

5 The Postmodern Dialogue and the Ethics of Digital Based Learning

David Kergel

Abstract

The article discusses the ethics of digital learning. Starting point is a postmodern understanding of communication and the dialogue as idealimage of postmodern communication. The dialogue can be considered as postmodern ethics in communicative practice. Such a communicative practice is defined by a 'decentral' and 'polydirectional' dimension of communication. Web 2.0 tools provide the media-structure to realize a digital based postmodern dialogue. Formulated the other way round: the media structure of Web 2.0 tools bears ethical implications: The polydirectional and decentral structure of Web 2.0 media enables a postmodern dialogue – one might speak of the ethical implications of Web 2.0 tools. Consequently, E-Learning 2.0 which bases on Web 2.0 tools bear ethical implications. For the E-Learning practice, one challenge is, to transfer such theoretical reflections into learning-scenarios, which meet the requirements of a postmodern dialogue. As a proposal for such a transfer from theory-to-practice, a best practice example for a Web 2.0 based learning-scenario will be provided.

Keywords: E-Learning 2.0, Web 2.0, Dialogue, Postmodern thinking, Communication, Polydirectional, Constructive feedback

5.1 How to Act? Ethics and Normative Communication

As a field of philosophy, ethics focusses on questions according to which rules, norms, values people should arrange their actions as well as their relations to others. In contrast to logic, epistemology and metaphysics, ethics discusses concrete actions and their moral implications (Copp, 2006). As branch of practical philosophy, one essential feature of (normative) ethics is that it defines communication strategies. From this point of view, ethics can provide orientationpattern for every day life, giving profound answers to the question 'how to act?' According to this applied dimension of ethics, Copp formulates typical normative ethical questions – 'What kind of actions are right or wrong? What kind of person should one be?' (Copp, 2006, p. 18). These guiding questions point to the social dimension of ethics. As mentioned before, one crucial task of ethical reflection is the discussion of communication: Communication can be considered as a basal factor of social life as it signifies social interaction processes. In the course of interaction processes 'communion' (community) is performatively constructed – communication constitutes a community. Ethics discuss how communication processes should be organized and thus how actors of a communication based community should interact which each other (for a more detailed overview see Nykanen, Ole, & Zeller, 2013 and Newton, 2013).

Ethical considerations have an normative perspective on communication processes and define values/norms for these processes. From this point of view it is possible to distinguish ethics by the way they define communication – e.g. the categorical imperative requires other forms of communication as Levinas concept of the Other (Kergel, 2015a). The following

subsection sets a focus on a postmodern understanding of communication and the dialogue as the ideal image of postmodern communication.

5.2 The Dialogue as Postmodern Ethics in Communicative Practice

5.2.1 *Metanarrations as Features of Modern Thought*

The notion 'postmodern' emerged within the 1930s-1940s. Until today it possesses various definitional approaches (see Al-Rodhan & Stoudmann, 2006). Basically, the notion signifies the state of a society after its modern phase. This modern phase bases among other on so-called 'modern' thought. Modern thought 'believes' in rationality and a rationality based societal progress. Postmodern thinking challenges this kind of modern thought: One main criticism of postmodern thinking centers the totalitarian implications of modern thinking. According to this criticism, a modern worldview tends to subject phenomena/social processes etc. to one coherent explanation model – so called 'metanarrations'. A metanarration can be defined as a 'totalizing' explanation model which enables to order and schematize diverse phenomena which appear. It has the function of an explanation model or scheme which gives meaning to everything, makes out of a past a history (gives past events a meaning) and predicts the future. From this point of view, metanarrations constitute a totalizing meaning and claim to possess the truth. The truth claims of a metanarration provides the legitimation of a society or group and their value-system. One problem is that there is more than only one metanarration and that they contradictory exist besides each other – for example Western Democracy/Civil Society versus Marxist-Leninist conceptions of society. The truth claims of the metanarrations are in conflict with each other. Actors, who represent metanarrations do not enter into a dialogue with an actor who is representing another metanarration. Instead of referring to each other in a tolerant, respectful manner, the truth claims of a metanarration are defended. From this point of view, modern thinking leads to a confrontative communication, wherein the interlocutors are trying to establish the truth claim of their metanarration.

5.2.2 *Pluralism and Diversity as Features of Postmodern Thought*

Postmodern thinking can be understood as a point of view which problematize the dysfunctional aspects of 'modern' communication which are caused by the confrontative communication between metanarrations. Thus, one essential feature of 'postmodern' thinking is that it suspends the truth claims of metanarrations: "Simplifying to the extreme, I define postmodern as incredulity toward metanarratives [...] The narrative function is losing its functors, its great hero, its great dangers, its great voyages, its great goal. It is being dispersed in clouds of narrative language elements" (Lyotard, 1979, p. xxiv).

To sum it up, it can be said that postmodern criticism addresses the truth claims of metanarrations and is defined by a skepticism towards the idea of a totalizing unity and concept of incontestable truth claims. Postmodern thinking is still modern, because it bases on rationality. But it is 'post' because it detaches from the truth claims of modern metanarrations. One might say, that to live in a postmodern world means that one lives in a world without an universal truth (for the complex background of the notion postmodern see Harvey, 2000). One consequence of the loss of incontestable truth claims is that diverse

interpretations of the world have to be considered as equal. Postmodern thinking is defined by a rational based meaningful and at the same time tolerant apprehension/perception of the world. One can stick to narrations to interpret the world, to understand the diverse phenomena which appear and social processes which take place in a society. But the interpretation of reality, in which one gives things a meaning and thus constructs narrations, has to be accompanied by the awareness that there exist other world views. These other worldviews have to be acknowledged as equal. The legitimacy of other narrations of reality, the equivalent appreciation of other interpretations are basic requirements of postmodern thinking (and also goals of a postmodern orientated education, Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991, p. 110; Kergel, 2015b). From this point of view pluralism and diversity are features of postmodernism. "Educationally, the art of creating and choosing is more important than ordering and following." (Koo Hok-chun, 2002, p. 58)

5.2.3 *The Dialogue as Idealimage of Postmodern Communication*

According to postmodern thinking, communication should be based on tolerant appreciation: The tolerant appreciation and the acceptance of diversity are the preconditions of a postmodern dialogue with other narrations and their cultural manifestations (other myths, rites etc.). Another ethical premise of communication in the sense of postmodern thinking is that every interlocutor considers the dialog partner, his understanding and experience of reality as equivalent to his own: On the ground of such a mutuality, a dialogue can take place. In such a dialogue a critical reflection of narrations should be realized. The postmodern epistemological skepticism towards truth claims manifests besides the appreciation of other narrations in an infinite rational based challenging of 'believes' about how the world is organized. The meaning of the world is questioned within dialogical interaction: Therefore postmodern thinking is defined by a critical challenging of all prefigured and seemingly indisputable positions. Lyotard illustrates this 'attitude' with reference to the modern development of art:

What then, is the postmodern? What place does it or does it not occupy in the vertiginous work of the questions hurled at the rules of image and narration? It is undoubtedly a part of the modern. All that has been received, if only yesterday [...] must be suspected. What space does Cézanne challenge? The Impressionists'. What object do Picasso and Braque attack? Cézanne's. What presupposition does Duchamp break with in 1912? [...] In an amazing acceleration, the generations precipitate themselves. A work can become modern only if it is first postmodern. (Lyotard, 1979, p. 79).

With reference to these considerations one could raise the thesis that the communication structure of the postmodern challenging possesses the structure of a dialogue.

5.2.4 *The Communicative Structure of a Dialogue*

As a communication process, the dialogue is defined by the way, in which interlocutors interact with each other. In a dialogue interlocutors confer with each other in a tolerant, rational, and open-minded manner. With reference to Habermas one can identify three criteria which define a dialogue. Such criteria or 'validity claims' are 'truth', 'rightness', and 'truthfulness'. These validity claims are made by the protagonist when s/he engages in dialogue:

- an utterance is used to refer to something in the world (truth),

- s/he establishes a legitimate intersubjective relation (rightness),
- and expresses intentions (truthfulness).

In his concept of communicative action Habermas stresses the rationally based and tolerant structure of communication (Habermas, 1984): “This approach is coined by the intention to provide a strategy [...] how actors in a society could reach a common understanding. And [...] how this actors could be enabled to coordinate rational and consensus based cooperate actions” (Habermas, 1984, p. 86). Fundamental to this strategy is dialogical interaction, which ensures an open-minded and equal exchange of opinions, ideas, and worldviews. Premise of such a communication process is that every interlocutor has equal rights:

Only if there is a symmetrical distribution of the opportunities for all possible participants to choose and perform speech acts does the structure of communication itself produce no constraints. Not only are dialogue roles then universally interchangeable, but there is in effect also an equality of opportunities to take these roles, that is to perform speech acts’ (Habermas, 2001, p. 98).

These requirements of equality within interactions can be considered as an ethical premise of a postmodern dialogue. The dialogical interaction is defined by the reciprocal assumption that the interlocutor is open minded as oneself. From this perspective a dialogue requires trust to establish an open-minded relation. Such a dialogue can be considered as challenging: “Challenging because engaging in dialogue entails trusting others with personal experiences and reflections” (Kelly, 2014, p. 58).

In dialogical interactions different worldviews meet. The postmodern dimension of a dialogue entails the discussions/critical analysis of truth claims. The mutual open-minded recognition provides the precondition for dialogical interaction, in which the truth claims can be tested/evaluated through discourses. The parties deliberately discuss the truth of a matter on equal terms. In a such a dialogical interaction the own worldview is at stake: “Dialogue, by its nature, is a type of conversation that challenges people to enhance their understanding of themselves and others by sharing and reflecting on deeply held beliefs and values” (Kelly, 2014, p. 55). The infinite challenging of the own worldview prevents the worldview to become a totalizing meaning with incontestable truth claims. The skepticism of postmodern thinking is thus re-produced. Already Socrates point to the challenges which arise from a dialogue partner. He expressed the challenging impact of dialogical practice in a socio-political dimension when he stated:

For if you kill me you will not easily find another like me, who, if I may use such a ludicrous figure of speech, am a sort of a gadfly, given to the State by the God; and the State is like a great and noble steed who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size, and requires to be stirred into life. I am that gadfly which God has given the State, and all day long and in all places am always fastening upon you, arousing and persuading and reproaching you [...] I dare say that you may feel irritated at being suddenly awakened when you are caught napping; and you may think that if you were to strike me dead [...] then you would sleep on the remainder of your lives, unless God in his care of you gives you another gadfly. (Plato, 1899, p. 25)

A dialogue enables a critical challenge of all prefigured and seemingly indisputable meanings – an effect of this dialogical critical challenge is that new perspectives on the world, new meaning-patterns can be discursively constructed. Challenging the own worldview means also to wider the perspective and discover new meaning-patterns. These meaning-patterns can be in turn dialogically challenged.

To sum it up, it can be said that via a dialogue, conventionalized thinking patterns are put into question, traditional principles and established worldviews can be evaluated. A dialogue

requires open-minded acceptance of diversity. Only such an acceptance makes it possible to enter into a tolerant exchange with other worldviews/narrations. From this point of view the dialogue can be considered as the ethical practice of postmodern thinking: A rationally based, tolerant, and open-minded dialogue helps us to gain new perspectives on the world. Via the dialogue we can discover new worldviews – and thus construct new knowledge. The dialogical discussion of worldviews lead to the construction of new perspectives – a process which can also be theorized as learning (cf. Kergel & Heidkamp, 2015). The dialogue is at the same time an ethical concept as well as a concept of postmodern learning: “Post-modern education mediates/ teaches post-modern skepticism and implements the epistemological skepticism within intercultural encounters” (Kergel, 2015b, p. 1192). The ongoing media change enables a dialogical learning in the postmodern sense of the term. The polydirectional possibilities of so-called Web 2.0 media open up the space for a digital based dialogical learning. To elaborate on this thesis, the next subsection discusses, whether the Web 2.0 provides the structure for a digital based postmodern dialogue. In this context, we refer to the concepts of E-Learning 2.0 and Connectivism. Both approaches are strategies to implement the postmodern dialogue into E-Learning contexts.

5.3 Web 2.0 and E-Learning 2.0

5.3.1 *Web 2.0 – the Redefinition of Mass Media in the Digital Age*

The emergence of so-called ‘User Generated Content Technology’ (Lehr, 2012) provides the possibility that users can become interactively involved in the internet. User Generated Content Technology permits the users to produce easily content. They can ‘inscribe’ themselves on the internet. Via Web 2.0 tools users are able to produce an interpretation of the world through blogs, wikis, and podcasts. Social networks sites like Facebook and Google+ provide a platform for internet based interactions and via some clicks the users can write articles on Wikipedia. New forms of digital based communication arise – a.o. the users can communicate with each other instantly. The possibilities of Web 2.0 technology mean that the users are able – at least potentially – to enter into a dialogue with other users. O’Reilly (2006) termed this polydirectional internet the Web 2.0. With the Web 2.0 a user-centered internet, based on polydirectional communication is evolving.

The media change of the Web 2.0 leads to a redefinition of the notion mass media. Former mass media such like the television were defined as mass media, because they could reach a mass of individuals. The individuals functioned as receivers and could not answer the sent message. This definition of mass media is limited to an unidirectional understanding of communication. Due to the lack of dialogical structure, such an understanding of mass media corresponds with a non-dialogical structure of metanarrations which spread their message (cf. Baudrillard, 1972). In the context of the digital age, a mass media is defined by the fact that a ‘mass’ of people can communicate via media in a polydirectional way with each other. In contrast to an unidirectional orientation of mass media, Web 2.0 tools need the users as producers of content. Consequently, the receiver who answers the message turns into a sender. Without the interactive dialogical dynamic, Web 2.0 tools such like wikis can not unfold their polydirectional potential – the Wikipedia concept of a collaborative validation of articles requires a partner in dialogue. The individual can thus become part of a collective

process of knowledge construction. From this perspective the media change is more than simply a technical issue. With the new technologies new structures of communication emerge. The dawning digital age effects new forms of communication and therewith new forms of teaching and learning. This has led media educational researcher Stephen Downes (2005) to understand the new digital possibilities as a social revolution: "For all this technology, what is important to recognize is, that the emergence of the Web 2.0 is not a technological revolution, it is a social revolution" (Downes, 2005, para. 26).

5.3.2 E-Learning 2.0 and Connctivism – The Postmodern Dialogue in Educational Contexts

E-learning can employ the dialogical, online based orientation of the Web 2.0. With his programmatic article "E-Learning 2.0", Downes (2005) formulated an approach which transfers the polydirectional communication possibilities of the Web 2.0 into E-Learning contexts – "And now, e-learning is evolving with the World Wide Web as a whole and it's changing to a degree significant enough to warrant a new name: E-learning 2.0" (Downes, 2007, para.2).

This approach uses the polydirectional dimension of the Web 2.0 for online based learning processes. The E-Learning 2.0 approach empowers the learner to become more dialogically productive in E-Learning scenarios (*cf.* Martin & Noakes, 2012). The E-Learner 2.0 is not only a recipient of media content but produces media content via dialogical interactions. From this point of view, the process of producing media content in the course of dialogical interactions is a crucial part of the learning process – for example, when hypotheses are formulated and discussed via blog posts. The implementation of dialogue based E-Learning needs to employ Web 2.0 technologies.

In his concept of 'Connectivism', Siemens (2004) point to the dialogical aspects of modern E-Learning. Siemens thereby seeks to provide a theoretical learning model for the digital age:

Behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism are the three broad learning theories most often utilized in the creation of instructional environments. These theories, however, were developed in a time when learning was not impacted through technology. Over the last twenty years, technology has reorganized how we live, how we communicate, and how we learn. Learning needs and theories that describe learning principles and processes, should be reflective of underlying social environments. (Siemens, 2004, p. 1, for a critical approach towards Siemens interpretation of learning theories see Jones, 2015)

In encounters and interaction processes the learner can produce dialogical knowledge. These encounters/interactions processes are conceptualised as 'nodes'. For Siemens, learning "is a process of connecting specialized node or information sources" (Siemens 2004, 5). And Şahin (2012) stresses that "[i]n Connectivism, learning occurs when a learner connects to a learning community and feeds information into it" (Şahin, 2012, p. 442). According to the concept of Connectivism, one principle is that "Learning and knowledge rests in diversity of opinions." (Siemens, 2004, para. 27). It is not about to produce a totalizing worldview but to exchange knowledge und to produce knowledge in the course of dialogical interaction processes. One purposive idea of such an learning process is decision-making in the pragmatic sense of the term:

Decision-making is itself a learning process. Choosing what to learn and the meaning of incoming information is seen through the lens of a shifting reality. While there is a right answer now, it may be wrong tomorrow due to alterations in the information climate affecting the decision. (Siemens, 2004, p. 5)

With reference to postmodern thinking, such an understanding of decision-making can be

interpreted as the substitution of truth claims through the acknowledgement that we are living in a 'shifting reality'. To cope with the 'shifting reality', dialogical based interactions might help, to produce a multi-perspective interpretation towards this shifting reality – instead of sticking to one metanarration and its truth claims.

From this perspective the media structure of the Web 2.0 and the dialogical implications of an E-Learning 2.0 correspond with the ethical aspects of postmodern thinking/postmodern communication. The dialogue as prototype of postmodern communication requires to acknowledge other worldviews and to evaluate in rational based interactions truth claims. In the course of such an interaction, knowledge is produced. The media structure of the Web 2.0 enables to establish an E-Learning 2.0 which bases on the premise of an dialogical connecting. The learners can produce in a dialogue orientation-patterns within a 'shifting reality' – and thus put truth claims into question. One can raise the thesis that the polydirectional potential of the Web 2.0 and the unfolding of this potential within learning contexts through the concept of E-Learning 2.0 is the realization of the idealimage of the postmodern dialogue in higher education.

One challenge is, to transfer such theoretical reflections in appropriate E-Learning 2.0 scenarios, which meet the requirements of a postmodern dialogue. In the following subchapter, a best practice example for such an E-Learning 2.0 scenario will be introduced.

5.3.3 *The Postmodern Dialogue in Educational Practice: The Web 2.0 based constructive Feedback*

The following best practice example has been developed within the field of higher education. The best practice example uses Web 2.0 tools to implement an online based dialogical structure. This dialogical structure is realized via feedback-processes. It has been applied in context of inquiry based learning 2.0. Inquiry based learning 2.0 is an approach which combines elements of inquiry based learning with elements of E-Learning 2.0 (Kergel, 2014).

The presented best practice example combines inquiry based learning with a formative feedback by other students and is often used in inquiry based learning 2.0 scenarios (Kergel & Heidkamp, 2015). The students are organized in research groups. Each research group is asked to develop a research question and a study outline. They should collect and interpret data and finally present their research results. Every research group has the task to present their outcomes on a so-called Seminarblog – a Wordpress based, Web 2.0 learning platform. At the same time, every research group has to provide a feedback on the outcomes of an other research group.

Via the constructive feedback every phase of the research process accompanied by a dialogical discussion of the research. This approach ensures the dialogical structure of scientific inquiry.

As an example of how the constructive feedback can be used in an online based learning scenario, the course 'Das Ich und das Netz – subjektorientiertes e-Learning in Theorie und Praxis' ('The I and the Net – subject-orientated E-Learning in Theory and Practice') will be introduced (the course took place summer term 2014 at the pedagogical Institute of the Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg). This course was organized as an online based learning scenario. Each research group presented their results and provided their constructive

feedback online via the Seminarblog. The students had been divided into three research teams. Each research team was tasked with producing an essay. Each research team should,

- develop an own research question for the essay,
- develop a structure for the essay,
- write the essay.

All these tasks were accompanied by a constructive peer feedback from another research team. The outcomes of each phase (developing a research question, developing a structure for the essay, and writing the essay) was uploaded to the Seminarblog. The constructive feedback in each phase was provided via the commenting function of the blog. After a research team has received the constructive feedback to their work, the research team was asked to list the three main points of the received constructive feedback. Via this strategy a dialogical, online based interaction between the research teams could be secured. The constructive feedback turned the essay into a collaborative text. The reviewers inscribed themselves via their feedback in the text and a postmodern multiperspective exchange could be established.

This online based interaction ensured the quality of the essay during the different phases. A further advantage of this online based, dialogically structured inquiry based learning 2.0 is that each student experience both perspectives: the perspective as a reviewer and as recipient of a constructive feedback. As simultaneous recipients and reviewers, they hone the dialogical process from different points of view.

The course described above was a pilot course. Due to the character as pilot course a formative evaluation was carried out for the whole length of the course. At different phases, the students were surveyed in a questionnaire based survey whereby semi-standardized open questions were used (questions which can be answered without prefigured, implied, or explicitly presented choices). The students were asked how they experienced the collaborative work process in its different phases (the evaluation design was orientated at Dalsgaard [2005] concept of 'theoretically grounded evaluation', Kergel, 2015c). This evaluation process was accompanied by exploratory interviews with two students. The results of the exploratory interviews allowed to adjust the semi-standardized questions of the evaluation to the needs/perspectives of the students. The evaluation questions thematized mainly the self-awareness of the learner within a collaborative, dialogical oriented E-Learning 2.0 process which implemented the constructive feedback. Via this evaluation concept the dynamics of a dialogical based E-Learning 2.0 process could be reconstructed. In the following main results of the evaluation are listed in a synoptic overview (for a more detailed and systematic presentation of the evaluation results see Kergel & Heidkamp 2015): All students appreciated the requirement to provide feedback because... *'One is forced to think about the work of the other students'*.

In response to the question of whether they would prefer to give constructive feedback within a group or alone, all students preferred to provide constructive feedback in a group: *'The reason is that the collaborative feedback provided a more profound understanding of the work to be reviewed'*.

Receiving feedback put the students in a position to 'understand one's own work more deeply and sharpen and structure it'. To 'receive feedback helps to better locate one's own work'.

Formulating constructive feedback appropriately, particularly critical points, was experienced as a challenge: *'To put critical points in a friendly way is quite hard'*. The significant degree of self-regulation and independent organization was mostly experienced as a *'relief'* – *'one is usually forced into very pre-structured courses in Bachelor's as well as Master's studies. The organization process can be complicated but encourages more active participation in the course'*.

The intrinsic motivation as an effect of required independent organization of the own research overlapped with the intrinsic motivation resulting from the content orientated requirement to develop an own essay topic: the process of learning/knowledge creation was experienced as more *'deep and profound'* due to the freely chosen topic of the essay: *'I can apply myself more actively because I can write about things which I am interested in'*.

The students felt appreciated and respected as dialogue partners. The feedback testified to the relevance of their position as being worthy of statement: *'somebody was really interested in my/our work'*.

The Web 2.0 based constructive feedback turned the students into dialogue-partners. With process of producing and reviewing an essay, a postmodern process of knowledge creation emerged and realized the postmodern communication via the polydirectional media structure of the Web 2.0.

References

- Al-Rodhan, N. R. F., & Stoudmann, G. (2006). Definitions of globalization: A comprehensive overview and a proposed definition. Doi: 10.1.1.472.4772&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
- Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Postmodern education: Politics, culture, and social*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baudrillard (1972). Requiem for the Media. URL: http://shmacek.faculty.noctrl.edu/Courses/MediaCritSyllabusSPR2_files/19-baudrillard-03.pdf. Last accessed: 3 May 2017.
- Copp, D. (2006). Introduction: Metaethics and normative ethics. In D. Copp (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (pp. 3–35). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dalsgaard, C. (2005). Pedagogical quality in e-Learning. *Eleed* 1(1). URL: <https://eleed.campussource.de/archive/1/78>. Last accessed: 3 May 2017.
- Downes, S. (2005). E-Learning 2.0. *E-learn-magazine* 1(10). URL: <http://www.elearnmag.org/subpage.cfm?section=articles&article=29-1>. Last accessed: 3 May 2017.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *Theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon Press
- Harvey, D. (2000). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Hoboken: Wiley & sons.
- Jones, C. (2015). *Networked Learning – An Educational Paradigm for the Age of Digital Networks*. Wiesbaden: VS Springer.
- Kelly, U. (2014). Studying Dialogue – Studying Dialogue – Some Reflections. *Journal of Dialogue Studies* 1(1), 51–62.
- Kergel, D. (2014). Forschendes Lernen 2.0 – lerntheoretische Fundierung und Good Practice. In O. Zawacki-Richter, D. Kergel, N. Kleinfeld, P. Muckel, J. Stöter, & K. Brinkmann (Eds.), *Teaching Trends 14. Offen für neue Wege: Digitale Medien in der Hochschule* (pp. 37–50). Münster: Waxmann.

- Kergel, D. (2015a). Exclusion Ethics: Towards an 'Episteme-critical' Approach. In J. Pelkey & L. G. Sbrocchi (Eds.), *Semotics 2014. Yearbook of the Semiotic Society of America* (pp. 379-387). Toronto: Legas.
- Kergel, D. (2015b). Semiotics of Western Education. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *International Handbook of Semiotics* (pp. 1185-1197). Heidelberg: VS Springer.
- Kergel, D. (2015c). Strategien zur Qualitätssicherung für ein forschendes Lernen mit digitalen Medien. In *Hamburger eLearn Magazin* 14, S. 18-21. URL: <https://www.uni-hamburg.de/elearning/hamburger-elearning-magazin-14.pdf>. Last accessed: 31 May 2017.
- Kergel, D. & Heidkamp, B. (2015). *Forschendes Lernen mit digitalen Medien. Ein Lehrbuch. #theorie #praxis #evaluation*. Münster: Waxmann.
- Koo Hok-chun, D. (2002). Quality education through a post-modern curriculum. *Hong Kong Teacher's Centre Journal* 1, 56-73.
- Lehr, C. (2012). *Web 2.0 in der universitären Lehre. Ein Handlungsrahmen für die Gestaltung technologiegestützter Lernszenarien*. Boizenburg: Vwh.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Martin, M., & Noakes, M. (2012). Fostering a Web 2.0 Ethos in a Traditional e-Learning Environment. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning* 10(3), 283-292.
- Newton, L. (2013). Ethical decision making: Introduction to cases and concepts in ethics. Heidelberg: VS Springer.
- Nykanen, H., Riis, O., & Zeller, J. (2013). *Theoretical & applied ethics*. Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.
- O'Reilly, T. (2006). Web 2.0 Compact Definition: Trying Again. URL: <http://radar.oreilly.com/archives/2006/12/web-20-compact.html>. Last accessed: 3 May 2017.
- Plato (1899). *Dialogues of Plato. Containing the apology of Socrates, Crito, Phaedo and Protogoras*. New York: Colonial Press.
- Şahin, M. (2012). Pros and cons of connectivism as a learning theory. *International Journal of Physical and Social Sciences* 2(4), 437-454.
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning* 2(1), 3-10.

Authorinformation (Chapter I)

Heidkamp, Birte, M.A.

E-Learning Centre of the Rhine-Waal University of Applied Sciences

Research focus: e-Education, e-Research, Research on Media-Education, Qualitative Research in Education and Learning

Web: www.learningcultures.me

E-mail: birte.heidkamp@hochschule-rhein-waal.de

Address: Hochschule Rhein-Waal, Friedrich-Heinrich-Allee 25, 47475 Kamp-Lintfort

Kergel, David, Ph.D.

Habitussensitive Teaching and Learning, HAWK Hildesheim

Research focus: Research on Precarity, e-Education, Qualitative Research in Education and Learning

Web: www.learningcultures.me

E-mail: david.kergel@hawk-hhg.de

Address: HAWK Hildesheim, Gorschentor 1, 31134 Hildesheim, Germany

Rachwał, Tadeusz, Prof., Ph.D.

SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw

Research focus: critical theory, philosophy of language,

Web: <https://www.swps.pl/>

E-mail: trachwal@swps.edu.pl

Address: SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Chodakowska 19/31, 03815 Warsaw, Poland