Redefining the discourse toward a “better fit” cultural framework of beliefs, thought, language, and action through ultrasociality, a constructivist meme can help nurture an epistemological break (or rupture) from the traditional objectivist paradigm in education.
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“If the doors of perception were cleansed everything would appear to man as it is, Infinite.”

—William Blake

“From symbiosis to parasitism is a short step. The word is now a virus.”

—William S. Burroughs

Learning as a social and interactive process results in the transmission of culture. What is shared with others is influenced by affective and environmental factors including the heuristic language used to communicate the ideas; therefore, each potential recipient of learning is a potential sharer of that culture. This differs from a traditional objectivist view of learning, which implies that learning is the imparting of knowledge to a person. Marra (2005) distinguished between two types of epistemological (nature of knowledge) beliefs: objective and constructivist. An objectivist epistemology supports a transmission or conduit (Yero 2010) model of education where knowledge is prepackaged and passed verbally from instructor to students via lecture. A constructivist epistemology assumes that individuals create knowledge from their shared interactions with others. It asserts that educators do not transmit knowledge to students, but instead they help them discover meaningful ways to learn about the content, mirroring an active environment where the amount of lecture time could become minimal, thus expressing a learner-centered approach of education (Blumberg 2009; Fosnot 1996, 2005; McCombs and Vakili 2005; Weimer 2013), which has also been shown to be favored by learners (Wohlfarth et al. 2008).
**Constructivism**

Constructivism is a theory of learning that views knowledge as actively constructed by learners in a social process (Fosnot 1996, 2005). Constructivism requires the learner to engage in interpretation, organization, and inference creation about knowledge, with the cognitive structures they have previously constructed. Social media becomes a useful vehicle for the active construction of knowledge via an interactive process (McLoughlin and Lee 2008). This shared process leads to the development of meaning from the learned material through the interaction of individuals within the learning environment (Stabile 2014b).

Constructivism, as a theory of learning, recognizes that teaching is less about “covering” content and more about using the content to develop unique and individual ways of understanding (Weimer 2013). Knowledge is actively constructed, suggesting that the relationship between teaching and learning is about “interactions, growth, and development” rather than simple changes in behavior (Fosnot 2005). Constructivism advocates that learning is relative to the individual and is a “messy” process. Within this framework, learners change their schemas or paradigm as they experience new ideas and concepts. Meaning is created via the mental structures of the mind itself and from social interactions. This process describes how culture is shared, adapts, and changes. Students as well as faculty learn by constructing knowledge rather than by receiving knowledge from others (Huba and Freed 2000). This creation of knowledge functions virally; as knowledge is shared, meanings can change as each learner synthesizes his or her perspective into the learning process. The method in which ideas and assumptions are created as a result of this interaction can be explained though memes.

**The Influence of Memes**

A meme is an idea virus that spreads (Brodie 2011). As the host of a certain idea, assumption, behavior, or attitude directly or indirectly communicates ideas to another person, the other person becomes a carrier, ready to “infect” (Heylighen and Klaas Chielens 2009). Dawkins (2009) stated:

> Examples of memes are tunes, ideas, catch-phrases, clothes, ways of making pots or building arches. … If a scientist hears, or reads about, a good idea, he passes it on to his colleagues and students. (192)

The traditional understanding views memes as replicating autonomously, spreading ideas from mind to mind, and a requirement for cultural evolution (Dawkins 2006). However, we agree with gene-culture co-evolutionists (Lewens 2007) that memes are not simply copied and adopted (Sperber 2000a). Individuals and groups may be exposed to multiple techniques from unknown lineages (Boyd and Richerson 2000), which are
shared virally and ultimately learn to construct their own culture by connecting these ideas with each other (Sperber 2000a) and integrating these concepts into their own repertoire based on fitness. Memes can embed in the mind of a host and can be selected to replace previously adopted memes, such as a new favorite song, cultural icon, or representation of a system of beliefs and assumptions (Coscia 2013).

As beliefs are derived from multiple influences and exposures (Sperber 2000b) and these beliefs ultimately shape what is learned and shared with others; it is also relevant to consider the affective domain as an important factor in the shaping and creation of cultural sharing and learning. Thus, adopted and synthesized memes and their associated system of beliefs could influence action/behavior (Heylighen and Klaas Chielens 2009). Because sharing of learning is dependent upon the affective domain and the use of grammatical language (Boyd, Richerson, and Henrich 2011; Korzybski 1993) for selecting which techniques to imitate, whom to emulate, and what to modulate and ultimately share with others, organisms (including humans), via their actions and choices, modify their own and others’ cultural niches (Laland and O’Brien 2012).

Cultural niches create an energy flow of ideas through ecosystems so that organisms construct culture instead of adapting to culture (Lewontin 1983), however, any current habits, beliefs, and ideas that are shared may be maladaptive; for example, individualistic and self-interest behaviors. These could be seen in the culture of higher education as the questionable, yet persuasive belief that there are universal truths that can be transmitted via lecture to willing students (Taylor 2005) or long-held traditional views of the teacher as the exclusive content and classroom authority (Weimer 2013).

We point out that reducing these maladaptive behaviors from being emulated into the construction of a “better fit” culture niche as a consequence of ultrasociality, which is defined as large-scale cooperation among unrelated individuals (Richerson and Boyd 1997, Campbell 1983; Turchin 2013). It is the invisible hand that modifies such individualistic or self-interested practices that emerges from a “tit-for-tat” strategy. However, as noted by Richerson and Boyd (2005), this strategy tends not generalize to large groups; thus, the maintenance of modified behaviors requires populations large enough for innovation (Kline and Boyd 2010) to offset potential individualist imitation. In other words, innovation occurs in larger populations where more cooperation evolves from cultural transmission of shared ideas and making variation likely to occur. Thus, we posit that the traditional objectivist model of education has perpetuated an outdated, individualistic and narrow memetic structure that dominates the potential discourse of faculty thereby limiting innovation. We propose ways to alter directions and move toward a “better fit” imitation model of constructivism through ultrasociality, where members of this cultural niche become “profoundly interdependent” (Gowdy and Krall 2015, 8) by reframing and then replacing the current individualistic memetic framework of discourse where
this process of change itself is embedded in a constructivist analysis of change: memes are adapted, synthesized, and then adopted for fitness based on multiple exposures from others, offering more innovation within the discourse. We now see social media assisting in this modification process.

Social Media Meme

According to Coscia (2013) social media are “virtual communities present on the Web that allow people to create, share, exchange, and comment on pieces of content among themselves” (100). Thus, De Notaris (2011) noted that an important activity on the web is “remixing content.” Remixing refers to “taking material found online (songs, text, images and videos) and merging it in a new, original, creation” (111). This mixing and remixing of understandings and ideas spread to others virally. Synthesized ideas can become a newly adopted meme ready to be spread rapidly via social media. The content of the language used to talk about these ideas becomes memes that spread with the help of social media, such as blogs, YouTube, wikis, and other social network sites.

This remixing of ideas reflects the postmodernist perspective (Anderson 1995) that an “understanding” is created by a complex interplay of internal and external dialogues with the self and others. Because we argue that knowledge may be linguistically constructed and communally created, the knower and knowledge become linked (Berger and Luckmann 1967). Knowledge, therefore, is fluid and created (Marra 2005). Postmodernism invites us to examine and reimagine our traditions and the practices that flow from them. For example, the historical dichotomy between teacher and student can be reframed to view their development as linked and interdependent, instead of fragmented, permitting the discovery of the teacher-as-learner and learner-as-teacher (Lawler and King 2000); thus, learners can be viewed as educators (Fletcher and Ershler 2014). The roles begin to blur (Nilson 2010) and are not mutually exclusive or independent.

Due to social media’s viral nature as a virtual community, a fictive is a “constructed” differentiation existing between those who “educate” and those who “learn.” Because of the democratization (De Notaris 2011) of people within a social media community, it has become more likely for the remixing of terms and the creation of knowledge from interactions. Therefore, it is possible to develop a new perspective where an educator-as-learner becomes an affector. This is the term for an educator who believes that learning is a social, affective, and continual process. Viral infection and transmission of new understandings may become more virulent via critical reflection (Brookfield 1995). By becoming aware of the current discourse’s “tit-for-tat” (Richerson and Boyd, 2005) limitations, affectors can be liberated from the traditional memetic perspective by being open to infection or reinfection like a virus.
The ability to exchange traditional memes with different constructivist memes is referred to as the *chaine opératoire* (Leroi-Gourhan 1993) for the learning, sharing, growth, and development of an interdependent cultural niche, which we call the Learning Virus (The *L-Virus*). The *L-Virus* and infection become new social memes depicting this ability to change mindsets from an objectivist to a constructivist orientation, thereby creating a newer discourse to more closely describe the learning process. Thus, this change itself follows from an ultrasocial social media framework because of the discursive creation of shared knowledge among those within a cooperative community of higher education faculty, students, and administration. Because constructivism provides the background of learner-centered teaching (LCT) as noted respectively by Fosnot (2005) and by Weimer (2013), it provides the DNA of the L-Virus; it is the basis of building a new culture. We posit that the sharing and transmission of culture is diffused in a viral-like manner. Ideas have the potential to be shared and spread like an infectious disease (Heylighen and Klaas Chielens 2009). Hosts infect carriers who in turn, spread what they have learned in a nonrecursive and nonlinear manner similar to the effects of social media.

Ideas as memes may not necessarily be discussed within the static scope of a traditional objectivist framework but this concept is supported by a decentered and discursive constructivist paradigm in which the L-Virus, as a meme, embedded with these constructivist principles and ideas, provides “infected” faculty the ability to promote reflective conversations. The need for these reflective conversations helps demonstrate limits of the current paradigm, thereby helping affectors alter the mindset of other faculty by helping reframe the collective faculty use of language. This change in mindset, based on different beliefs and assumptions resulting in a potential reframed use of language, could set forth a general discard of the traditional objectivist model of education and promote a move toward the adoption of a “better fit” model resulting in an epistemological break (Althusser 2005; Bachelard 1938) between these two modes of discourse.

This chapter describes how the L-Virus as a constructivist meme would help nurture this epistemological break (or rupture) from a traditional objective paradigm, thereby redefining the discourse toward a “better fit” cultural framework of beliefs, language, thought, and actions (Whorf 1978) as depicted in Table 1.1.

As more faculty engage in cultural exchange, the continuously growing social learning framework provides ripe expansion capabilities for the L-Virus. Larger populations produce a greater number of more complex cultural adaptations than small, isolated populations (Kline and Boyd 2010). We should therefore expect the collective constructive power of social media’s growing population of users to have a tremendous influence on the adaptive creation of learning and the sharing of culture. This epistemological break between the traditional objectivist and the constructivist view of knowledge occurs through the introduction of small changes in ideas from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (Paradigm or Framework) of Education</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Learner-Centered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. View of Knowledge (Epistemology)</td>
<td>Objectivist</td>
<td>Constructivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Analogous Scientific Framework</td>
<td>Classical Scientific Theory</td>
<td>Quantum Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cultural Aspects</td>
<td>Modernism</td>
<td>Postmodern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Views of World</td>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Meaning</td>
<td>Independent of Observer</td>
<td>Dependent Upon Perceptions of Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Theory of Education/Learning</td>
<td>Behaviorism</td>
<td>The Epistemological Break: A Change in Mindset via the L-Virus as a Social Meme Fostering a Reframed Discourse of Beliefs, Thought, Language, and Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teacher Education Model</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Constructivism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instructional Mode</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assessment</td>
<td>Measures Knowledge and Facts</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Learner</td>
<td>Solitary</td>
<td>Diagnostic of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Consciousness</td>
<td>Unreflective</td>
<td>Connected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teaching Focus</td>
<td>Discipline Specific</td>
<td>Reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Learning</td>
<td>Cover Material</td>
<td>Learner Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Faculty</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>Discovery or Uncovering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Recipients</td>
<td>Passive Receptors of Facts</td>
<td>Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Higher Education</td>
<td>Balkanized</td>
<td>Truth Is Relative to the Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Interpretation</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Socially Connected and Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Affective Connection</td>
<td>Minimal or None</td>
<td>Differentiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Potential for Praxis and Paradigm Shift</td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>Maximized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive and Transformative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“infected” individuals who become “carriers” of the discourse and talk to and engage others with their enthusiasm for learning. The discursive nature of this process is mirrored within social media itself, which provides another avenue for reflection and conversation (Tay and Allen 2011).

Reflective Practice as Affective Growth

Engaging in reflective practice (Brookfield 1995; Schön 1983, 1990) can open up a potential faculty member to adopt a new framework of empirically-verified practices grounded in reexamined beliefs about learning. Learners first acquire local practices and occasionally experiment with or modify them (Boyd, Richerson, and Henrich 2011). Those infected with the L-Virus would be more likely to engage in a constant search for new structures and methods that fit better (de Jong 1999) for learning and success, and they expect even these to be redesigned continually and to evolve over time (Barr and Tagg 1995). Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964) developed an affective domain taxonomy that was ordered according to the principle of internalization, a process whereby a person’s affect toward an object passes from a general awareness level to a point where the affect is internalized and consistently guides or controls the person’s behavior (Seels and Glasgow 1990, 28). However, this model fails to distinguish between the learner’s assumptions about the learning experience and the actual affective learning (Neuman and Friedman 2010). Affective learning implies how learners feel and what they believe about their learning experience and also how the actual affective learning relates to feelings, assumptions, and values because of the learning experiences (Neuman and Friedman). We propose the following Discursive Affective Transformational Qualities shown in Figure 1.1.

Transformation is a “messy” self-reflexive process with no clear start or end as depicted by a Möbius strip. Transformative learning, as an affective process, can involve a continual questioning of emotional assumptions and beliefs. It is during evaluation that teachers may begin to see themselves as learners and begin the assimilation (Piaget 1952) processes toward becoming an affector. Affectors represent their transformed values and alignment

Figure 1.1. Discursive Affective Transformational Qualities
of attitudes and beliefs through action (Parsons and Shils 2001). This representation, soul, or “inner curriculum” (Intrator and Kunzman 2006) of the affector is not static; it is continually dynamic, reflective with imaginative possibility (Hillman 1975). By freely choosing to realize that assumptions exist (self-awareness) a person has the ability to engage with any of these transformative qualities in random order. As Chödrön (1994) noted, people start where they are. Because transformation is relative to each person involved, he or she can choose, according to Stabile (2014b, 36–37), to:

- Recognize that an individual operates and experiences the world based on a set of assumptions,
- Illuminate to clarify these assumptions by asking what they mean and why they exist,
- Evaluate them for their truthfulness or falsehood,
- Rework or refine the set of assumptions for clarity as needed,
- Live the newer sets of assumptions by aligning their actions and language with their new assumptions (transformation and adoption of newer memes to use).

Affective educators should be able to recognize their own willingness to engage in self-reflection and to critically analyze their own beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions regarding education, teaching, learning, curriculum, learners, etc. (Brookfield 1995; Mezirow 1991, 1997). The inability to recognize a willingness to engage in the internal dialogue is a limiting “scotoma” (a blind spot in an otherwise normal visual field) that may inhibit further internalization of the affective heuristic. Through the critical reflective process educators begin to illuminate their assumptions, beliefs, feelings, and opinions. They may reflect on the basis upon which their belief system rests, whether or not their beliefs are valid (Korzybski 1994), and through critical reflective practice may be able to identify the source of these affective elements. This process itself is constructivist in nature, which is similar to the process discussed by Korzybski that change first starts with a change in perspective.

Thus, in order to build a “better fit” culture of teaching and learning through ultrasociality, one must become aware that the common assumptions and the traditional individualistic language that expresses these assumptions to the world maybe a hindrance in this process. Korzybski (1994) expressed this problem of assumptions and their consequences through the extensional method of general semantics: that in order to solve a problem, one must be aware that such a problem exists. By becoming aware of this problem, affectors may find tremendous value in closely examining rationales for routine classroom practices. Katie (2002) describes a personal investigative process in which “observers” engage in honest dialogue with themselves and question whether their beliefs are “true.” In the process of reckoning, when observers realize they are governed by a
particular thought or paradigm that might be “erroneous,” they should note “who they would be without that thought?” Aronowitz and Giroux (1991) refer to this personal process of transformation as “border crossing” and note the inherent self-awareness associated with this journey. A “turnaround” is then possible (Katie 2002). An example of this turnaround process is articulated with a traditional meme in higher education: “I have to teach chapter 5” to “There is no chapter 5.” This process is described as:

“I don’t have to teach chapter 5.”
“Students expect me to teach chapter 5.”
“I choose to teach chapter 5.”
“Students need to learn content in chapter 5.”
“There is no chapter 5.”

The last part, “There is no chapter 5” implies a “chapter 5” actually exists in a textbook, but it is an abstraction, an illusion, or a fiction (Fuller 1967) that permits educators to act “as if” (Vaihinger 1984) it is real. Fictions are mental structures that allow humans to develop pretend classifications (Vaihinger). These classifications are a substitute construct of reality (Fuller) providing a filtered lens to view something as “real” even though it is not (Ershler 2004). Fuller described a fiction as a framework that permits people to derive conclusions that are “right” even though the basis or support of these ideas may be false or incorrect. As noted, these fictions are memetic and serve as a way to describe what educators feel they need to do within this traditional objectivist paradigm: I believe I have to cover chapter 5.

This exploration of unexamined assumptions leads to the understanding of the meme as a potential carrier of the L-Virus. As Coscia (2013) observed, the characteristics of memes are useful for examining cultural patterns, so memes are culturally adopted, synthesized and can be selected for diffusion in a viral-like manner, consciously and unconsciously, regardless of whether or not these memes are fictions. For further instance, the National Training Lab’s “learning pyramid” is understood to be a fiction, yet Magennis and Farrell (2005) suggested it is still useful for discussion of teaching methods at workshops, even though it was argued (Main 2013) that it is a meme. Because these particular fictions become a useful and expeditious way to describe a reality within the traditional objectivist framework, the need to reframe the conversation by adopting newer memes to closely mirror a constructivist interdependent framework becomes imperative.

Language Clarification

It is the realization that what faculty may talk about, such as their role, learning, teaching, curriculum, chapters to cover, the learning pyramid, or education, may function as a meme regardless of framework. When people move from one culture to another, they modify their language and social
behavior in response to local linguistic and social norms so that they will be understood. (Boyd, Richerson, and Henrich 2011). Korzybski (1994) expressed that the “map is not the territory” (58), indicating that by clarifying the language used to express assumptions of teaching and learning, faculty do not make the map (their words) become the territory (their actions). In other words, this clarification in language ensures that the words faculty use do not become more real than the actions the words denote. For example, one cannot talk in phrases that denote allness within the learning environment. All of chapter 5 may not be needed or relevant (Stabile 2014a), where the words, “covering all of chapter 5” become the fictive reality of the map (embedded with beliefs and assumptions), which may not reflect the real territory of the learning environment. The role then of the faculty educator must be to engage faculty in the realization and clarification of their underlying beliefs that make allness a fictive reality.

Learner-centered reflective practices could help induce ultrasociality through varying faculty conversations possibly increasing cooperative and innovative ideas (memes) used to discuss planning, organizing, teaching, and learning. Changes in the language naturally follow an adoption of new memes. It is important to point out that the reciprocal nature of action and assumption creates a very limited framework for reflection and clarification. As memes depend on effective social communication for their dissemination and replication (Falk, Morelli, Welborn, Dambacher, and Lieberman 2013), learning and cultural exchange thus can depend on the ability of the person making the recommendation to accurately predict the recipient’s interests and preferences (Subramani and Rajagopalan 2003, 303).

Action

Wang and Sarbo (2004) pointed out that faculty educators as adult educators must help facilitate the transformational process by focusing on the assumption that learners are human. Helping educators view themselves as humans who also learn could help them view students as human too, instead of merely focusing on what to “cover” in class. This transformational learning via the L-Virus can result in the ability of educators-as-learners to critically reflect on their assumptions about their instructional practices and to transform their discourse of education. Critical reflection helps faculty become mindful that they teach students not chapters or material, that using the word “cover” to describe what they do in the classroom has negative connotations (Wiggins and McTighe 2005, 16), and that their assumptions and beliefs relate to their attitudes, opinions, and actions. A “theory of action” (Argyris and Schön 1974; Parsons and Shils 2001) indicates that faculty beliefs determine instructional practices inside the classroom. Faculty education should assist faculty to realize that their assumptions about what and whom they teach is mirrored in how they approach teaching and learning; thus, using Brookfield’s (1995) critical reflection method becomes
a viable method for faculty to realize their assumptions. The L-Virus, as the embodiment of these critical but core reflective practices (Korthagen and Vasalos 2005), helps faculty to recognize and to clarify how their beliefs and assumptions influence their actions. Once these become shared among faculty, this collaboration helps develop either on-ground or virtual learning communities (Nugent et al. 2008; Tay and Allen 2011). As Marra (2005) found, faculty whose epistemological beliefs are aligned with constructivism and who engage in a learner-centered faculty development initiative were more likely to engage in conversations challenging their own beliefs and assumptions about their teaching habits. Despite the success of learner-centered teaching (Blumberg 2009; Huba and Freed 2000; Marra 2005; Weimer 2013), the teacher’s conception and beliefs of knowledge (what it is and where it comes from) influence his or her teaching practices (Marra; Windschitl 2002). Thus, we must unlearn what we have learned in order to move forward. The first step in this process can begin with the ability to recognize that humans act on sets of assumptions and to realize these assumptions may or may not be valid (Stabile 2014a, 2014b).

Learner-Centered Faculty Engagement

The learning perspective proposed first by Barr and Tagg (1995) and further explored by Tagg (2003) is based on the paradigm work of Kuhn (1996). This perspective calls for faculty educators to engage faculty in their own learning by creating a learner-centered framework to plan, organize, and deliver development initiatives that assist faculty in becoming aware of their own assumptions about teaching and learning. This process begins with the reflective practice described by York-Barr et al. (2006), suggesting that the critically reflective educator begins with the recognition of the assumptions upon which instructional practices rest (Weimer 2013). To make this learning paradigm a reality, the beliefs of faculty educators must also internalize a constructivist epistemology before fostering a learner-centered classroom environment. Thus, a reevaluation of the assumptions of faculty educators serves as the entry point to start this epistemological break (Stabile 2014b).

When faculty are viewed as learners by faculty educators (Lawler and King 2001), they become more likely to experience learner-centered education during faculty development initiatives, thereby permitting faculty to reflect, evaluate assumptions, and discuss their own learning rather than sitting passively listening to an inservice speaker, making transformational learning less likely. It is important to note that faculty development reflects the beliefs of the faculty educators and the institution. As Stabile and Ritchie (2013) noted, the beliefs of the institution are reflected in the creation and purpose of “faculty learning initiatives.” If the beliefs of the institution (and of faculty educators) strongly support a need for compliance, then lecture-based inservice programs may become more likely. However, it is possible that with a shift in the mindset of faculty educators, they and/or other
institutional leaders begin to influence others by talking about learner-centered education. This learner-centered approach must fit within the beliefs and expectations of leaders and faculty educators before it can be introduced and later internalized by faculty.

Unfortunately, it is possible that past experiences with traditional modes of faculty education such as passive presentations may lead to skepticism about faculty development initiatives (Farkas, Johnson, and Duffett 2003). New methods are typically broached by faculty during these passive “training” sessions without clarification of their beliefs about teaching and learning. This form of faculty education reflects the fictional beliefs of faculty educators who may insist that material has to be “presented.” Faculty, in the role of learner within these types of sessions, may be more influenced to reciprocally teach in this manner, i.e., teach the material rather than the students. The faculty educator-as-learner must serve as a congruent role model for faculty by engaging in both implicit and explicit modeling as stated by Lunenberg, Korthagen, and Swennen (2007).

Ultrasocial modeling determines how the L-Virus becomes more virulent and faculty begin to focus on students instead of chapters or courses (Bain 2004). For this to happen, faculty educators become faculty coaches who facilitate the learning process of faculty-as-learners through discovery, exploration, and clarification of their own assumptions about their teaching beliefs before they are presented with new methods. It is possible that, without this clarification, new methods may be viewed as “extra” (in the sense of something else to do along with all other commitments) because the mindset and framework to interpret these new teaching methods (e.g., use of graphic organizers to enhance a lecture) do not match current expectations and goals. An affector, as a faculty learner, would not likely see a graphic organizer or another learner-centered teaching method as extra in the sense of something else to do but could see it as an opportunity to replace current instructional practices such as lectures with graphic organizers and problem-based learning to help students learn (all newer memes used to describe this potential reality).

Because faculty actions mimic their beliefs and goals, it is again possible that some faculty could accept and adapt new methods whereas others may not (Pedersen and Liu 2003). Thus, by reflecting on the traditional framework that supports the current memes used by faculty, learner-centered faculty initiatives could seek to solicit assistance from affectors willing to engage in learner-centered conversations that use new memes (e.g., graphic organizers) and experiment with new learner-centered methods (such as using social network sites in class or within virtual faculty learning communities). Faculty educators may find that these more willing faculty members are more likely to contribute to the larger conversation of the organization (an implication of spreading the L-Virus), thereby increasing the population of cooperative “infected” faculty to counterbalance maladaptive “tit-for-tat”
imitation (Richerson and Boyd 2005). It is better to start small and let the interested faculty willing to be infected with the L-Virus in order to spread learner-centered memes to others, which is a potential consequence of ultrasocial transformation.

Conclusion

It is our intention that after reading these words you become linguistically “infected,” thereby beginning the reflective process to realize that you can reach your full potential because the affector is inside each of us waiting to emerge. But the choice to become an affector rests with individual educators. The new direction in teaching and learning is for faculty who accept the current traditional objectivist paradigm of education to realize that how they describe their current reality may be based on unexamined assumptions expressed as memes. This phenomenon leads to a never-ending cycle of disagreements in degrees of opinion because of the differences in the memes used to express ideas about learning, teaching, and each faculty’s current reality. As a community of both on-ground and virtual faculty, we must go beyond an educational reality consumed with opinions, unexamined assumptions, fictions, and a general dismissal of education to realize and live within a cultural niche or maybe a “cognitive niche” (Boyd, Richerson, and Henrich, 2011, 10918) that allows us to engage discursively in the learning process because we use a language that promotes this discourse (Stabile 2014a).

If the world is socially constructed, then what would the paradigm of a socially connected campus look like within this postmodern world? Our hope is that this future campus exists now, where all stakeholders share in the cultural enrichment of learning. More specifically, a shift towards a learning cultural paradigm frames the discourse supporting “revolutionary science” (Kuhn 1996) to (1) reflect deeply about their use of memes, (2) use empirically-verified practices, and (3) speak a language that incorporates memes that closely describe what faculty actually do: teach students by helping them learn. The process of spreading memes, whether grounded in the traditional objectivist model or in a learner-centered model, is itself a constructivist process. Thus, a constructivist mindset emerges from either critiquing this process or by accepting this process, thereby creating the necessary predetermined assumptions (Fish 1980) to interpret the chapters within this monograph.

Notes

1. Because we refer to “discourse” as the concept elaborated on by Foucault (1972) that is not “words and things” but the governing practice of the “ordering of these objects [words and things],” we find that “discourse” provides the context of a given moment in order to show how “what people talk about” creates an insight into their reality.
2. We are of the position that a constructivist analysis is not to be distinguished from the behaviorist, cognitivist, or humanist classification of transformative learning, learner-centered teaching, pedagogy, or andragogy but is rather the formative ontogeny of these entities that are defined by population thinking.
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