INTRODUCTION

MULTIMEDIA ANNOTATIONS (MAs)

Piece of information linked to the original content to explain or add further information.

OBJECTIVES

1. Analysing the quality and quantity of the responses generated by students when they make annotations to define and justify an innovative educational project.
2. Studying how the tags pre-set by the teacher to guide the task and the format used (text vs. video) influence students’ MAs.

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

Science undergraduates enrolled in the Degree in Pedagogy and Primary Education at the Universities of Granada and Málaga (academic years 2016-17 and 2017-18).

TAGS IN MAs

Appearance of tags: competence (20%), evidence (16.5%), problem (16.5%), solution (14%) and others (the remaining 33%).

DIFFERENCES ACCORDING TO FOLKSONOMY

The quality of responses jointly and by separate formats differs and does not exceed the average in any of the tags. Videos: more concentration and it is more complex to maintain parallel thinking. Text annotations without given tags have more words and explanations because they are backed up with quotations and references. Annotations on problems very low number of responses.

QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF MAs

The quality of responses is jointly and by separate formats differ and does not exceed the average in any of the tags. Videos: more concentration and it is more complex to maintain parallel thinking. Text annotations without given tags have more words and explanations because they are backed up with quotations and references. Annotations on problems very low number of responses.

RESULTS

TAGS IN MAs

- Appearance of tags: competence (20%), evidence (16.5%), problem (16.5%), solution (14%) and others (the remaining 33%).
- Folksonomy: more in narrow than in broad.
- Video and text: No significant differences in folksonomy (greater response quality in narrow).

DIFFERENCES ACCORDING TO FOLKSONOMY

- Broad folksonomy: There are no significant differences in quality.
- Narrow folksonomy: Yes.

QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF MAs

- Use of text and narrow folksonomy:
  - Higher number and quality of responses
  - More structured presentation in the text code.
  - In narrow folksonomy, there is a greater probability of response according to tags, with more words and reflective capacity.
  - The video message is more evocative and exciting.

TEACHERS

- Must monitor the task
- Providing students with a simple, intuitive interface and data visualization tools.

CONCLUSIONS

Use of text and narrow folksonomy:

- Higher number and quality of responses
- Differences provoked
- More structured presentation in the text code.
- In narrow folksonomy, there is a greater probability of response according to tags, with more words and reflective capacity.
- The video message is more evocative and exciting.

Evaluating a mixed approach and the potential of Coannotation.com as an educational tool for argumentative work.