The Agencement of taskification: On new forms of reading and writing in BYOD schools

Samira Alirezabeigi, Jan Masschelein and Mathias Decuypere

Abstract:

The proliferation of digital devices in educational settings have contributed to the decentralization of knowledge from teachers and established textbooks to fluid online personalized resources, and from blackboards as spaces of materialization of this knowledge to personal screens. In this new constellation, school practices such as reading, writing and note-taking take new forms. How are these practices reconfigured when centered around mobile digital devices? In this paper, we investigate routine lesson practices of a Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) school by means of an ethnographic observation. Adopting the term *agencement* as a heuristic device, we explore what practices are being constituted and how they are always in connection with one another. Moreover, we show that by practicing they produce different forms of action. We argue that in such a hybrid constellation, tasks find a different status beyond isolated and self-contained units for enhancing learning in different lessons. We introduce *task-agencement*, through which the task always entails a process of taskification that formats BYOD schools. With taskification, we mean that the task-agencement expands the domain in which tasks not only influence the organization and structure of lessons, but equally the very organization of the BYOD school by enacting particular form of schooling. Finally, we propose a taskified form as a form of BYOD schooling that templates and formats how practices such as reading and writing, contextualization and introduction of the lesson are conducted.

Keywords: Agencement, BYOD schooling, Taskification, keyword reading, micro writing

1. Introduction

Personal digital devices are no longer unfamiliar school objects and they have been globally integrated at schools by implementing different models in the last decade. One of the most common of these models is the Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) model (Carvalho et al., 2017; Selwyn et al., 2017; Song, 2014). It has been argued that deploying this technology model, which requires students to bring at least one personal device to school, rearranges school's space-time organization and activities in various ways (Decuypere & Vanden Broeck, 2020; Fenwick, et al., 2011; Beetham & Sharpe, 2013). In

this regard, educational scholarship has developed several accounts and concepts that aim to conceptualize how the BYOD setting reconfigures our traditional understanding of learning, teaching, and school's spatiotemporal organization. For instance, the term 'networked learning' is one of the prominent models that provides a theoretical ground to capture how learning in the presence of digital networked devices is configured (Jones, 2012; Ryberg et al., 2012; Carvalho et al., 2017). Networked learning was firstly defined as ways in which 'information and communications technology (ICT) is used to promote connections: between one learner and other learners, between learners and tutors; between a learning community and its learning resources' (Goodyear et al., 2004, p1). For the implementation of this theory into classrooms and instructional practices, networked learning theorists deploy the Activity Centered Analysis and Design (ACAD) model. Emphasizing that learning cannot be designed, they adopt this model in order to recognize the role of emergent activities of students that shapes their learning during classes with digital devices. Nevertheless, they acknowledge that learning can be influenced by design, either physical, social or epistemic design (Carvalho & Goodyear, 2018). Design for learning is chiefly concerned with designing *tasks* to be carried out by students in environments in which digital technologies are an embedded part. This implementing of a design perspective in the classroom, diverges from more traditional instructional takes on design, where the attention is merely paid to the designing tasks *prior* to the lesson (Beetham & Sharpe, 2013; Carvalho & Goodyear, 2018; Goodyear & Carvalho, 2013). In that context, it is then often argued that these traditional instructional approaches, by merely focusing on task preparation before lessons take the start, dismiss the *emerging* activities of teacher and students *during* the lesson and possible adaptations and adjustment to designed practices (Fawns, 2018; Goodyear & Dimitriadis, 2013). Diverging from this traditional view, the design perspective adopted by networked learning theorists proclaims to be activity-based and focuses both on what is being designed and on what emerges in the moment of implementing (ibid).

Although networked learning theories and the corresponding ACAD perspectives contributed to our understanding of what concretely happens in BYOD settings, relatively little attention has been paid to emergent lesson activities, and in particular, reading and writing practices in BYOD contexts. In fact, the emergent activities are majorly seen in relation to designing future task rather than understanding what form of schooling comes forward as emergent activities are repeated over and over (Fawns, 2018; Ryberg et al., 2018). Articulating what these practices are and how they are constituted allows us to understand what form of schooling is being produced as a result of these lesson practices. Therefore, in this article we are going to observe lesson practices, in order to finally be able to denote the particular *form* of schooling that comes forward.

In scrutinizing lesson practices, not only is it our aim to pay specific attention to practices that are tightly connected with forms of reading and writing as these practices are one of the fundamental established practices of schooling (Vlieghe, 2017); we equally aim to observe and account for how these traditional school practices constitute complex and hybrid practices (such as note-taking) in the presence of digital devices. In contradistinction with more interactive and so-called digitally native practices such as video making (Toohey & Dagenais, 2015), these fairly ‘traditional’ but nevertheless profoundly hybrid practices are often less attended topics in educational scholarship when it comes to BYOD schools. In this respect, Dezuanni (2018) argues for the need of much more expanded understandings in how more traditional practices (such as reading and writing) are formed at contemporary school settings with digital devices. In this study, more particularly, we focus on these traditional practices, yet at the same time avoiding to approach them as being entirely isolated or self-contained. By introducing the fairly uncommon concept of *agencement* in educational studies, we aim to show how practices always entail an aspect of *practice-ing*, which points to different forms of action that actors set into motion while practices are being practiced (Gherardi, 2016).

In order to do so, we conducted a sociomaterial ethnography (cf. Latour, 2005) in which we followed and closely observed different lessons such as geography, literature, history and mathematics over a period of five months in a school that implements the BYOD model. In the following sections, we firstly elaborate the theoretical framework that constituted this study. As stated, we adopt the notion of *agencement* as a heuristic device that allows to scrutinize processes of practicing and their capacity to act and therefore, invent a form of schooling. Secondly, we analyze different BYOD lesson practices by means of presenting four exemplary vignettes that are structured into two sequential compositions of introducing and executing tasks. Finally, we discuss how BYOD schools are structured around tasks and they introduce a form of schooling of which taskification is at the heart.

2. Agencements, sociomaterial studies and BYOD practices

In sociomaterial approaches, the focus on practice is one of the main points of departure (Mathias Decuyper & Simons, 2016; Fenwick & Edwards, 2010). More particularly, practices are perceived performatively, i.e. as the effect of relations between different actors (Law, 2007). This means that practices are conceived to be the result of interrelations between entangled actors such as humans, artefacts, as well as documents and policies and thus, adopting a sociomaterial lens necessitates to account for these heterogenous actors and relations in a symmetrical vein (Mathias Decuyper & Simons, 2014).

Decuyper (2019) argues that sociomaterial approaches serve more as *sensitizing devices* that allow researchers to become sensible for and see how specific practices are

being made and effectuated, than as theoretical narratives that make general repetitive claims about how reality is constituted. In particular, we introduce the concept of *agencement* as a methodological sensitizing device towards BYOD lesson practices.

The term *agencement* is a French word which is commonly translated to English as *assemblage* (and sometimes as *arrangement*). Callon and Çalışkan (2010) firstly re introduced this concept in social sciences by drawing on socio-technical *agencement*. They argued that, although ‘*agencement*’ is very close to *assemblage* or *arrangement*, the English concepts nonetheless imply a divide between agencies and arrangements (Çalışkan & Callon, 2010). Later, Callon (2016) set out from the way market is used in economic studies and established a novel understanding of market relations by arguing for *mark-agencement* instead of *market-interface*. The notion *agencement* was precisely proposed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) to stress that agencies and arrangements are not separate. Rather, the notion *agencement* allows for tracing agency in the configuration of the arrangement instead of tracing it in sole actors.

In the context of practices, the English translation as ‘*assemblage*’ equally suggests that practices are to be conceived as finished states or final products, whereas the French term *agencement* points to the ‘*becoming*’ of practices, to *practicing*. The word *agencement* in this respect means ‘*in connection with*’ and shows how practices are connected and in constant state of becoming (Gherardi, 2016). Gherardi, in elaboration of this notion of *agencement* in relation to the more familiar concept of ‘*practice*’ states that:

what we call ‘*practice*’ is a heuristic move that de-territorializes and re-territorializes the unfolding of a flow of practicing. It is within practicing that connections are established and dissolved without a pre-defined order, and it is the process of *agencement* (of connecting with) that creates it’ (p. 689).

This means that by adopting the term *agencement*, the attention is relocated from merely *identifying* all the actors and subsequently accounting for them in isolation, to sensitizing oneself to seeing how these actors in *connection* enact a specific practice that is then constantly in the process of becoming (ibid.).

According to Gherardi, another advantage of using the notion of *agencement* as a sensitizing device is ‘that *agency* is reformulated as the outcome of the process of establishing associations’ (p.689). In this way, we can approach practices as having agency, rather than looking how specific distributed agencies make these practices. As such, considering the agential element of practices, that is, the active process of *agencement*, allows the inquiry to denote a specific *form* that is generated as a result of the effect of practicing. That is to say, using the notion *agencement* points to ‘socio-technical arrangements when they are considered from the point view of their capacity

to act' (Çalışkan & Callon, 2010, p. 9). The notion is mainly deployed as a methodological term designed to study the variety of *forms* of action that different practices are capable of generating. In this sense, agencement can be described as 'arrangement + specific action' (Gherardi, 2016, p. 688). Put differently, "through privileging dynamic articulation and its effects, agencement targets not the assemblages per se but how they produce particular forms of action and agency" (Mcfall, 2009, p. 51).

While exploring different practices with regard to reading and writing, this notion will help us, firstly, to focus on the totality of practices in which digital devices as well as other actors are accounted for as an embedded part of the practice. Thus, as a sensitizing device it avoids separating practices to different segregated actors such as digital, teacher or student. Secondly, by adopting the notion agencement we will be able to observe and analyze practices of reading and writing that emerge during lessons, constantly enacted in the spatiotemporal organization of the classroom and above all common between different subjects. As such, we are not looking at *particular* reading and writing practices, such as a form of reading that might be specific for the subject of literature, rather we focus on practices that are common among different classes. Finally, by not considering these practices in isolation and analyzing their effects, we portray what forms of action are put forward in BYOD schools.

In the process of data analysis, two distinct sequential compositions were identified in different lessons that we will discuss in the remainder of this paper. Arranged around a task (in the specific design-based sense as introduced above), in the first sequential composition a task is being *introduced* and in the second one the introduced task is being *conducted*. By elaborating the specific practices of each composition, we will discuss particular forms of action that are generated in each composition.

3. Introducing tasks

The first composition that mostly takes place in the first fifteen minutes of lessons portrays different practices

3.1. Task presenting

'How much does a pair of jeans cost?' This question is displayed on the interactive whiteboard below a picture of a pair of jeans (through the teacher's laptop). The teacher is sitting behind his desk and the slide is frozen. This 'frozen' mode only displays the slide on the interactive whiteboard without making visible what the teacher does on his own personal laptop screen. The pair of jeans creates a lot of talk: as students enter the classroom, the slide is the first thing that captures their attention. They start to relate to the slide by speculating with each other. 'It all depends on where it was designed and where it was manufactured', one student says. The teacher leaves his seat, as he uses their input to give further explanations.

As he talks, he walks between students' desks who have their laptops open in front of them. The slides change smoothly with the remote controller and occasionally, the remote's laser light is casted on one part of the slide in order to point to where the teacher is explaining. The slides include headlines, few bullet points, and one or two pictures explaining the different resources used in the production of jeans such as cotton, fertilizers, etc. 'All eyes on board', the teacher loudly announces as he goes on to the next slide where resources are classified to natural and human. 'No need to take notes, I will put the slides on the learning management system (LMS)', the teacher says while glancing at students' laptops. He asks for students' attention on a graph that is now being projected on the interactive board and asks students to analyze what is being displayed. 'Look at the map here and discuss TEA', he announces and walks to the whiteboard next to the interactive whiteboard. 'T stands for trend, E for example and A for anomaly', he writes while recalling loudly what each element means. Students start discussing by looking at the map. After listening to their responses, the teacher announces: 'Now, your task is to identify the resources posted on LMS. Articles, videos, and PowerPoints are the resources I shared. Write one sentence per each factor', and he continues by reading the last slide that concretely explains the task.

The above scene describes part of the first fifteen minutes of a geography lesson. The first part of the lessons in this school serves as the point of departure for introducing and contextualizing a task that students need to work on individually (or sometimes in duo) for the rest of the lesson. This introductory part, which is performed at the collective level of the classroom, can equally be recognized in other lessons and subject matters. That is to say, this vignette is illustrative for the more general observation that prior to the description of concrete tasks, each task is always *contextualized*. Mostly in the form of slides, the teacher often a range of educational and noneducational online resources, and then customizes and re-assembles them into slides based on the local lesson plan and finally *presents* in this introductory part. The slides materialize the sequence and impose a linear order to the practice of task contextualization, e.g. in case of the above vignette, starting with definitions, then classifications and finally examples. The imposition of the slides' order becomes more apparent when in the moment of presenting, the teacher dismisses his spontaneous explanation when it is not in line with the sequence of slides. Moreover, as argued by Friesen (2019), the slide form necessitates an act of selecting from a realm of information and illustrations which generates a kind of second order pointing. The second order pointing of PowerPoint means "a highlighting a representation, something selected" (p.19).

With regard to practices of reading and writing, prepared and written points on slides frees the teacher from the space in front of the interactive whiteboard and

mobilizes him through fixating knowledge. Consequently, for any type of immediate textual interaction, the teacher uses the whiteboard next to the interactive whiteboard, where he can write, erase, and edit. Despite the interactive board that presents the end product of teacher's preparatory work and produces designed interaction, the whiteboard remains the space of spontaneous interaction.

The presentation of the task incorporates an act of *instructing* at the same time, which is in connection with the way task contextualization is being presented. The file of the PowerPoint slides shared with students creates a specific relation with them where they are instructed *not to take any notes* and only look, listen and participate in questions. Not only the slides freeze and fixate the knowledge while presenting the context of the task, but they also serve as student's note. In this regard, the established lesson practices of lecturing and note-taking are configured by the embeddedness of digital actors in such a way that the composition is coordinated in a specific way, between what appears on the interactive board, what is said by the teacher and its order, and how students are instructed. This means that the teacher talks to students majorly to elaborate on the slides, and as the slides are compositions of visual and textual elements, they serve as notes which are concretized, and thus students do not need to take any action in this regard. As such, students are constantly being instructed by the teacher, to how to relate with digital actors, by looking and not taking any notes. By means of the above vignette, we demonstrated how different practices in connection with one another arrange the lesson in the form of the first sequential composition. However, task presenting can be organized differently, which leads to producing other type of practices that we will illustrate in the second vignette.

3. 2. Templating and micro-compiling

The students have their laptops in front of them while the video of a BBC documentary about a London cabdriver who travelled to Mumbai is being displayed on the interactive whiteboard. The students are expected to fill out a template word document (made by the teacher and shared on LMS) by the end of the lesson. One student googles Mumbai, opens the city's Wikipedia page and scrolls through the text. On his screen, the templated word document, Google map of India, a pdf file of the web of deprivation that the teacher shared with them, and a folder where these documents are saved can be seen as he is switching between different tabs. 'Do you know how this is called? The process of sending money home?', the teacher asks as he pauses the video. 'It's remittance, and it's a popular way in LIC (low income countries)', he continues as he writes the word on the whiteboard and mimes the gesture of writing to encourage the students to take note. One student googles remittance, and copy-pastes the first definition he finds on his template note. The

template focuses on the main keywords that students should know in this lesson, such as remittance, deprivation and despair. 'Let's review and reflect on resources that is shared with you. Please check definitions and do apply some judgment when writing about the slums', the teacher says after the video is over. One student googles 'web of deprivation and ethnic diversity'. He takes a minute to scan the search results and finally asks the teacher for the relation between the two terms. After explaining the relation to the student, the teacher asks everyone to google the keywords in order to find answers for their questions while conducting the task.

In this vignette, the task is introduced and put forward before its contextualization through the video. Here the act of presentation is majorly done by means of the video and the teacher only occasionally highlights and comments the notable parts. Unlike the slides where the points were already written a priori, in this vignette the visual content needs to be translated into a text, and thus students are instructed to take notes. In doing so, students not only type what is being said or shown in the video into the template, but they also make a compilation of texts gathered and selected from different online resources and thereby, their notes extend from the immediate and collective source (the video and annotations of the teacher) to individual online searching. The online search materializes and fills any instantaneous line of thought that comes to students' mind in the form of keyword searching. As such, notetaking as we see in the vignette, is not merely transcribing sayings of the teacher or what is being showed and said on the video, it equally includes a component of searching, scanning, copying and pasting. This way, the writing for the students is partly structured by the teacher through the act of templating that organizes the notes in the format of bullet points or boxes that need to be filled, and partly by the features of networked screen through online searching and text editing.

Rather than writing, what the student does here is the orchestration between these different inputs and compilation into a comprehensive format. Thus, the practice of notetaking comes into being as a non-linear process in which different multimodal elements such as pictures, maps, hypertexts, and copy pasted resources come together in one plane. Being engaged with digital texts by means of adding and modifying visual elements constitute the practice of *templating* and *micro-compiling*. In this constellation, the teacher comes into being more as the commentator of what is being presented. At the same time, it can be argued that teacher's instructions (announcing when to take notes or not) install a form of learning that is equally formatted by digital actors.

The architecture of this composition sets the conditions for assigning different forms of actions. As such, based on the above exemplary vignettes, the task is contextualized and introduced by means of slides or video presentations. Different situated practices such as, notetaking and templating are generated as a result of the form in which the task is presented. This points to the fact that, task contextualization and instruction with digital

devices requires its own particular *template*, and actions are framed to follow the template of the digital. As similarly argued by Selwyn et al. (2017), teachers are tasked to curate the teaching content from the pre-existing online material. Students are then, templated to work closely with keywords, tagging the resources by the keyword, and micro compile them. At the same time, these templates install a specific format of how the task should be done. As Gherardi (2016) argues, these interrelated practices are doings such that while they do, they invent “the way of doing” (690) and that is how agency comes as the product of the process of practicing. The constant practicing around tasks in different forms brings forward the task-agencement that will be elaborated after the second composition of executing the introduced task.

4. Task execution

Introduction of the task is the first sequential composition that takes place in most lessons. The second composition that occupies the larger part of the lesson, reorganizes the actors for the execution of the introduced task. This rearrangement is particularly done through individual engagement of students with their personal screens. By drawing on two vignettes that portray the practices created in this composition, we elucidate the task-agencement that puts forward a particular form of schooling.

4. 1. Resource scanning

The teacher walks between students, who are now working individually on their personal devices, to monitor what they do and answer their potential questions or unclarities. ‘Do the task for as many resources as you can for the next half an hour. You have seven resources. What is your job? Looking for information’, he says loudly and continues his walk. As some of the shared resources are online videos, the sound of videos on personal screens fills the classroom, while some students are watching the videos without headphones. An article on Guardian website can be spotted on one student’s screen. A grey layer is covering the lengthy article’s text, and the keywords are indicated in white to be easily findable. The student goes back and forth between opened tabs, that are the article and an online word document. ‘We don’t read, we want to access essential information. Try to do ctrl +F to shorten the time and find keywords, also just physically with your eyes scan those keywords without reading the whole text’ the teacher announces, and glances at screens to make sure that students are clear on how to proceed. He walks between students and answers their questions. ‘When you find the information write them in bullet points. The shorter, the better. You don’t need to write full sentences.’

In this vignette, the second composition is arranged around the students’ individual work on the task. Although the tasks differ in different lessons and subject matters, the composition of executing a task is framed similarly among different lessons. Examples of these tasks in different classes include investigating the supply chain of a smartphone in

geography lesson, highlighting the main arguments on different book reviews in literature lesson, recommending a gothic church to visit in Paris with arguments for history lesson.

In the above described vignette, the task is arranged around multiple resources selected by the teacher and shared with students via LMS. These resources include videos on YouTube, articles on news websites, blogposts, and online slides. After the task's formulation in the first composition, the teacher's instructions navigate students to how to execute the task. The teacher instructs students with different forms of reading and writing. As the time of the lesson is limited for reading the shared textual material in entirety, much of the work is done through scanning these resources with commands like Ctrl F and rephrasing the information in form of short bullet points that are not full sentences. As such, in working with resources a new form of reading and writing is introduced.

In elaboration of different forms of reading, Hayles (2013) argues that the screen space suggests hyper-reading which invites for spatial scanning of the text instead of deep and linear reading that happens with printed text. However, scanning is only one of the ways in which reading can take form. As it is shown in the vignette, the teacher promotes searching keywords which is another form of engaging with textual resources. By doing ctrl F, students only work with keywords and read sentences that are spatially close to these keywords. Thus, the text is read only fragmentedly which introduces *keyword reading* as another form of reading. Moreover, comparing reading a written text with reading an image, Flusser (2002) argues that in order to get the message of a written text one needs to follow the linear order of the words, whereas an image doesn't follow a linear order and its message is seized at a glance in its totality on the surface of the page. Similarly, in this case students extract the message through the keywords they already have. It can be argued that in this form of reading the text is considered and treated the same as visual materials. In this vignette, the task is translated into core keywords that act as a compass for carrying out the task. The execution of the task proceeds when the essential information is extracted from resources and is then reformulated by micro-writing in the form of bullet points. In these practices, a form of doing a task - reminiscent of how algorithms work (T. Bucher, 2018) - is formatted by actions of keyword searching and micro writing: Similar to search engines, students are instructed to act like a search engine, by working with keywords and reconstructing meaning in bullet format. Proliferation of socio-algorithmic logic frames the ways in which tasks are being conducted, introducing practices of *keyword reading and micro writing*.

4.2. presentation making

A new task has been introduced by the history teacher, in which students need to give a presentation on an artefact's process of innovation, development and its

possible future. The teacher provides an example in which he presents the first photograph as his selected innovation. 'The slides are shared in LMS and you can use them as a template and source of inspiration to create your own slides. You should take into account that you can only use four slides. The first slide should be dedicated to the title of your innovation. You have only five minutes to present your artefact for your classmates, and in the end of the presentation I ask you a general question with regard to your innovation', and he moves to the second slide that explains the innovator of the first photographs and its history. The third slide is dedicated to its development and the last one discusses its possible future.

After this collective introductory task presentation which is part of the first composition, actors are reorganized for the individual work of task execution. With the start of the second composition, students immediately put on their headphones. Keywords such as 'top innovations in the last century' and 'funny innovations' pops up on their search engines as they search in order to pick an innovation. One student opens a new PowerPoint slide and fills in the headlines in line with the instructions. Then, she switches between her Spotify, Google tabs that are getting opened and closed and the PowerPoint slide. Browsing among image results of the washing machine keyword, it seems that she has chosen her innovation. The presentation topics are chosen individually based on students' personal interests. She drags and drops one of the images into her slide and reopens the Wikipedia page to scan. Scrolling to the history of early washing machines, she copies part of the text in another slide, and reformulates the sentences into a textbox. She then, selects an image of an early washing machine and drag and drops into her slides. Resizing the picture, adding a title with a different font for the slide as among the actions that follow. Next keyword is 'washing machine innovator' that appears on the search bar. She opens the first three search results in different tabs. The process of opening and closing tabs, selecting the useful information and assembling the slides happens swiftly for this student, while a fellow classmate is still undecided about the topic of his presentation. Flickering over the web results of different innovation, he compares the printing machine with the webpages about gaming consoles. After two more consecutive lessons dedicated to individual work, it is time for each student to give a presentation of their slides to the rest of the class. While students present their slides, the teacher takes notes according to his evaluation rubric.

The practice of making presentations and presenting is one of the most common practices in different subject matters at this school. The above vignette tries to demonstrate the different practices that are generated while the task of making presentation is being conducted. As it was shown, the process of making a presentation

includes online searching, scrolling and browsing, copy pasting images and rephrasing texts into a specific sequence and format that is given by the teacher.

This form of selecting and re-assembling can be conceptualized with the notion of making a bricolage. As Johri (2011) explains, making a sociomaterial bricolage includes using existing resources for a short term goal while by making it one creates a new use. Multiple media formats such as audios, videos, texts, and images from different available sources are selected, taken out of their context and crafted anew in order to serve a different goal that is carrying out the task. The last part of the task, that is *presenting*, shares the result of the slide making (the bricolage) in the collective space of the class. This means that, at the moment of presentation, the bricolage/slides act as a single actor, concealing processes of translation from heterogeneous multimedia resources into one unit of presentable slides (Law, 1992). This also shows that in this task different media are assembled next to each other not as standing alone products, and they are not meant to be read, but they mainly enhance the oral presentation. Equally, at the moment of presentation to the public of the classroom, they act as resources for teacher's evaluations and students' questions.

By elaborating on two exemplary vignettes, we illustrated how a task is being executed by means of working with online resources. Whereas in the first example these resources are selected by the teacher, in the second example of making presentations, it is the student who performs processes of making a bricolage by going through available online resources. The analysis of the compositions demonstrates how during the individual work the lesson is being taskified in a specific way by active processes of task-agencement.

The above analysis of lesson practices in this BYOD school demonstrates that tasks are not self-contained units that solely constitute a part of the lesson activities, rather, it could be argued that they *form the school* through the ways in which they are presented, contextualized, and executed, and the practices (such as keyword reading) they generate as the effect. In the last section of this paper, we will discuss taskification as a form of BYOD schooling that is formatting school practices.

Task-Agencement: Taskification as a form of schooling

The aim of this paper was to analyze the form of BYOD schooling through tracing lesson practices and more in particular, reading and writing practices. By means of deploying the sensitizing device of agencement as a heuristic methodological lens, we argued that lesson practices are centered around tasks that put forward a form of school, of which taskification is at the heart.

Traditionally situated within the context of networked learning, tasks are one of the components of ACAD. According to ACAD theories, tasks are to be considered as

instruments to achieve the desired learning outcomes (Carvalho & Goodyear, 2018). Hence, the main concern of design work is directed towards designing good tasks, whilst at the same time acknowledging that learning cannot be fully determined (Goodyear & Dimitriadis, 2013). This way, tasks are entities designed by teachers or designers *prior* to the lesson and are orchestrated *during* the lesson, in order to provide responsive guidance for students. The students, then, carry out the task by interpreting and customizing them. That is to say, ACAD differentiates and strictly separates design, orchestration and student activities, but similarly and equally recognizes emerging practices of students and teachers during the lesson (Fawns, 2018).

Scrutinizing lesson practices in this paper, we argue that there are similarities between the way ACAD approaches lesson practices and how the notion *agencement* allowed us to analyze these practices. By taking emergent practices seriously, and thus studying them, both perspectives provide strong analytical lenses to observe school lessons. However, by adopting the notion *agencement*, different actions of the lesson are *not* divided among designated agencies (e.g. the teacher who designs and orchestrates, the student who practices), rather, agency is accounted for as the outcome of different lesson practices, directed by *collective* action. By adopting such an analytical perspective, tasks find a different status for the lesson *beyond* designed entities that are performed to achieve learning outcomes, and which require teachers' orchestration and students' activities.

The task-*agencement* that we presented in this article illustrates that tasks are not merely instruments of learning, but more importantly, they are central factors in coming to terms with what BYOD schooling is all about. The notion task-*agencement* allowed us to trace the *processes of taskification* during multiple lessons. On the one hand, tasks are the connecting tissue between all the actors, that is, actors are related with each other through the task. On the other hand, tasks are materialized on the surface of personal screens (both on students' and teacher screen). This means that the lesson is structured in a specific (screened) way around tasks, directing collective actions towards contextualization, instruction, presentation and execution of the task. As we argued, this structuring of the task is achieved through a set of framings variously identified as working with templates, socio-algorithmic logic, and bricolage. These framings give the collective action the format it is designated to have.

These specific framings portray that processes of taskification constantly *task* different actors accordingly, and therefore, tasks don't act as bloc entities, but rather, they actively format how the lesson and its activities should look like. Even stronger, we would like to conclude with arguing that in and through this task-*agencement*, the task always entails a process of *taskification* that formats BYOD schools. With 'taskification', we mean that the task-*agencement* expands the domain in which tasks not only influence

the organization and structure of lessons, but equally the very organization of this BYOD school by enacting particular form of schooling.

In sum, the notion agencement proves to be a valuable sensitizing device for educational studies that seek to disentangle and come to terms with discussions of educational *forms* (Decuyper, 2019). As such, in the context of BYOD schooling and similar to what Selwyn et al. (2017) argue, namely that, “task-based activities are understandably core elements of the ‘job’ of being a school student” (306), it seems that the *taskified* form that is characteristic of BYOD schooling, comes close to the labor or work form of activities (E. Bucher & Fieseler, 2017). The very pressing questions that require further research and reflection, then, are first of all how this taskified form of schooling is to be discerned from other pedagogical forms, and secondly whether there (still) is a clear distinction between school forms in general, and forms of other social orders such as labor or family forms.¹

¹ For further explorations of these questions, see Laboratory for Education and Society, 2018 and Masschelein & Simons, 2019

Reference

- Beetham, H., & Sharpe, R. (2013). *Rethinking Pedagogy for a Digital Change*. Routledge.
- Bucher, E., & Fieseler, C. (2017). The flow of digital labor. *New Media and Society*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816644566>
- Bucher, T. (2018). *If...then: Algorithmic power and politics*. *If...Then: Algorithmic Power and Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190493028.001.0001>
- Çalışkan, K., & Callon, M. (2010). Economization, part 2: A research programme for the study of markets. *Economy and Society*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03085140903424519>
- Callon, M. (2016). Revisiting marketization: from interface-markets to market-agencements. *Consumption Markets and Culture*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2015.1067002>
- Carvalho, L., & Goodyear, P. (2018). Design, learning networks and service innovation. *Design Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.destud.2017.09.003>
- Carvalho, L., Goodyear, P., & de Laat, M. (2017). *Place-based spaces for networked learning*. *Place-Based Spaces for Networked Learning*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315724485>
- Decuyper, Mathias, & Vanden Broeck, P. (2020). Time and educational (re-)forms – Inquiring the temporal dimensions of education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/00131857.2020.1716449>
- Decuyper, Mathias. (2019). STS in/as education: where do we stand and what is there (still) to gain? Some outlines for a future research agenda. *Discourse*, 40(1), 136–145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2018.1549709>
- Decuyper, Mathias, & Simons, M. (2014). On the composition of academic work in digital times. *European Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), 89–106.
<https://doi.org/10.2304/eej.2014.13.1.89>
- Decuyper, Mathias, & Simons, M. (2016). Relational thinking in education: topology, sociomaterial studies, and figures. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 24(3), 371–386.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2016.1166150>
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987 [1980]) *Mille Plateaux*. Paris: Editions de Minuit (English trans. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Dezuanni, M. (2018). Minecraft and children's digital making: implications for media literacy education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 43(3), 236–249.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2018.1472607>
- Fawns, T. (2018). Postdigital Education in Design and Practice. *Postdigital Science and*

- Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-018-0021-8>
- Fenwick, T., & Edwards, R. (2010). *Actor – Network Theory in Education*. Routledge: Newyork
- Fenwick, T., Edwards, R., & Sawchuk, P. (2011). Emerging Approaches to Educational Research: Tracing the Socio-Material. *Emerging Approaches To Educational Research: Tracing the Sociomaterial*, 232.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.4324/9780203817582>
- Flusser, V. (2002). *Writings*. (A. Ströhl, Ed.), *University of Minnesota Press*.
- Friesen, N. (2019). The academic lecture (1800–present): subject, medium and performance. In M. Vansieleghem, Nancy; Vlieghe, Joris; Zahn (Ed.), *Education in the Age of the Screen* (pp. 9–22). Routledge.
- Gherardi, S. (2016). To start practice theorizing anew: The contribution of the concepts of agencement and formativeness. *Organization*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508415605174>
- Goodyear, P., & Carvalho, L. (2013). The analysis of complex learning environments. In R. Sharpe & H. Beetham (Eds.), *Rethinking Pedagogy for a digital age* (pp. 49–63). Routledge.
- Goodyear, P., & Dimitriadis, Y. (2013). In medias res: Reframing design for learning. *Research in Learning Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v21i0.19909>
- Goodyear, P., Banks, S., Hodgson, V. & McConnell, D. (2004). Research on networked learning: aims and approaches. In P. Goodyear, S. Banks, V. Hodgson & D. McConnell (Eds), *Advances in research on Networked Learning*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hayles, N. K. (2013). How We Read: Close, Hyper, Machine. *ADE Bulletin*.
<https://doi.org/10.1632/ade.150.62>
- Johri, A. (2011). Sociomaterial bricolage: The creation of location-spanning work practices by global software developers. *Information and Software Technology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2011.01.014>
- Jones, C. (2015). *Networked learning: An educational paradigm for the age of digital networks*. Heidelberg/London: Springer.
- Laboratory for Education and Society, KU Leuven (2018)., *Sketching a Place for Education in Times of Learning*, Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-76920-2
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Law, J. (1992). Notes on the theory of the actor-network: Ordering, strategy, and heterogeneity. *Systems Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01059830>
- Law, J. (2007). Actor-Network Theory and Material Semiotics. Version of 25 th April 2007. *Disponibile Online Allindirizzo Http://Www. Heterogeneities. Net/Publications/Law-ANTandMaterialSemiotics. Pdf*, (Scaricato Il 18 Maggio 2007).
- Masschelein J, Simons M., (2019) Bringing more 'school' into our educational institutions. Reclaiming school as pedagogic form. In *Unterrichtsentwicklung macht Schule Forschung und Innovation im Fachunterricht*. Editors: Bikner-Ahsbahs, A., Peters, M., 11-30. Springer Verlag
- Mcfall, L. (2009). THE AGENCEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL BRANCH LIFE ASSURANCE . *Journal*

- of *Cultural Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17530350903063933>
- Ryberg, T., Davidsen, J., & Hodgson, V. (2018). Understanding nomadic collaborative learning groups. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12584>
- Ryberg, T., Buus, L., & Georgsen, M. (2012). Differences in understanding of networked learning theory: Connectivity or collaboration? In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, & D. McConnell (Eds.), *Exploring the theory, pedagogy, and practice of networked learning* (pp. 43–58). New York: Springer.
- Selwyn, N., Nemorin, S., Bulfin, S., & Johnson, N. F. (2017). Left to their own devices: the everyday realities of one-to-one classrooms. *Oxford Review of Education*, 43(3), 289–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2017.1305047>
- Selwyn, N., Nemorin, S., & Johnson, N. (2017). High-tech, hard work: an investigation of teachers' work in the digital age. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 42(4), 390–405. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2016.1252770>
- Song, Y. (2014). “bring Your Own Device (BYOD)” for seamless science inquiry in a primary school. *Computers and Education*, 74, 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.01.005>
- Toohey, K., & Dagenais, D. (2015). Videomaking as sociomaterial assemblage. *Language and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2015.1006643>
- Vlieghe, J. (2017). ICT Literacy: A Technical or Non-technical Issue? *Foundations of Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10699-015-9458-3>