

# Baseline survey

Name: \*

Surname: \*

N.B.: your name and surname will be kept confidential among the teachers/researchers of the project

## Section A. Sociodemographics data

1. Gender: \*

2 Year of Birth: \*

3. What is your school qualification? \*

- Diploma (Senior High School)  Bachelor Degree  Master's Degree or more  None of the above

4. What is your area of studies? \*

- Education  
 Foreign languages  
 Political science  
 Film studies  
 Business and communication  
 IT and foreign languages  
 Communication and Media  
 Other

5. What is your first language? \*

6. What other language(s) do you know?

7. What is your level of English (self-assessed)? \*

- Beginner  Intermediate  Advanced  Proficient  Native language

## Section B. Multimodality

8. Have you ever studied/covered "multimodality" as a subject or as a concept at University/college/elsewhere? \*

- Yes  No

If yes, please specify.

## Section C. Digital texts

9. Which of the following texts/genres are you more interested in producing better? Rate your interest from 1 (not interested) to 5 (highest level of interest)

Blogs: \*

- 1  2  3  4  5

Corporate Videos: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Fanvids/ mash up videos: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Video Interactions: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Websites: \*

1  2  3  4  5

10. Which of the following texts/genres are you more interested in understanding better? Rate your interest from 1 (not interested) to 5 (highest level of interest).

Blogs: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Corporate Videos: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Fanvids/ mash up videos: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Video Interactions: \*

1  2  3  4  5

Websites: \*

1  2  3  4  5

11. Have you ever produced a blog or a website? \*

Yes  No

If yes, provide the url address(es).

12. How frequently do you use FaceTime, Skype or other types of video-communication? \*

every day  twice a week  every week  twice a month  once a month  never

13. Have you ever produced a video and uploaded or streamed it online? \*

Yes  No

If yes, please provide the url address

14. Have you ever produced a fanvid or a mash up video? \*

Yes  No

If yes, please provide the url address.

15. How would you rate your level of expertise in using digital tools / online platforms / search engines? (0 = no expertise at all / 5 = top expert) \*

1  2  3  4  5

16. How useful do you find e-learning platforms in your study experience? (0 = not all useful / 5 = extremely useful) \*

- 1  2  3  4  5

## Section D. Teaching/learning styles and methods

17. What kind of teaching activities and resources do you think you learn more from? (you can choose more than one option) \*

- lectures, group/class discussions  
 tutorials  
 online/digital materials  
 textbooks/readings  
 Peer-assessment  
 feedback from teachers  
 other

18. Have you ever assessed your colleagues/fellow students? \*

- Yes  No

19. In which areas do you think that having assessment/evaluation skills could be useful for you in your future? Tick where appropriate. (you can choose more than one box) \*

- Education  
 Human resources  
 Marketing Management  
 Communication/Media  
 Information technologies  
 International Relations  
 Creative Arts  
 Other

# ASSESSMENT - ABOUT US PAGE

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 multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.4 Web writing techniques (are the main web writing techniques used correctly?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.5 Visual resources (are visual resources meaningfully and consistently combined with written texts?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.6 Structure (are the 4 sections – tagline, summary, fact sheet, further details – clearly identifiable and well-balanced?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.7 Self-branding process (have the communicative and rhetorical strategies been effectively developed?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.8 Informativity (is informativity fully achieved in terms of salience and information value?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.9 Usability (is the multimodal meaning production strongly affected by usability constraints?) \*

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 future

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

# ASSESSMENT - CORPORATE VIDEO

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 multimodal digital 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 multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.4 Structure (is the structure comprehensible and suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.5 Image (is the usage of moving images suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.6 Written text and/or speech (is the usage of superimposed written texts and/or on-screen and/or off-screen speech suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.7 Sounds and/or music (is the usage of sounds and/or music suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.8 Informing, advertising and entertaining (is the balance between informing, advertising and entertaining suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

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

### 5. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

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

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

# ASSESSMENT - FAN VIDEO

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 multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.4 Structure (is the structure comprehensible and suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.5 Image (is the usage of moving images suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.6 Written text (is the usage of the written texts suitable to the practices of the most relevant discourse community?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.7 Sounds and/or music (is the usage of sounds and/or music suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.8 Resemiotization (are the resemiotization processes coherent with the artifact's communicative aim?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.9 Design (does the artefact integrate the hermeneutic tradition of fan communities with postmodern/intertextual design?) \*

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 future

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

# 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 future

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

# ASSESSMENT - WEBLOGS

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 multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.4 Layout (is the use of layout suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.5 Colour (is the use of colour suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.6 Font (is the use of font suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.7 Image (is the use of image suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.8 Writing (is the use of writing suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

1.9 Interactivity (is the aesthetics of interactivity suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

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 future

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

# Evaluation Form

Name of Your University: \*

N.B.: the data you'll provide in this form will be kept anonymous (but we would like to see if there are any differences across universities in the way students evaluate the quality of the teaching they received from us in the project)

1. Rate the module overall from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

2. Rate the usefulness of handouts, references and readings from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent): \*

1  2  3  4  5

3. Rate the usefulness of the core part of the module from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). (the 'core part of the module' is the one that was delivered by your University teacher, introducing the theories of the module, which covered the 'Primary readings') \*

1  2  3  4  5

4. Rate the quality of the core part of the module from 1 (low quality) to 5 (high quality). \*

1  2  3  4  5

5. Rate the usefulness of the workshops on blogs from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

6. Rate the quality of the workshops on blogs from 1 (low quality) to 5 (high quality). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

7. Rate the usefulness of the workshops on corporate videos from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

8. Rate the quality of the workshops on corporate videos from 1 (low quality) to 5 (high quality). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

9. Rate the usefulness of the workshops on fanvids from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

10. Rate the quality of the workshops on fanvids videos from 1 (low quality) to 5 (high quality). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

11. Rate the usefulness of the workshops on About Us webpages from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

12. Rate the quality of the workshops on About Us webpages from 1 (low quality) to 5 (high quality). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

13. Rate the usefulness of the workshops on video-mediated interaction from 1 (not useful) to 5 (very useful). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

14. Rate the quality of the workshops on video-mediated interaction from 1 (low quality) to 5 (high quality). \*

1  2  3  4  5  I can't rate (I was absent)

15. Rate how much your ability, if any, in designing/producing a digital text has improved from 1 (no improvement) to 5 (outstanding improvement). \*

1  2  3  4  5

16. Rate how much your ability, if any, in interpreting/analysing a digital text (that is, in understanding how a digital text works/produces meanings) has improved from 1 (no improvement) to 5 (outstanding improvement). \*

1  2  3  4  5

17. Rate how much your ability, if any, in evaluating/assessing digital texts produced by others has improved \*

1  2  3  4  5

18. Rate your general experience with peer-assessment from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

19. Rate the usability and reliability of the EU-MADE4LL platform from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

20. Have the assessment criteria been made clear? Rate from 1 (not clear) to 5 (completely clear). \*

1  2  3  4  5

21. Score from 1 to 5 each type of Which of the three was the most useful teaching activities? (you can assign the same score to more than one type)

a. Lectures

1  2  3  4  5

b. Seminars/Workshops \*

1  2  3  4  5

c. Practicals \*

1  2  3  4  5

d. Tutorial \*

1  2  3  4  5

22. Which of the following was the most challenging assignment? \*

designing a digital text  transcription or mock up (if relevant)  essay  peer-assessment

23. Which of the following was the most useful/interesting assignment? \*

designing a digital text  transcription or mock up (if relevant)  essay  peer-assessment

24. Were the deadlines for submission carefully planned for you? Rate from 1 (not at all) to 5 (excellent timing). \*

1  2  3  4  5

25. Have you had any previous experience of similar programmes/modules/strands in terms of contents? Rate from 1 (no experience) to 5 (many experiences). \*

1  2  3  4  5

26. Have you had any previous experience of similar programmes/modules/strands in terms of methods (e.g. different teachers for workshops, kinds of assignments, peer-assessment, etc.). Rate from 1 (no experience) to 5 (many experiences). \*

1  2  3  4  5

27. For which purpose among the following do you think that this project is, if any, useful? \*

- theoretical understanding of multimodality
- practical digital skills
- use and design of texts outside university/college
- ability in assessing other people's work
- improving chances to get a job
- other

If other, please specify:

Please write your comments below. Comments can be general on the whole module. If you wish to add a comment on your rating on any of the above questions, please specify the number of the question your comment refers to:

# PEER ASSESSMENT - ABOUT US PAGE

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.3 Intercultural communication (is the multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.4 Web writing techniques (are the main web writing techniques used correctly?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.5 Visual resources (are visual resources meaningfully and consistently combined with written texts?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.6 Structure (are the 4 sections – tagline, summary, fact sheet, further details – clearly identifiable and well-balanced?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*



1.7 Self-branding process (have the communicative and rhetorical strategies been effectively developed?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.8 Informativity (is informativity fully achieved in terms of salience and information value?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.9 Usability (is the multimodal meaning production strongly affected by usability constraints?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

## 2. ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

### 3. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

Write below any other comments and constructive feedback. The aim is not to spot your fellow student's mistakes, but to help her/him increase the quality of his/her work (max. 400 words)

# PEER ASSESSMENT - CORPORATE VIDEO

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 multimodal digital text suitable to its communicative purposes?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.3 Intercultural communication (is the multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.4 Structure (is the structure comprehensible and suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.5 Image (is the usage of moving images suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.6 Written text and/or speech (is the usage of superimposed written texts and/or on-screen and/or off-screen speech suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.7 Sounds and/or music (is the usage of sounds and/or music suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.8 Informing, advertising and entertaining (is the balance between informing, advertising and entertaining suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

## 2. ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

### 3. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

Write below any other comments and constructive feedback. The aim is not to spot your fellow student's mistakes, but to help her/him increase the quality of his/her work (max. 400 words)

# PEER ASSESSMENT - FAN VIDEO

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.3 Intercultural communication (is the multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.4 Structure (is the structure comprehensible and suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.5 Image (is the usage of moving images suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.6 Written text (is the usage of the written texts suitable to the practices of the most relevant discourse community?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.7 Sounds and/or music (is the usage of sounds and/or music suitable to the communicative purposes of the multimodal digital text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.8 Resemiotization (are the resemiotization processes coherent with the artifact's communicative aim?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.9 Design (does the artefact integrate the hermeneutic tradition of fan communities with postmodern/intertextual design?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

## 2. ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

### 3. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

Write below any other comments and constructive feedback. The aim is not to spot your fellow student's mistakes, but to help her/him increase the quality of his/her work (max. 400 words)



# PEER 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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

## 2. ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

### 3. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

Write below any other comments and constructive feedback. The aim is not to spot your fellow student's mistakes, but to help her/him increase the quality of his/her work (max. 400 words)

# PEER ASSESSMENT - WEBLOGS

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

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.3 Intercultural communication (is the multimodal digital text suitable for an international audience?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.4 Layout (is the use of layout suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.5 Colour (is the use of colour suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.6 Font (is the use of font suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.7 Image (is the use of image suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.8 Writing (is the use of writing suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

1.9 Interactivity (is the aesthetics of interactivity suitable to the communicative purpose of the text?) \*

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

## 2. ANALYSIS ASSIGNMENT

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

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

- A  B  C  D  E  F

Give reason for your above answer: \*

### 3. QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

Write below any other comments and constructive feedback. The aim is not to spot your fellow student's mistakes, but to help her/him increase the quality of his/her work (max. 400 words)

# Aarhus Event Evaluation

Please provide the name or acronym of your University: \*

1. Rate the International Digital Communication Seminar overall from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

Comment on your rating (optional)

2. Rate the usefulness of handouts, references and other printed materials from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

Comment on your rating (optional)

3. Rate the usefulness of the lectures on crisis management (day 1) from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

Comment on your rating (optional)

4. Rate the usefulness of the workplace experience sharing (day 2) from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

Comment on your rating (optional)

5. Rate the usefulness of the Rocca Creative Thinking three-day training (days 3-4-5) from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

Comment on your rating (optional)

6. Rate the quality of the event in terms of logistics and social events (facilities, rooms, timing, etc.) \*

1  2  3  4  5

Comment on your rating (optional)

7. Rate the overall group participation in the social media campaigns from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). \*

1  2  3  4  5

Suggest ideas on how to keep the campaign running (optional)

8. Now that the project has reached its conclusion for you, rate each project activity from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent):

Classes \*

1  2  3  4  5

Final assignments \*

1  2  3  4  5

Peer assessment \*

1  2  3  4  5

The two-day Seminar \*

1  2  3  4  5

The three-day Rocca Workshop \*

1  2  3  4  5

Please write your constructive feedback below: