

Reflections on the Ecolab and the Zone of Proximal Development

Rosemary Luckin and Benedict du Boulay*,

The London Knowledge Lab

**University of Sussex*

Abstract. In 1999 we reported a study that explored the way that Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development could be used to inform the design of an Interactive Learning Environment called the Ecolab. Two aspects of this work have subsequently been used for further research. Firstly, there is the interpretation of the ZPD and its associated theory that was used to operationalize the ZPD so that it could be implemented in software. This interpretation has informed further research about how one can model context and its impact on learning. Secondly, there is the Ecolab software itself. The software has been adapted into a variety of versions that have supported explorations into how to scaffold learners' metacognition, how to scaffold learners' motivation and the implications of a learner's goal orientation upon their use of the software. Vygotsky's work is as relevant now as it was in 1999: it still has an important role to play in the development of educational software.

Keywords. Vygotsky, Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), Interactive Learning Environment (ILE)

MOTIVATION

The work reported in our 1999 paper (Luckin and duBoulay, 1999) was motivated by a desire to understand more about how Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky 1978, 1986) could be used to inform the design of educational technology. The ZPD was defined by Vygotsky as:

The discrepancy between a child's actual mental age and the level he reaches in solving problems with assistance indicates the zone of his proximal Development; ... Experience has shown that the child with the larger zone of proximal development will do much better in school.

(Vygotsky, 1986: 187)

In order to explore the use of the ZPD in software design an Interactive Learning Environment (ILE) called the Ecolab was built and evaluated. Vygotsky's original presentation of the ZPD left several questions unanswered. The nature of the assistance that should be offered to learners and the timing of help interventions, for example. Our work was therefore also motivated by a desire to interpret the ZPD in a way that answered some of these questions.

The setting for the work we discuss was the school classroom and in particular learners between 8 - 10 years of age. This age group was selected, because it was in line with Vygotsky's writing about the ZPD. At the time of writing the 1999 paper few schools were linked to the internet and not every classroom had a computer. The computers that were in schools were generally quite bulky PCs and there were no smart phones or small personal devices. Our operationalization of the ZPD was therefore developed to encompass the relatively limited technologies that were available at that time. The situation is different now, with most learners having internet access and some smart personal technology. The way that our ideas have developed takes into account these changes. In 1999 UK children were subjected to a national curriculum and to national testing. The curriculum implemented in the Ecolab therefore needed to encompass concepts found in the national curriculum. It focused upon a part of the science curriculum and in particular upon food webs and food chains. This situation has changed very little, there is still a great emphasis upon a national curriculum and national testing in the UK. In many other countries the situation is little different, for example in the US there are the U.S. New Generation Science Standards.

APPROACH AND CONTRIBUTIONS

The first step in the approach we adopted was to unpack and interpret Vygotsky's writing about the ZPD. The concept as introduced lacked specificity about the type of assistance that should be offered to learners, how it should be quantified and how it should be provided and withdrawn. Therefore, in order to clarify the ZPD in a manner that would assist in its operationalization two additional concepts were introduced:

1. The Zone of Available Assistance (ZAA); and
2. The Zone of Proximal Adjustment (ZPA).

The ZAA describes the variety of resources available within a learner's world. These resources could potentially provide different qualities and quantities of assistance. The ZPA is created from a sub-set of the resources from in ZAA and should represent the resources that most accurately match a learner's needs. Within the resources of the ZAA, one very special resource is a More Able Partner (MAP) or Partners who will help the learner. The learner and MAP/s work together to select the optimal resources from the ZAA to create the learner's

ZPA. This conceptualization of the ZAA and ZPA represents an interpretation of the ZPD. In order to operationalize the ZPD for implementation in the Ecolab software a further factor was identified: the assistance offered to a learner must be flexible and capable of being increased and decreased, the assistance must therefore be quantifiable.

The metaphor underlying the presentation of the Ecolab to the child is that of an Ecology Laboratory. The Ecolab is an environment into which the child can place different organisms and with which she can explore the relationships that exist between them. The overall motivation that is presented to her is that she should explore which sort of organisms can live together and form a food web. Learners can use the menu commands to specify actions with the organisms they have placed in their Ecolab. For example, the child can specify that a sparrowhawk will eat a thrush. If the action specified by the child is possible it will occur and the changes can be observed. If the action is not possible the child will be guided (in accordance with the system variation in use) towards a possible alteration so that the effects of the selected action can be observed. When learners interact with the Ecolab they do not need to deal with the full complexity of possible food web inter-relationships straight away. The learning environment provided by the Ecolab can operate in 4 phases of relationship complexity. This means that not all the possible actions with the Ecolab are available all the time. In phase one, which is the simplest, the relationships that can be formed by the Ecolab objects are only those between two organisms: a food and a feeder in the eat or be eaten by relationship. The second phase of complexity allows the formation of food chains and thus relationships between more than two organisms. The third and fourth phases allow the formation of food webs and relationships between all the different members of the web. The system can switch between these four phases from the less to the more complex, or in reverse from the more to the less complex. The activities available to direct children's actions are consistent with the phase of complexity at which the Ecolab is currently operating. A further variation in what children experienced with the Ecolab was that the Ecolab environment could be viewed in different ways, each of which emphasised a particular aspect of the relationships which currently existed within the Ecolab: World view showed a picture of the organisms that were currently members of the Ecolab environment. Web view provided a diagrammatic representation of the organisms and the links that existed between them in a manner similar to the food web diagrams used in text books. Energy view illustrated each of the live organisms in terms of their current level of energy in a block graph, Figure 1 illustrates the original Ecolab interface.




Figure 1 The Ecolab Interface in Energy view

The design and implementation of the Ecolab software was built around the concepts of the ZAA and ZPA. In the software the resources available to the learner (the ZAA) are: the animals and plants that could be placed in children's simulated worlds; the flexible complexity of the different phases of the simulation environment; the actions that can be completed; and the different views that children can use to look at their simulation. While switching views is not essential to any of the activities, it can provide additional help as each view offers a different form of information about the ecology system.

The underlying knowledge of food chains and webs used by the software was organized in a manner that reflected educational requirements about the concepts to be learnt and which ones might be particularly problematic. Three versions of the Ecolab software were developed in order to enable the comparative evaluation we reported: VIS (the full version of the software inspired by Vygotsky's ZPD); WIS (a system that adopted a contingent approach to

supporting the learner based upon the work of David Wood (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976); and NIS (a system that offered no support other than that inherent in the simulated world environment). The MAP's role is played by the VIS and WIS versions of the software through the selection of different levels of help and different levels of Activity Differentiation between individual learners. Decisions about how to target the assistance offered by the VIS system MAP are based upon a detailed, dynamic model of 'beliefs' about the learner's ability to solve problems. This model was based upon the rules in the curriculum and an estimate of the amount of assistance learners would need from the system in order to achieve success. The model was dynamically updated after each action completed by children with the software. Changes to the model were based only upon learners' interactions with the software and not on any self report or observational data. The decisions based upon this learner model helped to target the resources of the ZAA for a particular learner to form the interactions of their ZPA. In the WIS version of the system there was no sophisticated learner model, but rather a record of the learner's most recent action in terms of its success or failure. Decisions by the WIS system MAP were based upon the contingency principle that if the learner's most recent action had been successful then less help would be offered, if the learner's most recent action had been unsuccessful then more help would be offered. In other words help offered is contingent upon the learner's success or failure. Both the VIS and WIS systems could be considered as attempting to provide assistance to learners in a manner that would support the creation of a ZPD. The difference between them is in the sophistication of the decision making about how much help to offer learners and in the fact that VIS provides the support it deems optimal, whereas WIS suggests to learners the support that it deems optimal.

The Ecolab software was a tool to explore how well this interpretation of the ZPD supported learners. It offered learners a simulated environment that they could explore in order to complete a series of activities. Simulated environments for learning science, such as ecology continue to be successful. For example, Dede and his colleagues at the Harvard Graduate School of Education have developed and studied the EcoMUVE curriculum (<http://ecomuve.gse.harvard.edu>). This offers middle school students two immersive, simulated ecosystems in which to learn science concepts and authentic inquiry practices. Learners can see plants and animals in their natural habitats, and collect data. They are set a problem to solve that requires them to work together, collecting and analyzing data. EcoMUVE supports learners through powerful visualisations and realistic data. Other systems that have focused on simulation include the games River City (<http://muve.gse.harvard.edu/rivercityproject/index.html>) and Quest Atlantis (<http://atlantisremixed.org>). These have shown that immersive game-based learning environments can motivate and engage learners as well as providing a powerful new form of curriculum for teaching and learning science. In addition to systems that, like Ecolab, use simulation to support learning there have been a range of approaches to providing learners with timely assistance. For example, David Wood's Quadratic system (Wood and Wood, 1999) embodies a contingent approach to providing help, Meta-tutor (Azevedo, Witherspoon,

Chauncey, Burkett and Fike, 2009) offers metacognitive support and the cognitive tutors (Koedinger et al, 1997) use a model tracing methodology.

Both the interpretation of the ZPD and the Ecolab software have been used for a rich vein of research in the years following upon their original introduction. These were the core contributions of the work we reported in 1999 which along with the pre and post tests used in the system evaluation facilitated subsequent development and deployment. One area of the work we originally reported has not been expanded by us or by others as far as we know. This was the element of the domain knowledge representation within the Ecolab that was informed by Vygotsky's view of concepts, as either scientific or everyday (Vygotsky, 1978; Vygotsky, 1986). Attention was paid to designing the Ecolab knowledge representation as a hierarchical system. The organisms were classified into a taxonomic structure and the terminology describing this structure ranged from language with which children would probably be familiar, such as "snail" and "grass", to language that was less familiar, such as "consumer" and "producer". In the original Ecolab the activities and actions could be completed using less or more familiar language, although few children experienced the less familiar language versions of the activities, as they did not spend long enough with the system for it switch this language in.

PRACTICAL IMPACT AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT

The evaluation of the Ecolab software reported in 1999 took place in a school classroom. It demonstrated that the software was suitable for the classroom context. Learners completed a pre and post test, through which we identified learning gains. We also recorded learners' interactions with the software, which enabled us to explore the relationships between different learner behaviours and learning gain. The findings from the evaluation indicated that offering learners a combination of challenging activities and appropriate support could improve test scores, which may indicate learning. The VIS version of the Ecolab produced the greatest average improvement in test scores, but was not the most successful system with learners of all abilities. The mean improvement amongst WIS users who were in the high ability group was greater than those for VIS and NIS. Likewise the mean learning gains for low ability NIS users were higher than those for WIS and VIS. When considering these findings one must bear in mind the small number of participants, nevertheless it is interesting to explore them further. Why did the lower ability learners do better with the system that had no scaffolding interventions? These children limited themselves to a small part of the Ecolab and often repeated actions again and again. The NIS version of the system allowed the learners this freedom, whereas the VIS system did not. Perhaps the VIS learner model was not sensitive enough to adapt to the less able learners and allow them to repeat actions many times? Why did high ability learners learn more with the WIS version of the system? The WIS version of the system suggested what learners should do in terms of choosing task difficulty and

choosing help level. Perhaps high ability learners preferred this approach, because it gave them more control than the VIS system? Questions like this led us to adapt the design of the VIS system and to explore what elements of WIS and NIS it might be valuable to adopt in the next version of the Ecolab.

Returning to the underlying concepts of the ZAA and ZPA: the ZAA in VIS, WIS and NIS were identical except for the existence and nature of the MAP. In NIS there was no MAP and it was down to the learner to create their ZPA, whereas in VIS and WIS there was a MAP. In VIS and WIS the MAPs operated on different principles and therefore worked with learners to create their ZPAs on a different basis.

In order to explore how the Ecolab might be further developed to better support all learners we looked to keep the ZAA as originally designed and to re-design the MAP. In particular we were keen to maintain the sophistication of the VIS learner model, but to make the system more sensitive to less able learners and to use the way that WIS suggested the type of support that learners should adopt, rather than just offering it to them. This had worked particularly well with more able learners. We therefore investigated how learners might themselves be better at selecting appropriate challenges and help. We developed the Ecolab II software which aimed to provide metacognitive support to help learners improve their help-seeking and task selection skills and, through this, their performance in learning about food chains and webs. Ecolab II was designed to combine aspects of the original VIS and WIS system variations of the Ecolab. It offered different qualities and quantities of prompts to try to get children to consider what they should do next: be it selecting an activity or selecting how much help to ask for. In order for the Ecolab II software to be able to offer this type of assistance, additions were made to the learner model. A third value was added to each of the rule nodes in the learner model structure we originally described in 1999. This value was used to represent how aware the children were of their own learning needs and it was based on a combination of their use of the metacognitive hints and their performance with the Ecolab activities. This value was used to decide upon the level of the next metacognitive prompt offered to the learner and to make recommendations to the learner about how much domain level help to request. Other systems that model learners' help-seeking behaviour include the approach of Aleven et al (2004), who developed a cognitive tutor to support help-seeking. Their approach to scaffolding involves focusing on the learner and providing fadable scaffolding advice. The difference in their approach to that adopted in the Ecolab II can be seen in their development of an ideal help-seeking model to support the system in detecting when the student deviates from the ideal, so that appropriate feedback can be provided. The broader topic of metacognition and learning has increased in popularity and this is reflected well in Azevedo and Aleven, (2013), which provides much useful information for those wishing to explore the scaffolding of metacognition.

Before moving on to the empirical evaluation of Ecolab II, it's worth returning to the concepts of the ZAA, ZPA and MAP and exploring how they are instantiated both in the original Ecolab and in Ecolab II. In the Ecolab software the resources available to the learner (ZAA) were those within the software itself: that is, the animals and plants that could be placed in the children's simulated world; the flexible complexity of the different phases of the simulation environment; the actions that could be completed; and the different views that the children could use to look at their simulation. The underlying knowledge of food chains and webs used by the software was organized in a manner that reflected educational requirements about the concepts to be learnt and which ones might be particularly problematic. This was in effect the curriculum as studied through the children's interactions with Ecolab. The MAP's role was also played by the VIS and WIS versions of the software through the selection of different levels of help and different levels of Activity Differentiation. Decisions about how to target the assistance offered by the MAP were based upon a detailed, dynamic model of 'beliefs' about the learner's ability to solve problems, that was based upon the rules in the curriculum and the amount of assistance they would need from the system in order to achieve success.

The available assistance within the original Ecolab software was through the software scaffolding techniques, that is, the Ecolab ZAA, could be targeted for a particular learner to form the interactions of their ZPA. These were partly in the control of the learner, and partly in the control of the software depending upon the version in use. The learner could decide upon the animals and plants to be added to their simulation, the actions they wanted to complete with those animals and plants, and the view they chose to look at their simulation. They could also select the initial activity they wanted to complete. This meant that children could select an activity that required them to use the most complex phase of simulation right at the start, or they could pick an activity that took them to the simplest phase. After this initial selection, the VIS system would then take over decisions about how the activity and phase might be changed in the light of the learner's performance with the activity they first selected. Obviously, the manner in which the learner could access the resources within the software was constrained by the way in which the software was written, in terms of the underlying knowledge representation, the learner model and the interface.

The resources that make up the ZAA of the Ecolab II software were very similar to those found in the original Ecolab software, with the addition of metacognitive help. The learner model that specified the way that the Ecolab II MAP scaffolded learners contained additional information about learners' use of this metacognitive help. This scaffolding was offered through the provision of suggestions made to the learner about how much help they should use and what level of task difficulty they should attempt. In Ecolab II there was a move towards decreasing the control taken by the system for the assistance offered to the learner in comparison to VIS and increasing the information provided to learners about the ZAA to support their own decisions about the assistance they needed to use in the construction of their

ZPA. A new interface element was introduced to help learners reflect upon their performance and make decisions about the assistance they should use. It provided learner with a map of the curriculum overlaid with information about how much assistance learners had used to complete activities at each point in the curriculum (see Figure 2).




Figure 2 The Ecolab II interface with curriculum map

An evaluation of Ecolab II (Luckin and Hammerton, 2002) demonstrated some interesting consistencies with the original Ecolab evaluation. In both evaluations learners who tackled more than one phase of Ecolab simulation complexity performed well at post-test. An odds-ratio analysis illustrated the consistency of these results between the original Ecolab and Ecolab II. Children who both interacted with different phases of simulation complexity and completed an above average number of actions were 11.4 times more likely to be amongst the learners achieving above average learning gains with Ecolab II, and 12.4 times more likely with the original Ecolab. In other words extending learners so that they interact with more complex concepts is consistent with learning. Another consistency between the Ecolab and Ecolab II was seen in the high percentage of children with above average learning gains who used a high level of help (level three domain help or above; level two metacognitive help or above) and an above average amount of system assistance. The students who gained most when using Ecolab or Ecolab II were those who were extended to work at a greater level of complexity and supported through help interventions. This feature of extension and support is consistent with the concept of the ZPD. Ecolab II encouraged this learner profile through the way that the MAP in the system worked with learners to create an appropriate ZPA from all

the assistance available within the ZAA. An interesting feature of the results from two empirical studies was that this time less able learners made the greatest learning gains.

Further studies adapting and using the Ecolab II software have been conducted. These demonstrate the usefulness of the Ecolab II software for exploring a range of issues, and are relevant to understanding more about affect and self-regulation. Each of the studies adds an extra resource to the ZAA of the Ecolab that present ever increasing challenges for MAPs to work effectively with learners to create their ZPA. Rebolledo-Mendez developed a system called M-Ecolab that monitored learners' levels of effort, independence and confidence to build a model of learners' motivation. Assistance consisted of providing levels of motivational feedback by suggesting to, but not directing, the learner when to ask for more challenging tasks, when to put in more effort or when to select more or less help. M-Ecolab built on each previous Ecolab system and maintained the original domain level assistance mechanisms. The results of a pilot study investigating the effect of motivational scaffolding in M-Ecolab showed that learners with greater learning gains had requested a higher level of help (Rebolledo et al, 2005). The results of a second evaluation showed a significant difference in learning gains between different ability groups and once again illustrated the relationship between learning gain and the use of a higher level of system help and taking on more challenging tasks (Rebolledo et al, 2006). This work was continued through a comparative analysis of the Ecolab and M-Ecolab software conducted in the Phillipines and demonstrated that both systems were able to sustain some positive affective dynamics; flow was persistent in Ecolab (significant) and delight was persistent in M-Ecolab. However, neither system was able to disrupt the persistence of boredom and frustration in students over time (Rodrigo, et al., 2008).

Martínez-Mirón (2007) explored the deployment of different strategies for offering assistance according to different goal orientation styles (Eison, 1979). Two new versions of the Ecolab II software were implemented. One version included system feedback that emphasized a mastery goal orientation (moEcolab), the other a performance goal orientation (poEcolab) (Martínez-Mirón, 2007). An empirical evaluation study with learners aged between 9 and 11 years found evidence that performance goal oriented feedback provided by the system affected the way children interacted and learned from the system.

The issue of goal orientation was explored further using Ecolab II in a study that investigated the extent to which mastery and performance goals influence learners' help-seeking behaviours when using Ecolab II (Harris, Bonnett, Luckin, Yuill & Avramides 2009). There were two options for seeking help while using Ecolab II: clues or views. A clue was presented automatically after an error is made. Children could then choose the type of clue they want; clues ranged from level one (least specific) to level four (most specific). As well as receiving clues children could also move freely between the Ecolab views. For the specific task given to

the children in this study, the Web view was the most effective way of seeing different food chains and the Energy view was the least useful for this task. Analysis of the activity logs resulting from an empirical study indicated that there was no difference between mastery and performance oriented learners in the number of times they chose lower level clues. However, while highly variable, performance-oriented children tended to select clues at the higher end of the scale more frequently than their mastery-oriented counterparts. Performance-oriented children were also significantly more likely to move on to another problem if the clue they had selected had not helped them immediately. Mastery-oriented children clicked between World and Web view more often and made significantly more use of the Web view than the performance-oriented children. Although not significant it is interesting to note that performance oriented children made more use of the Energy view, which was the least helpful. The differences we observed in this study between mastery- and performance-oriented children's help-seeking behaviour using Ecolab II highlighted the importance of considering this motivational dimension when supporting children's learning. The findings also highlight potential future work concerning the development of scaffolding that is sensitive to a learner's goal orientation and adjusts the advice that is offered accordingly.

The concepts of the ZAA and the ZPA have been further developed into the Ecology of Resources model of context. This work moves beyond the confines of a piece of software and grapples with the complex issue of how a learner's wider context can be described in a manner that permits it to be taken into account in the way that educational technology is designed and used. The Ecology of Resources is a specification and a method for modelling a learner's context. It is grounded on a particular definition of context:

A learner is not exposed to multiple contexts, but rather has a single context that is their lived experience of the world; a 'phenomenological gestalt' (Manovich, 2006) that reflects their interactions with multiple people, artefacts and environments. The partial descriptions of the world that are offered to a learner through these resources act as the hooks for interactions in which action and meaning are built. In this sense, meaning is distributed amongst these resources. However, it is the manner in which the learner at the centre of their context internalizes their interactions that is the core activity of importance.

Luckin, 2010 Page 17

The resources with which learners interact make up their ZAA and as in the Ecolab the role of the MAP is to work with learners to select the optimal resources from a learner's ZAA. However in the Ecology of Resources the ZAA extends beyond a single piece of software to describe learners' broader contexts. Associated with the Ecology of Resources model is a design framework with a three-phase process for working with educators to develop context

sensitive technologies and technology applications.

LESSONS LEARNED

In the original Ecolab the activities were part of the software and were linked to the fixed curriculum of domain knowledge. This was a limitation on the manner in which the simulated environment of the Ecolab could be explored. In subsequent versions of the Ecolab the activities were presented in a booklet that was separate from the Ecolab software environment. The Ecolab software directed the learner to the appropriate page of the booklet once an area of the curriculum had been selected. This approach had the potential to be more flexible, we hoped that teachers might want to author new activities for learners, but in reality they did not and the same booklet of activities was used in all subsequent studies with the Ecolab and leaves open the possibility for teachers to introduce new activities should they so wish. The original Ecolab software enabled children to explore populations of organisms as well as individual organisms. The feature was part of the most complex phase of the miniworld simulation and was rarely used by any learner, perhaps because of the limited length of time that learners used the Ecolab. Populations were not implemented in Ecolab II, but they could be added and learners could be encouraged to use the software for a longer period of time.

A related limitation was that of the curriculum itself, which was limited by the software's knowledge representation. The effort of developing the system was significant, but the area of the curriculum it covered was small. This was acceptable for a research tool, but would be a serious limitation for the development of a commercial system. Ways of dealing with this challenge include exploring the extent to which the meta level scaffolding in Ecolab II could be generated in a domain independent manner.

A further limitation of the Ecolab software was that it's design did not encompass people acting in the role of a MAP. It was not designed for use by a teacher and a learner, but for a single learner to use the software independently. There is however nothing to preclude teachers and parents from getting involved and asking learners about their activities with the Ecolab.

The Ecolab software offered learners a limited world of animals and plants with activities to be completed. It attempted to help learners to use this world to increase their understanding of food chains and webs. This was the case for most Intelligent Tutoring Systems at that time. The proliferation of internet access to schools and the rapid development of mobile smart technology means that there are potentially vast resources available and the role of a closed system such as the Ecolab is dated. This does not mean that we cannot learn from the studies completed with the Ecolab, but it does mean we need to update the ways in which we implement this learning. This is very much at the heart of the work on the Ecology of

Resources that has grown out of the Ecolab work.

A possible implication of Vygotsky's ZPD notion is that the effect of the actions and help of the more able partner is to improve the learner's *rate of learning*. Lack of help or poorly focused help would not usually help children to succeed, and so it's the success following strenuous mental effort and the reflective internalization of that collaborative success which drives learning. This suggests that an alternative model of evaluation would not just compare differences in pre/post scores as has been done, but also compare time on task to reach specific learning criteria as well as look at degrees of engagement during learning.

OPEN ISSUES AND FUTURE NEEDS

The increased attention that is currently being given to what are referred to as 21st Century skills confirms the perceived need for learners to develop good metacognitive skills. We have made progress in understanding how these skills can be scaffolded through our evaluations of Ecolab II. However, as already identified the software only deals with a small part of the science curriculum and the metacognitive skills that are supported are limited to help seeking behavior and challenge selection. There is much work still to be done in understanding and developing metacognitive scaffolding. This is also true for the issue of software scaffolding more generally. The studies with the Ecolab explored the design of scaffolding with respect to an increasing number of parameters that included not only metacognition, but motivation and goal orientation too. The empirical work has demonstrated some of the possibilities, but there remain significant questions. For example, in the case of learners' goal orientation should learners be scaffolded to behave in a mastery manner, or should they be scaffolded to support their naturally prevailing goal orientation? If a future version of Ecolab were to be developed that offered scaffolding for metacognition, motivation and goal orientation, how might any conflicts between these approaches be resolved? The Ecolab II interface illustrated in Figure 2 opened up aspects of the learner model for the learner, might further opening up and visualization of the learner model further scaffold learning?

Vygotsky's work was the original impetus for the research we reported in 1999 and it is still a driving force for subsequent and current work. His research was conducted in post-revolutionary Russia in very different circumstances to those in place today. His work is however still extremely relevant. The ZPD was introduced as a way of challenging the testing methods being used in schools at that time. These methods only evaluated what the learner already understood and took no account of things that the learner could achieve with some assistance from a more able other. Much of the educational world remains committed to testing regimes that only evaluate an individual's independent understanding. In contrast the world of work increasingly demands individuals who can work and develop as part of a team.

The concept of the ZPD has lost none of its usefulness and remains in need of further interpretation and development.

The advent of mass educational technology uptake has resulted in large data sets arising from learners' interactions with the technology. This has produced the new field of Learning Analytics that explores what these large data sets can tell us about learners' performance and behaviour. The methods used to track and model learner behavior in the Ecolab and Ecolab II studies were seen to be effective at supporting the system as a MAP for learners. These same methods may now be appropriate for use on these large data sets to track the development in learners' understanding.

The concepts of the ZAA and ZPA have been useful in much subsequent work since the original 1999 article, both through the range of studies conducted with Ecolab II and work with the Ecology of Resources. The Ecolab II studies explored an ever increasing range of potential resources for the software's ZAA including motivational resources and goal orientation resources. The Ecology of Resources extends the ZAA and ZPA concepts beyond learners' interactions with the Ecolab to their learning context more generally. This encompasses more of learners' lives and recognizes that the range of resources available to learners has increased over the years. Technology developments mean learners are rarely offline and can therefore almost always access information resources and people to help them with their learning. However, this increased availability does not mean that learners are necessarily good at pulling together the most appropriate resources to meet their needs. There is an increasingly important role for a MAP, whether in the form of software, people or some combination of the two.

REFERENCES

- Aleven, V., McLaren, B. M., Roll, I. & Koedinger, K. R. (2004) Toward tutoring help seeking — Applying cognitive modeling to meta-cognitive skills. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 3220*, Berlin, Springer-Verlag, pp. 227-39.
- Azevedo, R., & Aleven, V. (Eds.). (2013). *International Handbook of Metacognition and Learning Technologies*: Springer.
- Azevedo, R., Witherspoon, A., Chauncey, A., Burkett, C., & Fike, A. (2009). MetaTutor: A MetaCognitive tool for enhancing self-regulated learning. In R. Pirrone, R. Azevedo, & G. Biswas (Eds.), *Proceedings of the AAAI Fall Symposium on Cognitive and Metacognitive Educational Systems* (pp. 14–19). Menlo Park, CA: Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI) Press.
- Eison, J.A. (1979). The development and validation of a scale to assess different student orientations towards grades and learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

- Harris, A. Bonnett, V., Luckin, R., Yuill, N. & Avramides, K. (2009) Scaffolding effective help-seeking behaviour in mastery and performance oriented learners. In: Dimitrova, V. Mizogucji, R., du Boulay, B. & Graesser, A. (eds). *Artificial Intelligence in Education*, Amsterdam, Netherlands, IOS Press, pp. 425-32.
- Luckin, R. (2010), *Re-designing learning contexts: technology-rich, learner-centred ecologies*, Routledge <http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415554428/>
- Luckin, R. & du Boulay, B. (1999) Designing a Zone of Proximal Adjustment. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Education*, 10 (2), 198–220.
- Luckin, R., & Hammerton, L. (2002) Getting to Know Me: Helping Learners Understand their own learning Needs through metacognitive Scaffolding. In: Cerri, S. A. Gouardères, G. & Paraguaçu, F. (eds.), *Lecture Notes In Computer Science; Vol. 2363*. Berlin, Springer Verlag, pp. 759-71.
- Manovich, L. (2006) The Poetics of Augmented Space. *Visual Communication*, 5 (2), 219-240.
- Martinez-Miron, E. (2007) *Goal orientation in tutoring systems*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Sussex.
- Rebolledo-Mendez, G., B., du Boulay, B. & Luckin, R. (2005) ‘Be bold and take a Challenge’: Could motivational Strategies improve Help-seeking? In: Looi, C-K. et al. (eds) *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*. . Amsterdam, Netherlands, IOS Press. pp. 459–63
- Rodrigo, Ma Mercedes T., et al. "The effects of motivational modeling on affect in an intelligent tutoring system." *Proceedings of International Conference on Computers in Education*. 2008).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Trans. Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S. & Souberman, E. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986) *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Wood, D. J., Bruner, J. S. & Ross, G. (1976) The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17 (2), 89-100.
- Wood, H.A. & Wood, D. (1999) Help seeking, learning and contingent tutoring. *Computers and Education*, 33, 2–3, 153-69.