories” LINKS-UP partners will observe new Web 2.0 usages.
within existing projects using ‘action research’. Action Research (Pedler, 1997) focuses on gathering and analysing data to assess the nature and scope of changes to an existing intervention that are associated with the introduction of an innovation – in these cases the use of Web 2.0 to supplement existing learning practices. Observations made by the project manager and by participants will be collected, selected and reflected on. The data collection and analysis will be linked to specific hypotheses posed by the initial LINKS-UP research analysis. For example, the action research will test the hypothesis that ‘motivational resistance to participation in Web 2.0 learning environments can be reduced through peer support – especially with older learners’. On the basis of the action research results, a list of recommendations will be developed as a guideline to make better projects and policies in the future.

3 Exemplary projects for inclusion through learning 2.0

The Austrian partner of LINKS-UP, Salzburg Research, will deliver case studies of four initiatives and projects from Austria and Germany.

![Figure 2: Overview of the four case studies of the LINKS-UP team at Salzburg Research](image)

The four case studies that will be described and analysed by the LINKS-UP team at Salzburg Research focuses on diverse target groups as well as on different concrete goals and ways of inclusion with learning 2.0.

- The project “EduCoRe” is about “Educational Counselling during Rehabilitation” and is an ongoing European project. In the course of the EduCoRe project a tailor-made educational and career counselling process for rehab patients will be developed and tested. It will be supported by e-learning and e-counselling elements for patients who suffer from physical deficiencies after an accident or illness that threaten their employability and participation in society.

8 [http://www.rehab-counselling.eu](http://www.rehab-counselling.eu) [2010-04-20]
• Mixopolis\(^9\) is an intercultural online portal for adolescents to promote professional orientation. It is for young migrants from 14 years upwards and also multipliers and trainers (from schools, associations, youth welfare) which support the adolescent person in their professional orientation. It is supported by the German organisation Schulen ans Netz e.V.\(^{10}\).
• Seniorkom\(^10\) is a social networking platform for seniors from seniors and includes a large offer on services and information. The aim of Seniorkom is to enable and facilitate the access to computer and Internet for seniors and to inspire elderly persons in new technologies. Seniorkom also provides Internet training courses for free in whole Austria. It is funded and promoted by several Austrian initiatives for seniors, e.g. the Österreichischer Seniorenrat.
• Last, but not least, the project “MOSEP – More Self Esteem with My E-Portfolio”\(^11\) was managed by Salzburg Research and is already terminated. Nevertheless, it is one of just a few projects, where teachers on an international level were trained with a relatively new approach of teaching. The so-called e-portfolio method offers a possible way to minimize dropping out from schools.

Besides these four main projects, the team of Salzburg Research will identify and select additional cases in their local region to bringing together a wide range of projects and experiences. There will be a workshop at the EduMedia conference 2010 in order to develop a valid methodology of the LINKS-UP project by discussion with practitioners and other experts. Further workshops are also arranged e.g. at the EDEN conference 2010.

4 Next steps

In summer 2010 the case studies will be available for download at the project website\(^12\). Additionally, other materials, for example the final report will be published here. The project team is looking for further interesting projects and co-operations in this field.\(^{13}\).
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Links-up Workshop

Social Software for Social Inclusion. Successes or Failures

Policy & Conceptual Environment

Joe Cullen, Arcola Research
The conceptual landscape

**Inclusion theory**
- Social capital; underclass;
- Life politics

**E-inclusion theory**
- Disability; digital divide; Molnar model

**Learning theory**
- Constructivism; communities of practice; co-production of knowledge

**Web 2.0 theory**
- Utopianism; technical coding

**LINKS-UP**
- Learning key agency in inclusion
- Web 2.0 opens up learning to excluded
- Web 2.0 changes structural base of exclusion
Innovative use of Web 2.0 for an inclusive life-long learning

WP2: Intensive Case Studies

Wolf Hilzensauer
Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft m.b.H.
Overview

• 24 case studies
• Selection criteria
  – Different learning settings (formal, non-formal, informal)
  – Different learning situations (face-to-face, blended, ...)
  – Different learning needs (vocational, social, up-skilling)
  – Different types of interaction
  – Different target groups
### Selection Criteria: Scope of inclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Young Kids</th>
<th>Teenagers*</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Young Adult Professionals</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Service Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objectives</td>
<td>Remote Learning</td>
<td>Blended Learning</td>
<td>Classroom-Based</td>
<td>Non-Blended</td>
<td>Independent Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Technology</td>
<td>Always Available</td>
<td>Accessible with Technology</td>
<td>Accessible without Technology</td>
<td>Not Accessible</td>
<td>Not Accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>0-12</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>19+</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Teenagers refers to individuals aged 13 to 18 years old.

---

**Table 1: Inclusion Objectives**

- Remote Learning
- Blended Learning
- Classroom-Based
- Non-Blended
- Independent Learning

---

**Table 2: Access to Technology**

- Always Available
- Accessible with Technology
- Accessible without Technology
- Not Accessible

---

**Table 3: Age Group**

- 0-12
- 13-18
- 19+
- 20-30
- 30+

---

**Table 4: Gender**

- Male
- Female
- Both
- Unknown
- NA

---

**Table 5: Location**

- Rural
- Urban
- Both
- Unknown
- NA

Links-up.eu
Background

• General assumption
  – The introduction of innovative components will promote a different behaviour of the individuals and thus, provide a foundation for (social) inclusion.

• Intervention concepts
  – Supporting basic e-skills
  – Promoting activities on the web
  – Promoting self-directed learning
  – Facilitating a communication platform (peers and trainers)
  – Preparing teachers/vocational counsellors for better assisting students
Tools

• Mostly a multi-tool approach
• 3 major areas:
  – Communication and collaboration
    • Blogs, forum, chat, ...
    • Social networking
  – Classical „e-learning“
    • Moodle
  – Virtual worlds
    • Second Life
Lessons learnt

• Resistant organisational cultures
  – Web 2.0 and open educational methods challenges traditional methods, settings and teacher-student roles.

• Measuring learning gains and securing formal certification
  – The certification of learning outcomes is a crucial factor and is responsible for the engagement of the users.

• Active participation of target groups
  – The active engagement and participation of the target group can not per se be expected. Moderation and mentoring is required!

• User needs and requirements
  – The user needs as well as organisational issues must be taken into account.

• Project-to-project work with hard to reach communities
  – Without co-operations and joint activities between similar projects and activities, the sustainability of the project is hard to reach!

• Issues of technology access and flexibility
  – The appropriateness of the technology and tools is a key factor for the acceptance of the project activities and the success of the project as a whole.
Tools

Do similar projects use similar tools?

No!

But the core functionalities (esp. communication) are used in a similar ways with different tools!

Low-tech with high touch!
Weblogs, social bookmarking tools, Wikis
Recommendations 1/6

• Overcome resistance of organisational cultures
  
  – Expect facing resistance by *organisational cultures*
  
  – Identify additional *benefits* for the target group AND target organisation that may trigger organisational change.
  
  – Secure *support* and *commitment* of organisational intermediaries (school directors, ... )
Recommendations 2/6

• Meet the user needs!
  – Identify properly the user *requirements* and needs!
  – Take the *organisational framework* into account!
  – Make sure the *appropriateness* of the used *technologies*!
  – Use a *blended approach* –
    (especially when basic e-skilling is required!)
  – Consider *gender and ethnic* issues! (esp. when working with minorities!)
Recommendations 3/6

• Promote Web 2.0 based educational practices in schools
  – Using Web 2.0 challenges existing learning paradigms
  – Help teachers and students finding themselves in their new role (facilitator/coach rather than teacher)
  – Make sure, that Web 2.0 initiatives are not left to individual teachers
  – Provide supervision and coaching to the facilitators
Recommendations 4/6

• Using appropriate e-learning and e-inclusion methods
  
  – Convince people, that *engaging in social activities* is worth the effort!

  – Identify already *available e-skills* and build your activities upon them!

  – Combine face-to-face and online activities – *blended approach*!

  – Use *peer-mentoring* for a better community building activity

  – Reflect on the *learning experiences* – they might be new!

  – Suggest to use *tools for documentation* of the learning process (e-portfolio, weblog, ...)

Recommendations 4/6
Recommendations 5/6

• Drive actively the community website

  – The existence of *social networking facilities* per se does not drive participation and communication

  – Provide an online *community manager* in order to support the learners!

  – *Monitor* and *moderate* instantly the activities, taking place at the community website.

  – Provide a *safe place* for communication amongst the peers.
Recommendations 6/6

• Secure sustainability and impact

  – Make clear for policy makers that ICT supported learning and social inclusion are necessary for the *participation in the knowledge society*.
  
  – Identify and involve third party *organisations*, establish *co-operations*.
  
  – Evaluate the project and identify individual success factors, which can be communicated.
  
  – Identify and present *role-models* and *success stories*!
Success Story:
Podcasting with elderly people
Local TV-Station
Case Study Report

- Download case-Study report @ www.links-up.eu

- Buy Case-Study report @ Amazon: ISBN: 978-3-902448-28-6

- Download detailed case study descriptions: www.links-up.eu
Contact

Dr. Guntram Geser
Mag. Wolf Hilzensauer

Salzburg Research Forschungsgesellschaft m.b.H.
Jakob Haringer Str. 5, 5020 Salzburg | AUSTRIA

{guntram.geser, wolf.hilzensauer}@salzburgresearch.at
Links-up Workshop
Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society – Understanding the Picture

The Validation Experiments
Evaluation Methodology & Toolkit

Davide Calenda
PIN Servizi Didattici e Scientifici per l’Università di Firenze, Prato, Italy
Does web 2.0 facilitate the social appropriation of technology and digital inclusion?

• How and to what extent users have participated to the implementation of the experiment?
• How participant have used the Web 2.0 tools?
• What factors explain the different reactions/behaviours among participants? (e.g. age, gender, cultural background, socioeconomic status, digital skills etc.)
• Are there differences between the way in which the use and objectives of the Web 2.0 was originally designed and the way in which it was actually used by the participants?

What are the outcomes and impacts associated with the use of Web 2.0 for inclusive learning?

• What have been the benefits for them, in terms of supporting inclusion; developing ICT skills; developing other skills; supporting learning and labour market participation?
• Do the experiment and the outcomes produce an impact in terms of institutional and organisational change? How the decision makers have reacted to this new situation?
• Have the innovations introduced by the experiment amplified and/or specified the potential effects in terms of social inclusion if compared with the previous situation/previous approach?
Pilot Case Research Questions II

What can be learned from the use of Web 2.0 to support inclusive learning?

• What problems have been encountered and how have they been addressed?
• What success factors can be identified in relation to outcomes and impacts?
• Which are the main indications to support future policy and initiatives in this field?
Links-up
Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society:
Understanding the Picture

www.links-up.eu

Thomas Fischer, Innovation in Learning Institute (ILI), Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nürnberg, Germany

Budapest, September, 2011
what’s it all about

• Learning 2.0 for an Inclusive Knowledge Society – understanding the picture

• Web 2.0 and Social inclusion

• 3 main questions:
  – is Learning 2.0 really supporting inclusive life-long learning?
  – can isolated experiments be mainstreamed?
  – is Learning 2.0 fundamentally changing the educational landscape?
WP1: review of state of the art

objectives

• identify the major themes (‘hot topics’)

• identify the ‘gaps’ in state of the art

• Identify and select LINKS-UP case studies

outputs

• a ‘map’ of the prevailing policies, concepts and practices on 'Learning 2.0' for inclusion

• a ‘theory of change’ model, specifying the psychological, cultural and social factors that need to be embedded in the design of Learning 2.0 for inclusive lifelong learning.

Budapest, September, 2011
WP1: review of state of the art | 3 maps

POLICY MAP
Inter-connectivity map

- Renewed Lisbon Agenda/ Europe 2020
- Education policy
- Youth policy
- ICT policy
- Culture & sport policy
- Human Rights and justice
- Social inclusion
- Democracy & participation
- Employment policy

GLOBAL-LOCAL
- Globalisation
- Meso-local
- Intermediaries between global-local

LOCAL-LOCAL
- Globalisation
- Meso-local
- Intermediaries between global-local

CONCEPT MAP

- Inclusion theory
  - Social capital; underclass;
  - Life politics

- Learning theory
  - Constructivism;
  - Communities of practice;
  - Co-production of knowledge

- E-inclusion theory
  - Disability; digital divide;
  - Moller model

- LINKS-UP
  - Learning key agency in inclusion
  - Web 2.0 opens up learning to excluded
  - Web 2.0 changes structural base of exclusion

PRACTICES MAP

- Special Needs
  - IEMs; disabled; offenders
  - Informal

- Adult Learning
  - Informal
  - Training Centre

- Personalised Learning Environments
  - Self-directed
  - Social networking

- NEET
  - New forms of school
  - High end Web 2.0

- Youth at Risk
  - Social integration
  - e-skills

Budapest, September, 2011
WP2 – intensive case studies

• 24 case studies

• selection criteria
  – Different learning settings (formal, non-formal, informal)
  – Different learning situations (face-to-face, blended, ...)
  – Different learning needs (vocational, social, up-skilling)
  – Different types of interaction
  – Different target groups
## Case Studies: Inclusion Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Objective</th>
<th>Educational Re-insertion</th>
<th>Supporting Disability</th>
<th>Digital Literacy</th>
<th>Overcoming Low ICT Use</th>
<th>Addressing Social Isolation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALPEUNED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistive Technology Wiki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avatar@School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREAKOUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conecta Joven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberhus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EduCoRe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreqOut!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiStory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICONET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixopolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundo de Estrellas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettlikio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinoklo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rePlay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots &amp; Routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savvy Chavy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schome Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniorkom.at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web in the Hood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XenoCLI²Se</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• mostly multi-tool approach

• 3 major areas:
  – Communication and collaboration
    • Blogs, forum, chat, ...
    • Social networking
  – Classical „e-learning“
    • Moodle
  – Virtual worlds
    • Second Life
SCHOME – Notschool: school drop-outs
case studies: lessons learnt

- **resistant organisational cultures**
  - Web 2.0 and open educational methods challenges traditional methods, settings and teacher-student roles

- **measuring learning gains and securing formal certification**
  - The certification of learning outcomes is a crucial factor and is responsible for the engagement of the users.

- **active participation of target groups**
  - The active engagement and participation of the target group can not per se be expected. Moderation and mentoring is required!

- **user needs and requirements**
  - The user needs as well as organisational issues must be taken into account.

- **project-to-project work with hard to reach communities**
  - Without co-operations and joint activities between similar projects and activities, the sustainability of the project is hard to reach!

- **issues of technology access and flexibility**
  - The appropriateness of the technology and tools is a key factor for the acceptance of the project activities and the success of the project as a whole
WP4: innovation laboratory – conceptual framework

‘learning by doing’ = ‘practice’

understanding the real complexity

from WP 1 (literature), WP 2 (case studies), WP 5 (pilot sites), WP 3 (learning dialogues) etc

ongoing dialogue

analysis / reflection

inventory / description / experiences

‘policy’
WP5: validation experiments: aims

• apply what has been learned in review of state of the art and case studies

• to add value to existing e-inclusion projects

• using ‘Learning 2.0’
  – Innovation
  – Digital skills
  – Supporting inclusion
  – Institutional change

Budapest, September, 2011
validation experiments: locations

Budapest, September, 2011
validation experiments: London | three tries

Freud not!

No institutional buy-in

Wandsworth Museum

Museum isolated from community
No buy-in from community leaders

Oasis Academy, Enfield

Integrated in community
Institutional buy-in

Budapest, September, 2011
validation experiments: London | Oasis Academy | idea | web 2.0 platforms

Local Reporters: training in audio, video, publishing
Web 2.0 tools used:
• **improved ICT and creative media skills**
  Logic, Audacity, Recording, audio effects (reverb, compression, etc), filming, live radio (production and presenting)

• **improved Web 2.0 skills**
  social networking, using more ‘specialist’ Web 2.0 tools such as Soundcloud and Vimeo

• **developing ‘soft’ skills**
  teamworking, independence, creativity. Most participants also reported improved confidence and self-esteem

• **supporting learning**
  the skills learned on the course enabled the young people to achieve an accreditation in radio production

• **labour market participation**
  improving prospects in creative careers. , e.g. Enfield Gazette work experience

• **empowerment**
  able to engage young people during the riots, and help them to understand the different aspects of what was happening
‘Digirooms’ – neighbourhood resource bases to support learning and social networking. 800 users in Emmen and Almere.

Use Web 2.0 tools to help residents use ICT in daily life: Digital literacy; reduce isolation; increase empowerment, using website toolbox.

‘Animators’ (social professionals) create and support neighbourhood networks.
validation experiments: Netherlands | web in the hood

• **neighbourhood media team** stimulates citizens to connect, integrate, acquire skills and learn individually as well as a community.

• **support by a professional reporter** the core media group acquired skills
  1. operational: using media production software
  2. tactical: creating and producing news items
  3. strategic: creating process of reflection in neighbourhood

• **content creation** using web 2.0 tools and infrastructures
  - web 2.0 CSM: Web in the Hood application
  - video screen: local publishing in the mall
  - online community: Hyves, Facebook,
  - online media sharing: Youtube, Flicker
  - micropublishing: Twitter

• **promoting** the project in the hood
• **research and evaluation**
**validation experiments: Netherlands | participants**

- **core media team**: 6 people
- **extended team**: 30 people
- **direct readers**: 350 people
- **indirect readers**: 1500+ people

- **social professionals**: 6 people
- **social organization**: 14 people

- **neighborhood**: 4.300 households
- **inhabitants**: 10.000 people

Budapest, September, 2011
validation experiments: Netherlands | results

- **direct results**
  operational skills with web 2.0 tools
  tactical skills in writing and communicating
  strategic skills in getting neighbourhood to think differently
  news content about the hood on different web 2.0 platforms

- **indirect results**
  partnership with the municipality in projects to enhance skills for the labour market
  new contacts in the hood
  individuals and organizations contacted the group for reporting and for learning to report themselves

- **Sustainability** - the project will continue after the Links-up project

- **Unexpected:**
  specialization and cooperation on media within the media group (text, taking pictures, film),
  the large number of people contacting the group to be involved
  the quality of the content
  the goodwill and inspiration created in the neighbourhood
  other neighbourhoods asking for similar facilities
validation experiments Austria: Birncast | the idea

Activities:

• podcasting with older people
• workshop series in the Senior Center of Wals (AT)
• already existing: Narrator Club and Computer Club

Unexpected results:

• a new weblog based homepage for the centre
• edited by the participants

http://www.zentrumwalserbirnbaum.at
Improved your general knowledge
Improved your knowledge about particular subjects
Improved your basic computer skills
Improved your qualifications
Improved your self-confidence

Helped you to use computers to do more complex things (e.g. social networking)
Helped you to meet people and make new friends

Helped you to develop networks that provide opportunities
Improved your writing or reading skills
Contributed to improving your job prospects
Made you feel more involved in your neighbourhood
Characteristics

- Nettilukio provides adult learning and secondary education and can be described as a ‘Second Chance School’
- Nettilukio is a part of Otava Folk High School, Finland
- Complete online study programme of Finnish upper secondary school level using a learning platform, virtual classroom technology, wikis and blogs
Aims of the Validation Experiment

• To build up an **online learning community** for teachers
• To provide **motivation and inspiration for teachers** using Web 2.0 in classes
• To transfer **basic knowledge to beginners**
• To provide **advanced knowledge for experts**
• To offer **communication facilities for members**

Activities the Validation Experiment

• Online Learning Community: Wordpress + Buddypress platform
• Motivation and Inspiration: Collection of good practices
• Basic Knowledge: ‘Basics’ pages with the essentials, a list of tools and links to ressources
• Advanced Knowledge: ‘Experts/Advanced’ page with links to advanced ressources and Webinars
• Communication Facilities: Groups and Forums (general and language-specific)
validation experiments Germany: G8WAY

Objectives of the Validation Experiment

• Supporting young people on their way from school to work;
• Utilising and exploiting the potentials of Web 2.0, Social Software and Learning 2.0 (or probably 3.0);
• Developing ‘proto-typical’ transitional scenarios and ‘personas’ in transition (through story telling and analysis of ‘real’ life cases);
• Setting up an online portal combining different Web 2.0 methods and tools under a common pedagogy framework;
• Allowing users to follow their preferred learning pathway(s);
• Integrating intergenerational support i.e. mentoring into educational transitions.
validation experiments Germany: G8WAY

**G8WAY in Germany**

- Primary target group: mentors;
- Secondary target group: socially disadvantaged young people in lower secondary schools
- Mentors as ‘bridges’ to young people and as ‘bridges’ to technology
- Personal and online training of mentors how to use Web 2.0 for educational transitions
- Collaborative work with and support of socially disadvantaged young people
- Setting up of the German G8WAY portal

---

**Elements of the German Portal**

- Information:
  Why mentoring in the transition from school to work? Roles and tasks of mentors and mentees?
- Library of resources incl. education and training opportunities, online services, best practice examples, projects etc
- Knowledge sharing: digital story telling i.e. experiences of mentors working disadvantaged young people, narratives of young people, success stories and failures etc
validation experiments Italy: TRIO

- Technology, Research, Innovation and Vocational Guidance
- official e-learning platform of the Tuscany Region
- short series of workshops, where a group of migrants and unemployed people learned how to promote themselves on the labour market producing, publishing and sharing their multimedia CV
  
  - 26 unemployed people – Italians, African, Western European and South American
  - collaborative online environment based on Google services, supported by face-to-face workshops
  - develop skills to create multimedia CV to increase self-promotion in the labour market
  - create a Multimedia CV using “easy-to-use” digital devices and software
  - be able to publish the multimedia CV in dedicated Web portals

Budapest, September, 2011
Validation experiments Italy: TRIO | results

- Participants were satisfied with programme but though should be longer
- Participants reported increased confidence in presenting themselves in public
- And increased self-esteem about their professional identity and capacities.
- Working with multimedia made development of cv more interesting
- Blog not used much
- Little interaction among participants

- Online participation is limited when promoted in not-already established online/physical groups
- Web 2.0 learning is not e-learning and requires new organizational schemes
  - Variability between digital and media literacy
- Learning 2.0 requires bridging traditional Virtual Learning Environments (VLE) to new Personal Learning Environments (PLE)
- Learning 2.0 can be rich tool in helping excluded into labour market re-insertion
LINKS-UP Preliminary Observations

• Web 2.0 catalyst for lifelong learning on a societal scale
• each project is determined by social, economic and geographical context
• sustainability is challenging through short-term funding constraints
• early project often depend too much on initiators/champions/animators
• new research methods are needed, more than technology it is about social construction, social evolution and transferability

• lack of impact data and contradictory results

• new learning paradigm is needed for large-scale social contexts e.g. health, civil society, government

• needs shift from PLE’s to community and societal learning environments

Budapest, September, 2011