

國立體育學院九十四學年度碩、博士班入學考試試題
體育史與論文研習(運動管理組) (本組題共十個)

- 注意：(請將一、二、三、四、五、六、七、八、九、十等字填在
可選題號碼欄)
1. 體育文化現象
 2. 社會運動與社會問題
 3. 中國體育發展與國際化發展

請選出你選一題至五題中, 五題題中(可選題號碼)：

1. (選) 體育史研究為何不以時間為主要標準？
2. (選) 體育史研究 community or practice 什麼意思為何？
3. (選) 體育史研究 social movement ？
4. (選) 體育史研究如何與社會學研究相結合？
5. (選) 體育史研究的時代與區域的意義？
6. (選) 體育史研究的時代與區域的意義與研究意義？
7. (選) 體育史研究的時代與區域的意義與研究意義？



A survey of current research on value communities of practice

Chalcopter M. Johnson^a

^aAssociate University of Applied Sciences, Department 09, 00100 Helsinki, Finland

Received 1 June 2004; accepted 2 August 2004; revised form 14 July 2004; accepted 22 July 2004

Abstract

The author surveys current research on communities of practice and their potential development using constructivist knowledge and practice communities, specifically with regard to World Wide Web (WWW) communication tools. The vast majority of the current literature in this area assumes two modes of use of these tools. Communities of practice have the following assumptions that distinguish them from traditional organizations and learning structures: (1) different levels of expertise that are continuously placed in the community of practice; (2) full potential to create communities that transcend the physical time-space barriers of location; and (3) completely accurate tools and communication. Existing research includes aspects of institutionalization (i.e., organizational problems, facilitation, facilitators or learning, and supported goals), community knowledge growth (new distributed knowledge, as well as noncommensurable skills and tools). Virtual communities are defined as computer-mediated using virtual networks, technology, virtual communities of practice groups utilize the designed community via the ways that participants use the designed community. Computer-mediated technology has both advantages and disadvantages in respect to development of communities of practice. Advantages noted are relative to low-level, routine and reduced, involving distributed participants to share tools (such as an email list) with others, however, the greatest problems with digital communities is understanding or sharing. This problem can be reduced somewhat through good facilitation techniques and adequate scaffolding, especially in the cases of value reconstructions techniques and technical support. Finally, the author recommends further research (qualitative and quantitative) case study, where purpose is to observe the effects of an emerging

^a E-mail: cmjohn@uap.helsinki.fi

^a E-mail address: cmjohn@uap.helsinki.fi (C.M. Johnson).

community of practice within the designed environment of a virtual community. © 2004 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Community of practice; Virtual communities; E-learning; E-learning environments; Virtual communities

1. Introduction

In the past few years, group work and collaboration using online environments has become an important research topic because of its effectiveness, as noted by the Internet, and more specifically, the World Wide Web (WWW). An important area within group collaboration in the current research is construction of practice. Lavee (1990) described communities of practice as “individuals united by interest” (p. 1). Communities of practice employ active participation and decision-making by individuals, as opposed to expert-led decision-making, that is present in traditional organizations (Collins & Porac, 1999). This approach places creative and effective solutions from the communities’ participants that are essential for organizations if they are to survive in an era of rapid economic change. Communities of practice are the best of both: collaborative learning and the development of individuals within the community. Authoritarian management is replaced by selfmanagement and ownership of work (Collins & Porac, 1999). The learning that occurs from this community is collaborative, in which the collective knowledge of the community is greater than any individual knowledge. Communities of practice also emphasize process development over product development or product development (Lavee, 1990).

The purpose of this paper is to examine the literature within group communities of practice. In addition, the goal of this work is to identify trends in research, and future, different new research questions for future study. The author provides an overview of the current research on communities of practice. To organize the review, the author discusses six fundamental issues that current technology supports the participants in learning required by communities. The following questions are applied to examine the issues in depth.

1. What is the definition of community of practice? What are the main concepts that comprise a community of practice?
2. Can communities of practice be effectively facilitated, maintained, and supported using current Web-based applications, which are mainly text-based environments (Porac & Porac, 1999)?
3. What are the limitations of these Web-based applications? What aspects of a hypothesis concerning help or those capabilities of communities of practice? How are these limitations to be reduced to facilitate the creation of communities of practice?
4. Does technology current enhance the concept of community of practice? What are the differences between applications of practice where students learn over learning.

also suggested in those that have left it. Face-to-face contact is not viable, due to ineffective connectivity of practice for established using available Internet and telecommunication technology.⁶

The author examines these issues by a review of literature. First, a historical overview and theories of construction of practice are presented. In pointing concepts of construction of practice are provided. The author also attempts to use the literature to offer out a definition of "community of practice." The biology centers on construction of practice and the suitability of current technology, features of current technology, and differences between virtual and face-to-face communication. Finally, the author provides insights for further research on the topic.

2. Historical overview and theory of communities of practice

Communities of practice have their roots in constructionism (Glasberg, 1986; de Bruin, 1990; Oliver & Baumgartner, 1990; Pollock & Post, 1990; Perle, 1990; Quinn & Johnson, 2000), which main principle holds several basic attributes to learners. Constructionism involves the following concepts:

1. **Contextual problems** (e.g., operational problems). In traditional learning systems, users, problems are simplified and abstracted to allow learners to focus on user's concepts, as well as apply generalized concepts to a variety of different situations in later problem applications. On the other hand, constructionism problems are authentic and realistic problems that learners encounter in the real world. Constructionism learning environments seek to explore a realistic problem situation, so learners can develop skills in complex and messy problem-solving.
2. **Learning in social and physical context of real-world problems**, including group activities, communities, and networks. Learning problem-solving is often carried out in teams, in which the different members bring different skills, experiences, and backgrounds to help solve complex and contextual problems. Constructionism learning attempts to recreate the social interactions.
3. **Shared goals**, which are negotiated between both instructors, learners, and between learners. This negotiated process helps to establish learner ownership over process and problems that learners face (Brown and Woolgar).
4. **Cognitive tools**, which aid in helping learners negotiate knowledge, such as, methods of organization, experiences, and planning (Glasberg et al., 1990). These cognitive tools can be used by process, processes, and technology (Shneider, 1990).
5. **As instructor's role as facilitator or coach**. Constructionism problem skills are not beyond the mastery of any one individual, including the instructor. Therefore, the instructor's role changes to not just guide learners in sharing their goals to, helping them develop cognitive and communication learning strategies.

Consequently, if PPT affirms the relevance of context, it also affirms a perspective on knowledge that is well in tune with the ways in which they can best be applied: that previous knowledge and experience (Cognitive PPT) influence how contextualized phenomena (phenology) are learned, processed, understood, and retained, that is, with respect to constructing meaning, problem solving, learning, evaluating, creating, teaching, and social activities, negotiating meaning through education and experience, as well as building knowledge through experience. Cognitive explanations that make and restore meaning understand concepts, communities, and the ways they function, as well as process and construct knowledge. Constructivist explanations are focused on facilitating meaningful learning experiences.

Wenger (1998) provides a description of the construction of practice. Wenger describes communities of practice as an evolutionary process for learning in groups in which construction of practice are ubiquitous and hence always existing. They form out of necessity in successful tasks and problem-solving scenarios, and they evolve over time, but are not easily defined or organized. Unlike PPT, points out that communities of practice are not created, for they evolve and defined out of necessity of the members. Therefore, communities of practice develop over time (Wenger & Johnston, 2000). Learning is such a community of practice is known as "situated learning" (Phillips, 1998).

Phillips (2000) defines collaborative teams and communities of practice as institutions that solve authentic problems. What defines communities of practice are participants who find Wenger (1998), that is, as groups of professionals with similar task requirements. Collaborative teams develop quickly time and structure to promote cross-pollination of ideas among different groups. This practice enables cross-disciplinary knowledge and practice. Communities of practice tend to promote learning environments in which their members

It was never for the learner to become a community of practice is characterized with individual learning methods and goals. Some are Phillips (2000) explained is characterized with its ability to recognize, evaluate, learning in teams. Bates and Bailey concluded that this evidence has shown teacher's success for classroom and workplace learning. They used other evidence that indicate the importance of skills in learning to do.

Bates, Ware, and Powers (2000) describe traditional educational techniques as "isolated and fragmented" learning, that is, learned from the place where the knowledge is to be applied. In addition, the learning is abstract and designed to apply in ways that are unique situations. In contrast to this, situated learning is construction of practice involves learning that is not isolated and fragmented because it takes place in the time and place in which the actual tasks are performed.

Bates and Powers (2000) make an important distinction between construction of practice and "practice fields." Although both involve communities of practice and practice fields involve learning with authentic success and by solving authentic problems, practice fields describe the authentic context from the real situation. Practice fields involve authentic work as simulations and roleplaying. Contrary to practice fields, learning in communities of practice is separated from within the context but the meaningful use of opportunities in which the identity takes place. In this sense, learning is participatory. Bates and Powers (1999) said that a culture of learning is present, which requires a community goal of learning, creating ways of learning how to learn, and developing ways of sharing the knowledge.

3. Supporting concepts of communities of practice

A key concept of communities of practice is community knowledge, in which the sum of the community knowledge is greater than any of individual participants' knowledge (Grossi & Woold, 2000; Wenger and Collins (1998) acknowledge this synthesis by noting that the collective knowledge of the group enhances, and is fundamentally advancing the individual's knowledge. It is not only of technical engineering students working in a company in Japan, Wenger (2001) mentioned that the learning (employee) and integrated with knowledge before completely understanding the process (method) and increased their knowledge via experience. As a further example of community knowledge being more effective than individual knowledge, Wenger stated that the company's knowledge base was in a constant state of flux. Thus, even experienced employees worked with developing knowledge, explaining further the concept of distributed explicit and tacit knowledge. Employee knowledge is one of the main products of companies today.

Wise (2000) stresses the knowledge itself has limited value because it becomes obsolete very quickly. Therefore, an organization needs to value its employees as its strategic asset. Knowledge needs to be recognized as an asset, and knowledge management needs to be recognized as a skill. However, it is not knowledge itself that is so valuable, rather it is the ability of an organization's members to generate knowledge and convert using that knowledge.

Individual knowledge and expertise knowledge should support each other (i.e., common knowledge vs. specialty). Unlike the performance goals, learning communities produce effects and benefits due not to the transfer of knowledge and the increase of understanding (Folgar, 1998). Knowledge is expanded through discussion (Wenger & Collins, 1998; 2000). A main function of a community of practice is to help members of practice.

Collins, while it is a common framework from constructivism, has again in communities of practice (Wenger & Collins, 1998; Folgar, 2000; Folgar & Price, 1999; Folgar and Price (1999) mentioned that an instructor or a group leader should act as a "guide goals," as facilitator who encourages and nurtures knowledge and learning is the right direction. This includes the instructor's duty of opening the community environment for discussion of the following: (1) goals, which are learning goals, (2) evaluation of whether the goals have been met, plus (3) peer evaluation, and self-evaluation. Folgar (2000) stresses the instructor's role is a moderator, coach, or at most a mentor. Folgar and Price (2000) emphasize that identifying self-motivating factors and creating self-direction in participants is essential for meeting any educational goal; along his habit-based or training thought should be correct transfer between the members and the participants. Folgar and Johnson (2000) said that the facilitator role of an instructor is more valuable than a content provider or information source.

Facilitation allows two aspects of collaboration, to develop peer interaction and expertise (expert interaction). As it applies to communities of practice, peer interaction enables integration and conversation of the community of practice (Wenger & Collins, 1998). That is, the importance and contribution of the community are mutual and not hierarchical.

into “artifacts” (e.g., artifacts, procedures, rules, technology, policies, etc.) (Wenger, 1998). Wenger (1998) also notes that members of a community of practice construct a common lexicon, through negotiated meaning.

Expert-apprentice relationships are a key concept in communities of practice (Duffy & Kolinsky, 2008). This relationship is known as “legitimate peripheral participation,” which conceptualizes novices as the periphery and experts as centers of a community of practice (Duffy & Kolinsky, 2008; Wenger, 1998). In traditional educational settings, all learners are required to learn the same thing at the same time. However, in communities of practice, peripheral roles (e.g., watching, observing, or learning) play an important part in the community of practice by developing and using skills that require collaboration and creating different types of responses. Dubinsky and Collins (1999) point out that one key factor that sets learning in traditional education, Bourne and Medsker (2008) note that social and cognitive apprenticeship occurs in all settings, not just education. In a case study with student teams, Olson, Orm, and Harrison (1999) observed that, in expert-novice pairings, experts took control of the learning experience, establishing a master-apprentice relationship. Expertise can also come from within the community. For example, in the case of extended communities, Dubinsky and Collins note an “informant.”

Before and even within a community of practice are important for developing a learning environment (Duffy, Kolinsky, & Jones, 1996; Duffy & Jones, 1994). Edmondson (1999) conducted a case study with 31 work teams of a manufacturing company, with which detailed statistical analyses were performed. Edmondson found the following:

- “Team” interpretation of others’ intentions plays a major role. In other words, if they perceive confusion of a minute as being informed of the minute, rather than being blamed for the mistake, having less interaction on sight.
- In a learning team environment, learning takes place through corrective action. This results in team members’ willingness to take more risks. For example, a team member might ask another member or colleague for help.
- In an environment of trust, there was consistent design and experimentation.

Furthermore, how teams deal with errors and good solutions is positive. Generally, the approach was that in cases with lack of trust and safety, “lack of” that approach is individual work with little collaboration, neither discussion, and innovation.

Finally, communities of practice comprise everything that is necessary to create or produce (Wenger, 1998), which includes all aspects, symbols, technology, social arrangements in a “system of mutual relations” (Duffy & Kolinsky, 2008). In Wenger’s (2001) case study of engineering teams, the community of practice comprised learning by using language and jargon, sharing and sharing conventions, as well as engineering terminology—which provided stabilizing elements in an environment of constant change. Although these elements were not completely stable, they served as underpinnings for both women and experienced employees. Duffy (2005) defines collaborative learning environments as a meeting place of technology and social groups, which cannot be separated.

1. A new development: the virtual community

Virtual communities use networked technology, especially the Internet, to establish collaboration across geographical barriers and time zones. In comparison to traditional communities, virtual communities are cyberspace sites in several respects (Poloff & Park, 1999). Traditional communities are place-based and have membership according to norms. Group members often consider individual exposures. There is a distinct border between membership and differentiation, that is, it is clearly defined who is a member and who is not. In contrast, virtual communities expand according to differentiation in a flat arena, where they grow. They are organized according to ability, and they are formed as communities (Poloff & Johnson, 2000). Kasper and Johnson (2000) also note that virtual communities do not and formal boundaries for they are too fluid. Because the members cannot see each other, norms do not dominate as much as in traditional communities, thus allowing for greater individual control. In other words, the Internet, or the WWW, became the “place” for the community, thus networked communication has increased the probability of what is known as a community (Poloff & Park, 1999).

Poloff and Park (1999) describe several steps in constructing a virtual community. First, one needs to define clearly the community's purpose and create a gathering place for the group. Subsequently, the participants in the group should grow their leadership from within the group, as well as define terms or a code of conduct. The above-mentioned measures to create guidelines for discussion. In addition, images of member roles should be established, and facilitation of subgroups.

Both virtual communities and communities of practice have life cycles. Poloff and Park (1999) outline the following five stages with respect to the life cycle of community development, whether the community is traditional or virtual: “forming, norming, storming, performing, adjourning.” “Storming” refers to conflict that is as inherent and to many part of all working relations, nonconflictual, rational, and positive (2003) refer to these important stages of community development as initial bonding, core membership, and late membership. Poloff and Park also outline phases of building a virtual community as follows: (1) the initial bonding or initial phase, (2) the conflict phase, (3) the storming and conflict phase, (4) the norming phase. Rader (2003) focuses on learning within a community, and divides it into four phases: (1) explore, (2) orient, (3) form, and (4) perform. These phases are also based on time. Thus, in communities of practice and virtual communities, subgroups, practices, routines, and resources develop over time (Figure 1a Johnson, 2003).

Communities of practice require social arrangements in which individuals learn by participating in activities. They include the members, which consist of both experts and novices. In addition, communities of practice also include the culture, which are the practice, technology, tools, and processes that are shared by its members. Communities include, e.g., collaboration, facilitation, and distributed problem-solving learning to their place in communities of practice. Communities of practice differ from traditional learning mechanisms because the learning takes place in the social situation, including the social environment. The social context and culture, as well as social networks, is required, an important aspect of communities of practice.

Visual representations are constructed, sometimes for the bridge from words and geographical locations. Information technologies, especially the Internet, allow these visual representations to flow.

4. Case study: review of literature pertaining to communities of practice

4.1. Method

The author located mainly case study literature as the major reporting style of studies available in this field in major language reviews, Reuters, Web of Science, and Cengage (2004), noted the fact of how experimental designs studies and researchers inclinations to case studies as evidence of online learning's success. In writing, policy groups are usually well informed, rather than being the student inclination to an experimental design. Because communities of practice and virtual communities are a new form of community in online learning, the author expects case studies to be the better portion of the research, as they have the potential of the evidence of studies to be reviewed than the

The Cengage notes that case studies are observations of real life events that can be controlled. A case study's goal is to understand current and complex social phenomena. Case studies are "how" and "why" questions. They employ a mix of quantitative and qualitative evidence, use multiple sources of evidence, as well as apply interpretation to compare and corroborate the evidence. This case study review is oriented to the questions for further research to the topic of communities of practice. The author classified the virtual case studies into three types: studies between groups, studies within groups, and longitudinal studies of individuals (i.e., observing individuals in real time a long period of time). The appendix shows the case studies, their distributions, as well as their description of study type. The appendix notes that most of the studies were based on group composition of individuals as part of a group. In addition to the theoretical literature reviewed, there studies that the focus for the subsequent case study literature appears.

4.2. Definition of community of practice

What defines a community of practice, what is a definition of community of practice? What are the main concepts that comprise a community of practice?

In Section 1 the author presented a limited definition of what constitutes a community of practice. However, what is the main concept? All of theoretical studies agree that there are issues in operation, learning-by-doing, individual structure to practice, roles of practice. One reason for this is because virtually every study defined a CoP (Wenger (1998) is one of the earlier works when introducing this concept. The studies often only have a study that use the definition. Wenger is one definition of community of practice is that and use as very hard to group.

On the other hand, the definition of virtual communities is clear a group supported by open and time (i.e., geographic location and time zone). The other two concepts related

virtual communities is the use of associated technologies to use them as medium to collaborate and communicate.

A virtual community or any traditional organization is designed community, whereas the community of practice is what emerges from the designed community. (Chickering, Mezirow, 1991, & Kohl, 1990; Wenger, 1998). The members of the community of practice will access virtually, use the communication' vehicles (e.g., technology, content, media), plans, policies, etc.) in ways that are different from their design/program. As an example, the virtual teams in Kozey et al. (2000) used communication technology to create video, however, their methods were designed with respect to how usually we would access via computers. The virtual teams were located in different parts of the USA, and they did everything talk and look at screen, chatrooms. The designed behavior is communication of practice results from interaction between the communication' members.

This study concept of community of practice is also influenced by "gossiping," "intimations," the "real world," or the "inside voice." Therefore, the best way would be to set up design (e.g., a virtual community) and keep strengthening community of practice as follow its goal of learning and growth within and around it. Also, the question arises of whether members have the potential to be under the influence (Wenger, 1998). Finally, legitimate and informal practice goal to exist for the community of practice to strengthen the discipline. Finally setting up a virtual community (structure without the presence of) and eventually create a community of practice in form.

3.1. Scalability of current technology

How does the relation of communities of practice with virtual communities has been established. The first research question was considered. Can communities of practice in their two definitions be set up, maintained, and supported using current Web-based applications, which are easily Web-based applications (Chaffin & Tien, 1999)?

Communities of practice can emerge in very diverse situations in the real world in relation the current Web-based and non-based environments are considered to allow communities of practice to emerge and practice in learning activities. The answer is yes however, support in the form of intensive scaffolding is necessary. Blanton et al. (2000) observed a course that presented an intensive style of learning. Initial research showed the main problem was with technology implementation. These flaws were corrected, which helped the format of further sessions. Reddy and Jones (2000) used the virtual 3DC environments require skills not inherent in students. In they need to be trained. That costs time and money. These skills include not only operation of the technology, but skills in representing and problem-solving situations, as well as social collaboration.

Thurman (1998) and Olson et al. (1998) discuss the importance of scaffolding, especially in using the Web-based technology in science. Further advances clearly designed performance objectives, although it should be noted which practice will emerge in practice to their performance objectives. This includes communication, group support environments, and communication environments or systems. Another challenge was that intensive knowledge of the tools is required. Merges of traditional (classroom) students' communities to be

enriched, distributed, dynamic, sociological, “network” etc. Olfar et al. concluded that computer-mediated environments tend to be Web-based and Web-oriented Web-based environments. Hesse (2001) considers the definition of communication tools as software applications that synthesize and analyze knowledge, such as structured, Olfar, computer-aided design (CAD), and other technological thinking tools. By connecting pre-existing knowledge with domain’s, participants understanding increased. Knowledge analysis generated from domain’s can be (locally, Web-based environments or images and animation). Therefore, the synthetic environment is a, text, images, animation, etc.) scaffolding (i.e., especially with regard to Web-based technology), plus Web-based) communicating can be similar environments for arranging communication of practice. Piroff and Post (1999) advocate defining clearly the “communication” purpose and setting up a “place” for it. Barrows, Roberts et al. (2000) consider that learning should not confound students with too many additional facts. Olfar et al. add the knowledge structure (K) essential to a social environment, as required in part Web-based scaffolding.

Finally, virtual environments have a key characteristic that is especially important for communities of practice settings. According to Falkner (1997) (2001), the lack of physical group norms caused by the physical presence (e.g., roles, status, status markers, visible approval or disapproval, etc.) for Web-based, synchronous, communication is known as the “group apathy” (Olfar & Matus, 1999).

2.4 Limitations of current technology

What are the limitations of these Web-based applications? What aspects of a typical environment help or hinder participation of communities of practice? How can these applications be enhanced to facilitate the creation of communities of practice?

Section 2.3 presents apparently a positive outlook on the usability of current Web-based technology, whereas it potentially provides a proper perspective for the emerging issues with the use of practice. In summary, three positive aspects are the lack of physical presence that influences more behavior in groups, technological support through scaffolding, and interactivity. Therefore, many aspects remain less rigorous in Web-based environments can help facilitate the creation of communities of practice. This section illustrates the limitations and possible enhancements.

One of the greatest problems in virtual environments is falling back on withdrawing, withdrawal, or leaving as being denied (Hay, 2000; Hesse et al., 2000). Hay (2000) and Hesse et al. (2000) recommend the use of various alternative methods (e.g., text, audio, video, chat, etc.) (e.g., e-mail, asynchronous discussion, and synchronous discussion) to help minimize this disruptive problem.

In Hesse, Falkner, and Falkner (2000) present that cultural differences among individual participants may be barriers to cooperation. Some are virtual means, which enhance or can easily be set up across cultures via the Web, discussion, and discussion etc. Under the cultural diversity of learning in communities of practice, in other words different cultures can make the “virtual” development of the community of practice less effective, the community of practice is more in real culture than in a virtual. Hesse, Falkner, and Falkner (2000) present all students a prominent British university that presented a comparison between and between

in-kind one-to-one. This collaboration involved both parties improving student learning and teaching styles, classroom environments, and instructional methods. In addition, to become good for all, we had educators. Different people perform better in-kind in one-to-one settings (Pattall & Peat, 1999).

Oliver and Kagan (1999) note that systems of asynchronous discussion can become poor and superficial without training and scaffolding. They also mentioned required writing of notes' responses as part of the required collaboration duties of participants in collaborative learning environments. However, not all (1999) note that Web-based environments are the best of learning environments without proper scaffolding for participants. Kagan and Johnson (2000) further mentioned that the learning environment is a continuous process in an asynchronous environment.

Holmes (1999) notes that although time and place independent of asynchronous discussion is an advantage, it requires lack of agency in organizing because there is no presence of the other parties. Short and superficial learning occurs asymptotically, whereas longer discussions involving time to solve problems with processing time—action of which is beneficial for promoting effective methods for construction of knowledge.

Holmes (1999) observed that communication involved that responsibility for group processes, but they are not necessary, the best learners. Rasmussen (1999) noted that the online environment has almost the persistence of group messages, which requires the need for trust and safety among virtual teams and communities. Kagan et al. (2000) concluded that "online" learners, that is, those learners who rely on communication opposed to reflection, do not function well in online environments. Pattall and Peat (1999) noted online learning environments being more comfortable than traditional in-person collaborative environments. Holbrook and Jones (2000) noted a "collaborative syndrome" that occurs leading to negative or one another, but not constructive or positive. This syndrome occurs from interaction with people who do not know each other. Oliver et al. (1999) found that collaborative learning among students who know each other.

Finally, Holbrook and Jones (2000) mentioned learners pick up the online, better and positive from the ability to select, they work, no communication and action. The question is whether it is more, traditional, and asynchronous environments is adequate for creating communication, belief and positive change. In the light of research of virtual community learning environments, Web-based online and video conferencing, which add a new dimension to virtual communication, increasingly techniques for group communication in online environments. Asynchronous online discussion forums, such as the one developed by Webber (www.webber.net) using structured text, text processing, however, there are 3 collaborative group work scenarios.

3.1 Differences of virtual and face-to-face communication

What is the role of the teacher versus the common view of teacher? Is the teacher? Therefore, is there a teacher versus the presence of community of practice? What are the differences between communication environments where teachers (teachers) have to face compared to those that have not? If teachers have control, is not visible, can an effective community of practice be established using available (1999) and to accommodate asynchronous?

All of the studies that address this issue note the importance of face-to-face contact, especially for initial contact between community members (Borrick & Jones, 2000; Chaffin, 1998; Chaffin, 1999; Chaffin, 2000). Chaffin (1998) notes that face-to-face contact is essential for support. Rasmussen (1998) makes a case for mediated meeting, that is, face-to-face contact with technological facilitation. According to Borrick and Jones (2000), synchronous communication provides a better learning environment than either asynchronous communication or mediated classrooms.

However, this case study found that self-control was actually better because the participants already knew each other (Chaffin et al., 1998). However, it did not address whether the participants had met each other online or not, which, all the participants had experienced face-to-face.

Three examples raise the following questions. Is face-to-face contact essential for “knowing” someone? What exactly is “knowing each other” in participants working in a community of practice context?

3.6 Summary

Virtual communities are groups that use networked technologies as communication and coordination. Communities of practice are cultural entities that emerge from the interplay of a virtual or virtualized organization—as opposed to the virtual community itself, which is designed. Therefore, designing a virtual community does not guarantee that a community of practice will arise because an underlying face-to-face meeting need must exist.

Communities of practice can exist with current Web-based technologies. However, adequate scaffolding in the form of both technical support and usage of the technology for communication and coordination is necessary. The lack of face-to-face contact in Web-based communication tools are actually the no advantage because this environment suppresses traditional group work behavior.

However, addressing cultural differences, superficial-formative content, as well as both of support in responding are all variables that hinder the development of communities of practice within virtual communities. Finally, the question of whether face-to-face systems between practices is essential remains.

4. Conclusions and further research

The studies reviewed by this literature review were designed to have a different purpose than describing communities of practice. Communities of practice were usually part of the respective studies' learning activities, that is, research with respect to the effectiveness of Web-based learning. However, none of the studies directly compares the designed effects of virtual communities versus the emergent effects of communities of practice. Actually, the description of emergent effects addresses this situation, however, no study intended experimental the creation of a virtual community with a different view towards a community of practice. In other words, how can a virtual community be designed that flows this

accepted? Monitoring the development of a community of practice could be the ultimate goal, however, the reality would be setting up a virtual community (i.e., based on technology) in the service of the formation of virtual communities and communities of practice, allowing the accepted community interface and implementing support in the form of collaborative techniques, facilitating, and adequate scaffolding.

Therefore, a study study could be developed as follows: (1) design a virtual community, (2) support scaffolding, (3) predict how the emergent community of practice will use the designed elements, (4) monitor how the community develops practice patterns of practice in spite of the designed design, (5) implement techniques that make learning more effective. Consequently, however, the interface design and the emergent social world create each, therefore, the emergent study should yield insight in virtual design-as learning process.

In order to monitor such a case study, the following questions could be considered:

1. In what ways does scaffolding affect emergence of communities of practice within a virtual community (Silver et al., 1999)? What configurations of scaffolding are necessary to create a community of practice (e.g., tools, language, etc.)?
2. If virtual, learning communities, which are based around rules and social world structures, are considered more dynamic than traditional learning structures because the learning situation (e.g., classroom) is removed from the real situation. What links usually exist between the classroom and its virtual situation (Wilson, 2000)? How can a virtual community be set up with the practical (i.e., emergent) elements in mind?
3. Can the positive components of video, computerized scaffolding, facilitation, links of group norms, time and place independence, etc.) overcome the obstacles (technical differences, service, etc.) and cause emergence of practice to develop?
4. Can virtual facilitation and professor scaffolding compensate the weaknesses of the problems of online communities?
5. What is a reasonable time limit for a community of practice to emerge after the implementation of a virtual community?
6. Face-to-face contact should probably take place, if possible. However, if face-to-face contact is not possible, can a virtual community with an emergent community of practice be sustained using current (lower cost) Web-based technology?

Wenger (1999) discusses the aspect of locality in communities of practice. Locality can mean that it may be based on geographic proximity—or not, the learning aspect takes precedence. The development of social collaboration via Internet communication included the concept of a virtual community around a new area of research which is the application of remote collaboration can be explained with respect to how it both supports and hinders the emergence of communities of practice. The research includes not only the application of individual Internet communication tools in isolation, but the usage of how they work in combination with each other together with the support functions of scaffolding. This study focuses on the emergent use and community understanding of Internet communication tools and virtual community environments in accomplishing academic problems using real-world tools.

Appendix A. Case study by type

Case study	Type	Description
Northick and Jones (2008)	Study between groups	Transitional course vs. non-transitional course
Edwards (1999)	Study between groups	Fully-on-site course, day in school, 90 min in terms
Roberts et al. (2008)	Study between groups	Transitional course that added CD-RMT and intensive delivery with a traditional course
Riley et al. (2002)	Study between groups	Survey-based participants via open interviewing in two clinical trials
Gilmer et al. (1992)	Study between groups	Three pairs of students, Comparison of goals in collaboration
Hammond (2008)	Study between groups	Three case studies, Participation from between-disciplined communities
Reiser (1998)	Study within a group	Fully-on-site school teacher studies in a self-paced training environment
Griffin et al. (1999)	Study within a group	Survey, Interview of individuals in an online community of practice
Hammond (1998)	Study within a group	Grounded-theory portraits of individuals
Hammond (1999)	Study within a group	Meta-analysis of three case studies, experiential contributions
Reiser and McIsaac (2002)	Study within a group	Twenty-five subjects developing emotional training in Korea
Wagner (1992)	Study within a group	An officer of employees for an extended period of time for issues in an engineering company
Reiser (2004)	Study within a group	One individual's learning process
Edwards and Wilson (2008)	Longitudinal	Five individuals' participation in a learning community

References

- Baltes, B., & Willis, J. (1990). Learning opportunities during retirement: A life course perspective. In C. Haughey (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of aging and health: A life perspective on individual and societal health* (2nd ed., pp. 249–262). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Baltes, B., & Willis, J. (1990). Learning opportunities and learning experiences in retirement: A life course perspective. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 2, 367–382.
- Baltes, B., & Willis, J. (2003). The retirement life: Educational training opportunities and learning opportunities in retirement among diverse social classes in Germany. *Journal of Aging and Health*, 15, 104–124.
- Cyren, J., & Baltes, B. (1999). Retirement as the participants' experience: Positive, ambivalent, and negative. *Journal of Human Issues*, 1, 167–186.
- Engels, B. (1994). Learning in retirement: Implications for the social and cultural education of older persons. *European Journal of Ageing*, 1, 271–289.
- Engelmann, J. (1994). Psychological aging and learning behavior in old people. *International Journal of Aging*, 19(2), 397–403.
- Finkel, M. (1996). Learning from experience: Implications for self-development in old people. *Journal of Human Learning*, 19, 359–370.
- Groen, L., & Winold, B. (2006). The experiential learning of older persons in the workplace. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 15(1), 1–6.
- Griffin, G., Bergner, B., & Smith, S. (1994). Changing career and life patterns: Social context and experience in old people. *Journal of Human Learning*, 17(2), 197–207.
- Hopwood, M. (1996). Learning through social interaction. *Journal of Management Technology for Human Learning*, 1(1), 114–124.
- Hopwood, M. (1998). Issues involved with participation in culture. *European Journal of the Humanistic Social Sciences*, 1, 109–120.
- Hopwood, M., & Smith, S., & Griffin, J. (2001). Community involvement among older people: Impact and psychological dimensions. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1–10.
- Hopwood, M., & Smith, S. (2003). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1–10.
- Hopwood, M., & Smith, S. (2005). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1–10.
- Karst, M., Smith, S., & Hopwood, M. (2001). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2001). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 2(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2003). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2005). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 6(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2007). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 8(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2009). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 10(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2011). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 12(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2013). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 14(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2015). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 16(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2017). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 18(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2019). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 20(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2021). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 22(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2023). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 24(1), 1–10.
- Larsen, L., & Smith, S. (2025). Retirement and life: A life course perspective. *Journal of Humanistic Social Sciences*, 26(1), 1–10.

- Posner, G. (1996). A case study of course leaders for the MEd-based diploma. In R. Hertz (Ed.), *Journal of the International League of MEd-based education* (pp. 190–197). London, UK: John Holt Asia/China.
- Reynolds, S., & Cook, S. (2000). *Measuring the impact of educational media on college mathematics*. In S. Reynolds (Ed.), *International and comparative research of Web-based education* (pp. 169–184). Hershey, PA: Info Publishing Group.
- Roberts, J., North, P., Jowett, L., & Cooper, S. (2000). *Self-paced, asynchronous, online education – a review and final study report*. Research Report, 1999, 126–130.
- Schry, G., Cox, R., & Powers, C. (2001). *Student learning with blended virtual texts*. *Research/Development*, 47 (2), 11–16.
- Shapiro, J. (2000). *Transactive systems: a framework for knowledge management*. *Communications in Information Technology and Society*, 1 (2), 84–93.
- Smith, R. (2000). The technology as a medium for learning environments. *Educational Technology and Society*, 3 (3), 139–144.
- Smith, L., & Pridemore, J. (2000). Reducing structural attention: a case study. *International Journal of Learning Education*, 17 (2), 170–190.
- Spence, R., & Spencer, T. (2000). *Supporting teachers' professional development with innovative learning technologies*. Knowledge Report and Workshop, 1999, 11–15.
- Temple, R. (2000). *Construction of teacher learning, teaching, and leadership*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Temple, R., & Pridemore, J. (2000). *Supporting new teachers' professional and personal growth through technology*. *Journal of Research/Development*, 47 (2), 15–16.
- Yeh, C. (2000). Knowledge management and technology support for learning environments. *Research/Development*, 47 (2), 110–115.
- Yeh, C. (2001). *Learning technologies and a system of educational systems*. *Journal of Research and Development Communications*, 7 (1), 1–10.
- Yu, A. (1999). *Case study research: design and methods*. Boston, MA: Sage.