NRC Publications Archive Archives des publications du CNRC

Factors affecting the design and development of a personal learning environment : research on super-users

Fournier, Hélène; Kop, Rita

This publication could be one of several versions: author's original, accepted manuscript or the publisher's version. / La version de cette publication peut être l'une des suivantes : la version prépublication de l'auteur, la version acceptée du manuscrit ou la version de l'éditeur.

For the publisher's version, please access the DOI link below. / Pour consulter la version de l'éditeur, utilisez le lien DOI ci-dessous.

Publisher's version / Version de l'éditeur:

<https://doi.org/10.4018/jvple.2011100102>

International Journal of Virtual and Personal Learning Environments (IJVPLE), 2, 4, pp. 12-22, 2011-04

NRC Publications Record / Notice d'Archives des publications de CNRC:

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/view/object/?id=d4a39e61-f6ea-4264-9656-b1168d7b23e3>

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/voir/objet/?id=d4a39e61-f6ea-4264-9656-b1168d7b23e3>

Access and use of this website and the material on it are subject to the Terms and Conditions set forth at

<https://nrc-publications.canada.ca/eng/copyright>

READ THESE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CAREFULLY BEFORE USING THIS WEBSITE.

L'accès à ce site Web et l'utilisation de son contenu sont assujettis aux conditions présentées dans le site

<https://publications-cnrc.canada.ca/fra/droits>

LISEZ CES CONDITIONS ATTENTIVEMENT AVANT D'UTILISER CE SITE WEB.

Questions? Contact the NRC Publications Archive team at

PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca. If you wish to email the authors directly, please see the first page of the publication for their contact information.

Vous avez des questions? Nous pouvons vous aider. Pour communiquer directement avec un auteur, consultez la première page de la revue dans laquelle son article a été publié afin de trouver ses coordonnées. Si vous n'arrivez pas à les repérer, communiquez avec nous à PublicationsArchive-ArchivesPublications@nrc-cnrc.gc.ca.

Factors affecting the design and development of a Personal Learning Environment: Research on super-users

Helene Fournier, National Research Council of Canada

Rita Kop, National Research Council of Canada

ABSTRACT

After speculation in the literature about the nature of Personal Learning Environments, research in the design and development of PLEs is now in progress. This paper will report on the first phase of our research on PLE, the identification process of what potential users would consider to be important components, applications and tools in a PLE. The methodology included surveying “super-users” on their use of existing tools, applications and systems and their preferences in learning, in order to enhance the development of a PLE and reach a specification that potential learners will find useful and empowering in their learning. The research resulted in suggestions on factors affecting technology use and uptake, human factors and attitudes, and interface design that need to be factored in the design and development of a PLE.

Keywords: PLE, Personal Learning Environment, Learning Design

INTRODUCTION

Over the past five years the emergence of interactive social media has influenced the development of learning environments. The Virtual Learning Environment has come to maturity, but has been seen by learning technologists as not capturing the spirit and possibilities that the new media have to offer to enhance the learning process. They are controlled by educational institutions and are subsequently used to support institutional learning.

Each learner is unique and will have a unique learning experience. This has instigated the research and development of a different type of learning environment, a Personal Learning Environment (PLE) that is in controlled by the learner. The needs, requirements and experience of each learner using a PLE will be different, which makes the planning and development of a PLE that serves as an aid to each possible learner a challenge. An added problem is the openness of the environment and the large number of different dimensions that can be designed and developed. Moreover, PLEs are so new that research in their development has been limited so far.

The authors are part of a team researching and developing a PLE and after scrutinizing the literature about the possible

architecture of PLEs, research in the design and development of a PLE is now in progress. This paper will report on the first phase of the research; the identification of what potential users would consider to be important components, applications and tools in a PLE, and their learning preferences. The methodology included surveying “super-users” on their use of existing tools, applications and systems in order to develop the highest possible PLE specification.

The research paper will set out the research strategy, in addition to the results of the actual research. It will outline methodological concerns, and focus on the usability and functionality of the learning environment, the learner experience, and the minimum set of components required to facilitate quality learning. At the centre of the design and development is the premise that it should be the learner who owns the PLE and who makes the decisions about its use, not an educational institution.

PERSONAL LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

If the learning environment moves outside the realm of educational institutions, this might affect the learning experience (Bouchard, 2011; Kop, 2010; Weller, 2010). The lack of presence of an educator to aid the learner in his or her critical engagement with resources

has for instance been identified as a problem as the Web is not a power-free environment and people will have to adapt to negotiating this environment autonomously. To find the right information and to know how to access required resources, new competencies and abilities will be required from learners. Moreover, the new learning environment requires learners to be active in their learning by editing and producing information themselves in a variety of formats and by communicating and collaborating with others in new ways. People need to have a certain level of creativity and innovative thinking, in addition to feeling competent, confident and comfortable in using ICT applications to be able to do so. Learners need to be flexible, able to adapt to new situations and be able to solve problems that they come across during their learning journey. They will have to be motivated enough to take on new challenges and could use help from the system itself.

Some argue that these skills and competencies will develop while engaging in online communication with others, or via challenging feedback or recommendations through the PLE system itself (Downes, 2009). The system and technology itself, or the activity the learner is involved in, will have to be engaging and interesting enough for the learner to work his or her way through the problems that will undoubtedly come up during the learning journey. People will have to be motivated to use the environment.

Intrinsic motivation has an affective dimension and the literature highlighting the importance of affective aspects of networked learning is growing (Picard et al., 2004, Kop, 2010, Zaharias & Poylymenakou, 2009; Jones & Issroff, 2004). Other issues related to motivation have been highlighted by Lombard and Ditton (1997), and Dron & Anderson (2007) in the form of “presence”. Dron & Anderson (2007) discussed the different levels of presence in different online learning ‘settings’. They made the distinction between learning in ‘groups’, learning on ‘networks’, and learning by using ‘collectives’. Presence and motivation would be highest in a group, which would be a typical class room or organised online educator-led learning

setting, while presence in learning on an open informal network would be lower, e.g., on the 2008/2009 connectivism courses (Siemens, Downes 2008, 2009). The connection and presence on collectives would be even lower as the connections between people and resources would be in the form of tags.

The main characteristic of presence is that of an illusion of non-mediation. In other words, there is a high level of presence when a participant in an online activity experiences the activity as if it was taking place in real life, without the mediation of the computer. Garrison et al. (2000) argued that deep and meaningful learning results if three forms of presence play a role in education. These would be “cognitive presence” that ensures a certain level of depth in the educational process and would be important in the creation of meaningful online experiences, “social presence”, would also be important, and in a formal educational environment that of “teacher presence”. In PLE based learning the teacher presence would not necessarily be there, but one could argue that there are knowledgeable others on the Web who would take on that teacher role to a certain extent. A Personal Learning Environment (Downes, 2009) that would aid the learner in this endeavour could play a positive role. But which combination of components, tools and applications would form a pedagogical platform that would make learners think critically about resources accessed?

SELECTION OF SUPER-USERS TO IDENTIFY DESIRABLE COMPONENTS AND TOOLS FOR THE PLE

The Research in PLEs is only in its infancy and to know how best to research and evaluate a PLE we looked at e-learning evaluation and design-based research literature. The literature on e-learning evaluation (Attwell, 2006) provides a variety of models ranging from comparisons with traditional learning, to benchmarking models, product evaluations, performance evaluations, program and policy evaluations, studies of metadata and more complex all encompassing design-based research (Bannan-Ritland, 2003) models. The

approach to the evaluation in these models varies considerably and ranges from an emphasis on the program objectives, the management of the scheme, the outcomes for the user, the expertise required in the program to a participant oriented approach. (Attwell, 2006). These are mostly related to the organization of learning, the 'input' and 'output' and lack in substance when it comes down to establishing the process taking place and the learner experience. The PLE Project research question was based not on institutional requirements, but on learner needs and learner experiences and the research approach was design-based in order to create an iterative process of research, design, testing and evaluation and further development.

The PLE project eventually decided upon three parts to the research: 1) An exploration phase: exploration of the literature and of possible components for the PLE, and close contact with other PLE research groups worldwide 2) Usability testing of Plearn, the developed learning environment, consisting of feedback from users on mock-ups of the PLE and testing of the Plearn prototype at different stages of development and 3) Educational research, consisting of a comparison of learning without and with Plearn.

This paper will report on the first phase of the research, the exploration. As the first stage of the PLE research, we asked advanced ICT users, people who are using advanced technology in their everyday life and learning, which tools they use, and how and why they choose to use them. We surveyed "super-users".

In the literature, the word "super-user" is used in different contexts and has different meanings, ranging from loyal users in social media campaigns, the user account responsible for the IT system administrator, and brand-ambassadors (Merritt, 2009). In this paper we define super-users as people who use advanced Internet tools and technologies in an educational environment. These tools would include information aggregators, editors and publishers; ones that exploratory research highlighted as possibly

important to a Personal Learning Environment.

RESULTS OF THE FIRST PHASE

The first phase of the PLE research involved gathering information from potential users; what they consider to be the important components, applications and tools in a PLE. The methodology included surveying "super-users" on their use of existing tools, applications and systems in order to enhance the development of the highest possible PLE specification.

Use of online applications

A first survey was conducted to collect baseline information on experiences and perceptions regarding learning and use of technology by Internet users, on tools and functionalities already in use in order to learn what the important issues and features in the development of a Personal Learning Environment might be. Survey questions were developed based on knowledge and expertise within the PLE research and development team. The online survey format was tested internally amongst the NRC PLE research and development team (before it was launched at large). The survey included 28 questions and contained closed and open-ended questions; some allowed only one answer, others provided multiple options, with text boxes for additional comments and elaboration.

An invitation to participate in the online survey was advertized on the Principal Investigator's online learning daily newsletter—OLDaily (<http://www.downes.ca/news/OLDaily.htm>) and an email was sent to a targeted list of individuals who participated in an online symposium on Personal Learning Environments (PLEs) and Personal Learning Networks (PLNs) (<http://ltc.umanitoba.ca/blogs/ples/about/>). Findings from convenience sampling are usually not representative of the general population, so conclusions from this preliminary data set are limited in their generalizability. The goal was thus to derive useful information from the data to inform the

PLE design and development process. In total, 204 surveys were completed. Respondents' profiles and background information provided the criteria for recruiting and retaining those who were skilled or experienced to participate in subsequent surveys and usability testing. Inclusion criteria include: adults over the age of 18; experience with computers and the Internet; and experience with social networking tools and applications (e.g., Facebook, RSS, forums, blogs etc.).

The survey was structured in several sections, starting with a section containing information on participants' background and on their use of technology, including their motivations and frustrations. Another section surveyed participants on their management of learning; where they find information and what helps them understand and combine information more specifically. Finally, the last part of the survey dealt with design issues in creating a Personal Learning Environment. The sections contained a list of suggestions for the participants to choose from, in addition to a large comment box.

Participant demographics

The overall sample size was 204, the majority of participants in this first survey were males (55%); females (44%); missing values 0.5%. The age range of participants captured a broad spectrum of learners from young adults, middle-aged, to mature adults, with a majority between 43-48 years old (23%). Although most participants were from North America (48%), there was strong representation from both Europe (27%), and Australia (18%). The majority of participants possessed either college or university level education (90%) ranging from a Bachelor's degree (in areas such as Learning Management, Education, Distance Education), Masters (e.g., Educational Technology, Instructional and performance technology), to PhD degrees (e.g., linguistics, history and new media). A majority of respondents were employed (82%) in the following professions or areas: university instructor, departmental EdTech liaison, software designer, high school teacher,

research assistant, K-12 school principal and deputy principal, and knowledge developer. Participants were also asked about their use of technology and their level of use. In general, survey participants rated their technical ability as excellent (42%) or very good (39%); we can assume that a majority of respondents were comfortable with various computer technologies. The highest percentages of technologies used where applications such as word processing (daily 86% –weekly 13%), email (daily 100%), social networking (daily 83% - weekly 12%) and searching the web (daily 97% - weekly 3%) with lower percentages of respondents using media file editing (daily 21% -Weekly 36%), and news gathering (daily 78% - weekly 12%).

Motivational factors in using computer based technology were diverse (see Table 1).

Motivation factors	Number	Percentage (%)
When I learn something new	196	96
To produce something that I can be proud of	149	73
When I find a real gem of information	148	73
To see something made by others that is really amazing	129	63
When others recommend something really interesting	128	62

Table 1. Motivational factors in using computer based technology (N=204)

The motivational factors with the highest percentages were the “desire to learn something new” followed by “producing something that they can be proud of”, and the lure of finding “a real gem of information”. Other important motivational issues were “to see something made by others that is really amazing” and “when others recommend something really interesting”.

Other comments related to motivation highlighted issues of efficiency, supporting others in their use of technology and learning, and the requirement of using the technology

in the work place. Participants were also asked about their frustrations with the use of computer-based technology in general. The most common frustrations as chosen from a list of options were as follows: advertising (62%), when technologies do not work (62%) or “phishing” or identity theft (46%).

Survey questions explored the use of communication tools, with a majority (58%) of survey participants ranking email/webmail as their preferred communication tool; this was the case for a majority in North America (32%) and Europe (16%). Cell phones for texting or voice was the second most popular communication tool for 19% of respondents; social networking sites such as Facebook, MySpace or other social networks (10%) was third; Skype, Messenger, or other Internet (video) phone (4%) was the fourth most popular; web forums and discussion boards was the fifth (3%); and finally home phone (2%) rated lowest in popularity.

When using editing and publishing tools, blog publishing tools ranked highest in preference followed by online word processors and photo and video sharing sites. Real time communication/collaboration tools were ranked 5th in the category of editing and publishing tools. Finally, with regards to the use of online services, activities or applications, participants showed a preference for several different choices. The top five choices are listed in Table 2.

Participants identified “other” online services, activities or applications either consulted or engaged in on a regular basis, among them was Twitter, Etherpad, lino, wallwisher, Zotero, Librarything, WordPress blogging, RSS-Feedly, particular forums and Ning, just to name a few. Social networks were also consulted for sharing photos, videos, for meetings, creating and socializing in Virtual Worlds (e.g., Second Life), blog writing, and various social media.

Services/ Applications/ Activities	Number	Percentage (%)
Learning Management System	158	77
Internet shopping	134	66
Internet application organizing tool (iGoogle...)	128	63
Online product reviews and ratings	121	59
Leave comments and rate people's blogs	114	56

Table 2. Online services, activities, or applications consulted (N=204)

Survey respondents provided information related to their management of learning and what helps them to learn. A majority of respondents find information on a topic of interest, with Google or other search engines (98%), the web (92%), followed by social networks (69%), RRS feeds (69%), and books (68%). Friends were also important in finding information (50%) and other options were explored as well, including: university subscription services, databases (e.g., EBSCO, Lexis/Nexis, Naxos), professors, researchers, popular media (e.g., newspapers, magazines, ads), YouTube, occasionally TV, and online library collections.

Next, the most popular modes or mechanisms used for understanding and combining information are presented. Chart 1 reveals that a majority of respondents prefer “interactive activity” (69%) for understanding and combining information, followed by “presentations using graphs and charts” (54%), or “when presented in a video podcast” (52%).

[Insert Chart 1 about here]

Participants expanded on their answers regarding mechanisms that help them understand and combine information. What follows is a sampling of their comments:

- when I can discuss it with others, screencasts and slidecasts
- when I can organize it so it makes sense
- when it is posed as a challenge
- when I take notes and rework/process them
- when someone tweets a useful link and someone else tweets a link to a related story
- when I can combine and check information flexibly
- when it's blogged or op-ed'd
- when I can do something with it
- when it is written simply without a lot of extra words and jargon
- Cmap, visual approaches
- solitude and reflection

This information will be applied in the development of support mechanisms that will be available to learner/users of the PLE. In addition, a majority of participants indicated a preference for sharing interesting information from someone with their social network (79%) and thinking about the information (78%). Sharing the information via email (71%) was also important, while commenting (61%) and writing (57%) of blog posts was also seen as a valuable activity related to received information. Under "other" comments, a high number of respondents indicated a preference for (social) bookmarking options to help them understand and combine information (e.g., share on Google reader, Diigo, tag it in Delicious and retweet). A majority (83%) of participants indicated a preference for talking with other people to help them reflect on either a topic or learning activity. Receiving feedback from others, knowledgeable persons in particular, was seen as important for 56% of respondents. Writing it down in their own

words (74%) was also a well-liked strategy to facilitate reflection. Several found reading related material to be helpful (58%) as well as being on their own without distractions (50%). Another important aspect of the survey was aimed at discovering features and design issues of a PLE that would be of importance to learners. The features that were viewed as highly desirable in a PLE are presented in Chart 2.

[Insert Chart 2 about here]

When presented with a list of possible features for a PLE, participants emphasized both the ease of navigation and the offering of a variety of tools within the PLE as key requirements. In addition, functionalities that would enable interactivity, encourage personal development, and facilitate customizability of their personal learning environment were also requested. Components to help with career and employment planning, and to write a CV were all seen as less important. Comments in the 'other' response section ranged from issues of effectiveness and organization, to flexibility, sharability and transferability.

Participants were asked which information search and organization features would be most desirable in a PLE and several options rose to the top of their priority list. The PLE should not only help learners find information relevant to them, show information in a variety of formats (e.g., text video, audio), allow learners to 'mash up' information from different sources, it should also help learners collect information, edit and produce something from it, and publish it on the internet. Responses provided under the 'other' option reflected a desire for personalization, for the integration of social bookmarking, and social networking applications. Survey respondents were also asked about required features to support their learning in a PLE. Table 3 highlights features that would support 'learning from others' and 'help manage learning activities', including structuring, organization and planning, and finally storing learning activities as a priority for a majority of respondents. Other important

features for supporting learning in a PLE are presented in Table 3.

Important features and issues	Number	Percentage
Allows me to use it to learn from others	176	86.27%
Allows me to structure my learning activities (e.g., in folders)	163	79.90%
Features that help me to organize and plan my learning	162	79.41%
Provides a way to store all my learning activities	160	78.43%
Allows others to give me feedback on my learning activities	144	70.59%
Allows me to teach others	141	69.12%
Allows me to socialize with others	134	65.69%
Provides feedback on my learning activities	116	56.86%
Helps me to be critical of the information and resources I find online	107	52.45%
Teaches me about how the tool or application works	96	47.06%
Features that help me to learn about differences in quality of information sources	88	43.14%
Helps me to understand how search engines and other information sources work	62	30.39%
Other	15	7.35 %

Table 3. Features that support learning in a personal learning

To find out if learners would object to recommendations based on data collected in their learner profile and earlier searches for finding relevant information for them in the future, respondents were asked to provide either an affirmative or negative answer. These percentages are presented in Table 4.

From learner profiles	Number	Percentage
No answer	12	5.88%
I would be happy	170	83.33%
I would be unhappy	22	10.78%
From earlier searches		
No answer	18	8.82%
I would be happy	120	58.82%
I would be unhappy	66	32.35%

Table 4. Data collected from earlier learning projects for finding relevant information

Information aggregation

Participants from the first survey were invited to participate in a second survey which examined the use of information aggregation tools and technologies, and to share issues and challenges based on their previous experience with collecting various forms of data and information from various sources. Their views would help to inform the design and development of PLE components related to information aggregation. In total, 68 participants completed the survey, with a majority of males (57%) between 43-54 years of age, with representation for groups 25-26 years of age to seniors 55+ (same characteristics as for the sample population for the online application survey, *see section on Results of the first phase*). Table 5 provides a sampling of issues and features raised by the “super-users” which should be considered in designing tools for information aggregation within a PLE.

Important features and issues
Ease of use Tools and networking options
Loading time of the environment options for customization
Personalization and choice over automatic inclusion of information streams
Intelligent information searching options
Some indication of trust and reputation of sources as relevant for information searching strategies used
Synergy/ integration with LMS systems
Visual representation for the organization of information—i.e. automatic tagging, ranking for quality and relevance, e.g. number of stars, flags, annotations
Cross platform environment with mobile options

Table 5. Features and issues for designing tools for information aggregation

Editing and publishing information

Information and recommendations for supporting editing and publishing activities in a PLE were also gleaned from a sample of 62 respondents (“super-user”) who participated in the first and second survey, with comparable demographics for age, education, and ICT skills as previously described. Table 6 presents some of the important features

and issues to be consider in designing editing and publishing tools for use in a PLE, first in general, then for specific activities such as text, photo, web, video, as well as sound editing and publishing.

General
Ease of use Simplicity Universality
Compatibility issues in editors
Clear and easy: menus, navigation, structure, instructions
Simple and complex tracking advanced features right click options: help keyboard shortcuts user defined styles macros
Multimedia file inclusion options: images, video, audio
Text Editing
Various formats: brochures, newsletters, blogs, etc. Inter-operability (e.g., file format)
Online collaboration simple and granular sharing
Indexing and cross referencing
Photo editing
Cropping resizing (dimension and resolution) options RAW import, non-destructive brightness color and exposure adjustment options; the ability to adjust hues, in addition to options to use artistic filters and to use layers
Ability to add text and shapes add metadata captions label annotations
Simplicity ease of use universality level adjustment connectivity
Options to convert and save in a variety of file formats multiple formats intelligent file size optimization
Extensive tutorials & help intuitive interface multiple import export options low cost open source (free) solutions
Produce mash-ups with a variety of applications save them somehow

Table 6. Features and issues for designing tools for editing and publishing information

As represented in Table 6, survey respondents also highlighted important features and issues in web editing, video editing, sound editing which included many of the same options mentioned previously for general text and photo editing and publishing activities: namely ease of use, flexibility, capacity, variety and range of options/formats, mash up capability using a variety of applications. There was also a

preference for using a combination of editors, for organizing one's own editing and publishing activities, and having an intuitive interface design. Other valuable features for editing and publishing include options that are 'handy' and 'right for me' with the option to "customize" and "refine the organization" as much as possible.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Results of the first phase of the PLE research project provide important baseline data about user experiences with existing tools, applications, systems and desirable features for creating a new and improved personal learning environment. Participants gave high importance to social interaction in their learning and most were happy for their data to be used in information recommender systems. The surveys highlighted important factors affecting technology use and uptake, which included: demographics such as age, gender, education, experience, and specialization. Human factors such as motivation, incentive, support (organizational, social network online or in the community), perceived usefulness, ease of use, attitudes towards use, innovativeness, passed adoption behaviors, and knowledge and skill levels also need to be factored in. This research has emphasised the need for an intuitiveness and ease of use of the PLE and the tools recommended to learners. Simplicity in design features and easy navigation, as well as compatibility and interoperability of tools used and recommended were also shown to be important. Moreover, the research suggested important features for a PLE, such as an information aggregator and recommender in addition to editor, publisher and support structures, which are currently being considered as components for a PLE. Information and perceptions related to component usability along with educational research comparing learning in the context of a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) have also now been gathered and the concerns from this research have been tried out in the MOOC (Kop & Fournier, 2011 – in press). At the centre of the design and development is the premise that it should be the learner who

owns the PLE and who makes the decisions about its use, not an educational institution or organization.

REFERENCES

Attwell, G. (2006). Evaluating e-learning: a guide to the evaluation of e-learning. *Evaluate Europe Handbook Series Volume 2*, Perspektiven-Offset-Druck, Bremen, Germany, Available from http://www.pontydysgu.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/11/eva_europe_vol2_prefinal.pdf (Accessed 25th February 2010).

Bannan-Ritland, B. (2003). The Role of Design in Research: The Integrative Learning Design Framework, *Educational Researcher*, 32, 1, 21-24.

Bouchard, P. (2011). Network Promises and their Implications, in The Impact of Social Networks on Teaching and Learning [online monograph]. *Revistade Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento* (RUSC). Vol 8, pg. 288-302. UOC. Available from <http://rusc.uoc.edu/ojs/index.php/rusc/article/viewFile/v8n1-bouchard/v8n1-bouchard-eng> (Accessed 25th January 2011).

Downes, S. (2009). *New tools for personal learning*, Talk at MEFANET 2009 Conference, Brno, Czech Republic, via MVU Videoconference, available from <http://www.downes.ca/presentation/234> (Accessed 26th November 2009).

Dron, J., & Anderson, T. (2007). Collectives, Networks and Groups in Social Software for E-Learning, *World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education (ELEARN) 2007*, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 87 – 105.

Jones, A., & Issroff, K. (2004). Learning technologies: Affective and social issues in computer-supported collaborative learning, *Computers & Education*, 44(2005), 395-408.

Kop, R. (2010) *Networked Connectivity and Adult Learning: Social Media, the Knowledgeable Other and Distance Education*, Ph. D. Thesis, Swansea University, UK.

Kop, R., & Fournier (2011 – Accepted). *New Dimensions to Self-Directed Learning on Open Networked Learning Environments*, 25th Annual International Self-Directed Learning Symposium, Coco Beach, Florida, USA.

Lombard, M., & Ditton, T. (1997) At the Heart of It All: The Concept of Presence, *Journal of computer Mediated Communication*, 3 (2) September 1997.

Merritt (2009). *The Adventures of Super User*, Insite Objects, Available from <http://www.insiteobjects.com/papers/Super%20User.pdf> (Accessed 28th May 2010).

Picard, R., Papert, S., Bender, W., Blumberg, B., Breazeal, C., Cavallo, D., Machover, T., Resnick, M., Roy, D., & Strohecker, C. (2004). Affective learning – a manifesto, *BT Technology Journal*, Vol. 22 No 4, 253-269.

Siemens, G., & Downes, S. (2008). *Connectivism & Connected Knowledge*, Available from <http://lrc.umanitoba.ca/connectivism/> (Accessed 22nd February 2009).

Siemens, G., & Downes, S. (2009). *Connectivism & Connected Knowledge*, Available from <http://lrc.umanitoba.ca/connectivism/> (Accessed 15th January 2010).

Weller, M. (2010). The Centralisation Dilemma in Educational IT, *International Journal of Virtual and Personal Learning Environments*, 1(1), 1-9, January-March 2010.

Zaharias, P., & Poylymenakou, A. (2009),
Developing a Usability Evaluation Method for
e-Learning Applications: Beyond Functional
Usability, *International Journal of Human-
Computer Interaction*, 25 (1), pg 75-98.

Chart 1. Popular means for understanding and combining information

Chart 2. Desirable design features in a PLE in general