

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

Maria Rowena Raymundo¹

¹ University of the Philippines Open University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author presents the following points in the manuscript:

- Students must develop specific skills to cope in an increasingly complex world.
- Creative storytelling is one way by which students can communicate and express their feelings (and consequently develop these skills).
- However, *"there are discrepancies in the ways a story can be structured and even evaluated for constructive feedback."*
- Notably, in Computer-Supported Collaborative Storytelling (CSCS), engagement can be an issue when "students (especially those with Special Educational Needs) are usually invisible and reluctant to participate").
- The author mentions specific approaches to engage these learners in active learning. These include (1) The Awareness, Sensitivity, Empathy, Motivation, and Activation Model, which the authors claim to be *"anchored in Tibbits (2017),"* (2) Active participation eyeball, and (3) 4Cs+D skills building with message tagging.
- The author then suggests that these methods be applied to storytelling templates such as *Hero's Journey* and *Hero's Emotional Journey*.
- The author posits that these methods *"enable the teachers and their students to become more aware of students' processes and needs."*
- The author then proposes developing CSCS context-aware Theatre Forum Tools *to shed light on Primary School students' online learning activities and their discussion in creative storytelling.* These tools are (1) Theatre Forum Social Network Analysis (SNA), (2) Participation Avatar, and (3) Students' Discussion Tagging for 4Cs+D.

The strength of this manuscript lies in the author's intent to develop specific tools to assist teachers in engaging primary school learners in active learning so that they can acquire the skills needed to cope in today's complex world. This is a commendable and very relevant initiative on the author's part.

However, the manuscript itself needs much formative and substantive improvement for the following reasons:

1. The manuscript needs to clearly convey what type of research study it is reporting on. As a reviewer, knowing the type of research study is essential. There are many ways of conducting research, each with its subtle nuances (e.g., reviewing evidence synthesis papers is different from reviewing empirical papers), and reviewers may view these

papers from different lenses. In this case, it is unclear as to what type of research article this is. It does not seem to be a completed study; at most, it seems to cover the first two chapters of a research proposal for an application-type research (e.g., perhaps a Special Problem paper where one formulates a research problem and then proposes to develop a solution for that problem – in this case, software tools). It did not discuss the study design and methodology, so understandably, there are no results, analysis or conclusion at this point. Neither is it an evidence synthesis article since its four sections touch on four different topics, which I think were chosen to provide a background on why the author wants to create theatre forum tools. Putting all this together leads me to surmise that the manuscript is a research proposal intended for review but not necessarily for publication.

2. That said, neither does it follow the conventional structure of a research proposal. A standard basic research proposal starts with an abstract, followed by an introduction and statement of the problem, a review of related literature, and a description of the study design and methodology. This manuscript has an abstract but no Introduction or problem statement. Instead, the abstract is immediately followed by five numbered sections with the following headings: (1) Creative Storytelling, (2) Computer-Supported Collaborative Storytelling, (3) Theatre Forum Context-Aware Tools, (4) Theatre Forum Tools Proposition, and (5) Conclusion. It also seems to be missing a section on research design and methodology. However, upon closer reading, there seem to be some elements of the Introduction within the Abstract and Conclusion. Sections 1 to 4 also seem to correspond to the Review of Related Literature. I am uncertain whether section 4 (Theatre Forum Tools Proposition) is intended to be an overview of the research design or methodology. If it is, the author may want to consider a narrative explanation of the design or methodology she tried to convey in the figures.
3. A clear articulation of the essential elements of a research paper is missing: a clear problem statement and research question that the research seeks to address, as well as any research or knowledge gap that it intends to answer. Some elements seem to be in the manuscript but need to be clearly articulated.
4. The manuscript would benefit from an improvement in the discussion of the literature on each of the enumerated topics. This is where the importance of having a clear problem statement comes in. The literature review provides a critical summary of the current state of research or knowledge in the field; the flow is organized around and directly related to the research question. I believe there is room for more scholarly elaboration on some topics. For instance, it would be beneficial to elaborate on the ASEMA model, which I tried searching for since it figures prominently in the manuscript. The article mentioned that the model was anchored on Tibbits (2017), but upon reviewing Tibbits (2017), its connection with the ASEMA model needs to be clarified. It would also help to explain Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP) in terms of a community of practice or collaborative project since the author is interested in collaborative storytelling. LPP explains how newcomers become experienced members because learning is a contextual social phenomenon resulting from participating in a community of practice. This is not clearly explained in the manuscript.
5. The research needs to be anchored on solid theoretical underpinnings, and a well-thought-out theoretical or conceptual framework will help achieve that. The theoretical grounding should also be well-substantiated by scholarly literature.
6. Early in the proposal, it would also be beneficial for the author to articulate the scope, limitations, and delimitations of

the research to clarify the boundaries. For instance, the title says that the study intends to propose theatre forum tools to support the active engagement of primary school students. However, since the tools mentioned involve social network analysis (SNA), avatars, and discussion tagging, I am interested to find out exactly what age group of primary school students the author focuses on because these seem to be tools meant for older children and not the younger primary-grade students.

7. Lastly, the reference list and the in-text citation formatting can be improved. If the author intends to use APA referencing, I recommend reviewing the APA 7th edition referencing guides.

Overall, the research study shows potential since it is in a novel field that is relevant to current learners. I commend the author for her intention to develop tools to help improve teacher-learner engagement in primary learners and in students with special educational needs through Computer-Supported Collaborative Storytelling (CSCS). I am interested in how this research study will pan out, and I look forward to reading more about the later stages of this research in the future.