

# A Second Look at Improving Student Interaction with Internet and Peer Review

**Dilvan de Abreu Moreira**

*Stanford University, USA*

*University of São Paulo, Brazil*

**Elaine Quintino da Silva**

*University of São Paulo, Brazil*

## INTRODUCTION

In the last few years, education has been going through an important change: the introduction of information technology in the educational process. Many efforts have been conducted to realize the benefits of such technologies, such as the MIT-Media Lab *One Laptop per Child* initiative (MIT, 2007) in education. As a result of these efforts, there are many tools available today to produce multimedia educational material for the Web such as WebCT (WebCT, 2004). However, teachers are not sure how to use these tools to create effective models for teaching over the Internet. After a teacher puts classroom slides, schedules, and other static information on Web pages, what more can this technology offer? A possible response to this question is to use Internet technologies to promote collaborative learning.

Collaborative learning (CL) is an educational strategy based on social theories in which students, joined in small groups, are responsible for the learning experience of each other (Gokhale, 1995; Panitz, 2002). In CL, the main goal of the teacher is to organize collective activities that can stimulate the development of skills such as creativity, oral expression, and critical thinking, among others. When supported by computers and Internet technologies, collaborative learning is referenced as computer supported collaborative learning (CSCL). The main goal of CSCL is to use software and hardware to support and increase group work and learning. The peer review method, known by almost everyone in the academic world, when applied as an educational tool, can be considered a kind of collaborative learning activity.

This article describes an educational method that uses peer review and the Internet to promote interaction among students. This method, which has been used and

refined since 1997 (by the first author), has been used in different computer science courses at the ICMC-USP. Software tools, such as the WebCoM—Web Course Manager tool (Silva & Moreira, 2003)—are used to support the peer review method and to improve interaction among students. The main advantages of the peer review method and the WebCoM tool over other works in this context are that they:

- Allow debate between groups (workers and reviewers) to improve interaction and social abilities among students;
- Focus on the interaction among students and their social skills;
- Also offer support for group activities (such as reports and assignments) without peer review.

Results generated by the experience of managing classes with the WebCoM tool are also presented.

## STUDENTS GROUPS WITH PEER REVIEW METHOD

The peer review process is commonly used in the academic world: an article, project, course, or the like is proposed and peers judge the merits of the work. It is used in the educational context with a variety of goals, but almost always it is focused on communication and writing skills (Helpers, Duerden, Garland, & Evans, 1999; Kern, Saraiva, & Pacheco, 2003; Nelson, 2000).

In the educational peer review method presented here, students join in groups to carry out an assignment. After that, each assignment is made public, using the Internet, and is judged by another group of fellow students. These reviewers write a review report

presenting their opinions about the work. Once the reviewers' work becomes public, the teacher schedules a class debate. At this debate, each group presents its work and has a chance to defend it from the reviewers' criticism. The two groups debate the work done in front of their classmates and teacher. Usually, the teacher is able to grade the assignment based on the review and the debate.

Trying to do all those tasks by hand would greatly reduce the benefits of the method (because too much work would be needed to implement it). A software tool is necessary to manage the assignment process. Few authors have developed Web-based software to assist teachers doing peer review, for example:

- The PG (peer grader), a system that offers support to peer review activities in which students submit work, review other works, and grade the reviewed work. The final grade of each work is determined by the system based on the grade of the reviewers (Gehring, 2000).
- The WPR (Web-based Peer Review) system that is mentioned in Liu, Lin, Chiu, and Yuan (2001) as a tool for peer review management. Although some results of experiments using this tool are presented, there is only a brief explanation about the tool and no references to specific information about the system.
- The Catalyst Web Tools are a set of Web-based communication and collaboration applications designed for use in teaching, learning, research, and everyday work. Its peer review tool creates a shared online workspace for discussion or group work with peer review. Users can post, review, and comment on documents, projects, or assignments (Catalyst, 2007).

There are other Web-based tools that can be adapted for classroom use such as CyberChair (van de Stadt, 2004) and WIMPE (Nicol, 1996) which support the review process for technical contributions to conferences.

The major problem with these tools is the kind of review they support: one not targeted to promote interaction in educational environments. A new tool, WebCoM, was developed specifically to address this issue. Its main objective is to provide graphic interfaces to get, store, manipulate, and present information generated by both student groups and teachers during a course.

Using the WebCoM tool, the teacher can:

- Define assignments and deadlines dates;
- Define other activities such as reports and tests;
- Define which group a reviewer will review;
- Associate grades to students or groups.

And the students can:

- Create groups;
- Turn in assignments and reports;
- View and access works of others groups;
- Access their grades.

As a practical example, the next section shows how a very common kind of assignment for computer science courses—a software project—can be handled using WebCoM and peer review to promote interaction among students.

## **SOFTWARE PROJECT ASSIGNMENT**

The software project is a classic assignment in computer science courses. Commonly, it is in this type of activity that students are required to put into practice all concepts taught in class. There are two ways to conduct the software project activity: first, all students (or groups) develop a project from the same subject, and second, each student (or group) develops a project from different subjects. In either way, students are limited to explore and learn only about the project they are working on, mainly because of the individualism from traditional education methods (Panitz & Panitz, 1998). The presented peer review method minimizes this limitation because students (or groups) are required to learn about their colleagues' projects. When required to review projects and to participate in debates about other projects, students have an opportunity to extend their knowledge about other subjects, expanding the experience they would have using traditional individual learning. The development of a software project under the peer review method has five steps: group formation, assignment upload, choosing review groups, review upload, and classroom debate.

At the beginning of the course, the students have access to the course Web pages, where they can find the usual material (lecture slides, course calendar, etc.) and a list of available software projects. These proj-

6 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/second-look-improving-student-interaction/17545](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/second-look-improving-student-interaction/17545)

## Related Content

---

### User Interface Issues in Multimedia

John Fulcher (2009). *Encyclopedia of Multimedia Technology and Networking, Second Edition* (pp. 1493-1498).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/user-interface-issues-multimedia/17575](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/user-interface-issues-multimedia/17575)

### Research Challenge of Locally Computed Ubiquitous Data Mining

Aysegul Cayci, João Bártoło Gomes, Andrea Zanda, Ernestina Menasalvasand Santiago Eibe (2011). *Handbook of Research on Mobility and Computing: Evolving Technologies and Ubiquitous Impacts* (pp. 576-594).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/research-challenge-locally-computed-ubiquitous/50612](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/research-challenge-locally-computed-ubiquitous/50612)

### Virtual Reality and HyperReality Technologies in Universities

Lalita Rajasinghamand John Tiffin (2005). *Encyclopedia of Multimedia Technology and Networking* (pp. 1064-1069).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-reality-hyperreality-technologies-universities/17368](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-reality-hyperreality-technologies-universities/17368)

### Video Segmentation and Structuring for Indexing Applications

Ruxandra Tapuand Titus Zaharia (2013). *Multimedia Data Engineering Applications and Processing* (pp. 205-225).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/video-segmentation-structuring-indexing-applications/74946](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/video-segmentation-structuring-indexing-applications/74946)

### Synchronization of Uncertain Neural Networks with H8 Performance and Mixed Time-Delays

Hamid Reza Karimi (2011). *Gaming and Simulations: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications* (pp. 1208-1232).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/synchronization-uncertain-neural-networks-performance/49445](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/synchronization-uncertain-neural-networks-performance/49445)