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

Charalampos Dimoulas[1]

1 Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

The topic is interesting and timely. However, I think the introduced novelty and research contribution are poorly projected and demonstrated. I would expect some experimental results, either in the form of a social science approach (stating specific research hypotheses and questions and answering them through the appropriate instruments, i.e., content analysis, interviews/discussions, focus groups, questionnaires, etc.), or through the implementation and evaluation of the proposed approach/methodology (e.g., in what degree the targeted audience engagement has been achieved?). Comparisons with other techniques/methods are also missing. It gives the impression that this is purely theoretical work, which has not been employed/tested in real-world or simulated teaching scenarios. Even if this was the target, to present a new theoretical approach, the design aspects could be elaborated to present some solid scenarios or lesson plans (supported with data flows of activities, interaction/interfacing prototypes, etc.) to assess the aimed innovation and impact. Extending the above comment, structure-wise, I cannot see a pure experimental part to tell which aspects have been introduced in the current work. All sections are mostly bound to theoretical aspects without depicting specific originality and innovation. Hence, it is not clear (especially for the average reader) if the "Theatre Forum Tools" represent pure theoretical educational instruments or if they have their actual implementation counterparts, i.e., specific (digital?) tools that can be employed in the class. The same applies to other concepts, i.e., Avatars, Hero's clock, etc., with additional information required concerning their real-world implementation and utilization. Likewise, it is difficult to say if Figure 1 (ASEMA Methodology) was entirely crafted in the current work or elaborated/redrawn from previous works (which is the most likely), with citations being required in the figure caption in the latter case. I would suggest splitting baseline theory from its elaboration (if any) and practical implementation to indicate the required originality and research contribution. Furthermore, in most cases, references are somewhat outdated, with important perspectives to be missing. For instance, Computer-Supported Collaborative Storytelling (CSCS) which seems to be at the core of the conducted work, has been significantly elaborated since 1988 and 1996, which are the dates of the only two used citations. I think other perspectives presented in some latest works could have been mentioned. For example, I was surprised that aspects like transmedia storytelling, serious games, gamification activities and others, which have been used and assessed in educational applications, are entirely missing (to indicate the progress in the field, so as to demonstrate the gaps the current work tries to fill).

Presentation-wise, the article uses multiple bulleting and numbering lists, which are discouraged in most/many scientific journals (and to such a large degree). Especially for the numbered lists, this might be somewhat confusing because the

same numbers are repeated over and over again and also used in the numbering of the sections. I would also suggest starting sections with text and not Figures or Tables (by the way, Tables also need numbering and captions). Bullets should also be removed from the list of references, which seem to follow the APA standard.