Appendix \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Coding of IAM Phases and Operations from Gunawardena, Lowe & Anderson (1997)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **Post** | **IAM Code** |
|  | **Phase I: Sharing/Comparing** |  |
| E.R. | I think other reasons are:  - While there is interaction students will besides critically analyze content also REMEMBER the content better ...  - While interacting, you will often hear some new information you didn't know before, so you're EXPANDING your knowledge base. | PH I C |
| E.R. | Another thing I think is important: The more expert the one you 're interacting with is, the more you'll learn. That's why I think that learner-instructor interaction is better for learning than learner-learner interaction. | PHI/C |
| E.R. | What if you're interacting with a student who knows less than you about the content? I hope that you'll comment on this assertions I made. | PHI/D |
| J.M. | In addition to learner-instructor interaction within the classroom, some men­tion should be made of the relationship between student attrition (dropout) and informal student-faculty interaction. Noted attrition expert Vincent Tinto (1987) felt that contact outside the classroom was paramount when he stated the frequency and perceived worth of interaction with faculty outside the classroom is the single strongest predictor of student voluntary departure (reference cited, p. 8). | PHI/C |
| F.S. | I am not sure in which camp my comments fit I think they are closer to G.K.'s position than L.G.'s. So, I waited until today! Intuitively, there is no doubt in my mind that "interaction,” is a necessary ingredient in any educational transaction, including in distance education transaction. | PHI/B |
| B.B. | The original proposition underlying this debate was that interaction was essential to distance education. The research cited by L.G. in her opening statement, as well as the supporting testimony supplied by others, establishes well enough that interaction is a valuable enhancement to distance education. | PHI/B |
| M.L | I agree that F2F is limited in the reflection required for higher order thinking. Asynchronous interaction with fellow learners and instructors allows us this reflection time. | PHI/B |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Phase II: Dissonance** |  |
| F.S. | However, I think "interaction" is only one category of transaction. One of the reasons we have difficulty in dealing with the concept of interaction is perhaps we mean different forms of transactions by it. | PHII/A |
| D.R. | What I suspect colleagues are likely to be differing about here is not whether it is possible to learn without interaction but about whether non-interactive learning can be worthwhile (educational?) learning. Is that right? | PHII/A & B |
| B.B. | But does this research and testimony establish that interaction is  essential as the proposition contends. I think not | PHII/A |
| M.L. | C.O'H. and A.A. addressed FEEDBAC K under the negative. Yet, I feel they addressed the affirmative as feedback is interactive. | PHII/A |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Phase III: Negotiation & Co-Construction** |  |
| J.M. | If distance educators fail to include interaction opportunities outside of the classroom and course content, they will inevitably run into problems with student retention. Education obviously can't happen if there are no students. So perhaps the argument should be: "No Interaction, No Students, No Education." | PHIII/B |
| F.S. | So, I suggest that we should spend some time in defining it, and then as G.K. implied, find empirical evidence for its application. | PHIII/A |
| F.S. | So, before I go too far in this list, let say that my point is that we work with complex concepts in building a theory of distance education. Interaction is one of these complex terms. Complexity can be analyzed to a certain extent by using the right tools. I have selected systems methodology to do so. | PHIII/A & E  Two codes |
| F.S. | In moving toward that direction, I suggest we talk of transaction, as sug­gested by Moore, and conceptualize interaction as one category of it. In that way we may complicate things, but I think it will be a complexity which will bring more clarity. | PHIII/D |
| B.B. | To make this case it would be necessary to show, not merely that DE is better with interaction, but that it is severely defective without interaction. A compelling case for this latter point has not, I think, been made here.  The point is more than just a logical one. If interaction is not crucial to  effective distance education, but only a desirable enhancement (however valuable) then it must be judged in terms of its costs and benefits. | PH III/D |
| C.O’H | To conclude this point: Shouldn't we see the forms of interaction specified at the start of this conference-with content material, with teachers, with learners-less as forms of interaction per se than as different means for facilitating true reflective interaction in the learner? | PHIII/D |
| S.A. | It is perhaps unfortunate that the format for this discussion is a formal debate. This means that we are not really discussing the pros and cons of interaction per se-we are debating the statement 'No interaction, no education'. It seems to me that both sides are saying: interaction improves the learning experience, makes it deeper, makes it more fun, makes it more memorable.  But the "negative team" feel this is a nice.:.to-have, not a have-to-have. And the "affirmative team" is starting to agree!  "So there is no doubt people can learn without interaction" (M.R.) and  "Independent learning certainly takes place all the time" (C.L) and so on. In this context, I can only agree with all those who are promising a changed statement for the debate-"No interaction, no education" puts the "affirmative team" in too tight a comer. | PHIII/D |
| M.L. | C.O'H. asks about dynamic interactive multimedia as a feedback  mechanism. This brings to mind Alan Turing's test for computer intelligence—can a user distinguish between a computer's and a human being's response to a question? He addressed this before computer interaction was widespread. It is a viable question today. If we capture "our'' expertise in a computer program or simulation (as suggested by a recent contributor whose message I lost), are we not humanly interacting? | PHIII/D |
| G.K. | I just want to elaborate on one new idea raised by M.L.-interaction doesn't have to be with a human. Intelligent tutors can provide feedback ... and so can response forms in WWW. | PHIII/D |
| C.O’H | Indeed, it may be better to stress ACTIVITY rather than interACTIVITY ... | PHIII/D |
| T.M.0. | Well in simplistic terms you expose your arguments to others (maybe in a part progressive way . . . an outline here, a paragraph there ). This in turn allows others (peers and tutors ) to react to your thoughts ... you continue. Your mind changes ... somebody makes it succinct ... a piece of reading you haven't thought of ... Well this seems to be CMC written large to me. | PHIII/D |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Phase IV: Testing** |  |
| G.K. | More generally, I think what people want is some kind of response from the system ... so what we really need to worry about is that our distance ed courses/programs are responsive rather than interactive. I mean this is in the most general response: response on assignments, administrative problems, anything… | PHIV/B & C |
| C.O.’H | It is actually the ACTIVITY of the learner which we give feedback  on, and that can include the ordering of concepts, testing internal coherence, experience, experiment etc. So "No activity, no learning" and NOT ''No interactivity, no learning. | PhIV/B & C |
| C.O.H. | And RESP ONSIVENESS does not even imply people (teachers or other learners). A good book is "responsive"-it anticipates and responds to my "searchlight"-and when it doesn't respond, that is often equally suggestive!- | PHIV/C |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Phase V: Application** |  |
| G.K. | To summarize this rebuttal ... I think the preceding discussion indicates that it is not interaction that matters but responsiveness. | PHV/A |
| C.O’H | I am disappointed that there bas been no response, pro or con, to G.K.'s significant statement that "it is not interaction that matters but responsiveness." I think this is important because the "positive" school has sought to include just about every possible exchange between teacher and learner as an interaction-including ''feedback," ... They have tried to make responsiveness look like "interaction" ... | PHV/A |
| C.O’H | Responsiveness and activity I believe accommodates a much wider range of learning styles and learning facilitation that the interaction-positive lobby would suggest. And, most important keeps that focus on the learner and how he or she learns. Which might of course sometimes, but not necessarily, involve interpersonal interaction | PHV/A |
| B.B. | As I read through the remarkably thoughtful postings of this debate, I believe there is broad agreement that interaction is valuable and that its value is a function both of a particular student's needs and the dispositions, as well as a function of the type of learning aspired to. There are, however, several underlying areas of genuine difference, and if not as large as we might have thought at the outset, they are nonetheless significant. | PHV/A |
| B.B. | I believe the following are among these:  1. The appeal to a constructivist theory of knowledge, according to which "knowledge is constructed through social negotiation" comes perilously close to proving the essential value of interaction by mere definition. Adopting the premise that interaction is essential to the construction of knowledge forecloses a key issue in advance ...We would be better served to recognize the potential contribution of interaction and focus attention upon trying to articulate meaningful distinctions between different types of knowledge or learning and assess the importance of interaction (or specific types of interaction) to each. There are a number of pointers to such distinctions already implicit in this debate ... | PHV/B |
| S.L.C. | In the past two days, you who are contributing to this conversation have made me stop and think about "interaction." I guess you'd call that "learning." Without your thoughts this would not have happened. I think this signifies the importance of "interaction" to learning. | PHV/C  (meta  cognition) |
| B.B. | Prior postings here establish clearly that not every student necessarily  benefits (from interaction ), while, as G.K. points out. the costs can be more than at first appears. This is especially true considering the ...  It would appear that most of the research cited in this discussion focuses upon how students report feeling about the effect of interaction on the quality of their educational experience. G.K.'s suggestion that perception may be what's important here, makes me think that what would be most helpful is some good data on the actual use of alternative modes of interaction by students . . . None of which is to say that lots of interaction is not a good thing. Only that it is never free and perhaps not always worth the cost. Thanks to S.A. at Napier, whose earlier posting stimulated this line of  thought. | PHV/C |