

The Spaces Between: Towards Private Spaces for Peer Learning

Heather Ford¹

Keywords educational technology, privacy, identity, learning, CSCW

Abstract I analyze the spaces of a graduate school in the United States to understand their relevance to learning and privacy. I conclude that the “spaces between” - the classroom before and after class, the student lounge and computer laboratory - play an important role in the learning experience because it is here where students can construct knowledge with their peers and practice the performance of their new identities. The fact that these spaces are located outside the purview of those in authority and that they enable students to choose who they can be intimate with is consequently central to the success of these spaces. In contrast, private digital spaces are unavailable to students, with the result that students attempted to use spaces like Facebook to engage with one another resulting in harms including exclusion, identity crises and self-censorship. Online-only educational spaces seem to replicate only the classroom space but without the protective walls available in conventional learning environments. I conclude with three design implications, calling for online educational practitioners to build for intimacy, to avoid "invisible audiences" and to make sure that students have an online space of their own that is outside the purview of authority.

¹ UC Berkeley School of Information Masters 2011 Candidate

Introduction

Just before the dot-com bust of 2001, John Seely-Brown and Paul Duguid published their seminal critique of the hype surrounding the information age. While pundits predicted that information technology would lead to the end of the press, of politics and of the university amongst others, Brown and Duguid believed that this "tunnel vision" was stopping us from looking at where technology is really taking us. In their final chapter, entitled "Re-education", the authors lamented the design of online educational systems, declaring that even though the conventional system was flawed, it at least provided space for authentic learning to "leak" through:

From their old to their new guise, the conventional schools continue to regard learning as a matter of delivery. As we have argued, it is not. The old system, however, with its campuses and classrooms, nonetheless provided plenty of opportunities for students to "steal" knowledge from teachers and construct knowledge with peers, even though that was not necessarily the intention of the design. The new system, however, designs these opportunities out. The secure, narrow channels of digital technology make theft and collective construction much harder. Putting the pedagogy of the conventional classroom on line, that is, cuts out the hidden resourcefulness of the conventional classroom. (Brown & Duguid, 2000, p. 233)

The conventional classroom, I soon learned, was useful not only because of what happened within it during class time but because it was flanked by supportive spaces in which peers were using the in-class experience as fodder for learning from one another. Inspired by Helen Nissenbaum's theory of "contextual integrity" (Nissenbaum, 2004), I set about investigating the norms of information flow that governed the spoken and unspoken in these spaces.

What I learned was that these "spaces between" - the classroom before and after class, the school corridors, the student lounge and computer laboratory - revealed attributes that were specifically related to privacy. Although they were located within the remit of the institution, these spaces were outside the direct purview of authority, they were self-governing and were flexible enough for students to be able to choose with whom they wanted to share the space and how they wanted to engage with others in the space. The private features of these "spaces between" became the vehicle for the learning that was taking place inside them. Having control over these spaces so that students could control who knew what about them enabled students specifically to join new "communities of practice" (Lave & Etienne Wenger, 1991), to experiment with new identities and to practice performances that would take place during dedicated public events.

In contrast, no such space private existed in the digital realm. Student mailing lists were surveilled by staff who felt it their duty to watch the lists in order to protect students, and the class blogging systems were largely open and visible to the public Internet. In the absence of the student-lounge equivalent in the digital realm, students tried to squash uniquely-shaped educational relationship pegs into the round-holed platforms like Facebook, leading to harms relating to exclusion, identity crises and self censorship.

Two trends in educational technology add to these problems. The first is the unbridled enthusiasm that surrounds learning analytics that track a learner's every interaction in the name of "personalised learning". The second is the increased use of social networking services in blended and online educational platforms that encourage students to share more and more personal information in the name

of 'social constructivism'. The result is a lack of online spaces in which peers can learn with one another outside of the control of those who could exert power over them.

I begin by discussing my methodology for this study, I go on to outlining theories of learning and social constructivism and how they are being adopted selectively by educational technologists. This is followed by a day-in-the-life story of learning at the I School, after which I analyze learning through the lens of Brown and Duguid's "old" and the "new" systems. I conclude with an analysis of space, identity and privacy and the implications for the design of networked learning systems.

Methodology

In order to study the social life of information at a school, I wanted to get a context-rich understanding of information sharing in a traditional (face-to-face) educational experience. I had a hunch that people were self-censoring in online educational environments and so I chose a face-to-face environment in which I had direct access to the social, informal interactions of its participants. This required me to hone my observation skills in an environment in which I was also a participant.

Studies like Sharon Traweek's *Beamtimes and Lifetimes: The World of High Energy Physicists* (Traweek, 1992), were particularly instructive in this regard. Traweek, who conducted fieldwork at three national high particle physics laboratories over a period of five years, first worked at one of the labs explaining its activities to visitors. Said Traweek, “[a]s Public Information Officer I stood outside social divisions and yet was a familiar part of the lab” (Traweek, 1992, p. 12). She indicates that the fieldworker needs to remain marginal - that its socio-cultural assumptions would no longer stand out in the foreground of her attention if she were to become a fully integrated participant in the community (Traweek, 1992, p. 9). On the other hand, says Traweek, the very nature of participant observation requires the fieldworker to “live her days and weeks and months within the patterns of the community's life, moving in spaces shaped by the community taking part in its activities on its own terms” (Traweek, 1992, p. 10).

I chose to study students at my own school because only then would I be able, with limited time, to gain insight into the lived experiences of graduate students, the ways in which they share information with one another, as well as the ways in which information-sharing revealed deeper understandings of identity and privacy. In order to maintain some distance, I chose to study three masters students in the class adjacent to mine. Each class is very much their own “community²” and as a member of the I School community but separate from the 2010 class, I believe that I was able to retain my marginal status.

Grounded theory proved a useful methodology for this study. An iterative methodology that emphasizes the generation of theory from data in the process of conducting research, grounded theory enables one to stay close to the lived experience of the community, building levels of abstraction

² I use Traweek's definition of 'community' as 'a group of people who have a shared past, hope to have a shared future, have some means of acquiring new members, and have some means of recognizing and maintaining differences between themselves and other communities' (p6).

directly from the data, developing theories iteratively and then gathering further data to check and refine the emerging analytic categories (Charmaz, 2006). It is important to note here that my initial observations came out of a class in which we were experimenting with social media technologies in the traditional classroom. A particular discussion initiated by one student about “how open should this site be?” seemed illustrative of so many of the questions that we had been asking, and I started theorizing from there about what our direct experience with the artifacts meant for larger questions facing the educational technology and open education movements.

I went on to conduct four hour-long open-ended interviews with graduate students about their interaction with social media tools, their online identities and information-sharing habits. I chose students who seemed either very thoughtful about their presentation of self on the school website, on the one hand, or who were known to be very open in class and outside of class on the other. I also interviewed two staff members who were most influential in mediating the identity of students within and outside of the school and noted my observations in classes that I am taking or acting as a student instructor in, as well as observations that I have done in other areas of the school (for example, in the student lounge and workshop/co-lab space). I also interviewed a co-founder of Peer-to-Peer University (P2PU) and an organizer of one of the P2PU classes. I then coded those interviews and observations, and then conducted a second round of interviews with the students to check the analytic categories that I had developed. Because my sample is small, this should be seen as exploratory research. My question sets appear in the appendix.

The rise of social constructivism and the privacy challenge

Classroom 210



1898

Classroom 210



today

The School of Information is housed in the oldest building on the UC Berkeley campus. Built in 1873, this stately red-bricked building, rumored to have been the location for the rooftop scene of *Mary Poppins*³, stands in the center of campus opposite Sather Tower. A photograph taken in 1898 shows one of the lecture rooms with about a hundred smartly dressed students in seating that is raked upwards and backwards towards the end of the room. Women in pillbox hats sit on the right of the room and

³ The rumor is, unfortunately, false.

men on the left, with the professor, a fuzzily bearded man in a black suit and a pocket handkerchief, standing between the blackboard and the class.

This room hasn't changed drastically in the past hundred years. It is no longer raked upwards; chairs are probably more comfortable these days and the blackboard has been replaced with a whiteboard flanked by two screens. Classes are also much smaller -- never exceeding about forty students, and male students no longer wear suits to class. Female students, at least in this classroom, have decreased since 1898 to about 40% of the student population⁴.

This room may not have changed much, but all the other rooms in the school are equipped with reconfigurable tables and chairs to support greater flexibility in class configuration and learning styles. The CoLab on the second floor is a flexible space with a lounge area as well as movable tables, chairs, and white boards, to support informal meetings, group work, and individual study and the other classrooms can be configured in U-shapes or in-the-round to support "seminar-style" classes.

The move from fixed, lecture-style architecture to a more configurable one reflects the rise of social constructivist theories of learning in the time between these two photographs. Rejecting earlier theories of learning as a process of individual, passive assimilation, John Dewey pointed out that education is entirely a social enterprise.

Education, in its broadest sense, is the means of this social continuity of life. Every one of the constituent elements of a social group, in a modern city as in a savage tribe, is born immature, helpless, without language, beliefs, ideas, or social standards. Each individual, each unit who is the carrier of the life-experience of his group, in time passes away. Yet the life of the group goes on. The primary ineluctable facts of the birth and death of each one of the constituent members in a social group determine the necessity of education (Dewey, 1930, p. 3).

Dewey declared that the school was a community and that it made no sense to have students isolated at their own desks or forbidden from talking with one another. He advocated for a focus on purposeful activity in social settings and said that the best way to learn a new idea was in "normal communication with others".

Almost a hundred years later, we're still struggling to understand how to put the social constructivist ideal into practice. The devil, it seems, is in the details. According to Etienne Wenger, the structure of education today assumes that learning "has a beginning and an end; that it is best separated from the rest of our activities; and that it is the result of teaching" (Etienne Wenger, 2007, p. 3). Working with anthropologist, Jean Lave who investigated learning communities in countries like Brazil, Liberia and the United States Brown and Duguid found that learning is what we do in the practice of everyday life and that it occurs through a process of social participation within a community of practice.

Communities of practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning in a shared domain of human endeavor: a tribe learning to survive, a band of artists seeking new forms of expression, a group of engineers working on similar problems, a clique of pupils defining their identity in the school, a network of surgeons exploring novel techniques, a gathering of first-time managers helping each other cope. In a nutshell, communities of practice are groups of people who share a

⁴ When the doors opened in 1873, 167 men and 222 women students enrolled

concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly (Etienne Wenger, 2007).

Brown and Duguid, working at Xerox PARC in the 90s and tasked with “crack(ing) the learning problem” (Kumar & Ramsey, 2008), drew from the work of Lave and Wenger on learning as participation in "communities of practice" to declare that successful learning happens with and through other people and that what we choose to learn depends on who we are, who we want to become, what we care about, and which communities we want to join.

Although learning is social, remind Brown and Duguid, doesn't mean that networked technology is always highly compatible with constructivist theories of learning. In an important article entitled “Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation” (Brown & Duguid, 1991) Brown and Duguid argue against the assumption that, given the “right” medium people will exchange information freely because they say this overlooks the way in which certain socio-economic groups, organizations, and in particular, corporations, implicitly treat information as a commodity to be hoarded and exchanged.

The constructivist ideal has been embraced nearly wholesale by many educational technology companies who often claim – without any apparent opposition – that their application of social media technology is in keeping with the constructivist tradition. The past few years has seen a mushrooming of platforms providing social media tools (blogs, forums, wikis and profiles) to both formal and information educational initiatives that purport to embrace social constructivist theories. Providing little more than social-media enhanced content management systems that were built for contexts outside of the education one, such platforms purport to enable the building of “vibrant online communities⁵”, “social collaboration across campuses” with results that include “increased student engagement, improved faculty productivity, enhanced online learning and broader marketing outreach”.

One company, that bills itself as “the community platform for education⁶”, declares that they “are pioneering new ways of enabling social learning pedagogies in an online environment” and that “the concept of social learning is rooted in the notion that knowledge is socially constructed and that learning is best achieved through dialogue, collaboration, and transparent sharing of information across a community. A tool need only carry the term “social”, it seems, to be included in the latest set of educational technology or learning management systems. Learning may very well be social, and social media tools may very well enable people to engage socially, but does it necessarily follow that all social media tools enable social learning, and if this is the case, what kind learning results?

The use of social network tools in the educational environment introduces new audiences and new contexts that reconfigure the social environment in complex ways. Anthropologist, danah boyd (2010), writing about dynamics that shape “networked publics” discovers that such spaces are different because of three primary dynamics. Firstly, networked publics introduce invisible audiences that are not always visible or co-present when a person is contributing online, secondly, they result in collapsed contexts where the lack of spatial, social and temporal boundaries make it difficult to maintain distinct social contexts and thirdly, there is a blurring of public and private where “[w]ithout control over context,

⁵ <http://www.goingon.com/>

⁶ Ibid.

public and private become meaningless binaries, are scaled in new ways, and are difficult to maintain as distinct” (boyd in Papacharissi, 2010).

Social learning environments highlight this problem. Peer to Peer University (P2PU), for example, is an online-only tertiary education platform that attempts to use the affordances of the Internet to connect learners with one another. Co-founder, Phillip Schmidt, said that they started P2PU because “we were frustrated that there was all this amazing content, you could connect to people online but there wasn't that social aspect to education that the universities were able to provide and there wasn't that certification aspect that the universities are providing. So that's what we set out to do.” Inspired by Richard Light's Harvard Assessment Study in which he found that the number one indicator for academic success of Harvard students is their ability to form or join study groups, P2PU set about linking free and open educational materials with the students who wanted to learn about particular subjects together.

By using P2PU, users must license all their interactions under a Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike license that allows anyone to adapt anything on the site and publish it elsewhere. In a recent discussion on the P2PU research community mailing list, one of the co-founders made a proposal to make a data dump of the entire P2PU system, including clickstream data, available to the public under the same Creative Commons license. When one rather alarmed community member responded that no one “in government, business, academia, non-profits do anything like this” and that they should “proceed cautiously”, the person proposing the project retorted that “nobody else does this, just like almost nobody makes all student interactions open to the public, or offer free classes, or share material using open licenses⁷”.

Discussions about new online educational initiatives often take this path. We think that we're doing something completely different and so we have to chart new territories and make new rules. But Helen Nissenbaum reminds us that, “although contexts are tuned specifically to the task of framing a response to socio-technical systems and practices that have radically altered information flows, most of their key characteristics can be roughly matched with corresponding characteristics of their more formally developed counterparts” (Nissenbaum, 2009, p. 132). Although innovative online systems like P2PU are new and change the power dynamics of learning in fundamental ways, they still fall within the context of education. Nissenbaum's theory of “contextual integrity” proves useful in understanding the role of contexts – what Nissenbaum calls “structured social settings” – in designing for parallel social settings on the Internet. Nissenbaum believes that we need to look to formally established spheres (in this case, the tertiary educational institution) in order to understand the key characteristics of its corresponding socio-technical systems and practices (in this case, the P2PU system).

P2PU wants peers to be social with one another but has built an entirely new architecture to support this. If students set off to find their new school, they may be surprised to find a video-recorded disco instead. The disco is great for a while: there are fancy suits, no hierarchy and you can leave whenever you want, but this becomes its key problem: there is no one to impress, no markers to highlight who are the access points to communities of practice and no private spaces in which to practice with your peers before you perform in front of those who will give you such access. If in a conventional school information flows like a classical symphony where some parts are soft, some parts are loud, some parts are fast, other parts are slow, the P2PU disco makes information flow at the same tempo and at *forte* throughout.

⁷ View the discussion at https://groups.google.com/group/p2pu-researches/browse_thread/thread/32c8eadda3fc9488?pli=1

In boyd's language, contexts are collapsed that make spatial, social and temporal boundaries difficult to maintain. You seem to be my “buddy” now but might you be in control of a course I'm taking in the future? There are always "invisible audiences" present as we're interacting (future employers may be watching, now or in the future), with the result that there is a blurring of the public and private. In effect, there are no private spaces – no student lounge that students can return to in order to vent their frustrations, console one another or just “practice” before performing for the crowds that matter later on.

Defining these private spaces, then, becomes the key challenge for online social learning initiatives. Privacy in this sense becomes an important vehicle of the properties of these “spaces between”, enabling students control over information that could be used to make decisions against them in the future and for setting up protective boundaries necessary for certain interactions to take place. Privacy, we learn here, is not just important in order to protect students from harmful decisions, it is also critical to engaged learning among peers, whether offline or online.

I now turn to a real-life example of a day in the life of a first year masters student as she navigates the mediated social spaces of the school.

A story of learning

Sharon tells me about her day.

I got here and went to [class] which was at 11. I sat through [class] and we presented our projects. And then afterwards, Anna asked if I was going to a talk at the law school at noon and I said, no, I have a fire to put out, the fire being my 276 assignment. So I went to the lounge and worked on my paper. So Mary was sitting here and we like to chat with one another when we see each other down there, so I sat next to her and I was working next to her and then Anna came and sat next to me. And then I feeling kind of stressed over the outline and so the two of them helped me go over how to outline.

Tell me more about that...

I had Mary look over what I had so far and she looked over my intro and said: oh, it needs more bullet points and so then Anna came and looked at it and then gave me her document to look at to see how she outlined it and then Mary found a website showing how I would outline. Because my tendency is to just write paragraphs instead of points and so they were trying to show me how to shorten it up and put a dot into it. And then Tracy [second year masters student], who was sitting (opposite) was empathizing and saying yeah, she doesn't remember learning how to outline and that she finds it very difficult to. So it was mostly talking about how I can go about coding.

And so Tracy was talking about having done it last year and...

Yeah... and that it was difficult but that it has actually helped her since she has kind of gotten better over the years... or I guess months, since she's been here.

And was that helpful?

Yeah. I thought that someday I too could learn to code like a normal person. So yeah at some point I figured out how to do it by just looking at the examples and looking at how short Anna's sentences were.

And then I went to the [class] and I got there four minutes late because I think Stuart [guest lecturer] started at exactly 2.10 and I had to run to the bathroom... so I was slightly embarrassed but the class was half filled so I didn't feel too bad.

...

After class ended, Anna and I went up and introduced ourselves to him because Anna and I are working on a project together and [lecturer], a couple of weeks ago, came up to us and asked us what we were working on and then introduced us to Stuart. So we then talked to him.

And I ended up talking to Tristan after class, and asking him how I could get a job with the [company name redacted] after I was done and, I don't know, how do I **become** him pretty much.

And was he helpful?

He was really helpful and I was just asking him what he does now and I guess small chat.

Tell me more about this. Did you actually use those words: 'how I can become you'?

No, no... I asked how did you get involved in working for the [company name redacted]. or maybe how did you get involved with working for the [company name redacted]. And he told me he wrote a paper about [issue] and then I said oh, I'd be interested in working for them. And we kind of talked about that... And he said that if I was interested there was a happy hour tonight with [company names redacted]. And that he would send me the invite if I emailed him.

And then I gathered up my things and was going to leave and go work. But then I realized [guest lecturer] had a talk. And then Anna and I felt conflicted about what to do because we wanted to do work so we sat in the back and worked on our outline. But then [lecturer] sat behind us and so I felt uncomfortable doing work with him behind me. So I kind of paid attention, or half paid attention and dimmed my screen so you couldn't see. But then, when we left, when the talk was over, and Mitch left with us and he asked, 'Oh, how was working on 276?' And I thought great, if you saw, [lecturer] probably saw it. Maybe that's why he didn't say goodbye to me. How rude [of me]. Because I don't like it when other people do work in the presence of something else. And I try not to do it unless I think that its an emergency. And I felt like it was an emergency. I felt really bad the whole time.

Reflecting on Sharon's day at school, we can start to see how and where learning is being practiced and how this learning practice is being shaped by Brown and Duguid's "old" and "new" systems. While educators tend to talk about face-to-face versus online education as two distinct systems, we find that networked publics are entering and leaving the school as those connected to those networks join and

leave, creating an environment mediated by networked technology that draws in new publics, new communities and new ideas.

The "old" system

In discussing elements of the "old" system in Sharon's day, I analyze the key spaces in which Sharon engages directly, with her "whole person", in the learning practice. I'll start by describing the school's spaces and talking about what Sharon's choice of venues reflects. What followed in the opening example was a powerful peer learning experience in which Sharon learned practical ways of expressing her knowledge using the examples of individuals whom she trusted.

There are two main spaces reserved for students at the I School: the downstairs student lounge and the upstairs co-lab. The way in which these rooms are designed and the established norms of information flow that inhabit them make for very different kinds of interactions. The student lounge is on the ground floor of the school and houses student lockers and as such is the place where students generally "check in" to see who is around and where unplanned gatherings happen before a class, especially when students need to print documents in which case there will often be a bunch of students clustered around the printer laughing about whose paper is worse, how they struggled with a particular task or how they feel about the instructor. With a relatively low ceiling and many dividing walls, sound does not carry as well and as such it is used by students working on their own who often also want the company (and sometimes the assistance) of other students. In addition to students meeting at lockers, this room is also where snacks and fridges are located, making it a good place to talk to other students. Although mostly used by students, this small "kitchen" is also used by some staff and faculty members. As such, it is probably the space in the school with the most foot traffic and the most opportunities for interacting with the school community.

The co-lab, on the second floor, has a high ceiling and no dividing walls. Because of its size, and the availability of white boards and moveable furniture, it is generally used for group meetings and work rather than socializing. When students want to separate themselves from the rest of the room, they take the moveable white boards and "wall" themselves off. This is only effective in keeping group members focused and undistracted but also in letting others know that work is being done and that they shouldn't be interrupted. According to one student, this has less to do with them distracting him than him continuously looking up and speaking to people coming into the room. Other students use headphones to show that they are separating themselves audibly from those in the room. When Trudy, another masters student, wants to work, she goes downstairs to the student lounge and chooses the table at the far end of the inter-leading room since she won't get distracted by those entering the room on the other side. For others, a cue that someone wants some degree of quiet and doesn't want to participate in the talk will be that they are looking intently at the screen and not being distracted by others. In these ways, students can be "sociable", surrounded by people, and have them near for support, but still find ways to manipulate the architecture and benefit from the norms that enable students to do undistracted work on their own.

In the opening example, we see Sharon and her peers engaged in a peer learning experience. As Sharon progresses through her I School experience, she is collecting memories like this one that enable her to move further into the communities of practice (Lave and Wenger) she wishes to join. Learning, here, is occurring in what John Dewey termed "situations" in which Sharon and her fellow students are actively engaged. It is not the kind of "armchair" thing assumed by the "assimilation" perspective in which the

student sits back to imbibe information. According to Dewey, “Upon this view, thinking, or knowledge-getting, is far from being the armchair thing it is often supposed to be. The reason it is not an armchair thing is that it is not an event going on exclusively within the cortex or cortex and vocal organs... Hands and feet, apparatus and appliances of all kinds are as much a part of it as changes within the brain” (Dewey, 1930, p. 13). It is this "whole person" learning that we must look for as an example of engaged, successful learning practice.

Freedom locating

When Sharon went to the student lounge to work on her assignment, she was offered a great deal of choice of where to situate herself and with whom compared to class time in which she must compete with others for limited space. Sharon could have gone to work in the library where norms dictate quiet and where students go to do solitary work. She could also have gone to the co-lab but feels that it is “too loud” at this time of the semester where group projects are in full swing. Instead, she chose to go to the student lounge where she could still be among her peers (and possibly receive assistance and support from them) in a more intimate environment.

When Sharon saw friends who she trusted in the student lounge, she chose to locate herself near to them, increasing the opportunity for her to engage with them. Sharon sees Anna and Mary as her close friends at the I School. If she can't make a class, it is Anna and Mary (as well as a few others in her trusted network) who she asks for notes or for a summary of what she missed. When I asked her why she thinks she is friends with this particular group, Sharon said spatial and social proximity both play a role.

Maybe because we're women and we have similar personalities... We like to not procrastinate and... I don't know... I'm not sure. We're in serious relationships and have a life outside of the I School. And I'm a lot closer to Anna this semester and we're quite similar in our interests. I think it's a bit of work ethic plus personalities. We're all in the same classes and we're all sitting next to each other.

They sit next to one another in a lot of the same classes, but they all share a similar work ethic that makes collaboration (and encounters like this one) easier. And although they sit next to one another in class, it is these 'spaces between' that extend their friendship into the realm of peer learning. It is here in the student lounge that Sharon has the opportunity to learn the “language, tools and documents” that Wenger declares are central to moving into communities of practice.

Freedom to imitate

Sharon started off insecure about her ability to perform a task that she felt others in the community understood (“coding” research, in this case). The interaction that followed shows how Sharon learns how to imitate a document form, “the outline”, in order for her to gain credence in her community of practice. "Practice", according to Wenger, includes “the language, tools, documents, images, symbols, well-defined roles, specified criteria, codified procedures, regulations, and contracts that various practices make explicit for a variety of purposes” (Wenger, 2007: 47). Sharon says that her “tendency is to just write paragraphs instead of points and so they were trying to show me how to shorten it up and put a dot into it”. She did this by looking at Anna and Mary's outline and imitating the style.

Imitation or what Stanford psychologist, Albert Bandura calls "modeling" is central to social learning. Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely

solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them of what to do. Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action. Because people can learn from example what to do, at least in approximate form, before performing any behavior, they are spared needless errors. (Bandura, 1977)

Although learning theorists like Bandura acknowledge the role of imitation in learning, students in traditional tertiary institutions are still judged on individual performance and imitation in many forms is strongly disapproved of or banned outright. For this reason, students may feel freer practicing this kind of legitimate modeling in spaces that they control. Recall Brown and Duguid discussing the traditional educational system, “[t]he old system... with its campuses and classrooms, nonetheless provided plenty of opportunities for students to ‘steal’ knowledge from teachers and construct knowledge with peers, even though that was not necessarily the intention of the design” (Brown and Duguid, 2000: 233).

Identifying

In the opening example, Sharon is offered support from an advanced peer who, with a few words, identified with her and provided her with an example of what she might become. When entering the learning environment, students will immediately begin by trying to understand their identity in relation to others in order to find their place. It turns out that finding one’s place is actually essential to the learning experience. According to Brown, “[w]hat we choose to learn depends on who we are, who we want to become, what we care about, and which communities we wish to join. In this frame, learning is also a matter of changing identity, not just acquiring knowledge” (Kumar & Ramsey, 2008).

Hearing Tracy (who was a year ahead of Sharon in the master's program) tell her about her own problems with coding in the past, how she overcame them and how she learned that this practice was useful lent a sense of authority to the task and helped allay Sharon's fears that this might prevent her from joining the community of those who could outline (“perhaps one day I too will be able to code like a normal person”).

This kind of supportive peer-learning community offers an important buffer to what can be a frightening process of going back to school. In 2005, Stephen Brookfield celebrated his thirty-fifth teaching year by completing the second edition of his book “The Skillful Teacher”. Brookfield’s insight into the minds of students as they encounter the learning experience is particularly helpful in understanding the vulnerable situation in which they find themselves.

Students frequently feel like imposters, believing they don't deserve to be in the role of learner. They worry about committing cultural suicide as friends and family see them changing because of college. They often feel in limbo, that they are leaving old ideas and capacities behind as they learn new knowledge, skills, and perspective. Sometimes it feels as if learning is calling on them to leave their own identities in the past. However, if they can find others with whom they can share these fears - a supportive peer-learning community -- many of their anxieties apparently become much less corrosive (Brookfield, 2000, p. 32).

Tracy and Sharon are a year apart and take very few classes and social events together. This space, then, provides an important opportunity for serendipitous peer learning between students who may not be part of the same intake.

Rules of engagement

After working on her assignment in the student lounge, Sharon attends a class on the first floor of the building. In class, Sharon engages with the instructor (and the class, by proxy) when she offers a story of her own experience related to the information he is relaying. This experience connects Sharon briefly to the community of practice because she is able to identify with the material and thus find a "way in". The opportunities for such engagements are few and far between in a traditional class like this one where forty students must compete to find their own ways in to the community. Sharon said that the first time she raised her hand in class was extremely difficult.

Oh, that was really hard. I did not like that. I'm a very quiet person and also I was raised to be quiet, and also it's weird to be in grad school where you're expected to do the readings, to be critical about it and to have a point. I don't think I'm at that point where I can do all three for all classes. So, in fact, last semester I didn't really talk in class. But I'm trying to be better this semester. I tend to talk when I really know the answer to something.

Trudy said that she actually has a physical reaction when she raises her hand.

It's something I still struggle with: my heart races, I am questioning whether it even makes sense. And sometimes I have to hear myself to understand what I'm saying. And I sometimes say something and it sounds total rubbish but I have to say it to understand it. And I have to do to learn. I still struggle with it. But once I get started it's fine. I forget that I'm presenting, or I forget that I'm talking about something. But right before, I get a little shaky and nervous.

In the classroom, as opposed to the student lounge, many students seem to accept the role of "empty vessel". That is not to say that students are passive. As a group they recognize the value of lecturer engagement and chastise those who monopolize the lecturer's time. Here students are seen enforcing normative rules about when they can talk, when they should listen, and how to divide the attention fairly. Peter says that, even though he would prefer to ask a lot of questions, that he sometimes holds back in class because of such norms.

(T)he things that I know about I had to hold back. The things that I don't know about I've had to restrain myself from being too inquisitive and clarifying. In the past, I would dig deeper and deeper and deeper without restraint saying: well, that doesn't make any sense - can you explain it further? And that would drive everyone nuts. So I've learned to keep it to myself and ask somebody after class.

He says that other students have alerted him to the fact that he can monopolize engagements with the instructor sometimes. Peter appreciates that students at the I School have 'social skills' and that in class he receives cues about when he can engage.

They (other students) tell you - visual cues, audio cues: now's the time, now's not the time.

Peter has subsequently learned the rules of the community.

I frequently wait to see if anyone else raises their hand if I know the answer for sure and I've already responded a couple of times I just wait to see if anyone else has it, and if they do, cool, let 'em be - you know, let them have - not the 'glory' - but make sure they get their due because the professors are looking for that. And if no one else raises their hand, I'll slowly raise my hand and like: I know this one too. It's like a time-delayed Watson.

Alternatively, Trudy finds it difficult to speak in class because she feels that it requires an instant opinion and she takes time to digest things.

I don't know I need time to think about things. There are definitely people in our class - everybody knows who they are - who all you have to say is one sentence and they have opinions and they have comments... they have lots to say and often times not very deep, very superficial, no details. But it's funny they're perceived as leaders. It's kind of a bully perspective. You know, you're only considering these minorities to speak. And sometimes professors don't make it conducive to speak. You know, for example, where you offer an opinion that's counter to what the professor is saying and he doesn't have the depth of knowledge you do...

In the classroom, where a limited period of time as well as participation points⁸ introduce a competitive factor to student engagement, students like Trudy vacillate between giving up on ever participating in class and raising their hand on occasions in order to play by the institutional rules. While this may be instructive in learning to engage in larger groups, it becomes critical - especially for people like Sharon and Trudy - that there are spaces in which they are not being judged or graded for them to engage in less stressful learning practice. Outside of class, students are able to shrug off their "empty vessel" persona and don their apprentice overalls, becoming engaged in their whole persons in learning practice.

Between classes

The classroom, after class, forms the backdrop for another serendipitous learning occasion in our opening example. Tristan, an I School alumnus who is in town for an event on campus, has joined the class and offers Sharon a "way in" to the community that he is now at the center of and which she is at the periphery. Sharon identifies with Tristan because of their shared experience of the I School and wants to learn the practices that will enable her "to become him". Although many of the students who I spoke to may not have known exactly what they wanted to do when they left school, many of them held up examples of alumni who were central to the communities that they wanted to join. Initiating the conversation by telling Tristan that she had watched him on video, Sharon focused on the interests and experiences that they shared. In effect, she was telling Tristan "I'm just like you therefore I should naturally be in the same community as you". Tristan then responded positively to Sharon by inviting her to a get-together that evening where members of the "inner circle" of his community would be socializing, thereby enabling Sharon an opening and a step into the community that she wished to join.

The new system

Blurring boundaries

Engaging with respected peers in networked spaces like Facebook can become complicated - especially in the relationship between student and alumnus. In order to connect with an alumnus, the student may attempt to use social inroads because of their mutual school experience. Students generally friend

⁸ Instructors allocate part of the final grade to participation in class (and sometimes on class blogs)

others from the school on principle and so this may offer a strategic way of gaining credence in communities we wish to join. Peter, another student I spoke with, describes feeling torn between wanting to "friend" a respected peer (who is a recent I School graduate and part-time lecturer) on Facebook and having him see his frequent updates.

I friended Oliver for the first time yesterday. I have uber respect for the work he can do. I'm like: I aspire to be you! So I didn't want to waste his time with my drivel. Because I wanted to put my best foot forward. If I wanted to get a job at (company name redacted) or some other startup that he knows about, I wanna be able to say: hey, Oliver, I'm skilled. I didn't want to have this looming personality through my posts that he would have to sift through and say: well, really... What do you do, Peter? I'd want to have my abilities first and personality second.

Because there is no (simple) way to distinguish between nuanced relationships like this one, Peter had an experience where one of his friends from another sphere reflected badly on him:

On Facebook I post things and a friend of mine responded in a rather crude, childish manner - genitalia stuff and I was like why? And so I deleted it. But whoever saw it, it's a reflection of me because a friend of mine posted something in relation to my status.

To some extent, they are peers because of their common experience, but in other respects, there is an unequal power balance at play here. The alumnus no longer has the role of "student" but the more esteemed "professional" role in society. Peter knows that Oliver might prove helpful in finding job opportunities for him or help him to join the community he wants to gain entrance to. As a student on the periphery, however, he (theoretically) doesn't have much to offer the alumnus. Because there is no other platform for Peter to use to connect to Oliver in what is a highly contextual relationship, Peter must use the all-purpose, private Facebook platform where he has little control when his role as part of other plays overlaps with this emergent one.

This fear extends to the "invisible audiences" (boyd, 2010) that students often think about when they participate in online spaces. Many are fearful of the impression that they're making on potential employers, respected peers and lecturers. After being a prolific blogger in her teens, Sharon recently deleted her old blogs and restricted her social media profiles.

Another reason why I took everything offline - because it's nice if they search me and see the work I've done with other companies - but Flickr, Facebook - no way. Good reads - I even took that down - they don't need to know what I'm reading.

As we advance towards our new identity after "having learned" we hold on to some of the remnants of our old selves, trying those out with different people and advancing our new selves with others. In order to ensure that we're not "outed" with such apparent contradictions, we must ensure that we separate what some know about us as distinct from what others know. Privacy in this context, then, is about retaining the integrity of the context in which we share that information. Context, here, is specifically about information related to our different identities (rather than only about who we share that information with). As Goffman (Goffman, 1959) says, we have the ability to choose our props and costume and scenery to display to the audience and we choose these in order to retain coherence.

Bringing the outside in

The use of social media tools imported largely wholesale into the institution surfaces important inconsistencies for students. Last year, in a class on participatory media in education at the I School, instructors tested out new learning management software that made heavy use of social media tools.

Because the class was small and students knew each other well, and because it was successfully facilitated as a peer-learning seminar, students and instructors were generally fairly open (in the "whole person" way that Dewey describes) in the classroom, with lively debates and lots of social banter. The online component of the class reflected some of the jocularity of the class, although comments and postings by students were generally formal in relation to in-class conversation. The class was also being offered as online-only for those who couldn't make the class time, and it was from one of the online-only students that the following question came:

I wanted to get others' thoughts and feedback on how open the site content like blogs should be. I know I felt a bit self-conscious and self-edited when I considered the off chance that content could be viewed or searchable by students or employers. This might be a function of the site – but I wanted to get some other views. Can we make the content accessible only to logged-in members? Does it matter?

This comment was interesting from a number of perspectives. It seemed to be concerned with what we generally call "privacy" but the content that it referred to was not what we generally refer to as "private information" (including your name, contact details, grades and private emails). The student was taking the normative model of what blogs are supposed to be (irreverent, personal, "diary-style") and applying it both to what was expected of them in the class (i.e. to be conversational, to engage personally) but then recognizing that what they said would be public and thus accessible to those who might take what they said out of context. Using Nissenbaum's "contextual integrity" framework, there seemed to be a threat that the norms of information flow in the learning environment may be disrupted if the information was moved to a different sphere.

Although blogging in class often aims towards personal reflection, the result of the fact that these posts are more often than not made available to the world persistently and out of control of the student is that students take themselves out of posts. When I ask Sharon what she feels about blogging in class she said, "I mostly did it to get participation points - it wasn't anything personal".

This reflects a missed opportunity. Networked technology offers a number of affordances that enable (not necessarily better) but perhaps just more occasions for students to engage socially with one another and thus better enable the kind of learning practice that can result from this trust.

The digital spaces between

While the institution provides social spaces for students to work together and collaborate networked spaces are less available.

Perhaps the most sociable list is "noise". Although "noise" is purportedly a space where "anything goes", there are, in fact some invisible rules in place which only become visible when they are broken and Noise is used by faculty, staff and alumni as well as students

In the absence of such opportunities, students sometimes coordinate their own networked technology outside the reach of the administration. According to Sharon:

(T)he class of 2012 is all playing Words with friends together. It's like Scrabble for your phone. So Jasper - we have all our classes together and we started chatting - and one day he asked me if I play it and I said no and he said I should download it because other people are playing. And from there other people discovered I was playing and so we were all playing each other. So that's a weird bonding situation so I don't see Celia outside of class but we're still playing this game at like midnight...

Students also prefer to use other means to organise "outside" events because they are often unclear about rules for posting "social" events on an "academic" list. The student mailing lists are watched over by school staff who feel that because it is something all students are required to sign up to, they must make sure to exert some protective influence. Students often don't know what the rules are for posting to the students list because it is unclear who is "watching" and although it would be much easier in some cases to invite students to social events through the list, more often students use other platforms like Facebook or Evite.

This has caused problems in the past where new, perhaps quieter students are not invited to social events hosted by advanced peers because they were simply forgotten or were not already Facebook friends with the hosts or simply choose not to be on Facebook. In this way students who feel that Facebook violates privacy and that they do not want to join on principal, often become even more socially isolated.

Conclusion

It's difficult to imagine this school without its student spaces. Where would they go between classes other than the library (where they must be silent) or to a professor's office hours (where they must fall into the role of "empty vessel")? It would be a dull place, certainly, where students only run into each other in the classroom - a space where they are expected to act in a particular way and where the professor is always the authority figure.

As with the opening example, it is often the spaces between the classroom - in the corridors, before and after class, in the student lounges and outside the school - where we see these engagement of the whole person in learning practice. The key features of such spaces are that they are located within the remit of the institution and therefore carry with them the contextual norms and values shared by the school community; that, although these spaces were situated within the institution, they were located outside of the direct view and control of those in authority, and thirdly, that they were places where students had control over who knew what about them. Within the structure of individual grades and stressful social roles, the student lounge becomes a haven for students where they can conduct conversations unfettered by the need to perform or to display a particular competence and where they can have the opportunity to learn from one another.

In contrast, no such space existed in the digital realm. Student mailing lists were surveilled by staff who felt it their duty to watch the lists in order to protect students, and the class blogging systems were largely open and visible to the public Internet. In the absence of the student-lounge equivalent in the digital realm, students tried to squash uniquely shaped educational relationship pegs into the round-holed platforms like Facebook, leading to identity crises and self-censorship.

The future of learning systems technology seems to be in replicating spaces in which students can be social with one another in the context of learning. And having every interaction recorded and analyzed for educators to understand. But in doing so, we're attempting to bring the outside in, bringing the conversations that happen in the corridors and the student lounge and the classroom into the school hall, thereby disrupting the architecture that sustains peer learning. Using the school analogy, students don't just continue talking the way they usually talk in the student lounge just because someone put a couch in the school hall.

As Glynda Hull writes in the foreword to *Teaching Tech-Savvy Kids*, “[i]f social networking sites are used by and large to extend existing friendship networks, what instructional scaffolds might increase their reach and function, and to what pedagogical, epistemological, and ethical ends? What youthful practices should remain youthful practices, allowed to flourish in out-of-school contexts untouched by school-based purposes, and where might sturdy bridging be built?” (Parker, 2010).

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Deidre Mulligan for her support and advice throughout this project and for making some of the connections to privacy that were so helpful. Thank you also to Paul Duguid for his comments and suggestions on an earlier draft and for inspiring the sections on learning - in both his teaching and his work. Thanks also to the students and staff who I interviewed for their time and for their openness. Thanks to Helen Nissenbaum for providing the framework for thinking about this problem and to friends and colleagues at the I School for listening to me drone on about this with at least the facade of interest. I appreciate your solace and support in our spaces between. It is what got me through it.

Appendix

Literature review

I started this project by looking at theories of privacy from legal theorists like Daniel Solove, Julie Cohen and Helen Nissenbaum. Daniel Solove's work in *Understanding Privacy* (Solove, 2010) is useful for extending our conceptions of privacy beyond “secrecy” (what he calls the “secrecy myth”) to its role in the maintenance of intimate relationships. Solove contends that 'The privacy-as-secrecy conception fails to recognize that individuals want to keep things private from some people but not others.' Although useful in understanding how privacy is being redefined, Solove's view is limited to understanding privacy in terms of the visible harms, rather than those that may be invisible (i.e. when certain groups stop participating because of higher risks).

Helen Nissenbaum's theory of “contextual integrity” (Nissenbaum, 2004) is useful to explain why even those activities taking place in public may actually be privacy violations. Nissenbaum posits two types of information norms that govern all areas of life: norms of appropriateness and norms of flow. Norms of appropriateness dictate what information about persons is appropriate to reveal in a particular context. Norms of distribution refers to the transfer of information from one party to another. Nissenbaum argues that personal information revealed in a particular context is always tagged with that context and that norms are relative or non-universal. She states that distributing social goods of one sphere according to criteria of another constitutes injustice. This is a particularly important perspective when looking at the ability to transfer information expressed in the educational sphere and using it to, for example, assess someone's suitability for a particular job.

danah boyd (2010) says that, while Nissenbaum argues that we need to approach privacy through the lens of contextual integrity, she believes that 'we need to examine people's strategies for negotiating control in the face of structural conditions that complicate privacy and rethink our binary conceptions of public and private. boyd introduces the concept of "networked publics" to explain how networked technologies reorganize how information flows and how people interact with information and each other. According to boyd, privacy is not dead, it is merely in a state of transition as people try to make sense of how to negotiate the structural transformations resulting from networked media.

Moving from theories of privacy to empirical studies, I found the recent literature on youth and privacy to be particularly instructive in setting the stage for the way in which social relationships influence issues of privacy, community and learning. Much of the literature in this field seems to be a direct response to earlier literature and stories in the press indicating that “young people don't care about privacy” (Nussbaum). In a series of empirical studies of youth in the United States and Europe, boyd (2010), Livingstone (Livingstone, 2009) and Parker (Parker & Hull, 2010) analyse how young people are negotiating the boundaries between their private and public identities using social network sites, indicating that young people have a nuanced understanding and concern for privacy, even though they also sometimes share intimate details of their lives with large networks of “friends”. Research by Hoofnagle et al (Hoofnagle, King, Li, & Turow, 2010) on young American adults (aged 18-24) showed that “with important exceptions, large percentages of young adults are in harmony with older Americans when it comes to sensitivity about online privacy and policy suggestions”.

Such studies should show how young people understand privacy but does not explain how community membership is instructive in understanding many of the problems that young people face in open networks like Facebook. In a literature review on “Youth, Privacy and Reputation” Marwick, Murgia-Diaz and Palfrey point out that “Much of the studies of privacy online focus on risk, rather than understanding the necessity of private spaces for young people where they can socialize away from the watching eyes of parents or teachers. These seeming contradictions demonstrate how understandings of risk, public space, private information, and the role of the Internet in day-to-day life differ between children, teenagers, parents, teachers, journalists, and scholars” (Marwick, Murgia-Diaz, & Jr, n.d.).

Christina Nippert-Eng’s “Islands of Privacy” (Nippert-Eng, 2010) looks at how people “do privacy” and provides an interesting lens with which to study the effects of power and accessibility on privacy. Nippert-Eng is instructive in how the architecture and artifacts define boundaries in which we want to be private (even if those boundaries encompass a group rather than just the individual). Nippert-Eng’s “boundary work” (Nippert-Eng, 1996) in which she interviewed people at a particular lab about their separation of “home” and “work” lives is particularly useful for its focus on the social dynamics of privacy - especially since it is a study of privacy rather than just informational privacy.

In addition to privacy research, I also looked at literature covering social constructivism and education covered in the body of the paper. In the early part of the twentieth century, John Dewey, for example, saw learning as an active, social process of constructing knowledge rather than acquiring it, and that instruction should be a process that involves supporting that construction rather than of merely communicating knowledge. In their “e-Learning and Social Networking Handbook”, Mason and Rennie (Mason & Rennie, 2008) understand the move towards the use of networked technology in the classroom as highly compatible with constructivist theories of learning.

Brown and Duguid offer an important critique on wholesale adoption of 'social media technologies' in education. In an important article entitled “Organizational learning and communities-of-practice: Toward a unified view of working, learning, and innovation” (1991) they say that the assumption that, given the "right" medium people will exchange information freely overlook the way in which certain socio-economic groups, organizations, and in particular, corporations, implicitly treat information as a commodity to be hoarded and exchanged. In their work at Xerox PARC in the 1990s, Brown and Duguid explored the inherently social nature of learning, and how successful learning happens with and through other people and that what we choose to learn depends on who we are, who we want to become, what we care about, and which communities we want to join (Brown 2008).

The structure of education today assumes that learning “has a beginning and an end; that it is best separated from the rest of our activities; and that it is the result of teaching” (E. Wenger, n.d., p. 3). But anthropologist, Jean Lave and computer scientist, Etienne Wenger, investigating learning communities in countries like Brazil, Liberia and the United States found that learning is what we do in the practice of everyday life and that it occurs through a process of social participation within a community of practice.

As Lave writes, rather than “acquiring knowledge”, learning is actually about changing participation in social life. “There is no such thing as ‘learning’ sui generis,” she writes, “but only changing participation in the culturally designed settings of everyday life. Or, to put it the other way around, participation in everyday life may be thought of as a process of changing understanding in practice, that is, as learning” (Jean Lave in Illiris).

As McDermott (in Murphy 1999:17) puts it, “[l]earning traditionally gets measured as on the assumption that it is a possession of individuals that can be found inside their heads... [Here] learning is in the relationships between people. Learning is in the conditions that bring people together and organize a point of contact that allows for particular pieces of information to take on a relevance; without the points of contact, without the system of relevancies, there is not learning, and there is little memory. Learning does not belong to individual persons, but to the various conversations of which they are a part.”

This view of learning is in stark relief to those advocating for “open education.” With a focus on abstracted information itself, the open education movement declares that online educational resources, isolated from the context and communities that gave them life, are in themselves “revolutionary”. This is epitomised in Charles Vest's 2006 article in EduCause in which he declares the open materials and platforms are enabling the emergence of what he calls a “meta-university” - “a transcendent, accessible, empowering, dynamic, communally constructed framework of open materials and platforms on which much of higher education worldwide can be constructed or enhanced” (Vest, 2006). Discussions about the “power” of “open education” are expressed in terms of the growth in the “accessibility” of educational resources. According to Caswell et al from Utah University's Center for Open and Sustainable Learning “OpenCourseWares act as enablers to achieving the universal right to education. These technologies, and the associated changes in the cost of providing access to education, change distance education's role from one of classroom alternative to one of social transformer” (Caswell et al, 2008).

In assessing the resources available in answering the question of whether education should be open, there are a number of gaps for pursuing worthwhile research. Social scientists like Paul Dourish have done a good job of starting to bring the world of privacy and security - so long dominated by lawyers and technologists - into the world of sociology and design. But there is very little that assesses the impact of different concepts of privacy (online and offline) on institutional arrangements (such as the 'school'). The goal of this paper, then, is an attempt to bring together legal, sociological, technological, historical and educational literature together to provide an empirically grounded perspective on the 'open education' question.

Interview questions

Question set 1

Roles, participation

How did you come to the I School?

What do you see as your role in the class/classroom?

How did you feel on your first day at the I School?

Can you describe how you felt when you raised your hand/speak up for the first time in class? Do you feel like you understood the culture of the I School when you arrived? Can you think of any instances where that was/was not the case?

Do you see yourself as an active member of the I School? Why/why not?

Sharing

How did you feel about blogging in class? What did you like/not like about it?

Have you presented your work outside of class before? How did that feel?
If you miss a class, how do you catch up?
Have you ever been asked to share/take notes for someone who has missed class?
How do you feel about people recording classes?
Have you stopped saying something recently when you thought someone might steal your idea before you were able to say it first?
How important is the final project presentation to you? How do you want people to see you?

Identity

[Have them look at their I School profile/Google themselves]
You have a picture and some information about yourself here. Why did you choose to show/not show that particular info? What does this say about you?
Do you feel like people know you here at the I School/p2pu? What don't they know about you?

Privacy

What does privacy mean to you?
When was the first time you realized privacy was important?
Have you ever said something online that you wished you hadn't? What was the result?
Do you use different usernames? What does your username say about you?
Do you use Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn differently? How?
How do you feel about students/instructors friending you on social network sites? Do you have a rule about that? Do you think others have the same rule?
Do you feel restricted by who you are friends with on social network sites?
Do you rely on specific friends at the I School to help you navigate the culture?
How do you feel about the fact that things you've blogged about might be persistently available in the long term? Do you know what the I School's privacy policy is?
Is there anything else that you feel I should have asked you?

Question set 2

Can you draw the classrooms that you sit in for each class and show me where you sit?
Why do you sit in that particular space?
How do you feel when you're not in your seat (e.g. when someone else takes it before you arrive?)
Who do you sit next to? Do you notice what they're doing?
Think back to yesterday. Describe your movements within the school. Is this typical?
When you saw people in the school, what did you talk about? (go through each of the places)
What was the last thing you said in class? Is this typical?
What communities do you see yourself as a part of? For example, you could see yourself as part of the I School community, the 2012 community... what else?