

ASSESSMENT - VIDEO MEDIATED INTERACTIONS

NOTE: As the criteria listed below do not carry equal weight, there is no straightforward arithmetical correlation between the ticks awarded and the overall grade score. LEGEND: A= Excellent; B= Very good; C= good; D= satisfactory; E= not fully satisfactory; F=unsatisfactory

1. MULTIMODAL DIGITAL TEXT

1.1 Multimodal orchestration (is the combined use of all semiotic resources of the text suitable to its communicative purposes?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.2 Digital literacy (have the technological affordances of the medium been strategically employed for specific communicative purposes?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.3 Intercultural communication (is the conversation/interaction successful? Did participants interact and communicate meaningfully?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.4 Transcription (has the videocall been transcribed satisfactorily overall?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.5 Linearization (has the transcription clearly linearized and put in a correct sequence turn taking between participants, following a chronological order?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.6 Annotation (are the descriptive notes/comments relevant and meaningful to make sense of the conversation?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.7 Balance (have all resources been given equal status and care in transcription and annotation? E.g. no resource is overlooked). *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.8 Choice of segment to transcribe (comparing the recorded/produced videocall and the segment selected for analysis, has the transcribed segment been wisely chosen? Is it the segment relevant to understand the whole interactional process in the video-recorded conversation?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

1.9 Spontaneity (does the video-recording produce an effect of spontaneity or semi-spontaneity and naturalness of interaction? E.g. the video call does not appear to produce a previously rehearsed interaction). *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

2. ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

2.1 Structure (is the analysis well-organized in terms of argumentation, coherence and cohesion?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

2.2 Resources (have all the different semiotic resources and their interplay been described effectively?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

2.3 Terminology (is the scientific terminology of the readings used appropriately in the analysis?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

2.4 Command of English (is the language appropriate to academic writing?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

2.5 References (is the analysis adequately supported by the use of scientific sources?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

2.6 Analytical skills (has the analysis fully explained all the processes and resources involved in the text?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON ASSIGNMENT 1 AND 2: Things that worked well and things you could improve in the future

OVERALL MARK ON ASSIGNMENT 1 AND 2:

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ Don't show

3. PEER-ASSESSMENT

3.1 Argumentation (are the evaluations supported and justified adequately?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

3.2 Consistency (is the grading in alignment with the qualitative feedback throughout the assessment?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

3.3 Constructive feedback (are recommendations for improvement provided?) *

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F

4. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK ON PEER-ASSESSMENT: Things that worked well and things you could improve in the

OVERALL MARK ON PEER-ASSESSMENT:

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ Don't show

OVERALL MARK:

☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ Don't show