USING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT THEORY TO IMPROVESTUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN ONLINE DISCUSSION

Qazi Ahmed Daniyal[1], Usman Ghani Chishti[2], and Farrukh Hafiz[3]

Abstract

This research especially examines problems in the dialogue's design, which was constructed using Salmon's five-level model, and illustrates how simple it is to overlook the aspect while developing an important web activity. The newsletter covers how professional network enhancement employees in particular recognize and overcome barriers to involvement by igniting personal and emotional interests, which is kind of fairly crucial. Participation is kind of a pee-considered requirement for building networks. Salmon's five-level model was used to build the case study, which identifies flaws in the dialogue's structure and demonstrates how easy it is to overlook the factor when designing an online activity in a significant way. In the case study, the discussion topics did not resonate personally with many students. This has implications for designing activities that truly engage each student's interest from the start so that participation in the conversation will primarily turn into an innovative interest. This shows how participation is generally a pee-considered necessary for expanding network, so this newsletter discusses how expert network.

Keywords: Dialogue's Design, Participation, Personal Interest, Emotional Interest

INTRODUCTION

Regular learning occurs in a communal setting where playing shared sports builds a network of exercise (Winger, 1998). Online discussion has evolved as a hobby where people interact to share information, negotiate its acquisition, and so build a network of less-experienced people (Salmon, 2000). Students like to actively participate in in-person or online discussions, although they occasionally decide not to join up for anything anymore. College students who decide not to participate may lose out on learning opportunities.

So how might the layout of the teacher make online chats appealing? This essay replies to the question, "What works in phrases of fostering early participation with the asynchronous use of the bulletin/dialogue board?" that was addressed by Downing et al. (2007) in ALT-J and prompted by Borne et al. (2007) Downing et al. In Browning's case, take a look at the educator who built a welcoming environment that fosters trust, but his main contributing aspect is that his success was dependent on a formative assessment interest intended to promote social interaction. Each student added each other to the school in the online space, creating a sense of community and a comfortable setting for meeting friends. The experience discussed below demonstrates how simple it is to make mistakes while arranging a discussion; it examines a specific situation wherein college students shed light on poor incentives for involvement. In this case, 25 freshmen undergraduates were studying control in three fields, including network development. Community engagement theory, which was developed through practical experience in enticing people to participate in local communities, offers guidance to instructors on how to improve student involvement in online communities. This essay uses those ideas to enhance the accounts of novice people via online discussion supported by personal significance.

[1]Scholar, Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology, Karachi, Pakistan. Email: daniyalqazi59@gmail.com
[2]Assistant Professor, Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology, Karachi, Pakistan. Email: dr.usman@ssuet.edu.pk
[3]Senior Lecturer, Sir Syed University of Engineering and Technology, Karachi, Pakistan. Email: fhafiz06@outlook.com

Teachers may feel resentful when students choose not to participate, even though they have committed to the value of online discussion as a crucial strategy for creating a network of learners. "I had always assumed that as soon as the virtual classroom door swung wide at the start of the semester, my pupils may come pouring through, but this has no longer always been the case for all students," the author said (Bender, 2003).

A student must first be talented in order to participate in a learning network, and they must also connect with others by contributing to conversation. People have a right to observe online conversations that are taking place without any interaction before joining in. Reporting on a session that Jackie MacDonald helped lead and discussing Netizen Winger, who promoted the concept of groups of practise (Cos), "Lurking is a shape of cognitive apprenticeship that may be seen as valid peripheral engagement in dialogue-oriented Co's," it was advised (MacDonald et al., 2003). However, if people are to develop their character qualities and self-confidence and contribute to the welfare of a network, being discovered in a collecting setting is not necessarily enough?

Community improvement workers' urge that skill development or personal improvement no longer arises before but through involvement (Warbonnet, 1998). Therefore, those who lack the skills or confidence to be both gifted and sociable are barred from participating in the sports that could help them develop those skills or confidence for network interaction. The intention is to motivate people to cross the line before assisting them in joining in. There are various factors, mostly based on flaws or phobias that prevent you people from working together in a network. Researchers studying community improvement have found that people sometimes lack the awareness, time, confidence, education, skills, or motivation to make a difference (Daniel, Hewitt & Evans, 2007; Fraser, 2005). According to the government, people may be afraid of the unknown, saying the wrong thing, alienating their friends, and being patronized (Daniel, Hewitt, & Evans, 2007). Additionally, gathering places may be "hostile places where people felt intimidated" (Daniel, Hewitt & Evans, 2007). Similar findings were made by Skidmore, Bound, and Lonborough (2006), who were gathering information on participation for the Joseph Downtrend Foundation. They discovered that groups are frequently run by enthusiastic, well-connected, and unapproachable insiders, whose position is bolstered by their belief in local government. This turns off potential members.

All those factors are relevant to the range of meeting settings, from in-person to online, that some college students will find intimidating (Bender, 2003). While instructors may be persuaded by strong pupils to increase the barrier between insiders and outsiders, they may be conquering by utilizing anxieties or felt deficiencies in comparison with others to sidestep the beauty. To the character in magnificence, belonging to a studying network is just as crucial as living close to one: "Feeling covered in a collection is a key aspect for boosting the authentic ability for learning to take place" (Bender, 2003).

It's proper to issue a warning notice. Empowerment is opposed by the imposition of values such as "participation is appropriate for you." This element was developed at the workshop on practice groups, according to MacDonald et al. (2003): "attractive lurkers into active involvement feel somewhat like the 'father knows best' faculty of homogeneity" (2003). According to Referred and Dodgson (2008), participant strategies may be perceived as tyrannical while participation is demanded with the aid of using direction designs, tutors, and ultimately with the aid of using members in a reflective and normative way. This debate replicates the Utopian image of participation while exposing its dark side. However, network improvement researcher Moseley (2003) demonstrates that the "squandering of a tremendous resource" of human and social capital occurs when humans are not contained in collective or network action. These unsettling conflicts present an unexpected challenge for the trainer who is building online discussion.

However, while acknowledging that some students will no longer be motivated or able to join a learning network.

The teacher has a duty to design activities that appeal to as many pupils as possible and provide an engaging learning experience for a variety of personal reasons. The goal is specifically to increase self-confidence for engagement in areas where it no longer already exists. People who remain disconnected from the network run the risk of escalating their disadvantage and missing out on opportunities to develop their skills and knowledge. The goal of the research was to determine what barriers prevented students from participating in the capacity benefits of participation sidewinder the online network for "Management at Work," a first-level module offered at the University of Gloucestershire. The case examines studies conducted in 2006 that were based on works created in years prior. In 2004, a study of online discussion participation for the module "Town and Country Planning" found that a few students' inability to participate substantially damaged the network experience for those who were eager to participate. The absence of others, highlighting the unpleasant side of involvement that was exposed with the aid of technology, leaves participating college students unsatisfied (Referred & Dodgson, 2008).

The case examines studies conducted in 2006 that were based on works created in years prior. In 2004, a study of online discussion participation for the module "Town and Country Planning" found that a few students' inability to participate substantially damaged the network experience for those who were eager to participate. The absence of others, highlighting the unpleasant side of involvement that was exposed with the aid of technology, leaves participating college students unsatisfied (Referred & Dodgson, 2008). While some students were immediately informed about the failure of trust by the sports, a significant portion of students—36% of those studying Town and Country Planning—were no longer sufficiently trusting to share their ignorance with their organization. These students felt let down when other organization participants chose not to take part, leading in one instance to the furious claim that other students shouldn't be allowed to "select a person they don't even know" (Skinner, 2007).

The research conducted in 2004-2005 compared the students' less-than-pleasant sidewinder experience with the module "Management at Work" with their students' more comfortable sidewinder experience in the graded online discussion in "Town and Country Planning". Additional research looking at the control module in 2005–2006 suggested that additional support could support students' capacity for participation: "college students may also additionally develop in self-belief via online dialogue but in the event that they lack enough capacity for participation, then they may be definitely in issue from the start" (Skinner & Underground, 2008). Therefore, the goal of the study in 2006–2007 was to examine improvements to student support for "Management at Work" in order to promote student engagement outside of the evaluated online forum. First-year college students studying heritage, the environment, or network control take the module. The same students use Web CT for two different online discussion projects later in the year. As a collaborative essay network improvement concept, the first debates controversial planning software and the second one are interrelated, it is crucial to introduce the students to online discussion early in the course.

In "Management at Work," five dialogue responsibilities were initially created using Salmon's 5-degree version (Salmon, 2000), gradually introducing college students to production using the Web CT dialogue tool. Sports have been shown to boost class discussion, help students become more accustomed to one another, and expand cooperation based entirely on mutual interests. Students assuming the same situation could develop a fixed identity and exercise cutting-edge control thoughts relevant to their discipline.

The purpose of assessing the discussions is to encourage students to participate. They account for 50% of the module's final grade. The first mission involved a report on personal control stories (Stage 1: Access and Motivation). The students then listed their goals for the programs and emphasized motivation as a management technique (Stage 2: Online Socialization). Thirdly, students exchanged information about current issues in their field (Stage 3: Information Exchange), and fourthly, they applied control principles they had learned to roles in relevant professions (Stage 4: Knowledge Construction). With mission 5, they came to a conclusion by evaluating their entire performance and contrasting the dialogue enjoyment (Stage 5: Development). To boost students' self-confidence and offer suggestions for improvement, the teacher provided written frequent comments after tasks one and character comments after tasks three to five. Students were given points for thoughtful comments, the ability to spark conversation, and helping out other college students.

The framework provided by Salmon's version was ideal for introducing new students to online discussion. Although Boule (2007) claims that the model is merely too limited in how it approaches understanding production in a set setting, when that is the stated goal of online discourse, it offers a useful starting point. Salmon's response to Boule, in which she emphasises the version's versatility, is aided by the enjoyment of using the version (Salmon, 2007). The updated version served as a helpful early guide for the instructor who had experience with designing online dialogue. However, with practice, one gains the confidence to challenge, revise, and employ opportunity tactics. Nevertheless, structuring each discussion topic so that each student has an engaging experience has proven to be challenging. It became important to figure out why when it was discovered that a large percentage of students were engaging in conversations after the set deadlines throughout the module's run in 2006–2007.

According to Tisha Bender, an American web coaching representative, despite the fact that the internet is an asynchronous environment, we need to prevent stragglers from moving the conversation in the wrong direction by waiting until the last minute to join. Ideally, everyone in the class should be participating in the same conversation at the same time (Bender, 2003).

METHODOLOGY AND DISCUSSION

The 25 new college students taking "Management at Work" have been divided into three groups online based on their background in the subject, their environment, or their community, with 7, 15, and three students alternating between the three groups. To help students manage their time over an eight-week period, each activity was given a specified end date. With extensions needed if the closing date changed into currently not being fulfilled, the fifth closing date became the official submission date. As a result of studies sidewinder, more assistance was provided the previous year to boost students' ability and confidence prior to the start of the discussion and to make sure they were equipped with the tools they needed for joining in. Instructors can help by meeting the needs of healthy male or female college students in person, over the phone, via email, or in person, according to MacDonald. An evaluation of students' attitudes and level of confidence in their writing and online communication skills was done during the first week, along with practical computer training during the second and third weeks (Table 1). In week 4, a second poll verified which attitudes, skills, or levels of self-assurance had altered. The audit's goal was to identify college students who needed more specialized assistance during and after the seminars. All college students who completed the audits concurred that the results could be analyzed and included in the research project.

Table 1
Activities

Weeks	Tasks	Salmon's five stages	Supportactivity	Research active
Week 1				First skills audit (detailed)
Week 2			First hands-on Web CT workshop	
Week 3	Task One: Introductions	Stage One: Access and motivation	Second hands-on Web CT workshop	
Week 4	Task Two: Performance Targets	Stage Two:Online socialization		Second skills audit (light touch)
Week 5				
Week 6	Task Three: Information Exchange	Stage Three: Information exchange		
Week 7	Task Four: ManagementIssues	Stage Four: Knowledge Construction		
Week 8				
Week 9	Task Five: Performance Review	Stage Five:Development		
Week 10				Students' reflection on motivation in Task Five
Week 11				Interviews
Week 12				Interviews

Coated (2006) contends that "time on task" "is simply too harsh a level to grab the academic delight in," but these studies were never intended to look at how well students interact in online discussion. It results from a problem where success depends on college students being open to discussion and willing to participate. Every student's initial involvement in each interest was afterwards tracked and recorded with the help of the instructor. The analysis distinguished between students who

submitted their sidewinder interest using the advertised deadline, those who submitted their sidewinder interest one week later, and those who submitted their sidewinder interest more than seven days late.

These data were related to the character traits and attitudes of the students as determined by the skills audit, the written evaluations of the experience by the students, and seven interviews conducted after the completion of the module. The capabilities audit sidewinder the first week and the statement of students' reactions to workshops sidewinder the second and third weeks gave information about their pre-interaction procedures for online discourse. In particular, it identified pupils who could find it challenging to operate online because they lacked the necessary skills and confidence. Reviews of the graded online discussion by students provided additional evidence of their opinions toward involvement. Building on an earlier discussion of motivation as a control technique, students are asked to reflect on their motivation for participating in the five sports in endeavor 5. Additionally, they were encouraged to offer a mission critique that outlines areas for improvement. For the researcher who also serves as a creator, lecturer, and assessor, this situation poses problems. First and foremost, there is a risk that students' reflections will be harmed by the loss of anonymity and the desire to participate in evaluation. There is no evidence, nevertheless, that students held back on their feedback out of concern for offending their mark; instead, they appeared sufficiently confident in Task 5 to be critical of the activities and openly communicate their emotions to their institution and the assessor. Second, a researcher who is closely involved in the design, delivery, and evaluation of talks may be able to sway results by instructing students on how to respond, making it impossible for them to conduct an objective analysis of the statistics. On the other side, the teacher acting as the researcher is doing what all teachers should do: carefully contrasting their learning, teaching, and evaluation activities while encouraging students to express their viewpoints.

Thirdly, it is inappropriate to utilize pupils' artwork for purposes they are unaware of or for which they have not given their authorization. Garrison and Anderson (2003) contend that since teachers are responsible for making statements, there is no need to get consent from college students to listen to conversations. In this instance, students were aware that their contributions to project 5 would be used to evaluate the project and identify areas for improvement, and that they would thereafter receive a paper and response to their comments.

Seven students (28%) were interviewed after the module was finished to have a better understanding of how they felt about the experience and how they perceived what they had learned. The seven college students participated as volunteers, which is likely why they were more inclined to engage in online discussion. Though their levels of motivation, attitudes toward learning, and timeliness in their contributions varied greatly, four out of the seven started off with significant interest-related tension. Two of the seven have never been late, while one has been a little late, another has been significantly late, and the final three have periodically been very late. These college students provided formal permission for their opinions to be used below.

CONCLUSION

Overall, we observe many encouraging outcomes with these understudies, which is encouraging for other programs. We primarily observe significant outcomes, such as students receiving increased work responsibilities and being able to access exceptional opportunities as a result of their collaboration in this type of environment quite recently after they complete the program. As focused, fearful, and/or bashful individuals gain confidence and significantly assume administrative roles in LEEP, we observe intangible effects. We also observe people who appear to have accomplished little else physically

becoming fully-fledged members of their chosen profession. As a result of this kind of distinct curriculum, we may observe something unique: the understudies receive a very "dual education." Contrary to popular assumption, they learn how to actually use current technology, gain experience in remote engagement, and also understand the program's subject matter. We especially welcome regular and necessary additions to the library of any educational program, especially ones that are deserving of being sought for.

REFERENCES

Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., Thompson, M. P., McKeown, R. E., Bethea, L., & Davis, K. E. (2002). Social support protects against the negative effects of partner violence on mental health. *Journal of women's health & gender-based medicine*, *11*(5), 465-476.

How New Technologies Have (and Have Not) Changed Teaching and Learning in Schools: Journal of Computing in Teacher Education: 26(2). (n.d.). Retrieved January 19, 2022, from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10402454.2009.10784632.

Krause, K. (2007). Accommodating diverse approaches to student engagement. Paper presented at a seminar, April 16, at the University of Gloucestershire, Cheltenham. http://resources.glos.ac.uk/shareddata/dms/57C1B3F7BCD42A0398208AFD6C7CAB72.pdf MacDonald

Kynard, C. (2007). "Wanted: Some Black Long Distance [Writers]": Blackboard Flava-Flavin and other AfroDigital experiences in the classroom. *Computers and Composition*, *24*(3), 329–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPCOM.2007.05.008.

Moseley, M. 2003. Rural development: Principles and practice. London: Sage. Moule, P. 2007. Challenging the five-stage model for e-learning: A new approach. *ALT-J Research in Learning Technology. 15(*1), 37–50.

Ohmer, M. L., Meadowcroft, P., Freed, K., & Lewis, E. (2009). Community Gardening and Community Development: Individual, Social and Community Benefits of a Community Conservation Program. *Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/10705420903299961*,*17*(4),377–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705420903299961.

Oliver, R., B. Harper, S. Wills, S. Agosthino, and J. Hedberg. (2007). Designing and delivering e-learning. In Rethinking pedagogy for a digital age, ed. H. Beetham and R. Sharpe, 64–80. London: Routledge.

Rodriguez, S., Cunningham, K., & Jordan, A. (2019). STEM Identity Development for Latinas: The Role of Self- and Outside Recognition. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *18*(3), 254–272. https://doi.org/10.1177/1538192717739958

Roy, S., Bose, A., Basak, D., & Chowdhury, I. R. (2023). Open landfill site and threat to the proximity resident's: Addressing perceived consequences of unscientific solid waste dumping using GIS techniques. In *Urban Environment and Smart Cities in Asian Countries: Insights for Social, Ecological, and Technological Sustainability* (pp. 237-261). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Salmon, G. (2007). The tipping point. *ALT-J*, *15*(2), 171-172.

Sivak, L., Westhead, S., Richards, E., Atkinson, S., Richards, J., Dare, H., ... & Brown, A. (2019). "Language breathes life"—Barngarla community perspectives on the wellbeing impacts of reclaiming a dormant Australian Aboriginal language. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(20), 3918.

Skinner, E. (2009). Using community development theory to improve student engagement in online discussion: A case study. *ALT-J*, *17*(2), 89-100.

Warburton, D. (2013). *Community and sustainable development: participation in the future*. Routledge.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.