



## Indicator Explanation



DOMAIN	EFFECTIVE PRACTICE	INDICATOR
Instruction	Remove barriers and provide opportunities	3C.4 Teachers use online, hybrid, or blended learning as a part of instruction along with activities to strengthen relationships.

**Explanation:** Combining digital learning communities with socialization opportunities has been shown to produce positive outcomes, learning and otherwise, for individuals and their communities. In addition to producing positive incomes, increased opportunities for socialization with digital learning also produces student self-reports of better learning outcomes and satisfaction.

**Questions:** Why are socialization opportunities important? How are socialization opportunities combined with online, hybrid and blended learning approaches?

*Why are socialization opportunities important?*

The importance of creating community through socialization is backed by research that shows positive outcomes for individuals and the learning communities to which they belong. Interpersonal connections of community members increases their willingness to share information and resources, which sets the stage for collaborative learning (Hay-thornthwaite, 2002). It has been widely demonstrated that strong community ties increase the exchange of information among all members, the availability of support and cooperation among members, and satisfaction with group efforts (Argyle, 1991; Bruffee, 1993; Dede, 1996; Harasim, Hiltz, Teles, & Turoff, 1995; Wellman, 1999). Members' trust in the social community fosters contribution and support in times of need (Haines, Hurlbert & Beggs, 1996). Finally, individuals benefit from community membership by experiencing a greater sense of well being and happiness, and having a larger and more willing set of others to call on for support in times of need (Haines, Hurlbert & Beggs, 1996; Walker, Wasserman & Wellman, 1994).

*Why should socialization opportunities be combined with online, hybrid and blended learning approaches?*

Blended learning is a pedagogical approach that combines "the effectiveness and socialization of the classroom with the technologically enhanced active learning possibility of the online environment" (Dziuban, Harman & Moskal, 2004). Completion of activities, readings and assessments happens in the online environment, while face-to-face time is preserved for discussion and collaboration between teachers and students and between students and their peers. Not only does this "blended" arrangement produce positive student learning outcomes, but students report appreciation for the "more effective use of face-to-face class time" and "flexibility for learning" (Riley, Gardner, Cosgrove, Olitsky, O'Neil & Du, 2014) that blended learning offers.

Studies have shown that higher levels of social interaction in learning communities improve performance (e.g., Imm & Stylianou, 2012). The U.S. Department of Education (2010) reported that "Instruction combining online and face-to-face elements had a larger advantage relative to purely face to-face instruction than



did purely online instruction” (p.xv) for performance improvement. Liu, Gomez & Yen (2009) found that social presence is “a significant predictor of course retention and final grades in the community college online environment” (p.165). Further, Roseberry, Hirsh-Pasek & Golinkoff (2014) demonstrated that social interactions (online and in person) improved language-learning outcomes.

For learners who have access only to online communities, without a face-to-face component, studies have shown that sustainable, strong ties can be made in fully online communities (e.g., Baym 1995, 1997; Reid, 1995; Rheingold, 1993). As Wellman (1999) points out, these studies show that when we view community as what activities learners do together, rather than where or through what means they do them, we see communities that exist ‘liberated’ from geography, physical neighborhoods and campuses. Learners can still maintain close ties with others, through email, online chat rooms and text messaging. Moreover, learners can maintain ties with those who they might not otherwise have encountered, were it not for a shared interest in learning about a topic or subject (Wellman & Gulia, 1999; Wellman, Salaff, Dimitrova, Garton, Gulia & Haythornthwaite, 1996).

## References

- Argyle, M. (1991). *Cooperation in working groups*. In *Cooperation: The basis of sociability* (pp. 115–131). Rutledge.
- Baym, N. K. (1995). The emergence of community in computer-mediated communication. In S. Jones (Ed.) *CyberSociety: Computer-mediated communication and community* (pp. 138–63). Sage.
- Baym, N. K. (1997). Interpreting soap operas and creating community: Inside an electronic fan culture. In S. Kiesler (Ed.) *Culture of the Internet* (pp. 103–20). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. John Hopkins University Press.
- Dede, C. (1996). The evolution of distance education: Emerging technologies and distributed learning. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 10(2), 4–36.
- Dziuban, C., Harman, J., & Moskal, P. (2004). Blended learning [PDF]. *Educause Center for Applied Research Bulletin*, 2004(7). <https://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/erb0407.pdf>
- Haines, V. A., Hurlbert, J. S., & Beggs, J. J. (1996). Exploring the determinants of support provision: Provider characteristics, personal networks, community contexts, and support following life events. *Journal of Health & Social Behavior*, 37(3), 252–64.
- Harasim, L., Hiltz, S. R., Teles, L., & Turoff, M. (1995). *Learning networks: A field guide to teaching and learning online*. The MIT Press.
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2002). Building social networks via computer networks: Creating and sustaining distributed learning communities. In K. A. Renninger & W. Shumar (Eds.), *Building Virtual Communities: Learning and Change in Cyberspace* (pp.159–190). Cambridge University Press.
- Imm, K. & Stylianou, D. A. (2012). Talking mathematical- ly: An analysis of discourse communities. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 31(1), 130–148.
- Liu, S. Y., Gomez, J., & Yen, C. J. (2009). Community college online course retention and final grade: Predictability of social presence. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning*, 8(2), 165–182.
- Reid, E. (1995). Virtual worlds: Culture and imagination. In S. G. Jones, (Ed.), *CyberSociety: Computer-mediated communication and community* (pp. 164–183). Sage.
- Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Addison Wesley.
- Riley, J. E., Gardner, C., Cosgrove, S., Olitsky, N., O’Neil, C., & Du, C. (2014). Implementation of blended learning for the improvement of student learning. In A.G. Picciano, C.D. Dziuban, and Graham, C.R. (Eds.), *Blended Learning: Research Perspectives, Volume 2*. Routledge.
- Roseberry, S., Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Golinkoff, R. M. (2014). Skype Me! Socially Contingent Interactions Help Toddlers Learn Language. *Child Development*, 85, 956–970.
- U.S. Department of Education Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development Policy and Program Studies Service (2010). Evaluation of evidence-based practices in online learning: A meta-analysis and review of online learning studies [PDF]. <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/tech/evidence-based-practices/finalreport.pdf>.



- Walker, J., Wasserman, S., & Wellman, B. (1994). Statistical models for social support networks. In S. Wasserman & J. Galaskiewicz, (Eds.), *Advances in social network analysis* (pp. 53–78). Sage.
- Wellman, B. (1999). The network community: An introduction to networks in the global village. In Wellman, B. (Ed.) *Networks in the global village* (pp. 1–48). Westview Press.
- Wellman, B., & Gulia M. (1999). Net surfers don't ride alone: Virtual communities as communities. In M. Smith & P. Kollock (Eds.) *Communities in cyberspace* (pp. 167–194). Routledge.
- Wellman, B., Salaff, J., Dimitrova, D., Garton, L., Gulia, M., & Haythornthwaite, C. (1996). Computer networks as social networks: Collaborative work, telework, and virtual community. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 213–38

