

This is a post-print version of the following article:

Rapanta, C., Maina, M., Lotz, N., & Bacchelli, A. (2013). Team design communication patterns in e-learning design and development. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 61(4), 581-605. doi:10.1007/s11423-013-9306-5

The final publication is available at Springer via <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11423-013-9306-5>

### **Team Design Communication Patterns in e-Learning Design and Development**

Chrysi Rapanta<sup>÷</sup>, Marcelo Maina<sup>⊥</sup>, Nicole Schadewitz<sup>±</sup>, Alberto Bacchelli<sup>÷</sup>

<sup>÷</sup>Università della Svizzera italiana, via Buffi 13, 6900, Lugano, Switzerland\*

<sup>⊥</sup>Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, eLearnCenter, Roc Boronat 117, 08018, Barcelona, Spain

<sup>±</sup>The Open University, The Design Group, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK

#### Authors Note

Chrysi Rapanta holds a Phd in Communication sciences from the Università della Svizzera italiana. She is currently an Assistant Professor of Business Communications at Zayed University, Dubai. Her research interests include computer-supported collaborative learning, design, and argumentation.

Marcelo Maina is Lecturer in Learning Design at the Open University of Catalonia (UOC), Spain. He holds a PhD in Knowledge and Information Society from UOC. His research interests are related to technology innovation design for learning, and to design methodology.

Nicole Schadewitz is Lecturer in Design at the Open University, UK. She holds a PhD in Design from the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Her research interests cover design processes across cultures and domains, and design patterns.

Alberto Bacchelli is a Phd candidate at the Università della Svizzera italiana, Faculty of Informatics. His research interests include human factors in software engineering, mining software repositories, unstructured data mining, and computer-supported collaborative work.

\*Corresponding author: Chrysi Rapanta, (current address) c/o College of Business, Zayed University, Dubai, P.O. BOX 19282, United Arab Emirates  
E-mail: chrysi.rapanta@zu.ac.ae

### Abstract

Prescriptive stage models have been found insufficient to describe the dynamic aspects of designing, especially in interdisciplinary e-learning project teams. There is a growing need for a systematic empirical analysis of team design processes that offer deeper and more detailed insights into Instructional Design (ID) than general models can offer. In this paper we detail findings that emerged from two case studies of team design meetings in the development of totally online courses at two well-established European Distance Universities. We applied an activity-based approach to an extended verbal protocol dataset. This method proved to be adequate to describe the emerging team design process by taking into account both cognitive and social aspects of team activity in this specific context. Our findings provide evidence that design is *more than problem solving*, mainly because the design process is strongly related to the communication process in a team. Some interesting *patterns of designing* emerge, which shed light on the still implicit nature of ID performed by teams. We conclude by presenting guidelines and skills for team designing in the complex field of e-learning.

*Keywords:* Instructional design, e-learning, team communication, patterns, case study

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

### Team Design Communication Patterns in e-Learning Design and Development

Empirical research is essential to understand how design actually takes place. It can be conducted both as a direct and indirect observation of experience. In the ID field, several studies have empirically investigated the issue of how designers actually design (Kenny, Zhang, Schwier, & Campbell, 2005; Bichelmeyer, Misanchuk, & Malopinsky, 2001; Gibbons, 2003; Liu, Gibby, Quiros, & Demps, 2002). As a main observation, Kenny et al. (2005) claim: “ID models are useful to designers and inform practice, but few if any designers actually *use* models to confine their practice” (p. 9). The same was also reported by Tessmer and Wedman (1995), who explain that most ID models propose what designers should do, but these prescriptions are typically not followed in practice. In a more recent study, Cox and Osguthorpe (2003) were interested in identifying the ADDIE stages, as if they were types of potential activities that instructional designers would engage in during their practice. Their survey showed that only 47% of ID practice consisted of design tasks, whereas the rest 53% was focusing on organizational tasks, not included in the ADDIE model.

Another group of empirical studies in the ID field focuses on the skills that expert instructional designers show in their work. On the one hand, some researchers focus on the type of problem solving involved in designing instructional material. Given the particularly ill-defined nature of ID (Jonassen, 2002), no one-way problem solution path is appropriate. Instead, expert instructional designers represent problems as deep and rich casual networks of many links (Rowland, 1992), and more as challenges rather than constraints to overcome (Ertmer et al., 2008). Other researchers focus on both cognitive and social aspects of designing, thus giving a primary position to communication and to the relation building process between designers (e.g. Allen, 1996; Cox & Osguthorpe, 2003) or between designers, clients, and subject matter

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

experts (Dicks & Ives, 2008). Nevertheless, very few studies focus on the emerging dynamics among the members of an e-learning design team (e.g. Botturi & Del Percio, 2009).

In the light of these findings, ADDIE and similar models can be described as conceptual frameworks for practice (Bichelmeyer, 2004; Kenny et al., 2005; van Rooij, 2011), but they do not offer specific guidelines for the actual design decision-making process. The goal of this research is to provide an empirical method and application of this method to demonstrate how decisions are taken by an interdisciplinary team of instructional designers in the field of e-learning. We do that by identifying team patterns, meaning sequences of recurrent behaviour in design teams that lead to positive outcomes. As patterns describe small and contextualized “chunks” of behaviour, we consider them a valid approach to guide team design process rather than larger abstract prescriptive process models (Conole et al, 2008; Dimitriadis, Goodyear, & Retalis, 2009). In the following section, we will present the passage from the conceptualization of design as a process to its definition on the basis of concrete activities, which form the component units of a pattern. Right after, we will present the exact goals and questions of this development article, followed by an extensive Method section. Towards the end, we will present initial observations and results that emerge from the application of our patterns-based approach to two case studies. We will conclude with concrete guidelines and recommendation for e-learning design practice in teams.

### **Literature Review: From Design as Process to Design as Activity**

ID is mainly viewed as a problem solving (Molenda & Boling, 2008; Smith & Boling, 2009) or as an inquiry process (Garrison & Anderson, 2003). The idea of design as problem solving is situated in the cognitive paradigm of symbolic information processing (Simon, 1969). Under this view, “everyone designs who devises course of

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones” (Simon, 1969, p. 111).

To limit this overly generic definition, and in order to distinguish design from non-design processes, a number of conceptual models describing design in a specific context have been proposed. The most known are: (a) The design task environment approach (Goel & Pirolli, 1989), which introduces two additional factors to the problem-solving process, namely *time* and *world's feedback*; (b) the meta-design approach (Fischer & Scharff, 2000), which introduces users as a main mediator between design time and use time; and (c) the rapid prototyping approach, broadly used in the ID field (Tripp & Bichelmeyer, 1990), in which prototypes are the main catalyst of communication between the components of a design system. Such approaches are valuable, as they tend to integrate the technical, cognitive, and social aspects of design (MacMillan, Steele, Austin, Kirby, & Spence, 2001). However, the relation between these aspects remains unclear, which is what would serve designers in their interaction with others and with the design object and components.

The idea of design as an inquiry process is mainly inspired by the “reflection in action” approach (Schön, 1983) that was proposed after the SIP paradigm and continues to influence Design research in several ways. For Schön, design is not a rational search process, but a reflective conversation with the design situation. Moreover, in design thinking, activities of doing and thinking are equally integrated and dependent factors: “doing and thinking are complementary [...]. Each feeds the other, and each sets boundaries for the other” (Schön, 1983; p. 280). Schön proposes 4 main activities describing this “thinking-doing” process: framing, naming, moving, and evaluating. One of the main contributions of Schön’s theory has been the shift of focus from problem solving to *problem setting*. Moreover, he suggests that such problem framing is not linear, but passes through spirals of reframing, as the situation talks back to the

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

designer (Schön, 1983). The reflective approach of design gives emphasis on the interaction between the elements of design; however, what makes this interaction dynamic, continuous, and efficient is not sufficiently addressed. Also, the ways in which this interaction is manifested are a priori defined in terms of phases that follow one another.

Subsequently, the focus in Design research has gradually moved from conceiving design as a process that can be a priori defined and described, to identifying the concrete activities that take place during this process (Cross, Christiaans, & Dorst, 1996). Moreover, these activities shape the nature and structure of the design process. In general, there are two types of design activities: The ones that manage the evolution of a design problem into design solution(s), and the ones that manage the design process as the design evolves (Sim & Duffy, 2003). The former belongs to what is defined as exploration of the “design space,” whereas the latter refers to the management aspects of design, should we call it “management space.” Moreover, drawing on Activity theory (Engeström, 1987), any activity that takes place either within the design or the management space needs a concrete design object in order to be defined. Figure 1 shows the main generic components of a design activity.




Figure 1. A generic representation of design activity.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

Apart from this generally accepted view of design as an activity, few efforts have been made to define the specific aspects or structure of the design space or the management space activity, either in individual or in team settings. Since we were interested in identifying the nature of design as it actually emerges throughout team activity, we reviewed studies that combine the following characteristics: (a) They focus on design empirically, i.e. as it actually takes place, (b) they perceive design as a result of teamwork, and (c) they propose some specific categorizations to approach their research focus, being that the design space, the management space, and/or the design object. In sum, we reviewed representative development studies that propose analytical categories to describe at least one of the three entities previously mentioned, as they actually emerge during team design in any field. The results of the review are presented on a synoptic table (Table 1).

Based on the nature of the activities and objects proposed, we observe that some of the studies presented in Table 1 address the design space (e.g. studies 3, 4, 6, 12), some address the management space (e.g. studies 2, 7, 9, 10), whereas some others tend to address both (e.g. studies 1, 5, 8, 11). Very few studies also define the objects of the activities, and even when they do so, it is not explicit which of the activities are combined with which of the objects. Finally, the methodological foundation of the studies is not clear in all of the cases. Some scholars justify their selection based on a priori definitions of design as a process, which contains certain activities that serve the goals of this process (e.g. Valkenburg & Dorst, 1998; Louridas & Loucopoulos, 2002); others use the data and other empirical studies to define the types of activities they use (Darses et al., 2001; D'Astous et al., 2004; Visser, 2006). A structured approach of defining team design activity akin to guide team design practice is not evident. Last but not least, ID does not appear among the selected design fields.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

Table 1

*Studies proposing types of team design activities and objects*

Study ID	Field	Activity types	Design object
1. Olson et al. (1992)	Software design	Clarification, Digression, Walkthrough, Summary, Project/Meeting management	Issues, Alternatives, Criteria
2. Maia, De Lucena, & Garcia (1995)	Software design	Rationale, Agreement, Confirmation, Understanding	Value/data, Belief/ Opinion/ Preference, Feature
3. Valkenburg & Dorst (1998)	Engineering design	Framing, Naming, Moving, Reflecting	
4. Louridas & Loucopoulos (2000)	Any	Problem setting, Problem analysis, Evaluation, Resolution	Goal, Hypotheses, Justifications, Design action
5. Darses, Détiénne, Falzon, & Visser (2001)	Software design	Generate, Evaluate, Inform, Interpret	Problem data, Solution elements, Domain objects, Goal, Domain rule or procedure, Task
6. MacMillan et al. (2001)	Any	Specifying, Assessing, Identifying, Developing, Setting, Determining, Generating, Transforming, Selecting, Firming up, Evaluating, Improving	Business needs, Requirements, Problems, Solutions/Proposals, Project characteristics, Concepts
7. Stempfle & Badke-Schaub (2002)	Engineering design	Clarification, Generation, Analysis, Evaluation, Control, Planning	Goal, Solution, Decision
8. Eggersman et al. (2003)	Chemical engineering	Propose, Add, Remove, Modify, Merge, Select, Request, Calculate, Estimate, Determine, Experiment, Select, Evaluate, Justify	Requirement, Artifact, Attribute, Value, Synthesis, Position, Argument, Decision
9. Nelson & Stolterman (2003)	Any	Developing trust, Developing common understanding, Developing new insights	
10. D'Astous et al. (2004)	Software design	Manage, Introduce, Develop, Evaluate, Hypothesize, Inform, Justify, Accept, Reject/ Cognitive Synchronization, Review, Conflict Resolution, Alternative Elaboration	Solution, Project/meeting, Result of previous activity
11. Gero & McNeill (2006)	Any	Propose, Clarify, Retract, Make, Analyse, Justify, Evaluate, Consult, Look ahead, Postpone, Look back, Apply	Solution, Decision, External information, Domain knowledge, Design strategy
12. Visser (2006)	Any	Generation, Transformation, Evaluation	



### **Research Goal**

The goal of this development article is to propose and illustrate an approach for eliciting patterns of e-learning design in a team setting. It is also intended to show that patterns are an adequate approach to describe team design behaviour in e-learning, which in turn can be useful in guiding designers' practice. In this section, our approach of e-learning design as a socio-cognitive activity will be discussed. The types and components of this activity form the basis of efficient patterns of team design, as we show later on in this article.

The view of design as a sociocognitive activity, rooted in the work of Bucciarelli (1984), has two main implications: on one hand, any mental effort related to the task of designing, from now on "design task", needs to be made explicit as a communication message; on the other hand, any effort of designers to communicate their ideas, from now on "communication task", needs to be related to the design task to be considered efficient. Our contribution lies in proposing a re-usable method of analysing both the design and communication tasks, as they get transformed during interaction. In this way, both the design and the management space of team design activity and their parallel transformation are addressed.

Subsequently, a twofold analysis is necessary to understand team task-oriented interaction: One analysis focusing on the problem space exploration, i.e. the specific design task aspects, and another analysis focusing on the management space, i.e. the communication activities used to explore the problem space. However, a main difficulty of conducting this double analysis with highly interdisciplinary teams, such as e-learning project teams, is the identification and separation of the cognitive from the social aspects of discourse taking place during the meetings, in a way that can be applicable to any team. We consider this distinction necessary to come up with

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

concrete guidelines related to the type of skills that instructional designers nowadays must develop to efficiently work in teams.

In order to reveal and understand the double, socio-cognitive nature of team design in the field of e-learning, our research questions are formulated as follows:

1. Which are the specific design and communication activities that take place during e-learning design in teams? What types of design objects do emerge?
2. How do these activities and objects relate to each other?
3. Can these relations be interpreted into specific skills that instructional designers need to apply when they work in e-learning project teams?

To reply to these questions, we propose a method of direct observation and qualitative data analysis based on patterns of team design communication.

### **Method**

We followed a descriptive, multiple case-study design (Yin, 2003) given the possibility it provides to obtain more reliable results based on the comparison of the cases observed. The case here refers to the process of designing in team in the field of e-learning. Two cases were selected as being instrumental (Stake, 1995), in the sense of representing a highly collaborative design process with advanced quality standards. In addition, we adopted a methodological approach that is both qualitative, based on verbal transcript protocol analysis, and quasi-ethnographic, as we closely observed the participants in some of their practice, either *in-situ* or through video-recorded meetings. More precisely, we followed the paradigm of comparing patterns of designing (Stacey

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

et al., 2002). The term *patterns*, here, refers to interaction structures repeating themselves systematically in a specific context. Their identification allows for the reuse of similar behaviors in similar contexts, thus it promotes sharing of good practices and better communication between fields. This serves our upper goal of transferring our results to other cases by applying the abductive mode of naturalistic generalization (Stake, 1995), very popular in the design field.

To identify the patterns' components, we developed an interaction analysis coding scheme, composed of three levels: (a) The *micro* level, which refers to how each person behaves as part of the team; (b) the *meso* level, which refers to emerging structures as behaviors of two or more participants; and (c) the *macro* level, which refers to the shared subject focus of the team at a certain time of the discussion. The relation of these three levels to segmentation and coding is explained later on.

### **Participants**

To consider the cases as representative of the e-learning design practice, we respected the following criteria-requirements: (a) A high-standard quality course design, as required and verified by specific institution-related procedures; (b) a high level of expertise of the team members in both subject matter and design aspects; and (c) a high level of multi-disciplinarity regarding the field of expertise represented by each team member. The two teams (from now on Team A and Team B) participating in our study fulfill all three criteria, as: (a) They belong to two well-established European Distance Universities; (b) the average of years of experience in the field of e-learning design is high, and also the subject matter of the course itself is “design”; and (c) participants' fields of expertise vary in-between Product Design, Industrial Design, Interactive Media, Management and Pedagogy, for Team A, and Communication sciences, Philology, and History, for Team B. The fulfillment of these conditions leads to the assumption that the two selected teams are representative of high-quality on-line course

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

design requiring interdisciplinarity, subject-matter knowledge, and design experience.

To this, other extra evidence can be added, such as the international recognition of the corresponding institutions and the proven success of the specific courses; as a matter of fact, Team A has won a quality award for this course.

### **Data collection**

The data collection was based on the observation of the two teams, during their instructional design projects. Team A was observed for one year (February 2008-February 2009), during the production of a 60-credits Bachelor on-line course on Design Thinking, whereas Team B was observed for half a year (September 2010-February 2011), during the production of a 6-credit Masters on-line course on Instructional Design Models. The 60-credit course is part of a 360-credit Bachelor degree, whereas the 6-credit course is part of a 60-credit Masters degree. Both courses are equally central in the curriculum for which they are designed. Moreover, Team A's course was a first-appearing course, and Team B's course was asked to be re-designed in order to adapt to the most recent technopedagogical contents. Due to their centrality and innovativeness, the two courses were considered representative of high-quality on-line courses; thus, they were selected.

In total, 15 project meetings (10 from Team A and 5 from Team B) were video-recorded and 25.7 meeting hours were totally transcribed. Each meeting had an average duration of 1.4 hours. In both teams, the meetings were situated in the development phase of design, meaning that the courses' main structure and objectives had already been decided in previous informal discussions, get-aways, and brainstorming sessions.

The transcribed dataset was segmented in topic-based *episodes* (McDonnell, 2009), and only those interaction moments in which some type of reflective decision-making took place, formed the final dataset. The dataset was further segmented into *moves*, meaning discourse segments containing complete communication meanings.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

Moves share the function of utterances, when the latter are defined also by the silent understanding of the hearers (Bakhtin, 1986). Many moves together form *sequences* of moves (Schegloff, 2007). In our analysis, sequences are goal-oriented, meaning that two different sequences can address the same topic but expressing a different action. In summary, the macro level segmentation focused on episodes, the meso level on sequences, and the micro level on moves.

### **Data analysis**

The data analysis was composed of two phases. In the first phase, we coded both the moves and sequences into pre-defined categories, which were of two types: the ones referring to the design task, and the others referring to the communication task. All of them focus on a specific design object, in accordance to what was said in the beginning of this paper. In total, the following coding dimensions emerged: *design object*, *design move*, *design sequence*, *communication move*, and *communication sequence*. The second phase was composed of statistical analyses and identification of patterns in the whole dataset. More precisely, we devised a software tool to analyze the sequences of codes. It aggregates the codes in increasingly long sequences and computes the frequency of each sequence with respect to the others. This allowed us to clearly identify repeating sequences of codes, which we then analyzed to determine their value as statistically significant patterns.

**Design object.** Design object is what the team is talking about in each moment of interaction. Usually, a sequence focuses on one primary object, but one or more speakers frequently introduce new, secondary objects without changing the “flow” of the team discussion. So the object or cognitive orientation of the team as a whole can be different than the momentaneous shifts of orientation introduced by individuals during interaction. Either at a team or at an individual level, design object can be one of the following (Darses et al., 2001; Newell and Simon, 1972): problem, solution, goal,

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

method, domain object, domain rule, and task. Table 2 shows the codes, definitions, and a representative sample of each coding category (when applicable, we underlined the words that have served as indicators).

Table 2

*Design object coding categories*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Problem</b> <P>	Any explicit reference to a concept or state of affairs considered problematic for the design process/product. <i>Example: <u>I'm just nervous</u> that the Pinboard will just become a default area.</i>
<b>Solution</b> <S>	An explicit idea referring either to an artifact that can potentially form part of the design object, or to a design action presented as a solution. <i>Example: <u>What I would suggest</u> you end up doing is that you have a tutor version and then a student version.</i>
<b>Goal</b> <G>	Any explicit reference either to a specific, team/course-related prescribed objective, or to a general idea of how the course should be, without getting concretized into specific solutions or strategies. <i>Example: <u>you want to keep</u> it engaging in a way, you don't want to keep it too academic</i>
<b>Method</b> <M>	Any explicit problem-oriented strategy. It is distinguished from solution in the sense that method is not a potential part of the design object, but rather an action that guides the problem-solving process. It also refers to any expected learning result. <i>Example: I suppose <u>that helps them</u> (the students) discuss the process, as they are going through it.</i>
<b>Domain object</b> <O>	Any explicit use of an existing tool, artefact (course), or resource, as guide, model or help for the design object at hand. Also, any use of a disciplinary concept as intermediary representation, without “embodying” it in a concrete solution. <i>Example: because <u>in M234</u> (name of existing course) there is that option which says “Print whole week” or something isn't it?</i>
<b>Domain rule</b> <R>	Any explicit reference to an existing institutional or discipline-related rule, procedure, or established behavior relevant for the design process at hand. <i>Example: (Using technologies) is a very time-consuming friendship.</i>
<b>Task</b>	Any explicit task co-ordination or assignment between the team members

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

<T> at the present meeting time. Also it is used to code any design relevant past behavior of one or more agents (not necessarily team members).

*Example: Can you e-mail the link to this?*

**Design move.** Design move describes the nature of any verbal act that changes by some means the semantic-cognitive content of the object under discussion. Based on Visser (2006), we propose the following list of design moves, as adapted to our dataset: generate, specify, detail, add, duplicate, modify, revolutionize, merge, and evaluate.

Note that the “duplicate” move is the only one that proposes a non-change to the semantic content of the design object; however, it is still considered as a move when the speaker’s intention is to “go back” to an idea already proposed. Mere repetitions of the content of an idea by the same speaker do not mark the beginning of a new move.

Table 3 shows the codes and their definition, transferred to team design context.

Table 3

*Design moves coding categories*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Generate</b> <gen>	Introduce a first-appearing main relevant element. The notion of main is defined by whether this element forms part of an intermediary representation (proposal, constraint, and requirement) or it refers to a new task or object introduced.
<b>Specify</b> <spe>	Concretize a previously presented element, either by defining it or by making explicit (aspects of) its qualitative or quantitative nature, without expressing an evaluation towards them.
<b>Detail</b> <det>	Expand a concept or event by listing its component concepts and/or events, answering one or more “what else” question(s). The new information provided is usually presented in an “and”, “or”, “but” relation.
<b>Add</b> <add>	Add new information, such as time, place, means/tools, manner, or a whole idea or event to a previously stated idea or event. In the second case the new idea/event is added either because it is considered relevant or because of some type of “logical” relation, such as cause-effect, reason-result, means-purpose, condition-outcome. The goal is always to better contextualize an

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

	idea/event.
<b>Duplicate</b> <dup>	Reproduce an already generated element by shifting the focus again to it. Such reproduction can be either an exact repetition of a previously stated element <i>e</i> or a clear reference to it as the main focus of discussion for a second time.
<b>Modify</b> <mod>	Transform an element <i>e</i> into another version <i>e'</i> neither detailing it nor concretizing it. Such transformation can either refer to a re-contextualization of the element (e.g. when a problem becomes a solution or when a solution becomes a requirement), or to a change in its epistemic status (e.g. seen from other perspective or replaced by a slightly modified alternative). At any case a conceptual modification needs to be explicit, and not only inferred.
<b>Revolutionize</b> <rev>	Replace an element <i>e</i> by its opposite or by a totally different alternative <i>e'</i> that serves the same function as <i>e</i> . Revolutionization can also “stop” at a level of revision or cancelling, without exactly getting to an alternative. Its goal is to doubt or negate the validity of a concept in a specific context.
<b>Merge</b> <mer>	In design made explicit visually, disjunctions and adjunctions of elements are very common and are often combined with divergent and convergent modes of reasoning. In the present research, the term “merge” is used to describe each time two (at least) concepts, previously made explicit, are put together in an effort of distinction, comparison, or jointness.
<b>Evaluate</b> <ev>	Assess an element <i>e</i> by attributing it a value or by expressing an attitude of towards it. Such attitude is usually related to expression of preference/non-preference, but it can also express doubt, reflection, insistence of importance, etc.

**Design sequence.** Design sequence refers to the team design goal expressed in a sequence of interaction. A collective goal is not made explicit as such, unless someone, e.g. the course team chair, states it to guide interaction. In most of the cases, the decision on how the design object is treated by the team, which corresponds to what we consider as a team design goal, is based on the general impression of the analyst regarding what participants actually do at a specific moment of interaction in terms of design. Table 4 presents the main categories considered, adapted from Visser (2006), namely: presentation, transformation, and evaluation. Our definition of these categories



## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

takes the team context into consideration. This is important to have in mind, as slight changes may occur to the approach we follow; for example, we re-named “generation” activity into “presentation” activity, emphasizing on the social and verbal aspects of team design goals.

Table 4

*Design sequence coding categories*

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definition</i>
<b>Presentation</b> <pres>	The goal of the team is to “make known” any relevant facts, possibilities, ideas, considerations, or plans of action regarding a specific design issue-topic, without getting into details, and without assessing their truth, feasibility, or quality.
<b>Transformation</b> <trans>	The goal of the team is to “make understood” a relevant fact, idea, or consideration regarding a specific design issue-topic, by getting into details regarding its acquaintance, adequacy, or need for taking into account, without implying, imposing, or asking for any decision regarding its acceptance.
<b>Evaluation</b> <eval>	The goal of the team is to “make believe, accept, or discard” a relevant fact, idea, consideration, or plan of action, considered crucial or influencing for the design task/process. It is oriented towards decision-making, either at a conceptual or at an action level.

Apart from defining those generic concepts proposed in the Design Research field, we further contributed with our method in two main ways: (a) We considered both the individual and team levels, by combining moves into sequences, as it can be seen on Figure 2; and (b) we conducted a parallel analysis of the same dataset from a communication point of view, by using other types of categories, as explained later on.

<b>ID</b>	<b>Sp</b>	<b>Transcript</b>	<b>DesSeq</b>	<b>DesMov</b>	<b>Obj</b>
1640	G	Can they have an Elluminate session on their own without a tutor?	trans	spe [a]	S
1641	A	Yeah that's the idea ()			

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

1642	A	Well I wouldn't have done it ()	ev [a]		
1643	A	I would rather give them enough information to say			
1644	G	Yeah but it's about them having the the access to that space when they need it	gen [b: access]		
1645	A	Like the room the room's set up and the			
1646	G	Yeah			
1647	A	All that stuff			
1648	G	I would actually it might you know it probably is if you've got the room open all the time	det [b]		
1649	G	they probably can't go in			
1650	G	() they can just go in when you don't book it ()			
1651	E	I think it's difficult to have uploaded your thing and have a discussion there and then also have the group discussion at the same ...	eval	gen [c: activity space]	(P)
1652	E	it doesn't seem very...natural thing to do ...	ev [c]		
1653	A	Yeah			
1654	E	(it would be better) within your Elluminate room	mer [a,c] S		
1655	A	Yeah			
1656	E	Actually I think (that is what) you said as well didn't you so that we ()	dup [a,c]		
1657	A	Well that's a possibility but some people might not be happy with that or you know it's just	rev [a,c]		

*Figure 2.* Dataset excerpt coded with Design sequences, moves, and objects (the *a, b, c* letters accompanying design moves correspond to the conceptual representation to which the move is referring to; beginning concept *a* is retrieved from previously).

**Communication move.** Our definition of communication move is close to Bunt's (1999) definition of dialogue act: A "functional unit used by the speaker to change the context" (p. 141). The context here refers to the interaction context, which is influenced by linguistic, semantic, cognitive, physical, and social aspects (Bunt, 1999). In team design, the design task is managed by changing the interaction context. In other words, communication moves accompany, complete, or influence on the design moves. To define the most relevant communication moves for team design processes, we were based on a discourse relations model, namely the Connectivity model (Renkema, 2009), and more precisely on its interjunction (addresser-addressee) relationships. The reason for choosing discourse relations as our main theoretical guidance in identifying and defining communication moves is based on the flexibility they offer regarding segmentation. A new move is marked when a new type of relation is initiated among

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

itself and its discursive context (i.e. previous and following moves). Moreover, we opted for Renkema's relations, because of their potentially argumentative nature. Other non-argumentative moves, such as "narrate" or "instruct," were added to fulfill the dataset's needs. Table 5 presents the complete list of communication moves used for this study.

Table 5

*Communication moves coding categories*

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definition</i>
<b>Propose</b> <pro>	Present an element (concept, relation, action) as an appropriate solution at a given moment of interaction.
<b>Explain/</b> <b>expose</b> <exp>	Enhance understanding by giving new information about a statement, somebody's whole idea/saying, or a new concept/tool.
<b>Narrate</b> <nar>	Inform others about a sequence of relevant (to the design task) past events of another person or the speaker herself (the focus always being on the events, and not on the related object, if any).
<b>Instruct</b> <ins>	Show how to operate an action or how a tool functions, usually accompanied by gesturing or manipulating objects.
<b>Verify</b> <ver>	Request for a clarification about a known or unknown (introduced as new) issue
<b>Clarify</b> <cla>	Enhance understanding about an idea, statement, or state of affairs, either by reformulating it or by making explicit information that was previously taken for granted.
<b>Conclude</b> <con>	Make an inference towards a statement or summarize previously stated ideas.
<b>Justify</b> <jus>	Give support to the credibility of an opinion, either in the form of evidence, or with another opinion.
<b>Comment</b> <com>	Express a neutral opinion related to a previous idea, without explaining/clarifying it or proposing something new.
<b>Assess</b> <b>negatively/</b> <b>positively</b> <neg>/<pos>	Express a negative or positive assessment related to a previously stated idea or state of affairs.
<b>Interpret</b> <int>	Exteriorize understanding of another speaker's statement by reformulating it in an effort to expand it.
<b>Postpone</b> <psp>	Cancel or delay acceptance of a proposal or plan of action.
<b>Agree</b> <agr>	Express concordance to a previously stated opinion, by repeating its content or by expressing a simple ("good", "nice", "interesting", etc.) positive assessment or

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

	acceptance (“OK”, “let’s do it”).
<b>Call for attention &lt;att&gt;</b>	“Alarm” the other speakers by expressing doubt about the truth of an opinion, or call into consideration non-discussed issues.
<b>Open &lt;ope&gt;</b>	Introduce a new issue as object of discussion in a natural way, i.e. without calling for a special attention to it.
<b>Present alternative &lt;alt&gt;</b>	Present an idea as an alternative to a previously stated one.
<b>Oppose &lt;opp&gt;</b>	Express an idea as an opposite to a previously stated one.

**Communication sequence.** In correspondence to the design sequence, communication sequence refers to the team communication goal expressed in a sequence of interaction. Identifying communicative intention at a team level is not trivial. To achieve it, we identify one communication move per sequence as the main *presentation move* (Clark and Schaefer, 1989), which also gives its name to the whole sequence. Potential main presentation moves are: open, propose, present alternative, verify, clarify, comment, explain, instruct, interpret, oppose, and call for attention. As a consequence, these are also the main communication sequences, which can be identified in our dataset. Figure 3 details the same dataset as in Figure 2, but coded with communication moves and sequences. Objects are the same for both codings, to keep a sense of consistence regarding the focus of team design activity as a socio-cognitive type of activity.

ID	Sp	Transcript	ComSeq	ComMov	Obj
1640	G	Can they have an Elluminate session on their own without a tutor?	VER	ver	S
1641	A	Yeah that’s the idea ()			
1642	A	Well I wouldn’t have done it ()		com	
1643	A	I would rather give them enough information to say			
1644	G	Yeah but it’s about them having the the access to that space when they need it		att	
1645	A	Like the room the room’s set up and the		int	
1646	G	Yeah			
1647	A	All that stuff			

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

1648	G	I would actually it might you know it probably is if you've got the room open all the time	exp		
1649	G	they probably can't go in			
1650	G	() they can just go in when you don't book it ()			
1651	E	I think it's difficult to have uploaded your thing and have a discussion there and then also have the group discussion at the same ...	ATT	att	(P)
1652	E	it doesn't seem very...natural thing to do ...	jus		
1653	A	Yeah			
1654	E	(it would be better) within your Elluminate room	pro S		
1655	A	Yeah			
1656	E	Actually I think (that is what) you said as well didn't you so that we ()	int		
1657	A	Well that's a possibility but some people might not be happy with that or you know it's just	com		

*Figure 3.* Dataset excerpt coded with Communication sequences, moves, and objects (the object in parenthesis means that it was just an instantaneous individual focus, not shared by the rest of the team).

### Findings

As previously described, the goal of this article is twofold: (a) To propose a method that identifies and analyses team design activity in an overall manner, and (b) to verify the applicability and re-usability of the above outlined empirical method to gain meaningful insights regarding e-learning design in teams.

In relation to this two-fold objective, the study's main findings are divided into the following parts: the calculation of inter-rater reliability, the frequencies and relations between the coding dimensions and categories (corresponding to research questions 1 and 2), and the presentation of the most frequent patterns that emerged in both teams. These patterns of systemized efficient behaviour will form the basis of guidance and skills' inference (in accordance to research question 3), as discussed in the next section.

#### Inter-rater reliability

Even though reliability is considered one of the main validation techniques for coding methods (Trujillo, 1986), it is hardly ever reported by design researchers (Goldschmidt, 1996), mainly because in general it is difficult to obtain a satisfying

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

measure due to subjectivity of inferences. Regardless this general tendency, our proposed coding scheme obtained highly satisfying results. To facilitate its reuse, we briefly describe the process followed.

The inter-rater agreement was calculated for 3 of the 5 coding dimensions used: design object, design move, and communication move. The codes for design and communication sequences were inferred on the basis of the design and communication moves: the most predominant move of a sequence also defined its goal, and subsequently its code.

Regarding the 'design object' categories, an inter-rater agreement of 88.2% ( $K=0.72$ ) has been reached, with the first author serving as a "blind" rater for both the second and the third authors separately. This percent was calculated only for the moves that were coded by both raters. It was often the case that the main coder (second and third author) was more descriptive in her coding and considered more object shifts than the second coder. This is due to the personal relation the first coders had with the design process, as they were both participants in the design meetings coded. This personal involvement possibly had an effect on the rich and detailed coding of their own experience. At the same time, the first author, who was an external observer to both cases, was more restrained at the time of marking a cognitive shift. It only happened when a clear to an external person shift was observed. As this difference was noted for both cases, the first author's decisions were considered as a valid external measure, thus any disagreement regarding this aspect was resolved in her favour. Regarding disagreement about the selection of a code, possibilities were discussed, and a refinement of the coding process was achieved. Design and communication moves were also checked for reliability with an external expert to be able to provide a more specific view regarding their coding. Inter-rater reliability score was sufficiently high

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

for both dimensions ( $K=0.71$  and  $K=0.72$  correspondingly), given the context “blindness” of the second rater (an expert in Cognitive Linguistics).

Regarding validity, the second methodological quality criterion in case studies (Yin, 2003), we limited ourselves to some internal validity checking, given the extensive nature of the coded protocol. We did that mainly in two ways: By involving two of the participants in the inter-rater reliability process, as described above; and by conducting a Focus group with the teams after the end of the observation period. During these Focus groups, our main external observations were confirmed by the participants themselves. Validating our method with external measures, such as the comparison to design contexts other than e-learning, as not been considered necessary for this phase of the study, since we are interested in the proposal of a domain-independent method and its application in the e-learning design field.

### **Frequencies and Relations**

Our first research question pertains to the nature of design as a socio-cognitive activity. We have asked what are the specific design and communication activities that take place during e-learning design in teams and what types of design objects do emerge. To answer it, we identified the frequencies of every coding category we used. Figure 4 shows the frequencies of each one of them in the whole dataset.

Figure 4 shows that the frequencies of “evaluation” and “presentation” design sequences are almost the same (24.6 and 24.7% correspondingly) for the whole dataset, whereas the activity of “transformation” occupies half (50.7 %) of the total team design activity. Considering the design act categories, a predominance of “detail” and “add” moves can be identified (16.6 and 12.6% correspondingly), followed by “evaluate” and “generate” moves (10.5 and 10% correspondingly). As far as the design object types is concerned, the most predominant is “solution” (34.3%), followed by “method” (26.4%),





## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING




Figure 4. Frequencies of Design sequences, moves, objects and Communication sequences and moves.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

Table 7

*Crostabulation between Design and Communication moves*

DesMove*ComMove Crosstabulation														
Design Move	Communication Move													Total
	agr	cla	com	con	exp	jus	neg	ope	opp	pos	pro	ver		
0	Count	170	227	68	6	103	39	1	3	12	7	7	108	842
	%	.78	.53	.11	.14	.14	.23	.01	.06	.24	.06	.01	.48	.20
add	Count	2	15	138	19	46	73	20	0	0	7	132	10	528
	%	.01	.04	.23	.43	.06	.42	.22	.00	.00	.06	.19	.04	.13
det	Count	0	7	7	4	444	15	1	0	0	1	12	2	696
	%	.00	.02	.01	.09	.62	.09	.01	.00	.00	.01	.02	.01	.17
ev	Count	16	1	211	4	2	13	48	0	2	105	4	6	443
	%	.07	.00	.36	.09	.00	.08	.52	.00	.04	.83	.01	.03	.11
gen	Count	0	1	0	2	4	12	8	47	2	0	259	14	421
	%	.00	.00	.00	.05	.01	.07	.09	.90	.04	.00	.38	.06	.10
rev	Count	2	1	91	1	2	6	9	0	33	2	13	0	228
	%	.01	.00	.15	.02	.00	.03	.10	.00	.66	.02	.02	.00	.05
<b>Total</b>	Count	219	425	594	44	712	173	93	52	50	126	681	225	4200
	%	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0

We summarize our observations regarding the above results as follows:

- Based on the assumption that sequences represent team behavior, some team design behaviors (cognitive level) are especially related to some team communication behaviors (social level). More precisely, design “evaluation” activity is mostly expressed through a team tendency to comment on others’ viewpoints and present alternatives. Design ideas “presentation” is more closely related to introducing issues rather than to proposals, whereas opposition plays also an important role for new constraints and requirements to come up. Design “transformation” is almost exclusively accompanied by explanation, whereas verification behavior is also very common.
- Based on the assumption that moves represent individual behavior, some individual design moves (cognitive level) are especially related to some individual communication moves (social level). For example: (a) Adding information is more related to negative than to positive assessments; (b) comments can have an evaluative, adjunctive, or revolutionizing function; and (c) some communication

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

moves, such as agreements or verifications, function only in a communication management space, meaning that they do not add further to the process of constructing design representations (this is implied by the “0” design act code).

### Patterns of team designing

As previously said, we choose the notion of pattern to organize the obtained data into meaningful behaviors that are systematically manifested by the two highly experienced teams. Based on the teams' experience and professional recognition, we assume that their manifested patterns are related to efficient behavior. Accordingly to our multi-level system of analysis, explained in the Method section, patterns can be found in three levels (macro, meso, and micro) and can be of two types (design and communication). Thus, the following types of patterns emerge: (a) Patterns of design objects (DesObj) at a macro level (in topic-based episodes); (b) patterns of design and communication sequences (DesSeq and ComSeq) at a meso level (in team goal-focused sequences); and (c) patterns of moves (DesMove and ComMove) at a micro level (as part of a sequence). We hereby expose the most frequent of each type as shown on Table 8.

Table 8

*The five most frequent patterns of each type*

<b>DesObj</b>	<b>DesSeq</b>	<b>DesMove</b>	<b>ComSeq</b>	<b>ComMove</b>
Solution-Problem-Solution	Transform-Present-Transform	Detail-Detail-Detail	Propose-Propose-Propose	Propose-Explain-Propose
Method-Problem-Method	Present-Transform-Transform	Generate-Specify-Detail	Propose-Comment-Propose	Explain-Propose-Explain
Method-Rule-Method	Transform-Evaluate-Transform	Specify-Detail-Add	Propose-Call for attention-Propose	Propose-Explain-Comment
Solution-Rule-Solution	Transform-Transform-Transform	Detail-Add-Detail	Propose-Propose-Comment	Explain-Comment-Comment
Problem-Solution-Method	Present-Transform-Present	Generate-Detail-Add	Propose-Explain-Propose	Verify-Clarify-Explain

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

We summarize our observations in the following major points:

- Team design activity is problem-centered, as it can be implied from the two most frequent design object pattern types: Solution-Problem-Solution and Method. The most frequent patterns are cyclic. The linear problem-solving pattern Problem-Solution-Method is the least frequent type. Methods and solutions are discussed and re-discussed after relevant institutional or domain knowledge is introduced, which can be inferred from the circular patterns “method-rule-method” and “solution-rule-solution”.
- To transform, meaning to make others understand a fact or idea, is the starting point or core of the most frequent patterns in a design sequence.
- In the Design Move category, the most frequent pattern, detail-detail-detail is neither cyclic nor linear, but repetitive. We can observe a similarly repetitive pattern in Communication Sequences (Propose-Propose-Propose) at a meso level. To propose is the starting point for all of the most frequent communication sequences.
- In general, circularity and repetition rather than linearity are observed to be the most frequent types of patterns. An exception can be found in communication moves, in which two linear micro-processes emerge, namely “propose-explain-comment” and “verify-clarify-explain.” Some communication moves do not form part of patterns at all, such as “justify” and “evaluate.”

### **Discussion**

The previous sections answered our first and second research question. Now we turn to our third question: Can relations between design and communication activities

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

be interpreted into specific skills that instructional designers need to apply to competently work in e-learning project teams? The following statements translate patterns in our data into action-oriented guidelines for team design practice in the e-learning field.

*Designers continuously introduce new constraints and requirements alongside design solutions.* Solutions give rise to new problem constraints or methodological requirements in cycles of activity. The predominance of cyclic patterns of designing such as attending to problems that give rise to a solution but also a new problem has already been conceptualized partly through the notions of “co-evolution” (Dorst & Cross, 2001) or “cycles of activity” (Cross, 2001) in the Design Research field, and also through the findings about problem-solution cycles (Poole, 1983) and decision recycles (Poole & Roth, 1989) in the Small Group Communication field. Design has been described as a non-linear, heuristic, and dynamic process (Guindon, 1990; Hickling, 1982; Carroll & Rosson, 1985; Visser, 1994). Our study further shows that this circularity also takes place at a smaller scale of activity. In this way, we can be more precise regarding how exactly problems and solutions co-evolve. We note, for example, that problems do not give place to other problems, or solutions are not transformed into new solutions in an immediate subsequent manner. Intermediary concepts (Basque, Contamines, & Maina, 2010) play a fundamental role in this dynamic process, as they contribute to the transformation of problems into solutions and back again.

In the following example (Figure 5), the Pinboard solution is presented as a problem (line 1); then speaker A introduces the Open Design Studio (ODS) solution as an intermediary concept (lines 2-6), to show that Pinboard is not a problem itself. Finally speaker G expands on A by stating how exactly ODS will serve as an intermediary solution for the correct use of Pinboard (lines 7-9).

Line	Speaker	Transcript
1	B	I'm worried that the Pinboard will become a dead area
2	A	The thing is whether they are using Open Design Studio ...I think they'll be going the Pinboard will be in use
3	A	it's it's if they didn't use Open Design Studio
4	A	then I'd be worried that they weren't using Open Design Studio
5	A	but they are going to be (going) there all the time
6	A	so it's it's just another
7	G	Well we have to show when we make the bit for how to use ODS
8	A	Yeah
9	G	We have to make sure that we say something really positive about the Pinboard
10	C	Yeah

Figure 5. Example of problem-solution co-evolution.

*Designers are solution negotiators.* The predominance of transformation-oriented design sequences, and proposal-oriented communication sequences implies a process of continuous *epistemic negotiations* (Baker, 1999) until a satisfactory state of the design object is reached. During negotiation, self-explanation and verification play a major role as basic communication techniques. This means that team design deliberation does not share the persuasive nature of other public discourse contexts. It is more about promoting understanding and consensus between the team members. In this sense, *empathy* and *multiple personal expertise* are considered great value skills, because they help designers to achieve a better co-construction.

An example of this process is evident in Figure 2: The “access” solution (line 1644) is transformed into the “activity space” problem (line 1651), which then gives its place to a more sophisticated solution proposal that considers both aspects (line 1654).

*Designers frequently use brainstorming in team communication to negotiate solutions across disciplinary boundaries.* During the continuous introduction of proposals (proposal follow proposals), designers actually engage in so-called brainstorming episodes (Osborn, 1963). In order to allow people to build on ideas, proposals are accompanied by a wealth of explanation and clarification. The need to

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

not only propose but also to immediately comment on or explain the proposal possibly emerges from the high interdisciplinarity of e-learning design teams. Different types of domain knowledge and experience need to be shared, and perspectives need to merge in order to start a chain reaction of ideas, which is the goal of brainstorming.

Here is an example of team A's brainstorming regarding the iTunes solution

(Figure 6):

Line	Speaker	Transcript
1	A	but I mean you can you could upload them to iTunes
2	J	Yeah
3	G	() iTunes
4	A	That's that's when they upload it to iTunes then that's that sort of happens automatically (don't you) because you can subscribe to the Podcast
5	G	Exactly yeah
6	A	Then it automatically goes ()
7	G	I mean that would be the best thing to do
8	A	It would be great
9	C	It would be good
10	G	Plus plus some of the ...selected kind of course team things that we've got throughout the course
11	A	Yeah
12	J	Yeah
13	G	Because that you know
14	A	Yeah
15	G	That would make sense

Figure 6. An excerpt of a Brainstorming episode.

*Designers use 3 different approaches to frame problems.* These are: (a) A “sandwich” problem approach, in which problems emerge in the middle of a solution consideration process; (b) a “hidden” problem approach, in which solving known problems is the main team focus; and (c) a “broadening problem space” approach, in which problems give place to solutions and then to methods. Visser (2006) suggested that *design is more than problem solving*. Problems have a central place in team design, but their conceptualization and approach is different to “one and for all” information processing behaviour as implied by the SIP paradigm. The three approaches to

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

problems explain in more detail how problem solving and communication in a team are related.

The example that appears on Figure 5 also represents a “broadening” approach, whereas the example of Figure 6 corresponds to the “hidden” approach, as described above. Figure 7 shows an example of a “sandwich” approach: speaker A presents the solution of a contribute website (lines 1-4), then B intervenes to present the constraint of big documents (lines 5-7), allowing A to explain better his solution right after that (lines 8-10) gaining B’s consent (line 11).

Line	Speaker	Transcript
1	A	What I thought is the contribute site that I’ve set up is just a way of quickly getting all the stuff online
2	A	so everyone can see it
3	A	roughly in the form that students are kind of going to go through it
4	A	and then you, you as TLS or someone else, would transfer it from the contribute site to the structured content
5	B	That’s what I sort of envisioned
6	B	But in my view the problem is that if you are talking about a lot of, if you’re talking about big documents, it might make the process a bit tricky
7	B	So that’s why I would like to have a browse through
8	A	So () if you’ve set up this page “What is Design Thinking?” [indicates with mouse]
9	A	ehm, which is pretty much the same as this page, you know, “What is design” [indicates with mouse], something like that
10	A	so it’s basically a question of taking the text out
11	B	Copying it out of that...

*Figure 7.* The “sandwich” problem solving approach.

In addition to these guidelines, our study makes another contribution regarding the method of analysis that was used. As previously implied, one of the major contributions of a socio-cognitive interaction analysis approach is the independent coding of the cognitive and the social dimensions (Trognon, 1999). In applying such approach to our dataset we were able not only to describe in depth both processes separately, but also to identify the relations between them. In fact, we identified a



## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

strong interdependency between the design and communication processes at various levels.

### **Conclusion**

Prescriptive ID models, as presented in most of the literature (e.g. ADDIE), are conceptual frameworks that claim to guide design practice. Although they offer a general overview of an idealised ID process, detailed insights into the dynamic and often changing nature of interdisciplinary team design practice cannot be sufficiently represented by a stage model. We introduced the notion of patterns of designing to offer ‘smaller chunks’ of observed team designing behaviour, which are more adequate to guide practice. These ‘smaller chunks’ of good practice are more context sensitive and can be reproduced dynamically throughout the ID process. They do not replace larger models, but augment them.

This paper presents an approach for eliciting such patterns and demonstrates its applicability in the analysis of two ID case studies. In this approach, we view design in general and ID in particular as a complex socio-cognitive interaction process. The analysis approach considers two main types of tasks ID designers deal with: the design task, which concentrates on the cognitive aspects of the activity, and the communication task, which is equally important to the cognitive task when we consider design in teams. Conceiving and describing both tasks is essential to understand team design activity and give guidelines for action.

To elicit detailed patterns of communication and design, we propose an interaction analysis method based on five main entities: design objects, moves and sequences, and communication moves and sequences. We conduct a second step of analysis based on the repetitive combination of moves, sequences, and objects in

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

patterns of activity. We finally translate these patterns into meaningful efficient behaviors, and thus guidelines for practice.

Based on empirical data, our study confirms a number of previous findings from both Design and Communication research for the ID domain. We summarize them as in the following: (a) Problems intermingle with solutions throughout the design process; (b) most of the times this happens in small cycles of team negotiation; (c) confirming that design is more than problem solving, in the sense it was conceived thirty years ago (e.g. by the SIP paradigm). Moreover, we added more detailed knowledge about patterns of activity centered on problems. We identified three main ID approaches of problem solving, namely “sandwich,” “hidden,” and “broadening problem space” approach. Each approach reveals a different rationale of how ID problems are actually perceived by the observed teams, and how solutions are actually worked out. The non-linearity of the process is made evident by repeated cycles of epistemic negotiation regarding specific aspects of the problem at hand or of the solutions and methods addressing the problem. Concepts are continuously transformed, until they reach a state of completeness and precision that satisfies all disciplines involved. Team design activity is more of a knowledge sharing and co-construction activity than a pure cognitive activity.

This main observation paves the way to more communication-based analyses of similar settings to give a more detailed account of what communication strategies instructional designers employ while working in teams. Knowledge negotiation, multiperspectivism, and empathic attitude are the ones we identify in this paper. As Bucciarelli (1984) puts it, “I do not find it a matter of ‘performance specifications’, ‘concept formation’, ‘engineering analysis’, ‘solution specification’ and ‘production’ set apart in well defined boxes. Rather I see continual negotiation, hear banter and stories,

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

sense uncertainty and ambiguity, listen to participants as they voice their hopes, fears and sometimes condemnations. Design is, in process, a social process” (p. 185).

Some limitations of our study refer to the nature of the discussion emerging in both teams, which can be characterized as an informal, friendly, and democratic conversation. Most of the members knew each other for many years and had collaborated in previous projects. Moreover, the meetings observed were focused on the development phase of e-learning design, in both cases. Early design episodes, where more conceptualization takes place, did not form part of the present study, mainly because they do not capture the parallel design and communication processes as well as the middle-phase project meetings do. Last but not least, the identified patterns cannot be considered representative of the whole design decision-making process, much of it taking place in corridors, individually, or through communicating by other means such as e-mails, phone calls, blogs, and wikis. The meetings observed are just a structured snapshot of the design and communication processes followed by two ID teams. More evidence from other ID teams is necessary to validate the method proposed mainly regarding its replicability and generizability.

As a conclusion, this paper confirms our initial assumption that research about ID needs to adopt a generic approach, meaning not entirely relying on any particular learning theory or model, but preferably guided by the specific tasks that team design addresses. At the same time, this approach needs to be activity-based, to avoid any generalities and confusions provoked by prescriptive stage models that do not explain what exactly designers should do when working in teams. The replication of our activity-based method in other design contexts, different from ID, is also necessary for the further validation of the method. The comparison of the patterns discussed in this

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

paper with other patterns of team design communication emerging in other social, cognitive, and cultural settings can lead to the enrichment of the guidelines proposed.

### **Acknowledgements**

Acknowledgements will be provided when the article has reached the final review stage.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

## References

- Allen, M. (1996). A profile of instructional designers in Australia. *Distance Education*, 17(1), 7-32. doi:10.1080/0158791960170103
- Baker, M. (1999). Argumentation and constructive interaction. In Andriessen, J. & Coirier, P. (Eds.) *Foundations of argumentative text processing* (pp. 179-202). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam Press.
- Bakhtin, M. (1986). The problem of speech genres (V. McGee, trans.). In C. Emerson & M. Holquist (Eds.), *Speech genres and other late essays* (pp. 60-102). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Basque, J., Contamines, J., & Maina, M. (2010). Approches de design des environnements d'apprentissage. In B. Charlier, & F. Henri (Eds.), *Apprendre avec les technologies* (pp. 109-119). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bates, A. W. & Poole, G. (2003). *Effective teaching with technology in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Bichelmeyer, B. A. (2004). *The ADDIE model: A metaphor for the lack of clarity in the field of IDT*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Chicago, IL. Retrieved June 11, 2012 from: [http://www.indiana.edu/~idt/shortpapers/documents/IDTf\\_Bic.pdf](http://www.indiana.edu/~idt/shortpapers/documents/IDTf_Bic.pdf).
- Bichelmeyer, B. A., Boling, E., & Gibbons, A. S. (2006). Instructional design and technology models: their impact on research and teaching in instructional design and technology. In M. Orey, V.J. McClendon, and R.M. Branch (Eds.), *Educational media and technology Yearbook*, Vol. 31 (pp. 33-49). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Bichelmeyer, B. A., Misanchuk, M., & Malopinsky, L. (2001). Adapting a Master's degree course to the web: A case analysis. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 2(1), 49-58.
- Botturi, L., & Del Percio, M. (2009). Involvement, institutional roles and design models in e-learning. In U. Bernath, A. Szücs, A. Tait, & M. Vidal (Eds.), *Distance and e-learning in transition* (pp. 607-626), London: ISTE-Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Bucciarelli, L. L. (1984). Reflective practice in engineering design. *Design Studies*, 5(3), 185-190. doi:10.1016/0142-694X(84)90012-7

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Carroll, J. M. & Rosson, M. B. (1985). Usability specifications as a tool in iterative development. In R. Hartson (Ed.), *Advances in Human-Computer Interaction, Vol. 1* (pp. 1-28). New York: Ablex.
- Clark, H. H. & Shaefer, E. F. (1989). Contributing to discourse. *Cognitive Science, 13*(2), 259-294. doi:10.1016/0364-0213(89)90008-6
- Conklin, J. & Bergman, M. L. (1988). gIBIS: A hypertext tool for exploratory policy discussion. *ACM Transactions on Office Information Systems, 6*(4), 303–331. doi:10.1145/58566.59297
- Conole, G., Brasher, A., Cross, S., Weller, M., Clark, P., & Culver, J. (2008). Visualising learning design to foster and support good practice and creativity. *Educational Media International, 45*(3), 177–194. doi:10.1080/09523980802284168
- Cox, S. & Osguthorpe, R.T. (2003). How do instructional design professionals spend their time? *TechTrends, 47*(3), 45-53. doi: 10.1007/BF02763476
- Cross, N. (2001). Design cognition: Results from protocol and other empirical studies of design activity. In C. Eastman, W. Newstetter, & M. McCracken (Eds), *Design knowing and learning: Cognition in design education* (pp. 79-103), Kidlington, UK: Elsevier Science.
- Cross, N., Christiaans, H., & Dorst, K. (eds.) (1996). *Analysing design activity*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Darses, F., Détienne, F., Falzon, P., & Visser, W. (2001). *A method for analyzing collective design processes*. INRIA Research Report N° 4258, September 2001.
- D’Astous, P., Détienne, F., Visser, W., & Robillard, P. N. (2004). Changing our view on design evaluation meetings methodology: A study of software technical review meetings. *Design Studies, 25*(6), 625-655. doi:10.1016/j.destud.2003.12.002
- Dick, W. Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dicks, D. & Ives, C. (2008). Instructional designers at work: A study of how designers design. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 34*(2). Retrieved from: <http://www.cjlt.ca/index.php/cjlt/article/view/495/226>

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Dimitriadis, Y., Goodyear, P., & Retalis, S. (2009). Design patterns for augmenting e-learning experiences [Special issue]. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 25(5), 997-1188. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.02.001
- Dorst, C. & Cross, N. (2001). Creativity in the design process: Co-evolution of problem-solution. *Design Studies*, 22(5), 425-437. doi:10.1016/S0142-694X(01)00009-6
- Eckert, C. & Stacey, M. (2000). Sources of inspiration: A language of design. *Design Studies*, 21(5), 523-538. doi:10.1016/S0142-694X(00)00022-3
- Eggersman, M., Gonnet, S., Henning, G. P., Krobb, C., Leone, H. P., & Marquardt, W. (2003). Modelling and understanding different types of process design activities. *Latin American Applied Research*, 33, 167-175.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit.
- Ertmer, P. A., Stepich, D. A., York, C. S., Stickman, A., Wu, X., Zurek, S., & Goktas, Y. (2008). How instructional design experts use knowledge and experience to solve ill-structured problems. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 21(1), 17-42. doi: 10.1002/piq.20013
- Fischer, G. & Scharff, E. (2000). Meta-Design – Design for Designers. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Designing Interactive Systems (DIS 2000), New York.
- Fisher, B. A. (1970). Decision emergence: Phases in group decision-making. *Speech Monographs*, 37(1), 53-66. doi: 10.1080/03637757009375649
- Garrison, D. R., & Anderson, T. (2003). *E-Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: A framework for research and practice*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Gibbons, A. S. (2003). What and how do designers design: A theory of design structure. *TechTrends*, 47(5), 22-27. doi: 10.1007/BF02763201
- Gibbons, A. S., & Rogers, C. R. (2009). The architecture of instructional theory. In C.M. Reigeluth & A. A. Carr-Chellman (Eds.), *Instructional-design theories and models, volume III: Building a common knowledge base* (pp. 387-399). NY: Routledge.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Geiger, H. (2008). *Who's your ADDIE?* Appearing in the website of Prometheus training, LLC. Retrieved June 11, 2012 from: <http://www.ptrain.com/articles/addie.htm>
- Gero, J. S. & McNeill, T. (1998). An approach to the analysis of design protocols. *Design Studies*, 19(1), 21-61. doi:10.1016/S0142-694X(97)00015-X
- Goel, V. & Pirolli, P. (1989). Motivating the notion of generic design within information-processing theory: The design problem space. *AI Magazine*, 10(1), 19-36.
- Gibbons, A. (2003). What and how do designer design? A theory of design structure. *Techtrends*, 47(5), 22-27. doi:10.1007/BF02763201
- Goldschmidt, G. (1996). The designer as a team of one. In N. Cross, H. Christiaans, & K. Dorst (eds.), *Analysing design activity* (pp. 65-91). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Goodyear, P. (2005). Educational design and networked learning: Patterns, pattern languages and design practice. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 21(1), 82-101. Retrieved from: <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet21/goodyear.html>
- Guindon, R. (1990). Designing the design process: Exploiting opportunistic thoughts. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 5(2/3), 305-344. doi:10.1080/07370024.1990.9667157
- Gustafson, K. L., & Branch, R. M. (1997). *Survey of instructional development models* (3rd ed.). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED411780).
- Henri, F., Gagné, P., & Maina, M. (2005). Étude d'usages : un choix méthodologique en vue de la conception d'une base de connaissances sur le téléapprentissage. In S. Pierre (Ed.), *Innovations et tendances en technologies de formation et d'apprentissage* [Innovations and trends in teaching and learning technologies] (pp. 31-61). Montreal: Presses Internationales Polytechnique.
- Hickling, A. (1982). Beyond a linear iterative process. In Evans et al. (Eds.), *Changing design* (pp. 275-293). Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.



## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Jochems, W., van Merriënboer, J., & Koper, R. (2004). An introduction to integrated e-learning. In W. Jochems, J. van Merriënboer, & R. Koper (Eds.), *Integrated e-learning. Implications for pedagogy, technology, and organization* (pp. 1-12). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Jonassen, D. (2002). Integration of problem solving into instructional design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in Instructional Design and technology* (pp. 107-120). Upper Saddle River NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Kenny, R. F., Zhang, Z., Schwier, R. A., & Campbell, K. (2005). A review of what instructional designers do: Questions answered and questions not asked. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 31(1), 9-16.
- Kirschner, P., Carr, C., & van Merriënboer, J. (2002). How expert designers design. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 15(4), 86-104. doi:10.1111/j.1937-8327.2002.tb00267.x
- Klein, J., & Fox, E. (2004). Performance improvement competencies for instructional technologists. *TechTrends*, 48(2), 22-25. doi:10.1007/BF02762539
- Liu, M., Gibby, S., Quiros, O., & Demps, E. (2002). Challenges of being an instructional designer for new media development: A view from the practitioners. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 11(3), 195-219.
- Louridas, P. & Loucopoulos, P. (2000). A generic approach for reflective design. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering Methodology*, 9(2), 199-237. doi:10.1145/350887.350895
- MacMillan, S., Steele, J., Austin, S., Kirby, P., & Spence, R. (2001). Development and verification of a generic framework for conceptual design. *Design Studies*, 22(2), 169-191. doi:10.1016/S0142-694X(00)00025-9
- Maia, A. C. P., De Lucena, C. J. P., & Garcia, A. C. B. (1995). A method for analyzing team design activity. *Proceedings of the conference on Designing interactive systems: processes, practices, methods, and techniques* (pp. 149-156). ACM Press.
- McDonnell, J. (2009). Collaborative negotiation in design: a study of design conversations between architect and building users. In J. McDonnell & P. Lloyd

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- (Eds.), *About: Designing. Analysing design meetings*. Leiden: CRC Press/Balkema.
- McDonnell, J. & Lloyd, P. (2009). *About: Designing. Analysing design meetings*. Leiden: CRC Press/Balkema.
- Molenda, M. (2003). In search of the elusive ADDIE model. *Performance improvement*, 42(5), 34-36. doi: 10.1002/pfi.4930420508
- Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., & Kemp, J. E. (2006). *Designing effective instruction* (5th ed). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nelson, H. & Stolterman, E. (2003). *The design way. Intentional change in an unpredictable world*. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.
- Newell, A. & Simon, H. A. (1972). *Human problem solving*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Nonnon, E. (1996). Activités argumentatives et élaboration de connaissances nouvelles: le dialogue comme espace d'exploration. *Langue française*, 112, 67-87.
- Olson, G. M., Olson, J. S., Carter, M. R., & Storrosten, M. (1992). Small group design meetings: An analysis of collaboration. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(4), 347-374. doi: 10.1207/s15327051hci0704\_1
- Osborn, A. F. (1963). *Applied imagination: Principles and procedures of creative problem solving* (Third Revised Edition). New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Poole, M. S. (1983). Decision development in small groups II: a study of multiple sequences in decision making. *Communication Monographs*, 50(3), 206-232. doi: 10.1080/03637758309390165
- Poole, M. S. & Roth, J. (1989). Decision development in small groups IV: a typology of group decision paths. *Human Communication Research*, 15(3), 323-356. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1989.tb00188.x
- Reigeluth, C. M. & Carr-Chellman, A. A. (2009). *Instructional-design theories and models, volume III: Building a common knowledge base*. NY: Routledge.
- Renkema, J. (2009). *The texture of discourse: towards an outline of Connectivity Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Richey, R. C., Klein, J. D., & Nelson, W. (2004). Developmental research: Studies of instructional design and development. In D. H. Jonassen (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.), *Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 1099-1130) Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Richey, R., Klein, J., & Tracey, M. (2010). *The Instructional design knowledge base: theory, research, and practice*. USA: Routledge.
- Rowland, G. (1992). What do instructional designers actually do? An initial investigation of expert practice. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 5(2), 65-86. doi: 10.1111/j.1937-8327.1992.tb00546.x
- Rowland, G. (1993). Designing and instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 41(1), 79-91. doi:10.1007/BF02297094
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). Sequence organization in interaction. A primer in conversational analysis (Vol. 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sim, S. K. & Duffy, A. H. B. (2003). Towards an ontology of generic engineering design activities. *Research in Engineering Design*, 14(4), 200-223. doi: 10.1007/s00163-003-0037-1
- Simon, H. A. (1969). *The sciences of the artificial*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Smith, K. M. & Boling, E. (2009). What do we make of design? Design as a concept in educational technology. *Educational Technology*, 49(4), 3-17.
- Smith, P. L. & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Stacey, M., Eckert, C., Earl, C., Bucciarelli, L. L., & Clarkson, P. J. (2002). A comparative paradigm for design research. In *Proceedings of the Design Research Society International Conference*, September 2002, Brunel University, London.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stempfle, J. & Badke-Schaub, P. (2002). Thinking in design teams- an analysis of team communication. *Design Studies*, 23(5), 473-496. doi:10.1016/S0142-694X(02)00004-2

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Thomas, M., Mitchell, M., & Joseph, R. (2002). The third dimension of ADDIE: a cultural embrace. *TechTrends*, 46(2), 40-45. doi: 10.1007/BF02772075
- Thompson-Sellers, I., & Calandra, B. (2010). *From theory to practice: How do instructional designers make design decisions?* Paper presented at the meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Savannah, GA.
- Tripp, S. D. & Bichelmeyer, B. (1990). Rapid prototyping: An alternative instructional design strategy. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 38(1), 31-44. doi: 10.1007/BF02298246
- Trognon, A. (1999). Eléments d' analyse interlocutoire. In M. Gilly, J.-P. Roux, & A. Trognon (Eds.), *Apprendre dans l'interaction* (pp. 69-94). Nancy: Presses Universitaires.
- Trujillo, N. (1986). Toward a taxonomy of small group interaction-coding systems. *Small Group Research*, 17(4), 371-394. doi: 10.1177/104649648601700401
- Valkenburg, R. & Dorst, K. (1998). The reflective practice of design teams. *Design Studies*, 19(3), 249-271. doi:10.1016/S0142-694X(98)00011-8
- van den Akker, J., Branch, R. M., Gustafson, K., Nieveen, N., & Plomp, T. (Eds.) (1999). *Design approaches and tools in education and training*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer
- van Rooij, S. W. (2010). Project management in instructional design: ADDIE is not enough. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41(5), 852-864. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2009.00982.x
- van Rooij, S. W. (2011). Instructional design and project management: complementary or divergent? *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 59(1), 139-159. doi: 10.1007/s11423-010-9176-z
- Visser, W. (1994). Organization of design activities. Opportunistic with some hierarchical episodes. *Interacting with Computers*, 6(3), 239-274. doi: 10.1016/0953-5438(94)90015-9
- Visser, W. (2006). *The cognitive artifacts of designing*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

## TEAM DESIGN COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN E-LEARNING

- Vissers, G. & Dankbaar, B. (2002). Creativity in multidisciplinary new product development teams. *Creativity and innovation management*, 11(1), 31-42. doi: 10.1111/1467-8691.00234
- Visscher-Voerman, I.I., & Gustafson, K. L. (2004). Paradigms in the theory and practice of education and training design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(2), 69-89. doi:10.1007/BF02504840
- Wallace, H. (2005). Instructional systems development: A 30 year retrospective. *Educational Technology*, 45(4), 5-21.
- Yanchar, S., South, J., Williams, D., Allen, S., & Wilson, B. (2010). Struggling with theory? A qualitative investigation of conceptual tool use in instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58(1), 39-60. doi:10.1007/s11423-009-9129-6
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research. Design and methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.