

Screencasts and Learning Styles

Rui Alberto Jesus

CESPU, Instituto de Investigação e Formação Avançada em Ciências e Tecnologias da Saúde, Portugal

INTRODUCTION

Many people have heard about learning styles. Besides the criticism about the instruments that detect and classify these preferred learning modalities, learning styles appear to explain something that is obvious: people learn in different ways.

In broader terms, people have different personalities, different ways of processing information, and different sensory preferred modes (among others factors), that influence how each person relates to a learning environment.

In this chapter, the emphasis is on the different sensory modalities. Individuals perceive stimuli from the outside through the five senses, but each individual may have one or two of these senses more accurate than others. As such, he tends to acquire information more through that sense. This preference for a sensory modality has been investigated to explain the success or failure students have to assimilate certain learning content (e.g.: more orally or more in written form).

On the other hand, professors can use several didactic materials to deliver instruction to their students (particularly in eLearning). Text, images and diagrams, audio, video, simulations are all valid means to deliver pedagogical information. But which of these means suites best a particular learning style?

This chapter discusses the contribution of screencasts as one possible solution to that problem. A screencast is a digital recording of computer screen output, including mouse movements and clicks. Also known as a video screen capture, screencasts can include audio narration to explain the process that is being documented by the screencast. If well

planned and recorded, screencasts can include text, images, diagrams, audio, video and simulations, thus aiming to reach several learning modalities, including the preferred one of a particular student.

BACKGROUND

What Are Learning / Cognitive Styles?

One of the pioneers of the term ‘cognitive styles’ was Gordon Allport (1937), which defined them as the usual or typical way of an individual processing information. In other words how he perceives, thinks and remembers information, and how he uses it to solve problems. Since then, there have been many researchers who have dedicated themselves to study this concept, with the consequent identification of different cognitive and learning styles. For example, the work of Messick (1976) identified 19 different dimensions of cognitive styles (field dependence versus field independence, global versus analytic, inductive versus deductive, visualizer versus verbalizer, etc.), some of which are referred in the Additional Readings section.

Before moving on, it should be clarified that in this chapter, like in most of the area’s texts, the terms ‘cognitive styles’ and ‘learning styles’ are used to describe the same concept, although the first one is more used in the context of academic research, while the latter one is more related to their practical applications. Moreover, the term ‘cognitive styles’ is more connoted with a bipolar characteristic (e.g.: a student is either inductive

or deductive), while the term ‘learning styles’ does not require the existence of two poles (e.g.: one student may be visual and kinesthetic at the same time).

The VARK Model of Learning Styles

During the 1980s, and in informal conversations with college students, Neil Fleming realized that many of them attributed their learning difficulties, to the way learning content was presented. Some students said they had more difficulties with content presented orally; others, with written texts; some more, with ideas that were presented in graphical form; and others with subjects that were presented without any connection to practical applications. This finding led the author to focus on the sensory modalities as a dimension of learning styles with some prominence in relation to the other dimensions (Fleming & Mills, 1992).

In addition, the author found some basis for this assumption in his research in the neuro-linguistic programming area, which years before, had already identified three different sensory modalities – aural, visual, and kinesthetic – described below:

- *Aural* individuals learn best by listening, for example, to a lecture given by a teacher.
- *Visual* individuals learn best by viewing, for example, a video, an image, etc.
- *Kinesthetic* individuals learn best when, for example, attend a lecture but write what they hear or perform something practical.

Thus, more than studying the various dimensions of learning styles, which seemed to have little practical application for students (Fleming & Mills, 1992), Fleming was interested primarily in the sensory preferences of students, giving rise to what he designated the VARK model (which is an acronym for Visual, Aural, Read / write & Kinesthetic).

As noted by the acronym, Fleming added a second visual modality to the neuro-linguistic programming model referred above. It is the

read / write modality, because, according to the author, there are some students who prefer text content, i.e., written words basically, while other students prefer other symbolic forms to represent information such as maps, diagrams and charts. Although both preferences are visual, seldom they are present in the same person (Fleming & Baume, 2006).

In summary, the VARK model proposes the following sensory modalities to enhance learning (Fleming, 1995):

- **Visual:** Learning centered on viewing images, graphs and diagrams, as well as in color and formatting variations of documents (e.g.: highlighted boxes); good perception of symbolic information.
- **Aural:** Learning centered on hearing, i.e., using the ears to receive the commonest way to exchange information in society, which is speech.
- **Read / Write:** Learning through texts, that is, through the written word; it is called “read / write” because this type of students use reading and writing as the first choice to receive information.
- **Kinesthetic:** Multisensory and practical oriented learning, i.e., this type of students like to experience learning through all senses, and although they like to learn by doing, they can also learn concepts and more abstract materials, provided they are accompanied by concrete examples or real life scenarios (in a phrase, they like learning through action).

Each individual has one or more of these sensory modalities by which he prefers to learn, and there is a questionnaire with sixteen questions, which helps students to diagnose those preferences (VARK Learn Limited, 2016).

One of the advantages of this learning styles model is that, besides allowing to know the sensory preferences of an individual, it also provides study tips for more effective learning. This is because

9 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/screencasts-and-learning-styles/183869

Related Content

A Case of Academic Social Networking Sites Usage in Malaysia: Drivers, Benefits, and Barriers

Maryam Salahshour, Halina Mohamed Dahlan and Noorminshah A. Iahad (2016). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 88-99).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-case-of-academic-social-networking-sites-usage-in-malaysia/152887

Dynamic Situational Adaptation of a Requirements Engineering Process

Graciela Dora Susana Hadad, Jorge Horacio Doorn and Viviana Alejandra Ledesma (2018). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition* (pp. 7422-7434).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/dynamic-situational-adaptation-of-a-requirements-engineering-process/184440

Fault Tolerant Cloud Systems

Sathish Kumar and Balamurugan B (2018). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Fourth Edition* (pp. 1075-1090).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/fault-tolerant-cloud-systems/183821

Chaotic Map for Securing Digital Content: A Progressive Visual Cryptography Approach

Dhiraj Pandey and U. S. Rawat (2016). *International Journal of Rough Sets and Data Analysis* (pp. 20-35).

www.irma-international.org/article/chaotic-map-for-securing-digital-content/144704

Evaluation Platform for DDM Algorithms With the Usage of Non-Uniform Data Distribution Strategies

Mikoaj Markiewicz and Jakub Koperwas (2022). *International Journal of Information Technologies and Systems Approach* (pp. 1-23).

www.irma-international.org/article/evaluation-platform-for-ddm-algorithms-with-the-usage-of-non-uniform-data-distribution-strategies/290000