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Abstract: This paper discusses an innovative pedagogical initiative that is currently the subject of ongoing development at Coventry University in the School of Art & Design - the Hybrid Learning Space (HLS) project. The HLS delivery paradigm originated in response to recent shifts in the tertiary education landscape: The need to meet the challenges of growth in student numbers; and the growing emphasis on international recruitment and the development of internationalised curricula. Fundamental questions need to be asked that challenge entrenched notions of what constitutes a learning space, and, the future role for the traditional design studio in internationalised design course frameworks. The imperative is to design integrated mechanisms of design course delivery that can meet these challenges without compromising the academic integrity and quality of the student learning experience. Methodologically, the paper draws upon thematic analyses of student survey and interview responses to uncover common pedagogically-relevant themes in the context of student participation and attainment. These analyses are correlated with direct observations of student behaviour within conventional and disrupted learning spaces. A case study review illustrates the HLS model in action. It draws upon active research initiatives, interventions and delivery practices from several institutions in the UK and in China. The objective is to explore the effects of learning space topologies on design student participation and to propose a conceptually alternative notion of the design studio as praxis-based learning environment. The paper concludes by summarising the potential benefits of the case study while pointing the way forward to the ongoing evolutionary development of the HLS experiment.

Keywords: hybrid learning space; design pedagogy; internationalised learning; alternative studio; student participation

1 Introduction

The School of Art & Design at Coventry University (CU), in common with many design schools, references a Bauhausian model of design education that positions the design studio as its core learning space and philosophical beating heart. Within that environment, students engage with and perfect their vocational skills while gaining insights into the theoretical underpinnings of their discipline. The ultimate educational aim is that design students are prepared for professional practice by developing a “whole way of understanding the world and responding to it...characterised...as ‘the Designerly Way of Knowing’” (Tovey, 2015, p. 52). While not being a true atelier system in which novitiates learn and collaborate within the studio under the guidance of a master, nevertheless, there are some commonalities with the atelier model. For instance, there is an expectation that course teams should include design tutors with practitioner experience who are able to impart their real-life expertise, professional credibility and
commercial understandings to students. It also the case that the studio space is the primary arena in which concepts are conceived, discussed, visualised, prototyped and tested. Above all else, the studio remains a collaborative, active place in which ideas are fertilised and brought to life. Yet, the expansion of internationalised cohorts in wider tertiary education over the last 20 years or so is beginning to reveal structural fault-lines that may threaten this long-extant delivery model:

The global landscape for higher education internationalisation is changing dramatically. What one might call 'the era of higher education internationalisation' over the past 25 years (1990-2015) that has characterised university thinking and action might either be finished or, at least, be on life support. (Altbach & de Wit, 2018)

If these premonitions are true of higher education in general, then it is reasonable to deduce that these same factors are also beginning to test the limits of the traditional studio-centric model of delivery. The studio as a learning space serves a particular role that is qualitatively unmatched in classroom and lecture theatre-based courses. Its longevity as a specialised design learning arena is testament to the entrenched perception that it is somehow innately essential. Arguably, it is this particularity that is its vulnerability. Ambitions for cohort growth expose its critical weakness: finite occupancy limits. If strategic ambitions for growth are not to be thwarted by capacity constraints, then the hitherto assumed centrality of the design studio as a key component in design course frameworks must come under scrutiny.

2 Methodology

From the Author's work with international design students stretching back some seven years, a working familiarity with some of the challenges faced by them has led to the identification a number of factors that have been shown to affect their academic progression and cultural assimilation into the world of tertiary design education in the UK. The findings reported here are drawn mainly from a combination of two research approaches: thematic analysis of coded survey and interview data; and direct first-hand observation together with video analysis of students’ participation in routine studio and classroom activities and in interventions designed to disrupt student behavioural within studio and classroom learning spaces. Upon completion of their course, students were asked to complete online surveys and to participate in interviews that sought to cast light on their learning journey, and in particular, the issues that they felt that they had found challenging. These survey and interview data were subject to thematic analysis by coding responses to identify common themes or patterns. Two predominant themes have emerged from the data: 1) That English language limitations, as reported by the students themselves, can have serious negative consequences on student participation and attainment (which is also borne out by pedagogical observation and examination of attainment grades). These challenges, in effect, amount to conceptual learning thresholds that students can struggle to overcome. 2) The power-distance relationship between teacher and student also has a strong bearing on the quality of the student learning experience. These findings suggest that affected students can find themselves struggling within conceptual liminal spaces that they find extremely difficult to escape from and progress. Interestingly, students themselves don’t specifically identify learning space dynamics as having an influence on their learning experience. However, by correlating the observations of actual student participation within conventional learning spaces and during the test interventions with the findings of the thematic analyses, it was possible to construct a schematic of the relationship that tie together many of the identified factors that have been shown to affect student participation and performance within the learning spaces, including the design studio (Figure 1).

2.1 The Challenges of Internationalisation of Design Education

The factors that have driven a globalised need for UK universities to adopt an internationalised perspective are a combination of shifting demographics, a contraction in the numbers of home students progressing to higher degrees (Wakeling & Hampden-Thompson, 2013), and financial imperatives caused by changes to traditional, government-funded structures.

As institutional internationalisation has become an embedded and widely accepted part of the higher education sector, the development of strategies to develop and manage international engagement is increasingly taking place at the national and regional level as well as at the level of individual universities. The UK’s research funding landscape reflects this shift toward driving international engagement. (Griffith, 2017)

CU has, for many years now, wholeheartedly embraced the trend towards internationalisation, seeing it as a both a positive factor in its future financial security and for its enhancement of the student learning experience – both domestic and international - and preparation for the world of employment (Hilton, 2015). European institutions also report the same imperatives and benefits:
Most [Dutch] universities recognise that providing an international perspective to students is central in the 21st century. (Altbach & de Wit, 2018)

International classrooms lead to improved learning outcomes, foster intercultural skills and create international networks preparing both international and domestic students for living and working in a globalised world. (Reinold, 2018)

Yet internationalisation is not without its downsides and difficulties:

Despite the benefits...many challenges remain. For instance, international students are confronted with many challenges upon arrival in the host country, including issues of adjustment, integration, discrimination, financial costs, restricted access to the labour market and other administrative and legal hurdles. (Reinold, 2018)

While these overarching concerns are certainly valid, to some extent many of them are systematic or societal in origin and are arguably beyond the capability of any educational institution to materially effect any wholesale remedy. In the context of this paper and its specific focus on the delivery of internationalised design courses, the objective here is to highlight identified design-specific issues and to offer insights into pedagogical strategies that seek to address them. The key point is that for many international students, the barriers to successful attainment are already high even before they are subjected to the additional challenges and conceptual thresholds of having to adapt to a, literally, foreign learning environment (Reinold, 2018).

2.2 The Importance of Participation

“Participation is a way to bring ‘students actively into the educational process’ and to assist in ‘enhancing our teaching and bringing life to the classroom” (Cohen, 1991, p. 699, cited in Rocca, 2010, p.188). This author’s prior research (CU Ethics Approval Ref: P31299) has demonstrated that sub-optimal physical learning space configurations – topologies – can exercise powerful, deterrent effects on international students’ overarching learning experience (Hilton, 2018). This is a view supported by others (Kao & Gansneder, 1995). As far back as the 1970’s it had been noted that some conventional classroom layouts were detrimental to student participation and discussion, and even minor changes to the classroom layout, for example, changing grid desk layouts to U-shaped configurations, were shown to have a generally-positive effect (McCroskey & McVetta, 1978). Another key factor that has been shown to negatively impact upon students’ participatory willingness is large class sizes.

There are various reasons, both speculative and empirically supported, that students fail to participate in class. One reason is class size, with students being more willing to participate... less anxious about participating... and less likely to be able to ‘hide’...in smaller classes than larger classes; large class size tends to hamper communication... (Rocca, 2010, p.189).

Large class sizes seem to amplify performance anxieties among international students, many of whom have been culturally conditioned to adopt self-inhibiting behaviours within orthodox classroom settings (Cheng & Guan, 2012). An intimidating learning space that discourages participation is described by Kao & Gansneder as a “negative classroom climate” (Kao & Gansneder, 1995, p. 136), and it is within such negative classroom climates that Asian students in particular (though not exclusively so) find it difficult to overcome innate participatory reticence: “Sometimes I want to ask question and I think I will try but then I don’t have courage.” (student interview responses, the Author’s research data, 2015-2018). A further significant influence on student participation is the nature of the relationship that the student has with the teacher (Armstrong & Boud, 1983). Where there is a perceived high power-distance between student and teacher, participation can suffer:

“In China, this [teacher-student] relationship is more like a boss and employee in the workplace. A master tells you what to do.”

“Chinese students do not like to speak in class and only speak if teacher ask them.”

“Communication. Not only the language problems, cultural differences, the fear of making mistakes caused by misunderstanding.” (student interview responses, Hilton’s research data, 2015-2018)

Observation analysis of students’ engagement within a variety of learning situations, reveals a tripartite relationship that connects learning space topologies, English language ability and participatory engagement (Figure 1). Negative feedback cycles (shown in red) consequently affect international students’ learning progression and academic
attainment. Conversely, optimum reinforcement loops (shown in green) create a virtuous feedback cycle that can materially enhance student learning, progression and personal development. And in learning situations in which the student-teacher power distance relationship is also diminished, the beneficial effects are noticed by the students themselves:

“This the tutors in UK, they are more like the character of friends, and the communication with my tutor is quite relax and comfortable.”

![Figure 1](image)

*Figure 1. How observed international student learning progression is affected by an interconnectedness between English language skills, learning space topology and attitudes to participation. The left-hand flow, shown in red, represents a damaging combination for student progression and attainment. The right-hand combination, in green, is the ideal Hybrid Learning Space and shows the optimal mechanism for fostering student progression and academic attainment. (Hilton, 2018)*

It is the Author’s development of pedagogical interventions (Hilton, 2015; 2018) that have been specifically designed to address these issues that has led to the construction of an alternative conceptual studio environment; the Hybrid Learning Space (the green side of the schematic in Figure 1). The HLS paradigm sees student activity taking place within an amorphous conceptual space that comprises a mix of physical spaces (both formal and informal) and digital environments that are contingently occupied according to shifting needs and circumstances. One of its central objectives is to create an overarching conceptual environment in which students are at ease and consequently more inclined to participate and actively, unselfconsciously, engage:

“The freedom is great, you don’t feel trapped and in a school environment.”

This quote is interesting because it reveals that the student is aware that within situations that feel like ‘school’ they are disinclined to participate because they have been behaviourally conditioned not to. Engagement and participation within the HLS is both physical and digital, is negotiated, strategically-contingent, and can be synchronous or asynchronous in nature. Students collaborate and communicate as individuals, or in groups and can even simultaneously interact in both physical and digital environments. The HLS model aims to overturn many of the physical constraints inherent in orthodox learning space capacities and topologies while giving students greater control in how they use these spaces – and indeed – any other non-formal spaces that they may care to appropriate as they see fit. There is a design truism; design for the weakest in society and everyone benefits. Thus, the HLS model, while originally designed to address pedagogical issues particular to international cohorts and most-specifically, Chinese students, its key attraction is that it offers the prospect that all students, including those domestically recruited, might profit.

Note that under this framework, typically, students normally have little or no control over classroom topologies as represented in the red half of the schematic. Hilton’s E&PDE 2018 paper explores this issue in greater detail, but in essence, the more a learning space resembles an orthodox classroom topology, the more likely it is that students will
be reluctant to participate (McCroskey & McVetta, 1978; Hilton, 2018). Figure 1 shows how intimidating teaching environments serve to militate against a student’s willingness to participate (for underlying social and cultural reasons), which in turn means that affected students don’t gain the practise and confidence needed to improve their English. This can lead to a downward spiral in student engagement, progression and attainment. Thematic analysis of Chinese student survey responses suggests that underlying cultural dimensions are at the root of why they are often passive within orthodox learning space environments, especially those that conform to conventional classroom topologies. Such culturally-derived factors can stymie institutional assimilation and limit their understanding of teaching discussions and what is expected of them:

“In China students are taught from early age not to question teacher but sit still, be quiet and listen. Teacher tell us what to do. Some friendly teacher we can ask questions but mostly not question teacher.”

Other responses demonstrate students themselves are very much aware that language limitations, cultural differences and fear of loss of face can severely harm their learning experience and academic progression, as one Chinese student reported:

“The weakness of your language ability and professional ability will become the obstacle when you study here.”

The only way for students to improve spoken English and to develop confidence in front of their peers is to practise it, as students themselves recognise:

“Language is one of the problems, but I always wanna try my best to practice and keep talking. Otherwise, if I want to do a good design, I must understand more about the culture here.”

Yet learning spaces that conform to orthodox classroom topologies and role expectations have been demonstrated, both in China and in the UK (Hilton, 2018) to militate against willing participation from Chinese students:

“Chinese students do not like to speak in class and only speak if teacher ask them.”

“Sometimes I want to ask question and I think I will try but then I don’t have courage.”

It should also be said that this phenomenon has also been observed in students from other nationalities, including UK students too. This leads to a conundrum; to what degree is this behaviour due to national cultural dimensions (Hall, 1989; Hofstede, 2001, 2010; Sit, 2013) and to what extent is it due to other contributory factors? While the data and students’ own understandings do appear to point to a participatory reticence that is stereotypically characteristic of the Chinese learner (Cheng & Guan, 2012; Sit, 2013), a more nuanced reading of situated learning space behaviour reveals other, perhaps more universal explanations. In observations of UK student behaviour within learning spaces at Communication University of Zhejiang (CUZ) in which lessons were conducted in Mandarin, Hilton reports that:

Uniformly, they [UK students] retreated to a collectivist, passive attitude…uncannily like the behaviour of newly-arrived Chinese…students in UK classrooms….The implication seems clear; if students from differing cultures exhibit similar situated behaviour when exposed to culturally alien learning environments, then these observed responses cannot be explained in terms of cultural difference alone. (Hilton, 2016).

3 Case Study: COIL, Hybrid Learning Spaces and Student Participation

At Coventry University, one aspect of the drive towards an internationalised student learning experience is the participation in short-term activities called Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) projects. COIL projects are collaborations between the University and international partner institutions that deliver comparable courses and are typically run over one or more weeks. The key characteristic of COIL projects is that they are orchestrated and delivered entirely online, while necessary background activities take place within physical spaces. The case study under discussion was run in January 2018 and involved design students at Coventry University and product design students at CUZ. At CU, the design students were a mix of both undergraduate and postgraduate from the disciplines of product design, interior design and design & transport. The participating students were from a diverse range of nationalities, including Korean, American, Polish, Indian, Lithuanian, UK and Chinese. This cultural mix, vertical integration of courses and cross-disciplinary engagement adds a richness and complexity that is generally not present in traditional discipline-specific projects. The brief was that groups from each cohort had to design a trophy that would be awarded to graduating design students of the other’s institution. So, CU student groups would design for
graduating students at CUZ, while those in CUZ would design for the students at CU. The brief made explicit the requirement that students from the two institutions would need to demonstrate that they had empathetically collaborated in their quest to discover the essential underlying cultural ethos of each institution as well as gaining insights into the wider, overarching national cultural differences. It was not enough simply to a design trophy based on superficial concerns, such as aesthetics, but rather, the design outcomes should clearly signal an empathetic and considered awareness of each institution’s cultural and philosophical values.

In COIL projects the involvement of academics is kept to a necessary minimum and the role is essentially that of a facilitator, guide and behind-the-scenes coordinator. In that regard, preparatory discussions between tutors from the two institutions revolved around the construction of the brief, how the project would be administered, monitored and outcomes delivered. For synchronous online meetings, it was decided to use Teamviewer, a browser-based conferencing and remote assistance tool, capable of Skype-like live-stream video discussions from course studios while also allowing participants to dynamically share computer desktops to access and exchange files (Teamviewer, 2019). For other synchronous and asynchronous communication, WeChat – a ubiquitous Chinese social media app along the lines of WhatsApp – was chosen, not least because course students at CU have also been using it for some years now and were already familiar with it (WeChat, 2019). Capable of simultaneous, multi-user video discussion and audio live chat, text messaging, in-built Chinese-English translation, image and micro-video posting, its versatility and connection resilience made its use especially suited for this project. More prosaically, both Teamviewer and WeChat, unlike some rival applications, are permitted communication tools under PRC Government internet access policies.

The week-long project was formally launched with an online Teamviewer meeting in which students and tutors from both institutions introduced themselves via a live video stream from each other’s studios displayed on large digital displays. Students were allocated to groups which were then paired up and then WeChat ID’s were exchanged. Almost instantly, while the meeting was still in progression, students began communicating with each via WeChat sending messages, pictures and mini-video clips of each other, with some of this activity being visible on the studio display screen in real time (Figure 2). There was much giggling and good-natured banter as the students quickly set about getting to know each other and exchanging contact details. After a run-through of the brief and a question and answer session, the students were given final instructions and reminded of deadlines and expected deliverables. What was striking was that even at this preliminary stage, all students were relaxed and extremely keen to communicate and participate within this online paradigm. There was no evidence of any participatory reticence.

![Figure 2. Screen grabs of WeChat discussion showing communication between Chinese tutor (on left) and English tutor (on right). Note the in-app translation of the Chinese text and the English speaker’s use of Chinese characters to say goodbye. The right-hand image shows students in China live video-streaming themselves from their studio, while simultaneously using WeChat to exchange messages with their UK counterparts. (Hilton, 2018)](image_url)

Over the course of the following days, it became clear that the students were evolving their own ways of working and collaborating with each other that suited their preferences and circumstances. This was most apparent in how they
handled the time difference (China being 8-hours ahead of the UK). Synchronous WeChat discussions tended to take place either early in the morning or very late at night. Where asynchronous communication was enough, then questions, requests, messages, images and micro-video clips were posted to the WeChat discussion group to await later responses. In terms of the students’ use of physical space, it was striking that students didn’t necessarily choose to work in the studio. The stages of research, concept generation, design development and prototyping were all carried out wherever it was felt to most efficacious for them. Variously, this meant working from the studio, from home, in public University spaces, in the library or workshops. During these sessions, students would capture images and videos of themselves working in these environments and post them to their WeChat group discussion accounts. This behaviour seemed to serve two purposes. One, was that it kept the partner group up-to-date with developments and progress; but, perhaps more importantly, it seemed to serve a social function in helping to strengthen the bonds of friendship and collaboration. Certainly, for this media-savvy generation, this appeared to be for them an entirely natural approach. What was absolutely, strikingly clear was that all parties, regardless of nationality, were completely at ease and happy working this way. Indeed, almost all the video-streaming sessions were punctuated by the sound of laughter and no-one seemed reticent in participating (Figure 2). By taking complete control of where they chose to operate, in both physical and digital environments, students had eliminated any performance anxieties as they engaged with each other under their own terms. Without conspicuous oversight from tutors and the imposition of a concomitant power-distance dynamic, the students were spontaneous, gregarious and entirely without introversion in their dealings with each other. They simply got on with the task, taking full control and collaborative responsibility for their progress. No doubt the tools helped in this regard, especially WeChat. Perhaps most impressive was that the inbuilt translation function within WeChat really helped overcome language barriers and communication reticence (Figure 2).

A key characteristic of the HLS paradigm is that while certain key hardpoints of course delivery still necessitate face-face engagement within studios, workshops and learning space topologies, for other activities such as independent study, supervision, feedback, tutorials and content provision - these can be delivered within ephemeral, negotiated online environments. Central to the HLS model is that learning delivery takes place within a variety of contingently-suitable physical and conceptually-alternate online spaces while still having direct access to teachers and learning support. The shift between physical space and digital is often dynamic and students can find themselves learning, collaborating and operating concurrently within both physical and digital learning spaces depending on circumstances. Students themselves are key determinants of where, when and how these conceptually-alternate spaces are inhabited. The project design outcomes were delivered as an online Teamviewer session in which each group of students took it in turn to a 10-minute presentation of their proposals. The start was delayed due to a technical glitch affecting the video feed. Interestingly, because the respective tutors were still able to communicate via WeChat, this did not prove fatal and during the time it took to resolve the problem there was very little evident anxiety and both students and tutors continued to chat freely until normal service was restored. The atmosphere remained relaxed and
tension-free. In retrospect, what this demonstrated was that such was the strength of the bonds that had formed over the preceding days, the sense of familiarity with each other meant that there was no sense of panic. In many ways, it was a great test of the experiment. In overcoming the technical setback, it showed that all parties had developed an evident tolerance of uncertainty that had enabled them to take setbacks in their stride. The deliveries themselves – enthusiastically received web cam streams of the students presenting their work against a backdrop of PowerPoint slides - went without hitch, being live-streamed to studio display screens and laptops (Figure 3).

The implementation and delivery of the COIL project drew upon aspects of practices inherent in the delivery framework that characterises The Open University’s design courses – most notably, module U101, Design Thinking in the 21st Century. While the OU does not possess workshops or studios in which students can engage in the physical construction of design models and prototypes, it is still able to offer design-specific modules that are part of pathways towards degree qualifications. Design modules at the OU are delivered within a mixed-media online learning environment that includes a Moodle-based content delivery framework, a bespoke assignment submission application as well as online fora and a conferencing application (Adobe Connect) for synchronous and asynchronous, peer-peer and peer-student communication and tutorials. It also features a virtual studio - Open Design Studio (ODS) - in which students can post images of their hands-on activities and artefactual outcomes that they have created, usually within their own homes.

Additionally, students get the opportunity to meet with each other and with their tutors several times across the duration of their modules in classrooms contingently hired from schools and colleges. That said, the students don’t get to form close face-face working relationships with each other, though they do self-initiate the formation of discussion groups on social media (typically, Facebook). These discrete online groups are popular and sit outside the formal forum environment that forms part of the OU’s online learning environment. In that these moves are organised by the students themselves, this strategy has much in common with the CU and CUZ students use of WeChat as their preferred online collaborative environment and learning space. From the author’s direct experience of this framework, when it works well it is extremely effective and motivated students respond fruitfully to these modes of delivery. Aspects of the COIL paradigm also drew upon the delivery framework at Shanghai Open University (SOU).

The only design course there is in graphic design, and the delivery differs in as much as the students do actually attend physical classroom sessions on site in which they learn and participate in the hands-on skills of their discipline. This is more akin to the traditional University paradigm than that of the OU’s. While much of the content is delivered and administered online, which the students consume at home, in discussions with the course’s tutors and administrators, their view is that with the particularities of teaching art and design courses, the tutor’s role and physical presence remains essential in imparting technical skills. Their view is that there is no substitute for the ability of tutors to be able to demonstrate and coach vocational techniques in the presence of students while offering direct pedagogical guidance. Simply, while technology and online systems can do much, for some things there is no substitute for a good teacher.

4 Conclusion

By common consent, both from the students’ and the tutors’ perspectives, the COIL project was hailed as a success. Notably, all students – both in China and the home students in the UK – reported that they had never previously worked in this way before and some declared it, ‘the best project we’ve ever worked on’. Similarly, the CUZ and CU tutors were impressed with the outcomes and the way the students collaborated and took responsibility for their own learning journey. The two institutions are continuing to collaborate on further projects. The project has demonstrated that notions of what constitutes a learning space – and that includes the design studio space – appear to be conceptually malleable if circumstances are propitious. Participating students have continued to use WeChat for their personal convenience and collaboration beyond the requirements of the COIL project. While the HLS project is still in its infancy, in broad overview, some conclusions from the COIL project can be drawn:

- In international cohorts, the relationship that ties together English language mastery, learning space topologies/dynamics, and student participation, can have a profound effect on student engagement and attainment. (Hilton, 2015, 2018)

- The use of appropriate technologies – and students’ freedom to use them under their own terms – can materially encourage unselfconscious and relaxed participation by reducing performance anxieties related to factors such as loss of face, perceived power-distance intimidation and an increased sense of control. With increased participation comes better chances of improved progression and attainment.

- Student participatory reticence is complex, especially in the context of perceived national cultural stereotype (Hall, 1989; Cheng & Guan, 2010; Hofstede 2010; Sit, 2013). But even where cultural factors do incline students
towards introversion, this project has demonstrated that reconsiderations of what constitutes a learning space and the judicious use of appropriate technology can significantly facilitate unselfconscious student engagement.

- The project has shown that while students did have access to their studio spaces, it became clear that they weren’t necessarily the spaces in which creative endeavour actually took place. Rather, the studio became more a contingent central meeting point at key strategic milestone stages.
- While the role of tutors during the project was more of that of mediator and facilitator, nevertheless, as the team at the OU and SOU also identify, it remains the case that the tutor occupies a key role in the delivery of a design education. While students did always have live access to tutors via WeChat, it was still the case that students wanted and valued face-face contact with tutors at key moments, especially during ideation and creative phases where work could be shown and discussed.

The pragmatic reality is that the COIL project, while it worked well, lasted only a week. The development and shaping of its underlying philosophy into a workable HLS schema that could eventually be deployed over the course of a semester or even a whole academic year is very much a challenge of a different magnitude. The next stage is how that transition can be made and this is the focus of a live research project that commenced in March 2019. Upon its completion, it is hoped that a further paper will document the outcomes of that research.
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