

My Philosophy of Learning

How Learning Takes Place

Learning takes place by creating meaning from one's experience (Ertmer, 2013). This constructivism approach believes one learns by relating to their experience. Learning should take place in a setting that is realistic to what and where the student has to learn. Whether it's at the workplace where they're performing the task, or providing a simulation of what they will actually experience that will resonate with the student in the most effective way. In a world of instant information, constructivism can become a guiding theoretical foundation and provide a theory of cognitive growth and learning that can be applied to several learning goals states (Karagiorgi, 2005). Molenda (2009) considers technology as a great approach to constructivist learning theories. Problem-based learning, games and simulations provide a great environment for a student to experience what they need to learn while enhancing the appeal of learning.

Teaching – What is the best way?

Every learner has a unique perspective. Karagiorgi (2005) discusses how *collaborative learning* helps learners develop, compare, and understand multiple perspectives on an issue. The learning environment should make it possible for students to build and articulate these theories to one another. By continually negotiating the meaning of observations, data, hypotheses, and so forth, the learners create frameworks that are largely consistent with one another. The LTEC 5030 Foundations of Learning class assignments are a perfect example of how this occurs. All students answer challenging questions and form opinions which they share after researching and reading articles. The class must respond to a minimum of three student forums with viewpoints that support, challenge, and provide additional research that back their opinion. This not only

allows the student to form their own knowledge by researching and providing an original statement, they can also see other viewpoints which helps evolve their learning. Alonso (2008) states that problem-solving should be collaborative so that learners learn through interaction with others. A good teacher should create learning objectives that contain a meaningful and realistic problem, and problem solving should be collaborative so that the students learn from one another through their interaction. Reiser (2001) drives home that there should be an emphasis on instructors providing authentic “learning tasks” that reflect the complexity of the real-world environment in which learners will be using the skills they are learning.

Learning Theory

In the education/learning profession *it depends* which learning theory you should use when designing learning. *It depends* on the content that needs presented, where your audience is located, and you must always consider the learner demographics. Flexibility with different approaches is key to designing and delivering quality educational material. A comprehensive *needs analysis* should always be performed before you start your learning design. Ertmer (2013) states that “Learning is a complex process that has generated numerous interpretations and theories of how it is effectively accomplished. A designer should look at all theories and present the one that’s of most value for the educational situation.” Instructional designers must understand the strengths and weaknesses of each learning theory to optimize their use in appreciate instructional design strategies (Karagiorgi, 2005). A good instructional designer will consider all methods when designing learning and approach their design accordingly. There isn’t one right way, and knowing the different theories and being able to flex as needed in your design will create the best experience for your learner.

Updates since 5030

My philosophy of learning hasn't changed since LTEC 5030. In fact, with the additional research and learning I have received through my master's journey, it has affirmed my previous view on learning and how one should best learn. As a big proponent of constructivist learning, I also feel collaborative learning is extremely valuable to assist with real-world learning. Leidner and Jarvenpaa (1995) discuss how in addition to sharing the pedagogical assumptions of constructivism, collaboratists also assume that knowledge is created as it is shared, and the more it is shared, the more it is learned. Why do you go to school to learn? The majority of students go to learn, get a job and become a productive and contributing member of society. In the workplace collaboration happens as a way of learning on a daily basis. Leidner and Jarvenpaa (1995) state that learners tend to generate higher-level reasoning strategies, more critical thinking, and more creative responses when they are actively learning in cooperative groups. Collaboration is a way to learn from each other actively, enhancing ones prior knowledge, and stretching critical thinking skills which makes one a productive member of society.

References

- Alonso, F., López, G., Manrique, D., & Viñes, J. M. (2008). Learning objects, learning objectives and learning design. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 45(4), 389-400. Retrieved from <https://libproxy.library.unt.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/210685381?accountid=7113>
- Ertmer, P. A. and Newby, T. J. (2013), Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism: Comparing Critical Features From an Instructional Design Perspective. *Perf. Improvement Qrtly*, 26: 43–71. doi:10.1002/piq.21143
- Karagiorgi, Y., & Symeou, L. (2005). Translating Constructivism into Instructional Design: Potential and Limitations. *Educational Technology & Society*, 8 (1), 17-27.
- Leidner, D. E., & Jarvenpaa, S. L. (1995). The use of information technology to enhance management school education: A theoretical view. *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*, 19(3), 265-291.
- Molenda, M. (2009). Instructional technology must contribute to productivity. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 21(1), 80-94. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12528-009-9012-9>
- Reiser, R. A. (2001). A history of instructional design and technology: Part II: A history of instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 49(2), 57-67. doi:10.1007/bf02504928