

Review of: "Fishing Rods for Magic: Theatre Forum Tools to Support Primary School Students' Active Engagement in Computer-Supported Collaborative Storytelling"

Caroline Walker-Gleaves¹

¹ Newcastle University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The abstract is clear and the proposed methods seem appropriate and inviting. The introduction in the section Creative Storytelling is quite difficult to understand however, with very long sentences and lots of ideas meshed together all into one big notion. It would be better if that first section was clearer and the justification better explained. Also, at the end of the section, Inclusion is brought in as an important concept, but it is not then extended into the next section, which rapidly progresses to Creative Process without really very much lead in, in terms of linking the prior ideas together.

The creativity cycle is interesting and relevant but there is little literature to support it however, indeed this is also the case with the discussion on CSCS complexity, multiple modes of learning and students experiences. The hero's journey is fascinating and an excellent exemplification of creative storytelling, but there are two problems with it in this paper. First, it is introduced with no explanation or justification or contextualisation from literature. Second, it is a large piece of descriptive text with no substantial analysis. It is the same notion for the Theatre Forum Context aware tools – its' very interesting, very clear and engagingly written, but not really enough justification or critical argument for its use.

The phrase at the end of this section is illustrative of how an important point is too quickly mentioned as a basis for further discussion later... 'In the 'race between technology and education' (OECD, 2019), the translation of the pedagogical methodologies into context-aware for CSCS can provide transformative skills as well as life competences to our students and future citizens.' This is such an important sentence but it is too brief and not grounded in sufficient literature. The CSCS section is better and clearly written, but is there more literature than Dillenbourg? What criticism is there of such collaborative interactions for example?

I think that the problems come to a head with the intersection of the ideas about collaborative learning, the hero's journey, and the very precise context aware tools. There is so much going on here, but mainly prescription and description, that it becomes confusing about what the paper is trying to argue. This is a shame because I enjoyed reading it and the ideas and methods that it proposes are fascinating, but it seems to have too many ideas and too little critical reflection rather than fewer and in depth.