Game On!

Newsletter of the Caldys2 Project

Putting fun back into language learning for dyslexia learners

CONTENTS

Caldys2 and the Game On! Newsletter and the 22nd Century

Every EU project is expected to have its own newsletter. So why should Caldys2 be any different?

But why produce something that you yourself would not like to read? Hence this "Newsletter" takes the form of a discussion of the issues that will be need to be addressed in the project, a review of current practice, and hopefully an implicit statement of why the games in Caldys2 will be something that will make a difference. But, I hear the cynics say

Aren't there already enough learning games out there without the need for yet another EU project?

There are many games out there, but most tend to be about information learning, such as the Spanish Armada or Dutch dikes. There are some language learning games, but in many cases the pedagogy is suspect, and there is little evaluation of the content.

Aren't games just about aggression and violence?

A game is as violent as you want to make it. A bit like football! We only hear about the violent games as they are the one that make the headlines. But in the overall picture, there are few violent related learning games.

How will teachers find time to use them?

These tools are not intended as an addition, but as an additional resource the teachers can use to re-engage the reluctant learner, especially the dyslexic ones.

Who says they work?

That is one of the main points – until now there has been little work on the efficacy of these products. In the Caldys2 project we will use specially developed rubrics as well as discussion groups to evaluate the products.

And the final question is

Is this the future of learning?

Who is to say what the future holds? But what do you imagine to be the basis of learning in Star Trek. Clearly is it motivating computer-based learning. But maybe there will still be books, and even teachers!

CONTENTS

Editorial

Despite what people may think, I have been shy to highlight the errors of others, or the shortcoming of a field I am moving into. But perhaps that is a failing of mine. Perhaps I should just state my case, and take the flack that will no doubt come my way.

So for example, I read all these papers where people are saying that what we are talking about are "serious games" and they should always be called that. And they are worried that the teachers are not accepting their work unless it is referred to as serious games. But why not use end user terminology, which is a good way to ensure engagement with the product. So call it "learning games" or similar, and remove what is itself probably a barrier to acceptance, the word "serious"!

For interest I recently checked the website of one of the leading computer-based literacy learning products, Wordshark. It is what I would call game-based activities. Its website says "It combines the excitement of computer games with the serious task of learning to read and spell."

And then there is the question of validity of the game learning. Don't these developers understand that it is not their product that is fun and motivating, it is the opportunity to do something that means they can disengage from the teacher that creates an apparent engagement with the computer games.

If these developers were confident in their products, they would also be confident to develop ways to show how effective they are. But these rubrics and metrics are sadly lacking. Of course there are many arguments about the difficulties of doing such activities, such as will the research be independent (who will pay to show a commercial product works?), if the exam is high stakes, is it right to include/exclude some of the cohort from the better solution? And just because is works in one school does not mean it will work in others.

So can this project claim to be any better than any other?

I think there should be rules to software approval including:

- All software should be a product of teamwork including educationalists, programmers, researchers and end users.
- The products should be scrutinised and evaluated by these groups with respect to learner preferences, pedagogy, sustainability and technical considerations.
- The games, though not necessarily the framework that supports them, should be open for adaptation for new and diverse contexts.

Will Caldysc2 adhere to these ideas? One can but hope!

Dr Ian Smythe, Ibis Creative Consultants Ltd

Why Game?

Wittgenstein had much to say on what is a game. Try to define it yourself, and you will see the problem he faced. How can you encompass football, catch, solitaire and a computer-based shoot 'em up literacy game under a single definition. Wittgenstein's point, often misunderstood, was that we do not need a definition to be able to use the word successfully. (N.B. I would argue that we can do so because there is nothing to be lost or gained if there is disagreement or lack of clarity over the definition. This is not the case with "dyslexia" which is also difficult to define, but where there are serious implications due to this lack of agreement of the definition of what is dyslexia.)

Wittgenstein (1953) also went on to suggest that it is the culture that determines the definition, and thus for the computer-literate pupil the notions of computer games may be very different to the teachers who grew up in a book based environment.

The computer offers us the potential to personalise learning, making it suitable for the high-flying learning, as well as those who may be struggling. It offers a tool to an overworked teacher who can provide suitable resources that ensure that every child is still actively involved in the learning process. But just because an activity is made into a game does not make it inherently more learnable, motivating or accessible. The game can offer a learning environment that takes away the constant gaze of the teacher and replaces it with the more acceptable neutral "voice" of the computer, making it even more exciting than any paper based game the teacher may devise, and then scrutinise for success, failure and cheating!

But there should not be complacency in the game development. Every individual is different, and what appeals to a ten year old dyslexic boy may not appeal to an eight year old literate girl, even though their reading ages may be the same.

Some have voiced a fear that the pupils will see it as taking away their leisure domain. But they are happy to read book at home as well as use books at school. So any talk of hijacking their domain will need greater explanation.

Put another way, I can almost hear the social commentator saying "The child will see this as hijacking their leisure activity." Yet strangely I cannot imagine a pupil saying "I do not want to learn through playing computer games at school."

Reference

Wittgenstein, L (1953). Philosophical Investigations. Blackwell Publishing. London

Evaluation of learning games

The 19th Century eminent scientist Lord Kelvin said "If you can not measure it, you can not improve it." Sadly, too much "improvement" in the field of education (as well as gaming) has taken place through people being convinced to make changes by strong characters advocating change toward their beliefs rather than because they really work! Fortunately in the last decade there has been a greater call for accountability, and the push for evidence-based education. However, the problem remains that it may take years for a certain methodology to show reproducible long term, consistent results that can be delivered by mainstream education systems.

Despite the growth of computer-based learning activities, there is surprising little written on the effective evaluation of computer games, at least from an educational perspective. Those evaluation models that are available may be acceptable in certain situations, but are not appropriate to evaluate learning in an environment where decisions need to be accountable. For example, the RETAIN model (Gunter et al, 2008) attempts to identify a series of areas to measure. However, it then makes the illogical step of attempting to produce a single figures, using weighted responses, to suggest the learning quality. However, this suggests (say) that if a games scores very well in all areas, but "relevance" is low, it may score as well as one that is good pedagogically, but the graphics are not as good as they could be.

For this reason, Smythe and Giulivi have produced Learning Games Education Evaluation Rubric (LGEER), a 19 question rubric that identifies the key areas within

- Learner Specifications
- Pedagogic Principles
- Sustainability
- Technical implementation

Furthermore, the evaluation has been modified for different audiences, such as the teacher, child and researcher, with a long and short version for each. Click on the following links for details:

Teachers Abbreviated version –

Full version – www.wdnf.info/resources/lgeer.pdf

References:

Kelvin (1891) The Six Gateways of Knowledge', Presidential Address to the Birmingham and Midland Institute, Birmingham (3 Oct 1883). In Popular Lectures and Addresses (1891), Vol. 1, 280.

Gunter, G.A., Kenny, R.F. &V, E.H., 2008. Taking educational games seriously: using the RETAIN model to design endogenous fantasy into standalone educational games. Educational technology research and Development, 56(5-6), 511-537.

MathBlaster is often cited as a favorite example of a good educational game by teachers and parents (though rarely by the children who are to learn from it), and yet it is a commonly used example of a bad educational game by professional game designers."

"MathBlaster is designed to be an educational game and among its objectives are educational items. One would assume that at least some of the Must-Learn items in an educational game would include the advertised educational objectives, but it turns out that most of the math questions in this game use a multiple choice format and many ask the players get immediate feedback as to whether or not their choice was correct. Furthermore, on any given level the same questions are presented in the same order. This means that it is entirely possible to get through these levels by employing the strategy of random selection alone, and with only two choices, the user does not have much to remember on second and subsequent tries."

"From the analysis of MathBlaster it becomes clear that it lacks the necessary balance in overall learning and does not meet its educational goals. In other words, it fails both as a learning object and as a game."

Can games teach and assess?

Too many activities, computer and paper based, are all about testing. They are not teaching. Imagine in maths, for example, how we teach. We use, in principle a short "chalk and talk" style of teaching, and then test the learning by forcing the child repeatedly do sums based on what has been taught. Those sums are tests, with a different name. (See Becker, 2011 and side panel.)

However, as shown in the illustration below, if we think how the teacher performs the task, and then use the computer to emulate that work, individualised to every learners needs (as would happen in good one-to-one teaching) then the learning can be continually adjusted to take account of the responses that are the tests that prove learning.

That is, if a task if for learning vocabulary (or syllables as shown below) then the teacher will present practiced words and adjust the words presented depending on what they correctly identified. They would thus be presented more often with the words they wrongly identified. In this way, as shown below, it is possible to seamlessly integrate the learning and assessment.

These adaptive methods can be used in a diversity of contexts to provide learning from phonics to language learning vocabulary, to grammar structures.

Annotated decision making for teachers in Sylli Clowns

Paper based logic, where the child cannot "miss" a number, and cannot be "hit"

Becker K (2011) The Magic Bullet: A Tool for Assessing and Evaluating Learning Potential in Games International Journal of Game-Based Learning, 1(1), 19-31, January-March 2011

Resources

The Caldys2 project will deliver six different types of activity, each of which will have 30 different formats. However, there will be a Web2.0 element that allow teachers to adapt the content to the needs of their learners.

Details will be available in the next Newsletter.

Caldys2 – Background to the project

Learning foreign languages is very important to all, as academic success and carrier prospects greatly depend on foreign language skills. However, traditional teaching methods are disadvantageous to dyslexic pupils. They have trouble with reading and writing in their first language and therefore often excluded from lessons in the second language due to assumptions about their learning ability in this new field. Our project aims to engage the beginner, or re-engage the formerly alienated adult or vocational students to learning, enabling them and their supporters with a database of user generated language learning activities. This project builds on results and experiences gathered in Minerva project Calldysc, by 3 ways: a) further developing outcomes based on user needs, b) involving new types of user groups and c) expanding the original partnership towards new countries.

Applying the European social model where the environment is adapted to the needs of all, including the disabled learner, we offer learning through adaptable multimedia educational games and also authoring tools that allow teachers to tailor classroom education to the needs of the dyslexic student. Teaching activities will target vocabulary building, grammar, communications skills and usage as well. SEN students will benefit from a) elements of multisensory teaching, b) personalized content and c) integrating assistive technology. Learning content will be generated in a web2 manner, i.e. content is created, uploaded and shared by language teaching professionals.

The aim of this project is to develop a suite of activities that could be used to teach the English language to the non-English dyslexic learner. This will be achieved by building upon the experiences of the Calldysc project, the responses from the user groups, and the information gathered by the partners.

Based on feedback from the original Calldysc project, this new project aims to:

- Expand the activities in the existing games
- Develop new games
- Deliver to three new language
- Improve the dyslexia friendly nature of the games.

Furthermore, there will be greater engagement with the teachers, providing them with training and resources to better equip them into work with the tools and with dyslexic students.

While motivation was generally high, the project will also pay greater attention to the game-playing side, with enhancements of the activities being provided through gaming theory combined with pedagogic principles.

"The Web 2 activities could be described as like speaking instead of just listening, of writing not just reading. And that is when the problem lies. Moving from a receptive to a productive culture creates difficulties for many SEN individuals, from the challenges of writing for dyslexics, to the interaction of social networks.

The problem is about making public ones weaknesses. Having had to endure the ridicule and humiliation of ones peers, they will obviously be reluctant to expose themselves again to such attacks on their self-esteem."

"The Web 2 principles, including social networking, shared environments, personal blogs, and collaborative learning, even across national boundaries, were adapted to the needs of this group by user prompts, short text, high levels of interaction and other techniques to promote re-engagement into a field many SEN children leave at an early stage."

Dyslexia, mobile learning and gaming

The following is from an academic paper about the original Calldysc project:

Crombie (1999), referring to the dyslexic second language learner, said that "We must ensure we are not imposing an unbearable burden that could result in further failure, demotivation and subsequent behaviour problems." This (Calldysc) project does not claim that the mobile phone is the answer to teaching a second language to SEN children, nor that the difficulties that these SEN children find in the social network can be overcome with mobile phones and an appropriate environment. But children engaged in the activities, and wanted to extend their knowledge beyond what the project produced. Typical responses from the children were "The phone did not laugh at me when I made a mistake." "It was cool using a phone!", "Learning English has always been difficult for me and I hated it. This made it fun. Even if I was not good, I think I learned something." and "The only thing that made me keeping going was that I hate not to win, but my friends did not see my scores." Clearly they appreciated that their failings were no longer under the watchful eye of their peer group, and given that they were not being judged against others, they appeared to like to show that, given time, they too could succeed. Parents acknowledged the desire for their kids to learn subjects that before had been a no-go area and were pleased to see the level of engagement. Clearly pedagogy should lead, but in collaboration with social and technical trends, it would appear traditional boundaries could be breached. The smaller the gap between the way life skills will be used in learning and in life, the greater the chance of engagement with the learning, irrespective of the subject matter.

Traditionally one talks of a blended learning environment using computer assisted language learning (CALL) in conjunction with assistive technology and teachers to help dyslexic learners. Calldysc has demonstrated that using handheld mobile devices (currently regarded as phone but increasingly may be seen as mobile computers using blended technologies) can increase learning opportunities. But as Nicholls (2003, p9) comments "Only pedagogical and access advantages will provide a lasting rationale for implementing eLearning approaches." Further quantitative data will be collected for this ongoing project, to confirm the qualitative results to date. Only if the evidence is clear that the effects of learning on the mobile are lasting will they be adopted more widely.

Reference

Győrfi A and Smythe I (2008) Re-engaging the SEN child into learning through social networking - A case study. In Nyíri K (Ed) in Mobile Communication and the Ethics of Social Networking. Hungarian Academy of Sciences. p86-93

Difficulties of getting it right

One of the problems with technology is that it moves so fast, and often research can become redundant even before the report is written**.**

Furthermore, even more than in "mainstream" teaching, there can be pockets of good technology practice which, due to the nature of journalism and research papers, become championed as examples of what is happening in schools, yet for a variety of reasons are not representative of mainstream schools.

Thus technologists show on their reports classrooms of kids at computers inferring it was normal. Yet most schools only have access to computers in a computer suite.

If we think about technology, even most reports cited in this publication were written before Twitter existed, and before Facebook became mainstream. And in that time, blogs have, to a large extent, come and gone, while YouTube has become a major learning tool.

The accountability of teachers makes them reluctant to step outside what they were told. But when they do, they are often surprise at the ease that kids can integrate the activities into their work, and the motivation that follows.

Teachers perspectives

The pedagogical process of technology-based education raises complex inquiries into the effectiveness of digital learning within a teaching environment. Many studies from have questioned the research on the effectiveness of educational games and their accessibility to children, particularly those with verbal/linguistic learning difficulties and cognitive impairment. Focus tends (rightly) to be on the child and the outcomes of digital tools for teaching, less however is known about the accessibility of digital games with little addressing the role of teachers, and the impact of the diverse factors involved. The requirement of an in depth, qualitative (and where possible quantitative) analysis of usability and support for staff looking to introduce educational ICT teaching methodologies, is paramount to our understanding and further development of a stable educational relationship between teacher, child, and technology.

A case study by the ESRC and Bristol University; Improving Classroom Learning with ICT examines the experiences of teachers learning to use ITC in the classroom. Professor Rosamund Sutherland (REFERENCE), who led the research said,

"Seventy per cent of the teachers who took part in the study were able to incorporate computers into their classroom."

Whilst this reflects a positive shift of opinions as to the beneficial qualities of ICT in the classroom, there is still that thirty per cent divide who present various concerns surrounding the implementation of educational games verses traditional teaching methods in the classroom. The ESRC study found that,

'Many teachers fear that computers would interfere with 'genuine' or book-based learning, particularly in the humanities and creative subjects and would use ICT only for administration and routine tasks.'

Thus while 70% may use the technology, there is a question of the effectiveness of its use. Fear of the technical unknown, requires a detailed assessment as to what support should be supplied to the educationalist, through the various stages of integrating ICT into learning. A closer inspection as to the need of what it takes to deliver a technically literate tool, allows for an inquiry into the development process and design of accessibility, conceptualized for both teacher and student. Once the concern of a teacher's accessibility is controlled through the support and development of a user-friendly instruction, further developmental questions can be explored as to how effective the analysis of the tool and the method of which evaluative feedback, if any, should be delivered.

Sammie Clarke

REFERENCE: Sutherland, RJ, Robertson, SL & John, PD. Improving Classroom Lerning with ICT, Routledge, 2009.

An alternative classification

Puzzle & Quiz

Adventure

Role-Playing

Action

Sports

Vehicle

Construction & Management

Strategy

References:

Anagnostou K (2011), Video Game Genre Affordances for Physics Education, International Journal of Game-Based Learning, 1(1), 59-74

Game types

There are many different types of games taxonomies that may be used as the basis of a game for learning. Below are the main types

> Shooters (and shoot 'em ups)
>
> Bat and ball games
>
> Platform
>
> Puzzles
>
> Mazes
>
> Sport Games
>
> Racing Games
>
> Real Time Strategy (RTS)
>
> Role Playing Games (RPG)
>
> First Person Shooters (FPS)
>
> Adventure games

Two others that should be mentioned are:

- Educational versions of existing board games or TV game shows - Limited by copyright issues)
- Massive Multiple Online Role-Playing Games (MMORPG) – Not considered due to development costs.

In Caldys2, the intention is to create attractive games that can be played online, and are suitable for the specific user group and whereby teachers can change the learning objects to extend the diversity of learning that may occur within the games.

Trials with the user groups, as well as discussions with teachers and programmers will identity which types are most suited to Caldys2 activities.

Two types of scoring

The traditional approach to scoring is "Highest Score". This is usually a simple algorithm that provides the learner with an indication of their activity that they can either try to beat next time, or compare to others. However, often this does not tell the teacher how well the child is learning.

One possible alternative, as used in Sylli Clown (a syllable counting game) is to use a rolling average to identify how the child has responded compared to how an "expert" would respond. The algorithm in Sylli Clown includes rewards for correct answers and penalties for incorrect answers. By devising appropriate scoring, and setting a learning outcome criteria (a score which if reached suggests that further game play will be a waste of time) it is possible to monitor progress, and have the child move on to the next task when ready.

Developing a game

Great ideas are cheap. A good brief that puts those ideas down on paper in a way that can be understood by the developers (designers and programmers) can be priceless.

In the same way that many dyslexic individuals will use a concept map as an intermediary stage between the idea and the written article, so the game developer will have a "tool" to bridge the gap between concept and product. This tool is the Game Development Document, and is a major step in the process, whether is the actual development, or the pitch of an idea to a game development agency.

Traditionally these documents are used for the market sector that does not require learning, or other measured outcomes. Thus issues of concerned to educationalist, such as learning outcomes, curriculum dependence and rate of learning have been largely ignored. However, in development of a game for learning, a team will include education specialists, programmer and designers, as well as end users. However, not all educationalists understand the nature of resource development and the potential of the computer to not only decide learning objects, but also adapt them to the learner and respond to their on-going learning.

Put another way, the teacher who is looking to develop a paper-based learning resource will rarely think explicitly about how to test the learning, and indeed, unless they are very confident about their approach, they may not want their teaching methods scrutinised. However, the computer needs to constantly evaluate learning explicitly.

One part of the development process frequently overlooked is the consolidation process, whereby the learning on the computer is embedded, usually through discussion or teacher led meta-cognition. Failure to do this activity may lead to the child successfully negotiating the game, but failing to learn the skills.

It is interesting to note that few research papers talk about using focus groups *prior* to testing. Most seem to go straight from what they think to testing on the user group, rather than attempt to perfect the product as far as possible prior to putting it out for trials. The reason is that it is often easier to have measurable results adopting this approach, whereas pre-testing with the user group may mean that the main reportable issues are no longer present. Clearly there is also an economic imperative, and a time imperative.

Technology in the classroom

As part of the preparation for planning the project contents, a series of surveys were carried out in the partner countries. In the pilot questionnaire in Hungary the respondents were asked to rank the different alternatives. The order from the responses was:

1. To teach/practice vocabulary

2. To improve listening comprehension

3. To teach/practice grammar

4. Pronunciation

5. To improve reading comprehension

6. To teach writing.

This provided a basis for consideration with respect to the technical and gaming elements.

Anecdotal evidence was also collected, and included the following.

Students have fun during the games so they get motivated. There is not much time and condition for the games in our school as classes are crowded and students' levels are quite low. (Turkey)

The idea of using digital games is really interesting. However there are some drawbacks. On the positive side they are highly interesting for the students. The animations and characters are funny. There are lots of digital games on the internet. The most effective skill is teaching vocabulary. My 13-year-old daughter thinks they are enjoyable, however logical. On the other hand it necessitates long hours to spend on the internet to find a match for the topic of the lesson and suitable for the age of the target group. Most of them are for kids and youngs. More digital games should be created for elderly language learners. (Turkey)

They can help dyslexic children to learn language. Some of them are too "simple" for older students. (Bulgaria)

Futurelab survey

A Futurelab report from 2009 suggested the following reasons for reluctance of accepting games in the classroom.

I do not know/envisage any barriers	3%
The amount of preparation time required	28%
Licensing issues (for example, difficulty obtaining site licences)	68%
Lack of IT/technical support in school	41%
Inadequate classroom space	28%
Problems accessing equipment	49%
Expense of games (software and platform)	74%
Difficulty of assessing the work produced	34%
Differing abilities within a class	15%
Pupils being unable to make the link between playing the game and the wider learning objectives	50%
Lack of relevance to the curriculum	39%
Lack of relevance to subject area	33%
Negative attitude of pupils to the games(s)	7%
Inappropriate nature of game content	51%
Health and safety	12%
Catering for special educational needs (SEN) pupils	11%
Objections from parents	46%
Objections from the governing body	28%
Objections from colleagues	21%
Teachers lack of knowledge about the game/platform/software	56%

Reference

Williamson B (2009) Computer games, schools, and young people: A report for educators on using games for learning. Futurelab

Web site about gaming

www.engagelearning.eu - European Network for Growing Activity in Game-based learning in Education

education.qld.gov.au/smartclassrooms/strategy/dp/games.html - resources and advice for educational gaming from Queensland, Australia

ltsblogs.org.uk/consolarium - blog from the Scottish Consolarium games and learning centre

www.ltscotland.org.uk/ictineducation/gamesbasedlearning - Learning Teaching Scotland game-based learning website

www.gamebasedlearning.org.uk - game-based learning site

www.newsgaming.com - Newsgaming website dedicated to games designed for social purposes

epistemicgames.org/eg - site on gaming as an introduction to professional skills

www.educationarcade.org/gtt/home.html - MIT/Microsoft partnership creating prototype educational games

www.persuasivegames.com - gaming for purposes other than entertainment

www.gameslearningsociety.org/research.php - educational gaming research site

Where to find more games

The Caldys2 blog lists a number of activities that are worthy of visiting. But here is an extended list of useful websites.

http://www.ramogames.com/

http://CoolMath4kids.com

http://www.arcademicskillbuilders.com/

http://www.learninggamesforkids.com/

http://www.vocabulary.co.il/

http://www.vocabulary.co.il/

http://www.SpellingCity.com/

http://hotpot.uvic.ca/

http://www.BrainPOP.com

http://www.interactivestuff.org/sums4fun/colquiz.html

http://kids.nationalgeographic.com/Games/

http://funschool.kaboose.com/

http://www.prongo.com/games/

http://www.thekidzpage.com/learninggames/index.htm

http://www.sheppardsoftware.com/web_games_menu.htm

http://www.gamequarium.com/

http://www.kidsgames.org/

http://www.theproblemsite.com/

http://www.funbrain.com/

http://www.primarygames.com/

I am grateful to Patrick Felicia for this list, published in Digital Games in Schools. Available from http://games.eun.org/upload/gis_handbook_en.pdf

Further information

Recommended Reading

Books

Gee, J. P. (2008) What Digital Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy. New York & Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Prensky, M. (2006) Don't Bother Me Mom – I'm Learning! St. Paul, MN.: Paragon House Publishers.

Shaffer, D. W. (2008) How Computer Games Help Children Learn. New York & Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Downloadable Reports

Futurelab (2007). Teaching with Games. Final report available at: http://www.futurelab.org.uk/resources/documents/project_reports/teaching_with_games/TWG_report.pdf

BECTA (2006). Computer Games in Education: Report. Available at: http://partners.becta.org.uk/index.php?section=rh&rid=13595

BECTA (2006). The Becta Review: Evidence on the Progress of ICT in Education. Available at: http://publications.becta.org.uk/download.cfm?resID=25948

Felicia P (2008) Digital Games in Schools. Available from http://games.eun.org/upload/gis_handbook_en.pdf

Williamson B (2009) Computer games, schools, and young people: A report for educators on using games for learning. Futurelab. Available from http://www.futurelab.org.uk/resources/documents/project_reports/becta/Games_and_Learning_educators_report.pdf

De Freitas S (2006) Learning in Immersive Worlds: A reviw of game-based learning. JISC. Available at http://www.jisc.ac.uk/media/documents/programmes/elearninginnovation/gamingreport_v3.pdf

Other activities

Dissemination activities

A series of international activities have been held with respect to the Caldys2 project. These include the following

Budapest Workshop – 18 Feb 2011

A workshop for teachers to discuss the potential of games, and what they already used. (HU and UK)

Ruse Workshop – 11 March 2011

Workshop about dyslexia which included discussion of the project. (BG, HU, IT, TR, UK)

Vaxjo Conference - 25 March 2011

A workshop for teachers to discuss the potential of games, and what they already used. (SE, BG, CH, HU, IT, TR and UK)

Vasto Workshop – 31 May 2011

A conference for teachers where the project was discussed (BG, HU, IT, TR, UK)

BDA International Dyslexia Conference – 2-4 June 2011

A conference for researchers, teachers and other professionals where the project was discussed (Many countries.)

Dr Mike Reddy talks to Dr Christer Jacobson, collaborator in Calldysc, and Dr Marianne Bjorn, partner in Caldys2.

Other conferences

Slovak Conference 21 September 2011 - Computer-based Knowledge & Skill Assessment and Feedback in Learning Settings

Future activities

SUPSI - 9 Sept 2011

In Switzerland, a country where Italian, French and German are spoken and taught, and where English is also part of curricular education, the support of dyslexia is limited, and resources are not available equally in all these languages. This conference "Learning Disabilities at School: Research and Education" (organised by SUPSI-DFA in Locarno near the Italian border) is aimed at trying to bring researchers and practitioners together. Confirmed Keynotes are Cornoldi, Lucangeli, Smythe, Tardif and Zesiger. Full details to be found on the website - http://www.convegnodas.dfa.supsi.ch/?lang=en

The project will be represented by at least two partners at the conference.

Czech Republic – 29 September 2011

A small conference in collaboration with the Czech Dyslexia Association is planned. All partner will attend.

Florence, Italy – 4th International conference on ICT for Language Learning - 20/21 October 2011

Conference web site: www.pixel-online.net/ICT4LL2011.

The project will be represented by at least two partners at the conference.

Turkey Final Project Conference

The final conference will be held in Kocaeli, Turkey. Date is still to be decided. All partners will attend.

Other useful contact

Partner contact details

Bulgaria

Daniela Boneva - dabg_rousse@yahoo.com

Czech Republic

Katerina Nevralova - management@euro-face.cz

Hungary

Anna Gyorfi - gyorfia@gmail.com

Judit Gombis - gombisj@yahoo.com

Italy

Filomena Zanfardino - itascern@tin.it

Sweden

Dr Marianne Bjorn - marianne.bjorn@lnu.se

Switzerland

Dr Sara Giulivi - sara.giulivi@supsi.ch

Turkey

Binur Küçükyildiz - bkucukyildiz41@hotmail.com

United Kingdom

Dr Mike Reddy - mikereddy@newport.ac.uk

Dr Smythe - Ianssmythe@gmail.com