



Poster Session

Title: Reference in APA: Van de Poël, J, Martin, P., & Verpoorten, D. (2015, November). Multimedia-enhanced learning productions - A typology based on instructional use and needed resources. Poster session presented at the EAPRIL Conference 2015, Belval, Luxembourg.

General abstract of the presentation (English) *(max. 150 words)*

including the aims/objectives of the research, the methodology, the results, and the main conclusions and/or implications for practice

This poster introduces a typology of educational multimedia objects stemming from the analysis of 400 audiovisual items produced in two years at eCampus (IFRES), the staff development center of the University of Liège (Belgium). This classification, which takes into account several factors impacting all stakeholders, is designed to optimize our means and resources in order to offer teachers a range of possibilities as broad as possible in the service of the quality of their teaching.

Detailed abstract

1. **How is this study founded by theory and/or how does it originate from practice?** (*max. 200 words*)

On the one hand, multimedia-supported teaching and learning develops as salient trend in higher education. This widespread adoption demands an increase in research on this topic. On the other had, it also has an impact on the daily work of pedagogical advisors who must coach faculty in a quality design of this instructional material. This poster is rooted both in the call for more empirical investigation and in the need for concrete tools likely to frame the pedagogical dialogue with faculty.

2. **What are the central research goal(s), problem(s) and/or question(s) in this study?** (*max. 150 words*)

The purpose of this research is to equip a team of techno-pedagogues with an illustrated classification scheme for multimedia production. The classification encompasses criteria related to the pedagogical intention of the multimedia outputs as well as indications of the resources implied in their production. Taking both dimensions into account is essential to optimize material and human investment in the service of instructional quality and satisfaction of teachers and students.

3. **Which research design did you use in this study and which methods did you use to analyse the data (i.e. subjects, instruments/intervention and procedure)?** *(max. 200 words)*

The study is conducted over all multimedia items produced by the staff development unit in the last two years. Firstly, a complete inventory was produced. Onto this material, the three researchers harnessed an exploratory process aiming at identifying and describing various categories of multimedia productions, through an iterative process of observation, discussion, classification, and refinement.

4. **What are the results of this study?** *(max. 150 words)*

The result is a typology of multimedia products based on a) their pedagogical intent and b) the level of resources (time and material) invested on the part of teachers and the techno-pedagogical support team. The defined categories are:

- 1) The "Ecological captation"
- 2) The "Me, Myself and Board"
- 3) The "Screencast"
- 4) The "Interview"
- 5) The "Illustrated narration"
- 6) The "Experiment"
- 7) The "Film"

Since the classification process is still ongoing, only the titles are given. However, the posters will add a depiction of each type along with an emblematic illustration.

5. What are the main conclusions of this study? *(max. 100 words)*

It is possible and profitable for a staff development unit to facilitate faculty coaching and dialogue about multimedia resources through a well-illustrated list of possible options.

6. Who (should) use the results of this study and how do the results contribute to the improvement of educational practice? *(max. 150 words)*

The result of this work is firstly meant to help local techno-pedagogical advisors and teachers. However, its relevance goes beyond this narrow context. The reflection upon this classification scheme can be of interest for any teaching and learning center facing an increase of the demand for multimedia-supported practice. The work gives also an insight into a ratio "investment-pedagogical benefits" which is an important aspect of any multimedia production initiative.

7. Which question or general statement related to your study would you like to present to the conference delegates for discussion? (max. 20 words)

(e.g. related to your concept, your findings, the implications of your findings, future research plans, how to deal with limitations of your study, etc.)?

The poster will foster a discussion with visitors about how their institution tackles the demand for more multimedia-supported teaching/learning.

8. List of references

Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2011). E-Learning and the Science of Instruction: Proven Guidelines for Consumers and Designers of Multimedia Learning (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Jamet, E., & Le Bohec, O. (2007) The effect of redundant text on multimedia instruction. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 32(4), 588-598.

Mayer, R. E. (Ed.) (2014). The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Muller, D. A., Sharma, M. D., Eklund, J., & Reimann, P. (2007). Conceptual change through vicarious learning in an authentic physics setting. Instructional Science, 35(6), 519 – 533.

Please upload this document, which will serve as your official proposal, as an attachment to your submission in the EAPRIL Conference System.

