



ASCILITE Adelaide 2016

Show Me The Learning

Conference Proceedings

33rd International Conference of Innovation,
Practice and Research in the Use of Educational
Technologies in Tertiary Education

University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia



CELEBRATING
25
YEARS



Table of Contents

Enabler or inhibitor? Educational technology in self and peer assessment <i>Chie Adachi, Joanna Tai and Phillip Dawson</i>	11
The design process of university teachers: A descriptive model <i>Shirley Agostinho, Sue Bennett and Lori Lockyer</i>	17
Attentional and cognitive processing of analytics visualisations: Can design features affect interpretations and decisions about learning and teaching? <i>Sakinah Alhadad</i>	20
Confidence drives exploration strategies in interactive simulations <i>Amaël Arguel, Jason M. Lodge, Mariya Pachman and Paula de Barba</i>	33
Using a Video-Based Critique Process to Support Studio Pedagogies in Distance Education – A Tool and Pilot Study <i>William Billingsley, Bing Ngu, Huy Phan, Nicolas Gromik and Paul Kawn</i>	43
Preliminary exploration of student behavioural outcomes using Blackboard Collaborate in fully online courses <i>Kelli Bodey, Vikki Ravaga and Sarah Sloan</i>	49
Engaging students in the use of technologies for assessment within Personal Learning Environments (PLEs): The development of a framework <i>David Bolton, Paula Mindenhall, Kwong Nui Sim, Lynnette Lounsbury and Maria Northcote</i>	57
Application of Personal Learning Environment to an Independent Study Experience <i>David Bolton and Irene Crossland</i>	67
A national strategy to promote Open Educational Practices in higher education in Australia <i>Carina Bossu, Linda Ward, Sandra Wills, Shirley Alexander, David Sadler, Peter Kandlbinder, Natalie Brown, Janet Chelliah, Katherine Klappdor and Philip Uys</i>	70
Digital equity and social justice: Whose reality? Reflections from South Africa <i>Jeanette Botha</i>	76
A Strategic Response to MOOCs: What Role Should Governments Play? <i>Mark Brown, Eamon Costello and Mairead Nic Giolla-Mhichil</i>	86
Staying the distance: Using digital readiness tools to support effective transitions into higher education for flexible learners <i>James Brunton, Mark Brown, Eamon Costello, Ann Cleary, Lorraine Delaney, Seamus Fox, Jennifer Gilligan, Lisa O'Regan and Jamie Ward</i>	97

Head Start Online: A MOOC for effectively supporting flexible learner transition into higher education <i>James Brunton, Mark Brown, Eamon Costello, Orna Farrell and Conor Mahon</i>	99
Embedding Classroom Practice in a 21st Century Learning Design (21CLD) MOOC framework <i>Deirdre Butler, Margaret Leahy, Michael Hallissy and Mark Brown</i>	102
Introducing pre-service education students to university experiences through an augmented reality game <i>Chris Campbell and Aisha Al-Harhi</i>	105
Snapchat at school - 'Now you see it... ': Networked affect – cyber bullying, harassment and sexting <i>Jennifer Charteris, Sue Gregory, Yvonne Masters, Myfanwy Maple and Amanda Kennedy</i>	111
Toward the development of a dynamic dashboard for FutureLearn MOOCs: insights and directions <i>Mahsa Chitsaz, Lorenzo Vigentini and Andrew Clayphan</i>	116
Blended Learning Boot Camps: Invigorating Curriculum Design in Undergraduate Nursing Science <i>Ben Cleland, John Smithson and Cecily Knight</i>	122
Designing Virtual Reality Environments for Paramedic Education: MESH360 <i>Thomas Cochrane, Stuart Cook, Stephen Aiello, Dave Harrison and Claudio Aguayo</i>	125
Beyond Pokemon Go: Mobile AR & VR in Education <i>Thomas Cochrane, Sarah Jones, Matthew Kearney, Helen Farley and Vickel Narayan</i>	136
Evaluating a Professional Development cMOOC: Mosomelt <i>Thomas Cochrane and Vickel Narayan</i>	139
Development of a tool to support continuous assessments and improve the feedback cycle on statistical analysis assignments for large classes <i>Alberto Corrias, Jeanette Lyn Fung Choy, Swee Kit Alan Soong and Mark Joo Seng Gan</i>	151
Social Media #MOOC Mentions: Lessons for MOOC Research from Analysis of Twitter Data <i>Eamon Costello, Binesh Nair, Mark Brown, Jingjing Zhang, Mairéad Nic Giolla Mhichíl, Enda Donlon and Theo Lynn</i>	157
Piloting Mixed Reality in ICT Networking to Visualize Complex Theoretical Multi-Step Problems <i>Michael Cowling and James Birt</i>	163
Blended learning in first year curriculum – Melding pedagogies to support student engagement and empowerment <i>Leigha Dark</i>	169
Content strategy: a lesson from the industry for university learning analytics <i>Roger Dawkins</i>	172

Determining the requirements for geographically extended learning (gxLearning): A multiple case study approach <i>Stephanie Day and Michael Verhaart.</i>	182
Digital learning: an important ingredient in equity of access to university <i>Lorraine Delaney and Margaret Farren</i>	192
Voice-to-Text Transcription of Lecture Recordings <i>Stuart Dinmore and Jing Gao</i>	197
Learning Design Research in Action <i>Eva Dobozy, Leanne Cameron, Shirley Agostinho, Chris Campbell and Panos Vlachopoulos</i>	203
Power of the Crowd: The Promise and Potential of Crowdsourcing for Education <i>Enda Donlon, Mark Brown and Eamon Costello.</i>	206
Open Educational Practices: A focus on instructional design <i>Dan Dubien, Niki Davis and Annelies Kamp.</i>	212
Learning gains in a flipped classroom to teach the principles of envenomation <i>Kristine Elliott and Ken Winkel.</i>	215
A case study exploring video access by students: wrangling and visualising data for measuring digital behaviour <i>Timna Garnett and Didy Button.</i>	225
It's what you do with IT that matters! <i>Lincoln Gill.</i>	231
Video-based feedback: Path toward student centered-learning <i>Cedomir Chad Gladovic</i>	237
Harvesting the interface: Pokémon Go <i>Brent Gregory, Sue Gregory and Boahdan Gregory.</i>	240
Exploring virtual world innovations and design through learner voices <i>Sue Gregory, Brent Gregory, Scott Grant, Marcus McDonald, Sasha Nikolic, Helen Farley, Judy O'Connell, Des Butler, Lisa Jacka, Jay Jay Jegathesan, Naomi McGrath, Amit Rudra, Frederick Stokes-Thompson, Suku Sukunesan, Jason Zagami, Jenny Sim, Stefan Schutt, Belma Gaukrodger, Merle Hearns and Leah Irving.</i>	245
The missing link for learning from analytics <i>Cathy Gunn, Jenny McDonald, Claire Donald, Marion Blumenstein and John Milne.</i>	255
Designing a Review of the Learning Management System <i>Liz Heathcote and Edward Palmer</i>	261
A review of the literature on flipping the STEM classroom: Preliminary findings <i>Elaine Huber and Ashleigh Werner.</i>	267
Moving forward with Digital Badges <i>Dirk Ifenthaler, David Gibson, Melinda Lewis, Deborah West, Scott Beattie, Kathryn Coleman, Kim Flintoff, Leah Irving, Alison Lockley and Jason Lodge.</i>	275

Refocusing institutional TEL provision on the learner: drivers for change in UK higher education <i>Martin Jenkins, Richard Walker, Julie Voce, Jebar Ahmed, Elaine Swift and Phil Vincent</i>	278
Proudly Pragmatic: Steps to Online Curriculum Transformation <i>Jacqueline Jepson and Deb Moulton</i>	283
Using digital tools in WIL to enable student journalists' real world learning <i>Dianne Jones</i>	294
Ethical considerations in the use of student data: International perspectives and educators' perceptions <i>Hazel Jones</i>	300
Deakin Hallmarks: principles for employability credentials <i>Trina Jorre de St Jorre, Liz Johnson and Beverley Oliver</i>	305
The Rise of the Flip. Successfully engaging students in pre-class activities through the use of technology and a flipped classroom design template <i>Sophia Karanicolas, Beth Loveys, Karina Riggs, Hayley McGrice, Catherine Snelling, Tracey Winning and Andrew Kemp</i>	312
All roads lead to Rome: Tracking students' affect as they overcome misconceptions <i>Gregor Kennedy and Jason Lodge</i>	318
Engineering professional identity practices: Investigating the use of web search in collaborative decision making <i>Maryam Khosronejad, Peter Reimann and Lina Markauskaite</i>	329
Incorporating student-facing learning analytics into pedagogical practice <i>Kirsty Kitto, Mandy Lupton, Kate Davis and Zak Waters</i>	338
Collective effervescence: Designing MOOCs for emotion and community <i>Stephanie Kizimchuk, Katharina Freund, Margaret Prescott, Crystal McLaughlin and Inger Mewburn</i>	348
Individual differences in motivations for using social media among university students <i>Wilfred W. F. Lau</i>	354
Lecture Pods Unlimited <i>Robert Leggo, Peter Steele, George Karliychuk and Fiona Thurn</i>	359
Transformation through transition: learning through 'theory of change' <i>Philippa Levy and Travis Cox</i>	362
Professional identity and teachers' learning technology adoption: a review of adopter-related antecedents <i>Qian Liu and Susan Geertshuis</i>	365
How to engage students in blended learning in a mathematics course: The students' views <i>Birgit Loch, Rosy Borland and Nadezda Sukhorukova</i>	375
Student Behavioural Engagement in Self-Paced Online Learning <i>Md Abdullah Al Mamun, Gwen Lawrie and Tony Wright</i>	381

PST Online: Learner voices guiding learning design <i>Dr Yvonne Masters, Dr Sue Gregory and Stephen Grono</i>	387
From practitioner-producers to knowledge co-creators: An early view of a design-based research project to foster insight generation into MOOCs <i>Katy McDevitt and Mario Ricci</i>	392
Cross-institutional collaboration to support student engagement: SRES version 2 <i>Jenny McDonald, Danny Liu, Adon Moskal, Richard Zeng, Marion Blumenstein, Cathy Gunn, Steve Leichtweis and Abelardo Pardo</i>	397
Exploring the unknown: Creating a serious game for tertiary education from scratch, a case study <i>Gillian McGregor and Emma Bartle</i>	406
Serious games in education: Fact or fad? Comparing training experiences using the digital game “Laurus” to those using a control digital game, a case study <i>Gillian McGregor and Emma Bartle</i>	409
Building cognitive bridges in mathematics: exploring the role of screencasting in scaffolding flexible learning and engagement <i>Catherine McLoughlin and Birgit Loch</i>	412
Evaluation of a learning outcomes taxonomy to support autonomous classification of instructional activities <i>Mark McMahon and Michael Garrett</i>	421
Gunya Online - access, engagement, retention and success for Indigenous distance students <i>Wendy Meyers, Alex Swain, Jennifer Gili, Emily Sutton and Sue Pinckham</i>	431
Natural Language Proficiency and Computational Thinking: Two linked literacies of the 21st Century <i>Ronald Monson</i>	434
Assessing the impact of an “Echo360-Active Learning Platform”- enabled classroom on learning gains in a large enrolment blended learning undergraduate course in Genetics. <i>Colin Montpetit and Sonya Sabourin</i>	440
Challenges implementing social constructivist learning approaches: The case of Pictation <i>Adon Moskal, Swee-Kin Loke and Noelyn Hung</i>	446
Using Gamification and Mixed Reality Visualization to Improve Conceptual Understanding in ICT System Analysis and Design <i>Juan Carlos Munoz, Michael Cowling and James Birt</i>	455
Mobile learning in the Asia-Pacific region: Exploring challenges hindering the sustainable design of mobile learning initiatives <i>Angela Murphy, Hazel Jones and Helen Farley</i>	461
Academic Development through Intensive Learning Design <i>Tam Nguyen, Stephen Abblitt, Colin Hickie, Jenny Pesina and Joan Sutherland</i>	470

Reflections of a new educational designer <i>Mark Nichols and Nicky Meuleman</i>	473
Show me the Feedback: A Multi-Institutional Project Exploring Technology-Enabled Feedback Approaches for First Year <i>Lisa O'Regan, Morag Munro, Mark Brown, Moira Maguire and Nuala Harding</i>	476
Using student voice in the design of game-based learning <i>Mark O'Rourke</i>	481
A blended learning model and a design model combine to support academics in pedagogical redesign of the curriculum <i>Linda Pannan and Katherine Legge</i>	487
Developing low barrier courses using open textbooks: a University of Southern Queensland case study <i>Helen Partridge, Adrian Stagg and Emma Power</i>	498
On the role of 'digital learning designer' for non-indigenous designers collaborating within culturally grounded digital design settings <i>Lynne Petersen, John P. Egan, Elana T. Curtis and Mark Barrow</i>	509
Multimodal feedback is not always clearer, more useful or satisfying <i>Michael Phillips, Michael Henderson and Tracii Ryan</i>	514
Tracking discipline mastery: The development of an online program assessment and evaluation tool <i>Diana Quinn, Paul Sutton, Paul Corcoran and Delene Weber</i>	523
Correcting tool or learning tool? Student perceptions of an online essay writing support tool at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University <i>Charlie Reis and Henk Huijser</i>	529
Contextualizing institutional strategies for technology enhanced learning <i>Carol Russell</i>	534
Failing forward in research around technology enhanced learning <i>Michael Sankey and Rachel Whitsed</i>	540
Visualizing Individual Profiles and Grouping Conditions in Collaborative Learning Activities <i>Augusto Dias Pereira Dos Santos, Kalina Yacef and Roberto Martinez-Maldonado</i>	545
Building academics' SoTL capacity through a course on blended learning <i>Swee Kit Alan Soong, Lyn Fung Jeanette Choy and Adrian Michael Lee</i>	555
Mining video data: tracking learners for orchestration and design <i>Kate Thompson, Sarah Howard, Jack Yang and Jun Ma</i>	560
Designing and Analysing STEM Studios for preservice teacher education <i>Kate Thompson and Harry Kanasa</i>	566
Learners Multitasking (Task Switching) during a Virtual Classroom session. Should teachers be concerned? <i>Kerry Trabinger</i>	571

Technology Advances in Virtual Classrooms (and how this affects learner engagement) <i>Kerry Trabinger</i>	580
Using mobile technology for workplace learning: Fostering students' agency <i>Franziska Trede, Susie Macfarlane, Lina Markauskaite, Peter Goodyear, Celina McEwen and Freny Tayebjee</i>	583
Designing a toolkit to support the development of copyright literacy <i>Beale van der Veer, Tony Carew and Luke Padgett</i>	589
Applications of Automatic Writing Evaluation to Guide the Understanding of Learning and Teaching <i>Peter Vitartas, James Heath, Sarah Midford, Kok-Leong Ong, Dammina Alahakoon and Gillian Sullivan-Mort</i>	592
Facilitating Summative Peer Review of Teaching: a software based on academic values <i>Dale Wache</i>	602
From Flipped to Flopped to Flexible classrooms in Higher Education? – Critical Reflections from Australia <i>Thomas Wanner and Edward Palmer</i>	605
learning design@CSU <i>Linda Ward</i>	611
Technology choices to support international online collaboration <i>Debbi Weaver</i>	616
The Sociological Imagination Machine (S.I.M.): using game elements to help learners apply the Sociological Imagination <i>Hilary Wheaton and David Hall</i>	624
Straddling the technology adoption chasm in university teaching practice using Multi-Mediator Modelling <i>Irena White</i>	630
Levelling the playing field: student and staff experiences of a curated, self-assessed, self-paced multimedia resource <i>Rachel Whitsed and Joanne Parker</i>	633
No More Lonely Learning: Applying Salmon's Carpe Diem process of subject re-design to three fully online postgraduate nursing subjects in a regional Australian university <i>Kristin Wicking, Scott Bradey, Stephen Anderson, Cecily Knight and David Lindsay</i>	642
Working with social media in tertiary education: A contested space between academics and policies <i>Julie Willems, Chie Adachi and Yana Grevtseva</i>	648
The promise and pitfalls of social media use in Higher Education <i>Julie Willems, Chie Adachi, Trish McCluskey, Iain Doherty, Francesca Bussey, Marcus O'Donnell and Henk Huijser</i>	654
WIL-fully flipping online: A novel pedagogical approach in STEM <i>Julie Willems, Karen Young, Adam Cardilini and Simone Teychenne</i>	656

Models for understanding student engagement in digital learning environments <i>Paul J Wiseman, Gregor E Kennedy and Jason M Lodge.</i>	666
Open Education Licensing: Making online education really work <i>Robin Wright, Luke Padgett, Derek Whitehead and Carina Bossu.</i>	672
Open Education Licensing: A toolkit for achieving openness in the global education market <i>Robin Wright, Carina Bossu, Luke Padgett, Derek Whitehead, Tony Carew and Beale van der Veer.</i>	675
Learning through Video Production - an Instructional Strategy for Promoting Active Learning in a Biology Course <i>Jinlu Wu.</i>	677

A case study exploring video access by students: wrangling and visualising data for measuring digital behaviour

Timna Garnett

Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching
Flinders University

Didy Button

Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences
Flinders University

Every click made by a student is being captured by our learning platforms and integrated web-based tools. This store of data acts as, in its simplest form, part of an individuals' digital behaviour with measurable points of interest. But how can this data give teachers an indication that our energy, time and potentially money spent making educational videos is worth the investment? Do-It-Yourself (DIY) videos are more commonly being made by teachers to replace written or face-to-face spoken content, provide an alternative instruction format or provide assessment feedback, to name just a few. This paper explores how we can help answer the most common question asked by teachers who undertake DIY video creation: are DIY educational videos being accessed by students? To answer this question, usage data generated by Moodle (student access point) and YouTube (video host) was collected. Simple analysis tools were employed to make sense of the typical log points generated by each system. Using a first year nursing subject as a case study, this project compared student access behaviour of pre-recorded one hour weekly video lectures. The results indicated an overall declining trend in viewing the video content online throughout the semester yet an increased video access when videos are presented in small segments assembled in YouTube playlists. An additional important outcome of this study was learning and sharing how to wrangle Moodle logs and YouTube Analytics data by non-statistical experts to quickly visualise video access. This information may ultimately support video creators to evaluate their videos, spend their time more efficiently when initially making videos, support decisions to change content or update curriculum, and to ultimately re-evaluate the role videos play in learning and teaching online environments.

Keywords: learning design; learning analytics; digital behaviour

Introduction

In this concise paper, a small scale pilot study responded to the increased discussion for using data captured through access (view) logs in Moodle and YouTube for determining whether a custom-made digital resource like a video was being accessed by students and therefore worth the energy, time and money spent to create them. This study specifically asked how data wrangled and visualised from Moodle logs and YouTube Analytics database around the student's digital behaviour access of weekly video lectures could provide both educational designers and academic teaching staff with practical considerations for the potential learning design of topics and/or digital content. This study related strongly to the type of digital behaviour explored extensively by authors such as Rowlands et al. (2008), who commonly associated human behaviour with digital information seeking behaviours using log files as a record. This paper makes connections between the patterns represented by usage of online videos using available log data to determine what can be glimpsed in human (student) behaviour around online learning activities. Ultimately this will help to inform staff around the possible learning potential for their educational videos and to reinforce that more planning should be considered during the design of topic and individual digital resources, to overall strengthen the student value of videos.

At a South Australian university, the use of videos created by teaching staff has seen an increase in recent years, due in part to the increase in student numbers which cannot be housed together in a single lecture facility. Additionally, there is an increased demand for learning flexibility for a blended on-campus and distance/off-campus study that is supported by a range of technologies such as web-based tools and online learning platforms. This is reiterated by Heimann and Pittenger (2000) who stated that videos, as a form of communication, had many benefits to education, especially when a voice presentation is integrated with lecture slides. However, video as a communication tool has the potential to be of high value beyond the traditional lecture style and should not be confused with the recording of a traditional face-to-face lecture. The new wave of videos in education are done by the lecturer in a low-tech way, using simple video recording and editing tools, and are hosted on a learning platform or cloud storage tool to be accessed by students as part of their course resources. These videos are usually heavily content-based, as a way to replace or strengthen the traditional lecture, but an increasing number are being created for improving visibility of a lecturer or tutor in an online space (Borup, West, & Graham, 2012; Kelly, Lyng, McGrath, & Cannon, 2009).

It is well recognised in educational fields that multimedia materials are increasingly being used in a range of learning and teaching activities to harness learner attention and interest through the delivery of an eLearning system or education-focused website (Chen & Sun, 2012; Copley, 2007). The education field also recognises that there is potential for students to enhance their learning potential by using media-rich resources, as created and shared by their teachers (Ragusa & Crampton, 2014). Research conducted by Wells, Barry, and Spence (2012) indicates that when videos (and potentially other media) are well-designed, are assessment-focused and readily available when and where students need them, videos have the potential to improve student satisfaction and grades. Another positive value of videos is their potential to build and maintain a social presence and display quality instruction in a highly online environment (Homer, Plass, & Blake, 2008; Kim, Kwon, & Cho, 2011). Zhang, Zhou, Briggs, and Nunamaker (2006) reiterate the value of videos to student learning outcomes when interactivity is included. These considerations should be made when designing topics for online and blended learning environments where video and other multimedia tools and resources are utilised as part of the online learning design.

Research design

This study explored what was being captured by the learning platform (Moodle) reports and YouTube (Analytics), with an emphasis of not using sophisticated statistical software for analysis, but relying on quick visualisation tools available to all staff. In order to answer the research question; are DIY educational videos being accessed by students? The principle behind the decision to use access log data, was to replicate what a non-statistical expert academic teaching staff member could readily use to view how/when their students access digital content, using the example of the weekly online video resource. Microsoft Excel with a pivot table and graph function was one analytical tool used throughout this study, simply because it is accessible to the majority of university staff and simple to use. YouTube Analytics dashboard was a new tool trialled for its value in visually displaying the *views* of individual videos, a group of videos and playlists.

The main aim of this case study was to investigate how Moodle logs and YouTube Analytics could be used to quickly visual the use of videos accessed by students, whilst also testing the potential value in dividing one hour lectures into 2-10 minute sections, which are then combined in a YouTube playlist. Overall this project's aim was to visualise access data of content-focused pre-recorded video lectures in a large (n=406) cohort of first-year nursing students in 2015. Alterations between the one hour videos lectures used in 2014 and segmented 2-10 minute videos presented in a topic playlist structure in 2015 are presented. This study uses two years of access data on weekly video lectures and hypothesises that flexible use of streamed segmented lecture videos stored in YouTube playlists will increase the access of the videos compared to those stored as 1 hour lectures in 2014 (n=413). The study continues the discussion of whether the energy, time and money it takes to plan, create and publish videos for replacing face-to-face lectures is a reliable form of information transfer for students if the majority of students are not accessing the content created.

Results and discussion

The potential investment of time and money it takes a non-video expert to make digital content-rich resources which is engaging for the audience and their importance as a replacement to the one-hour lecture cannot be underestimated. The videos created for this study used a balance of low-technology for their creation (Microsoft PowerPoint and Camtasia Studio 8) but were content-rich using images from the topic textbook. So how do we know they are being accessed? Moodle logs in the learning platform seemed to be a simple way forward. In 2014 student access of pre-recorded one hour lectures for ten weeks indicated only 46% (n=190) of students watched an average number of supplied videos (9 of 24 videos), but also as the weeks progressed, the trend continued to display a declining view of lecture video content. In 2015, the Moodle logs identified 54% (n=220) of students watched an average number of supplied videos (6 of 12 videos). While the number of videos changed between the years, the length of each video did not change. This was due to the repurposing of the videos, where two videos on the same content (Part 1 and Part 2) were merged into one playlist divided video. This resulted in the number of videos created and presented to students dropped from 24 to 12 between 2014 and 2015. Overall, access to video content was an important component to the design of the topic, as students were encouraged to access the video resources before their practical classes because the weekly theoretical content was only delivered digitally through video.

Figure 1 indicates that Moodle logs for the access of lecture video by students in 2014 (n=413) and 2015 (n=406). The results are visualised using Microsoft Excel pivot table chart and are meant to be a guide for staff to identify the access of the video content, not a measure of engagement. Interestingly, the percentage of students in 2014 who accessed all 24 videos at least once was 5.33% while in 2015 the students who accessed all 12 videos at least once is 13.79%. The results indicate that the number of videos presented to students is an important decision, as too many and they are unlikely to access all of them.




Figure 1: Comparing 2014 to 2015 video access in Moodle

Taking on board the low measured views of videos in semester 1, 2014, obtained from Moodle reports, a meeting between the topic coordinator and an educational designer resulted in editing the one hour video lectures used in 2014, into segmented shorter concepts (2-10 minutes in length) and stored in an unlisted YouTube playlist by topic/week. This playlist was then embedded into the online platform topic for semester 1, 2015, for students to access when needed. A total of eleven playlists were created, one for each unit of study within the topic. By using YouTube as a video host, the aim was to visualise access data of videos to determine if the use of playlists improved the video accessibility for students to review sections of the weekly content because of its menu-like feature. All videos were hosted in the topic coordinators' YouTube channel. YouTube also provided YouTube Analytics for measuring the view (click) of videos where no users were identifiable (See Figures 2A and 2B). Within the YouTube Analytics section is a valuable tool *Groups* when connected to the *Audience Retention* option, provides visual displays of the average view (access) duration of each video within a group (a *group* being a collection of videos or playlists). The flexibility of this feature enabled comparisons to be made between video segments or across playlists. This topic created all eleven playlists into a single group for analysis (Figure 2.A) and created an independent single playlist for each week's content (example for Week 4 provided in Figure 2.B).




Figure 2: Visualising possibilities in YouTube analytics samples (2015): A: comparing playlists in topic; B: individual playlist videos (an example of the week by week playlists)

The audience retention feature (determined by length of time video was accessed) captured by YouTube has been invaluable throughout this study, as it provides an overall view of the video visually with the view response from students at any given point in time of the video (illustrated in Figure 3). Interestingly, the YouTube Analytics summary for 2015 videos by topic playlist (Figure 2.A) identified that of the 118 videos (comprised of 2-10 minute video segments of the original 1 hour video) loaded into YouTube, the average view duration is 2:33 minutes per video. As illustrated in Figure 2.A, the trend displayed by the views in all playlists indicated the typical dwindling of access for later weeks' content (Week 4 is represented by blue and Week 13 is represented by red). The same can be applied for an individual playlist, as illustrated in Figure 2.B. Using YouTube Analytics for the example of Week 4 playlist containing 10 short videos, we clearly and quickly highlighted the average duration students spent for each section (content video) within the playlist. Additional filters can be viewed using the *metrics*, which are defined as individual measurements of user activity.

Overall the audience retention feature for each video displayed an interactive visual dashboard, enabling the user to pinpoint the section of the video that is poorly viewed (see Figure 3). Audience retention is defined by Google (2015) "as an overall measure of your video's ability to retain its audience" (para. 1). There are two types available; *absolute* and *relative*. The most useful type is the absolute which "shows the views of every moment of the video as a percentage of the number of videos views" (Google, 2015, para. 1). Once again, the emphasis of where (content location) students were spending their time is visually obvious and using the audience retention preview (see Figure 3), the user can play the video at the point where the majority of students appear to stop. This may lead to last minute changes in teaching focus (just-in-time direction), or highlight that the video had not been edited correctly (as case in point for Week 5 where a 20 minute black gap was accidentally left in between video segments). Further information may be asked from the students during class to determine whether students were coping with the content, or rather not coping. This would allow for targeted concepts to be evaluated in a face-to-face class or online discussion, or through the use of knowledge checkpoints (quizzes) as used in this topic. As illustrated in Figure 3, the YouTube audience retention visually demonstrated where in a video the majority of viewers switch off (stop watching defined by stopping video). The definition for the majority of viewers for our purposes was 50%.




Figure 3: YouTube audience retention example for the heart topic in 2015

As video segments were on average 2-5 minutes in length across all eleven playlists, the relationship to the required practical laboratory knowledge was not used in the study, however the potential to identify the point at which the video was stopped may be useful in determining whether the content being covered is appropriate and/or required prior to a practical lesson. In the example provided in Figure 3, the anatomy of the heart has a 2 hour practical laboratory class. If only 50% of the video content was played to the end by half of the students, would the teaching staff expect a different level of preparedness on the whole from their students than for the 23% of students who did play the video to the end? It may be considered that the nature of the video lecture, a voice over a PowerPoint slide, may not be a suitably engaging for learning basic heart anatomy. Would you question whether this content could be taught more visually, thereby making use of the video content? These are some questions which have arisen from analysing the 2015 data, but many more could come to mind in moving forward to consider the use of videos in 2016.

Conclusion

So do you know if your DIY educational videos are being accessed by your students? The potential access of videos created by the teaching staff is an important consideration in the future of tertiary education. Workload time required to develop the necessary technical skills required to learn video software may be a significant investment. Additionally, the potential cost to create online videos can come from a time or monetary perspective. This case study highlighted the potential value in not only supporting teaching staff to learn how to create engaging and good quality educational videos, but also to be able to measure basic access data by using simple data analysis tools to determine how the videos are being accessed. To help up-skill teaching staff in video development, it is recommended that supportive training workshops, guiding educational designers and accessible technical support are required as the demand for creating quality teaching videos continues to increase. While Moodle logs is readily available to all teaching staff at this university, it is acknowledged that not all teaching staff have the knowledge to interpret the data collected, nor manipulate the data into visual logs to gain insight. Whilst YouTube provides a more valuable analysis because of its visualisation power, Moodle logs could reinforce where a student went next online in Moodle, whereas YouTube was restricted solely to the videos hosted in the tool. Further exploration into YouTube Analytics potential is warranted as to how it can be used to design the online space to improve learning potential for students, but also how it can be used to change teaching practices in face-to-face classes. However, the power to use simple data analysis tools enables anyone to analysis how videos are being accessed and whether this has any impact on the learning potential. Moving forward, other considerations for university staff using analytic tools could include learning how to best encourage the creation of quality and engaging video content. Supporting approaches for the sustainability of the video content and identifying the value of interactive quiz throughout the video content may need further considerations. Ultimately, how to improve audience retention to increase learning potential is required as we move forward in this space. Additional studies into student opinions, motivation and engagement relate to how they want to use content-related videos would also strengthen any future use of these types of videos in the online and blended tertiary environment.

References

- Borup, J., West, R. E., & Graham, C. R. (2012). Improving online social presence through asynchronous video. *Internet and Higher Education, 15*(3), 195-203. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2011.11.001
- Chen, C.-M., & Sun, Y.-C. (2012). Assessing the effects of different multimedia materials on emotions and learning performance for visual and verbal style learners. *Computers & Education, 59*(4), 1273-1285. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.05.006>
- Copley, J. (2007). Audio and video podcasts of lectures for campus-based students: Production and evaluation of student use. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 44*(4), 387-399. doi: 10.1080/14703290701602805
- Google. (2015). Audience retention report. Retrieved from <https://support.google.com/youtube/answer/1715160?hl=en>
- Heimann, B. A., & Pittenger, K. K. (2000). Incorporating video as a teaching strategy in interpersonal communication. *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning, 27*.
- Homer, B. D., Plass, J. L., & Blake, L. (2008). The effects of video on cognitive load and social presence in multimedia-learning. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(3), 786-797. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2007.02.009
- Kelly, M., Lyng, C., McGrath, M., & Cannon, G. (2009). A multi-method study to determine the effectiveness of, and student attitudes to, online instructional videos for teaching clinical nursing skills. *Nurse Education Today, 29*(3), 292-300.
- Kim, J., Kwon, Y., & Cho, D. (2011). Investigating factors that influence social presence and learning outcomes in distance higher education. *Computers & Education, 57*(2), 1512-1520. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.02.005
- Ragusa, A. T., & Crampton, A. (2014). *Any voice will do: Distance students' perceptions of audio lectures*. Paper presented at the Ascilite Rhetoric and Reality: Critical perspectives on educational technology, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Rowlands, I., Nicholas, D., Williams, P., Huntington, P., Fieldhouse, M., Gunter, B., Withey, R., Jamali, H. R., Dobrowolski, T., & Tenopir, C. (2008). *The Google generation: The information behaviour of the researcher of the future*. Paper presented at the Aslib Proceedings.
- Wells, J., Barry, R. M., & Spence, A. (2012). Using video tutorials as a carrot-and-stick approach to learning. *IEEE Transactions on Education, 55*(4), 453-458.
- Zhang, D., Zhou, L., Briggs, R. O., & Nunamaker, J. F. (2006). Instructional video in e-learning: Assessing the impact of interactive video on learning effectiveness. *Information & Management, 43*(1), 15-27.

Please cite as: Garnett, T. & Button, D. (2016). Learning how to wrangle and visualise data for measuring digital behaviour: A case study exploring student video use. In S. Barker, S. Dawson, A. Pardo, & C. Colvin (Eds.), *Show Me The Learning. Proceedings ASCILITE 2016 Adelaide* (pp. 225-230).

Note: All published papers are refereed, having undergone a double-blind peer-review process.



The author(s) assign a Creative Commons by attribution licence enabling others to distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon their work, even commercially, as long as credit is given to the author(s) for the original creation.