# How OLPC project can help children to create PLE/personal learning environment?

# Abstract

*Some governments worldwide are distributing laptops for children in public schools with the support of the educational project called One Laptop Per Child (OLPC)[[1]](#footnote-1).* *The OLPC motivation is “…that Internet access and tools for expression (text, music, video, graphics) are the contemporary ’toys’ for learning”.  As projects like OLPC are introduced to the schools, learning environments become more complex and moved well beyond what our educators are taught to and regularly use to support student learning, concerns about the processes that underlie learning inside and outside the classroom have increased remarkably. And here, in this new reality, the study of personal learning environment (PLE) and the ways to develop it become important. This paper* ***examines/seeks to explore*** *some ideas on how OLPC projects can help children to create their PLE to support autonomous learning experiences regardless the present challenges facing the education system.*

**examine/explore** (Break an argument, idea, subject down into parts and examine them, showing how they relate to each other)

# Introduction

*What I understand about it?*

*We have always had a personal environment that we learn, although we may not have been aware of it and we have not needed to be, especially because the teacher-expert model was more than enough to provide us with the information relevant to living, even if we were still learning outside of it. Besides, there were limited sources of information and they were fully centralized in the educational institutions.*

*However, with the popularization of the small wireless devices such as laptops, tablets and smart phones and, the advent of Internet technology called Web 2.0[[2]](#footnote-2), things have changed. We are in an educational era that Weller (2011) calls "the abundance". Now we can access quickly and easily to a huge amount of information, resources and talk about almost anything, from different sources, with heterogeneous perspectives and multiple origins in an incredible variety of formats. The information environment is no longer exclusive, it become inclusive. We can make all this information comes to us through a lot of ways and presented it when best suits us, on different devices, languages, manners and places of our choice. Almost everything that might interest us is a click away. This means that the experiences, exchanges and activities that the use of technology has allowed us has extraordinarily increased, diversified and can also be customized according to our learning styles, to the point that learning environments centralized and common to all seem insufficient and impoverishing.*

*How is it Important?*

*The challenge is no longer to access information and supporting tools and becomes to filter and learn how to use them in the way that matters for effective learning. In this new context, not all the conditions necessary to leverage learning using the laptops are in place, for example, many of our existing educators do not have the same understanding of and ease with using technology to guide the students. The same can be said of many of the education leaders and policymakers in schools, districts and of the higher education institutions that prepare new educators for the field.*

*This gap in technology understanding influences program and curriculum development. Too often, this gap prevents technology from being used in ways that would improve instructional practices and learning outcomes.*

*Although children don’t need coaxing to take up digital technologies and their skills quickly improve relative to their elders as suggested XXXXX, without guidance most of the students will remain amateur users of information and communication technology (ICT). This raises concerns about how these children will develop their knowledge because they are not fully digitally literate, yet are deeply immersed in the digital technology. As pointed out in the report…. “they might not benefit either from traditional education – because there are a lot of distractions and time wasted to embed the laptops in the classroom activities - or from technology – because these children will not receive adequate guidance on how learning to learn in the digital age”. (ideal citar algum reporte para sustentar essa observação).*

*Consequently, it is imperative that technology plays a role beyond the mere information-diffusion and helps children learn to learn. This implies that technology must help children to tailor their PLEs whether in formal, informal, permanent or self-regulated learning/education.* **(add citations)**

*Which aspects I will deal with and why?*

*As a research topic, this paper analyses some of the ideas behind the Personal Learning Environment, reflecting individual children’s learning needs and ways of learning by using the laptops and the Sugar platform of the OLPC projects. The principal aim was to explore how OLPC can help children to create their own PLEs to leverage autonomous learning experiences regardless the present challenges facing the education system.*

*The paper is organized as follow: chapter 1 explores the most accepted definitions of PLE which can be found in literature, chapter 2 describes the foundations of the OLPC project, chapter 3 introduces the Sugar Learning Platform as a PLE for children, chapter 4 explores how children can create their own PLEs with their laptops and the Sugar platform and, finally, chapter 5 draws some conclusions and depicts some research ideas for the near future.*

# What is a Personal Learning Environment (PLE)?

*--Listar Core concepts do PLE estudados no IDEL—*

*The PLEs are not a theory of teaching but rather it can be perceived as a set of artefacts, cognitive processes, tools and physical connections gathered by the individuals that allow controlling and managing their informal learning process via web. The theoretical foundations on which to base the use of PLEs depend in great extent on the perspective in which will be introduced this approach. The concept itself is still developing and thus there are a number of definitions, which vary slightly from author to author. One of the first conceptualizations of PLE is found in the “VLE[[3]](#footnote-3) of the future”* (Wilson 2005)*, although the term itself already appears in “Lifelong Learning: The Need for Portable Personal Learning Environments and Supporting Interoperability Standards”* (Olivier and Liber 2001)*.*

*The following description proposed by Stephen Downes is intended to introduce the general nature of PLEs:*

*…not an institutional or corporate application, but a personal learning center, where content is reused and remixed according to the student's own needs and interests. It becomes, indeed, not a single application, but a collection of interoperating applications---an environment rather than a system. It also begins to look like a personal portfolio tool. The idea here is that students will have their own personal place to create and showcase their own work. (Downes 2005)*

*This description captures some salient aspects (listed above), which seem to be common across all current viewpoints found in the literature and which will guide the analyses of this paper:*

1. ***Personal and Global:*** *The* ***learning experiences are centred in the individual*** *and he/she* ***controls*** *its own PLE* ***(i.e. autonomy and ownership)****, thus it is not tight to an institutional portal like the VLE. As* Wilson et al (2007) pointed out*, the PLE is considerate personal and operates in a global scope, as the range of services is not restricted within any particular organization.* (Wilson et al. 2007)
2. ***Aggregation:*** *One of the side effects of* ***Web 2.0*** *is the large number of services and tools available. Users spend a lot of time trying new services, creating accounts, profiles, user names and passwords, and adding them to their growing and dynamic* ***digital identity.*** *This situation can create disorder, confusion and distraction for average learner. To work around these constrains, Attwell (2007) suggested a PLE should provide framework and tools to facilitate the use and aggregation of different services. The PLEs can help users to concentrate and manage all services from a single point. Technically, the PLEs should act as a hub of content related to the learning experience of a single person. A good metaphor of a PLE as an aggregator:* ***‘online learning desk’****.* (Attwell 2007)
3. ***Space:*** *As we move into a world where information is fragmented and dispersed in multiple spaces* ***(i.e. decentralized information)*** *and formats shaped by the technology and, “…learning will take place in different contexts and situations and will not be provided by a single learning provider”*(Attwell 2007)***,*** *the PLE is an important concept that can help individuals to learn efficiently.*
4. ***Flow:*** *As the individual become the centre of the PLE, he/she can personalize its own learning environment reflecting his/her learning moods, styles (visual, auditory or kinaesthetic) and learning experiences. Indeed, these intrinsic interactions around his/her own learning events can facilitate the* ***embodiment*** *of "the holistic experience that people feel when they act with total involvement – as flow" (Csikszentmihalyi 1975).*
5. ***Digital identity & Identity:*** *While the individuals build, expand and manage their PLEs, they also gain experience in developing their own personal and professional identity and also their* ***personal portfolio****. As they gain experience in a number of skills related to identity in the online environment, they also strengthen the network that supports a large part of their learning. Dabbagh and Kitsantas (2012) afirm that the learner develops an online identity where the personalized learning environment provides cues (affordances or possibilities for action) that prompt the learner about what to share, what not to share, who they choose to share with, and how to effectively merge formal and informal learning.*(Dabbagh and Kitsantas 2012)*.*
6. ***Collaboration:*** *Collaboration is an important skill to encompass the diversity of knowledge available in a rapid changing and sophisticate society. Its essence is directly linked with the assumptions of the PLEs because by collaborating and exchanging information, learners can test their knowledge, receive feedback on their works and scaffold their learning. It has always been possible to collaborate, but the Web 2.0 and its social tools (such as blogs, wikis and all kinds of different personal knowledge bases including bookmarks and tags) have added a new dimension to the concept of collaboration by* ***empowering learners*** *to also become producers of learning material collections (Attwell 2007). Now it is easier, cheaper and faster to work with peers and experts regardless of time zone or physical distance.*
7. ***Connectivism****: Connectivism (Siemens, 2005 and 2006; Downes, 2006 and 2007) is defined as a learning theory for the digital age which underlying the use of the opportunities offered by technology to enrich formal and informal learning. Siemens (2005) has formulated the principles of connectivism briefly: (i) Learning and knowledge depend on the diversity of opinions. (ii) Learning is a process of connecting nodes or specialized information sources. (iii) Learning may reside in non-human. (iv) The ability to know more is more critical than what we know at any given time. (v) Feeding and maintaining connections is needed to facilitate continual learning. (vi) The ability to see connections between fields, ideas and concepts is a key skill. (vii) The update (current and precise knowledge) is the intent of all connectivist learning activities. (viii) Decision-making is itself a learning process.The act of choosing what to learn and the meaning of incoming information is seen through the lens of a shifting reality. A right decision today may be wrong tomorrow due to alterations in the information environment that affects the decision (Siemens, 2005). PLE using a part of a constructivist environment for learning can help them design the activities proposed to students.*

*Additionally, some others aspects embedded in the PLEs that are important to highlight:*

1. *Learning experiences are centred in the individual.*
2. *Control: Individuals are the responsible for their personal information.*
3. *Autonomy.*
4. *Ownership.*
5. *Web 2.0 tools.*
6. *Online learning desk.*
7. *Decentralised information.*
8. *Embodiment.*
9. *Personal portfolio.*
10. *Empowering learners.*

# Foundations of the One Laptop Per Child (OLPC)

*Inspired by the educational ideas of Jerome Bruner[[4]](#footnote-4) and Seymour Papert[[5]](#footnote-5) to create an autonomous personal-computer for children of all ages, the OLPC Project aims to “empower the world’s poorest through education” (OLPC n.d.), by providing each child with a collaborative and joyful laptop that could engage children in their own education. Thus, talk about OLPC is to discover new uses and combinations for technologies to address old concerns such as Education for All (EFA)*[[6]](#footnote-6) *and, universal access to information and knowledge* (UNESCO n.d.)*.*

*The OLPC hypothesis is that children can unlock the potential that they have with a personal learning device with them at all times. This idea also conforms to Attwell (2007) visions that ubiquitous computing may offer new opportunities for learning (Attwell 2007). Therefore, if each child owns its own laptop (the OLPC laptop), this would enable a more learner centred approach as an alternative to the traditional instructional approach focused on trainers' needs, which is in many places is affected by deprivation, physical isolation, cultural and political barriers.*

*The OLPC project has a view of learning known as constructionist learning, a philosophy inspired by Jean Piaget’ constructivism[[7]](#footnote-7)* (Attwell 2007) *model, where the children act as the builders of their own intellectual structures to understand the world around them* (Papert 1980)*.*

*The collaborative and joyful aspects of the laptop to engage children in their own education are indeed good examples to differentiate Piaget's constructivism and Papert’s constructionism, as described by Papert himself:*

*My little play on the words construct and constructionism already hints at two of these multiple facets--one seemingly "serious" and one seemingly "playful." The serious facet will be familiar to psychologists as a tenet of the kindred, but less specific, family of psychological theories that call themselves constructivist. Constructionism--the N word as opposed to the V word--shares constructivism's connotation of learning as "building knowledge structures" irrespective of the circumstances of the learning. It then adds the idea that this happens especially felicitously in a context where the learner is consciously engaged in constructing a public entity…*(Seymur Papert and Harel 1991)*.*

*To best serve the OLPC cause, wherever the laptops are distributed, there are five core principals that must be respected:*

* ***Child Ownership:*** *Children should stay with the laptops. They should be free to take them home and use at the time they wish. When children have their own machine, they will not treat the laptop as government property, but as a personal medium and a valuable gift that needs to be protected. Taking the machines home generates additional opportunities to have the children devoting time to read and write more, and to acquire a more positive view of their potential. Learning becomes a focal point in their lives.*
* ***Low Ages:*** *The XO is designed for use by children between the ages of 6-12 years, covering the years of primary school, but nothing prevents its use earlier or later stages. Children do not need to read or write in order to play with the XO and we know that playing is an essential foundation of human learning (ADD CITATION). In addition, these digital activities help acquiring mathematical skills, scientific, reasonable thinking, reading and writing. Early learning experiences are critical to children's developing a passion for learning; easily boredom leads to the loss of this passion.*
* ***Saturation:*** *To achieve a significant improvement in education, access to a means of personal expression and knowledge should be a right rather than a prize. Therefore, provide equal opportunity to all citizens of the state/country is a key point of the project. “Nobody is left out” (Video OLPC Mission). The saturation also helps in the issue of security. As each child has their own laptop and communities feel part of this initiative, there is less envy, therefore less incentive for theft.*
* ***Connection:*** *The XO has been designed to provide the most effective wireless network, even without local Internet. Children in any neighbourhood are inter-connected in a wireless mesh to chat, to share information, join videoconferences and work together to create music, edit papers, read books and play games online. The connectivity removes artificial barriers for learning and development. Children can communicate across borders in a way that years ago there were not thought possible.*
* ***Free and Open Source:*** *By choosing free and Open Source platform, there is no inherent external dependency or restrictions on redistribution, software choice, licensing costs, upgrades, localization of the software into the local language and repurpose to fit their needs. The children and their communities should be free to choose.*

# The OLPC project and the PLE

*By given children they very ‘own’ and ‘connected’ laptop, the OLPC project also furnishes these children with a cognitive artefact (Papert 1980), which not only fits perfectly with the concept of a PLE but also enhance its domain, adding flexibility of learning.*

*An ideal PLE aggregates in a single and personalized dashboard, an entire collection of tools for learning.*

## The OLPC Laptop as ubiquitous PLE tool

*To attain the five OLPC’s principles, the project fundamentally reconsidered personal computer architecture—hardware, software, and display – to develop an innovative computer at the lowest cost and best quality available, respecting a set of design goals (OLPC n.d.) suitable to the conditions in developing countries. The design goals are (in order):*

1. *Safe: no children should be harmed.*
2. *Lowest Power: low power means longer run-time.*
3. *Lowest Cost: a lower cost means more children can have one.*
4. *Robust and Maintainable: because children drop things.*
5. *Performance: fast.*

*The result, says its creator Yves Behar (Behar 2007), is a green and small laptop called XO that can operate in the harshest conditions, where each part that makes up it is strategically planned to give the best performance, robustness and quality. For economy and efficiency purposes, every part of the XO laptop has two, three or more different functions. Such characteristics make the XO laptop very effective to work with children that usually walk to and from school every day; where the weather is unpredictable and rain, dirt and dust are part of their daily routine. Yves also observes that the XO is not a cost-reduced version of today's laptop, which is normally second-rate, second-hand, low quality that simply can’t perform under thought conditions, it is a whole new concept for children laptop. Among the XO’s features are:*

1. *The two Wi-Fi antennas, that provide the ability to connect the laptops to a local mesh network and to the Internet, in which case, only one of these laptops need to reach the Internet signal in order to relay it to others.*
2. *The screen made to operate both indoors and outdoors and the cover that can be rotated completely and turn the device into a touchscreen[[8]](#footnote-8) tablet without a keyboard.*
3. *The keyboard made of a single piece of rubber membrane, very resilient against both water and dirt, which also allows sealing the base of the machine.*
4. *The battery that consumes ten times less energy that a standard laptop (it should last the entire school day without requiring charging) and can be charged by hand with a standard crank charger (this feature is only possible because the XO consumes very little energy).*
5. *The XO also carry a webcam, microphone, two speakers, SD card reader, three USB ports and multiple types of game console buttons.*

## The SUGAR learning platform as a PLE for children

## How children can create their own PLEs with their OLPC laptops

# Conclusion and ideas for the future

Inserir images tais como:

* Evolução da VLE -> PLE
* Diagrama de constructivism X constructionism
* *--Link entre o conceito de PLE e o OLPC –*
* *the fact that a possibility of building a PLE was given to those children is still there.*
* ***The first six years of learning in our lives are very interactive and based on the game. We learn how to walk, how to talk and have a lot of common sense without formal teaching. Aspects of that learning style can and should continue in subsequent years. Start during the primary is the best way to improve the entire school system. When young children experience the joy of learning, will never want to withdraw.***
* ***We all learn best by doing and reflecting on what we do. Children learn best when working with passionate and committed experts. We are no longer limited by physical locations, where if there is no mathematical talent, we will be able to develop our own mathematical excellence. Through the connectivity can work and learn with experts from either side.***
* The child with an XO is not just a passive consumer of knowledge, but an active participant in a learning community. As children grow and pursue new ideas, software, content, resources and tools they need to grow. The nature of OLPC is that growth will be led locally, mostly by the children themselves. Each child with an XO can balance the learning of others. Children are taught each other, share ideas, and through the social nature of interface, support their intellectual growth. The children become students and teachers.
* *This feature follows one of the principles upon which this computer was created: connect/integrate children into a constructionist experience.*

1. One Laptop per Child (OLPC) is a project supported by the Miami-based One Laptop per Child Association (OLPCA) and the Cambridge-based OLPC Foundation (OLPCF), two U.S. non-profit organizations (Wikipedia n.d.), established in January 2005 by Nicholas Negroponte. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The next generation of Internet applications and the underlying technologies that enable conversations and contribution to the online community. Examples of Web 2.0 include content sharing (video, photo, etc), social networking sites, blogs, wikis and mashups (Wikipedia n.d.). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Virtual Learning Environment [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Jerome Seymour Bruner (born October 1, 1915) is a psychologist who has made significant contributions to human cognitive psychology and cognitive learning theory in educational psychology (Wikipedia n.d.). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Seymour Papert (born February 29, 1928) is an MIT mathematician, computer scientist, and educator. He is one of the pioneers of artificial intelligence, inventor of the Logo programming language and the developer of an original and highly influential theory on learning called constructionism (Wikipedia n.d.). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The Education for All (EFA) movement is a global commitment to provide quality basic education for all children, youth and adults (UNESCO n.d.). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Constructivism is a theory to explain how knowledge is constructed in the human being when information comes into contact with existing knowledge that had been developed by experiences (Wikipedia n.d.). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. *following prototype XO-2 will include a touchscreen* [↑](#footnote-ref-8)