DGfE-Conference 2010 – AG 46 "Individualised mobility as cultural resource: harnessing the 'mobile complex' for participatory learning"

Benjamin Jörissen – Comment on Ben Bachmair/Maren Risch/Daniel Zils

2) Privacy vs. public school space. Pictures of the home environment are e.g. important resources of self-reflection. Mobile tech appears as a means to relate curricular tasks to the own environment, which has great potentials (with regard to deep understanding, motivation etc.). On the other hand, it opens up the curricular stuff into the student's world, exposing it to reassessment. From a lifeworld perspective, conducting math calculations on private realms is at the same time enriching (new aspects on everyday life are added) as reductive (the emotional, biographical, memorical qualities of the corners are disregarded on ordner to conduct calculations on it). I guess, this is just a new ambivalence we have to deal with, that means it's an issue teachers have to be sensitive towards. Same goes mutates mutandis for 3) – It's in a way "at risk teaching"

3) Definition of „mobile" seems very broad. Did we have mobile learning technologies since the first Kodak Cameras ("You push the button …")? Is it rather about re-theorizing research for example on self-produced videos, as Horst Niesyto and many others conducted it? Or is it about a special quality of modern digital, wireless connected mobile technologies, which clearly open up very new options and potentials within this field?

1) Time and space of a learning situation are not "just there" but are achieved by the performative interactions within a learning group. The use of mobile technologies changes the temporal and spatial structures of learning situations. That affects the structure of what you call "contexts", which now happen so be spread among a hybrid space. This means a huge change to traditional learning settings and the rules of creating pedagogical situations. By "only" importing mobile technologies into the classroom, these causes problems of a structural friction. What would you say are viable strategies for overcoming this friction as well on an organizational level as well as in regard to the professionalization of teachers?

DGfE-Conference 2010 – AG 46 "Individualised mobility as cultural resource: harnessing the 'mobile complex' for participatory learning"

Benjamin Jörissen – Comment on John Cook

1) When learning is "augmentedly" situated like in the example you gave, I wonder how exactly it affects and transforms the structure of (situated, embodied) experience? Isn't this also a kind of absorbation of the senses (because it seems to focus on the visuals) as well as of the body, which is less a medium of experience of place an (historical) time but an extension of the devices which have to be operated, so that the actions the learners perform are kind of redirected to the use of gadgets?
The background of my question is that, to me, this learning setting seems to be very focused on fact learning and cognition. I guess it's possibly not meant this way, so it would be interesting to hear about the structure of technology in relation to the structure of experience.

2) In the given example, it's evident that learning takes place. Talking about "development" thus implies the rearrangement of patterns of experiencing the world (and oneself). This kind of rearrangement is very important to what we call "Bildung" (education or self-education).

   a. From this perspective of educational theory, we would tend to criticize the normative anthropological implications implied in the concept of development in favor of a focus on individual patterns of change. How do you grasp or transform Vygotsky's notion of development in this respect?

   b. If we make a distinction between a mere assimilation of information and a change of patterns of perception and meaning-making, I wonder if these kinds of changes happen to appear in the shown project, because the "Augmented Context of Development", which is a very interesting idea in itself, involves pretty classical, formal learning tasks and instructions. Wouldn't the didactical design have to be much more opened up, more informal and even more collaborative to do justice to the potentials of such augmented reality technologies?
   (Background of this question: It seemed a bit that technology is subordinated under a traditional learning setting; my question is if you would say that the transformative power of user generated contexts possible goes even beyond what has been developed in the shown example?)

DGfE-Conference 2010 – AG 46 "Individualised mobility as cultural resource: harnessing the 'mobile complex' for participatory learning"

Benjamin Jörissen – Comment on Gemma Moss

1) Book as a technology vs. digital technologies. Of course, in a historical view, books can be called technologies, but then again, esp. in the context of this AG-session, the lines between non-digital and digital technologies should not be blurred. Nevertheless, the focus on books as technology is insightful insofar it shows how even "low level" technology serves as an "actor" in pedagogical situations. More so this is to be expected from complex digital tech.

2) What are the structural qualities of the book as a technology? – Random access (Libraries), relative portability (some books), possibility to make annotations. Gemma's contribution shows that the LAYOUT of the book is a Form which carries a "Message", even can be seen as a technology of power (of distributing who is weak and who is strong, and to perform this difference on the classroom as a stage).

3) Does "Escaping the rules of proficiency" means "escaping a particular power relation"? [and if, how is this to be assessed?]

4) What if it had been eBooks or even iPads used in that class? Remembering McLuhan's iron vs. wooden axe example (in "Unterstanding Media'). Gemma Moss' presentation reminds us to look very carefully and to apply the depth of an ethnographic understanding when introducing new technologies to the classroom. (Explanation: This is not to say we should hesitate to introduce contemporary media technologies in the classroom, but to take the chance for a deeper understanding what actually happens in classrooms, how the "actor networks", the relations of people, time, space and objects actually interact.)

DGfE-Conference 2010 – AG 46 "Individualised mobility as cultural resource: harnessing the 'mobile complex' for participatory learning"

Benjamin Jörissen – Comment on Norbert Pachler/Claudia de Witt/Sonja Ganguin

The two presentations, as it seems to me, demonstrate two different directions of thinking about mobile learning. The first talk poses the question of how mobilized informal learning could enhance learning in formal learning situations (school). The second talk, as I understood it, puts the question how a mobilized *formal* learning (like augmented reality expert systems) can be used to enhance workplace learning. I think there's little question that mobile technologies in work-based contexts have some very clear benefits, as shown, for e-learning, so I'd like to focus more on the first presentation, where both generational media cultures and informal vs. formal learning cultures collide. I've got four remarks, or questions.

1) A black box of the talk is the realm that actually is accessed by mobile technologies, that is the social web. In ordner to understand the options, as well as to assess the consequences of such uses of technology in schools, one has to focus sharply on the social web. This is even more evident regarding the fact that the social web and mobile technologies are getting more and more integrated at the moment.

2) Can the disjunction between mobilized informal learning and the learning models involved in educational institutions really be bridged by "simply" importing mobile technologies? Wouldn't this imply to either colonize and functionalize young people's media cultures in a way (not to forget: school is a institution of power, it's about giving grades and deciding about job chances, etc.) OR to change the schools learning models from the bottom up, according btw to the ideas of progressive education (Reformpädagogik)? IE, does it fit to open and informalize learning and still restrict it to 45 min lessons, strictly divided disciplines and normalized, assessable knowledge?

3) Is there something like a "new habitus of learning"? This would mean to presuppose a common experience, and in the end to rely on the concept of digital natives, which has faced much criticism as not being differentiated enough. Aren't there rather multiple new habitus that to be identified, diverse patterns of learning with new media, which also imply great differences in learning quality and output?

4) Power – Does "becoming a producer" by using mobile technologies and the social web really means to "gain power"? Which theory of power is applied here, and how does it relate on the one hand to school as an institution of power, and on the other hand to mobile devices as new "dispositives of power", as Giorgio Agamben put it recently?