

Teacher Video Feedback on Academic Writing Class and Writing Performance: Switch from Text to Video

Mohammad Fatoni¹, Slamet Setiawan², ³Ahmad Munir

¹Universitas Negeri Surabaya; Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Sunan Giri

^{2,3}Universitas Negeri Surabaya

Corresponding email: mohammadfatoni.21020@mhs.unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the use of teacher video feedback on students' academic writing and the students' ability in writing by using this technique. The use of teacher video feedback was analyzed by using qualitative method. The results of the analysis reveals that the teacher video feedback has many benefits and can be used in the class. From 10 students' academic writings analyzed, teacher video feedback also influences the students' scores in content for eight students (80%), organization for six students (60%), vocabulary for seven students (70%), language use for eight students (80%) and mechanics for four students (40%). They also easily revise and edit their writings in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, and language use than mechanics due to unconstructive feedback given by the teacher in mechanics.

Keywords: teacher video feedback, academic text, writing components, writing skill.

First Receive: 08 November 2022	Revised: 18 December 2022	Accepted: 01 February 2023
Final Proof Received: 20 April 2023	Published: 01 June 2023	

How to cite (in APA style):

Fatoni, Mohammad., Setiawan, Slamet., & Munir, Ahmad. (2023). Teacher Video Feedback on Academic Writing Class and Writing Performance: Switch from Text to Video. *ELITE Journal*, 5 (2), 375-382.

INTRODUCTION

The use of feedback is exciting topic to be discussed. The feedback also helps the students' writing to be better (Marrs et al., 2016). However, there are still questions about whether the feedback helps the students to improve their writing or not, use feedback effectively and efficiently to improve the students' writings better. When the students write their academic writing, they also need feedback to improve their writing. This research evaluates the academic writing criticism provided to undergraduate students. It is arguable that feedback is one of the most effective influencers on students' academic growth and accomplishment (Hattie, 2007). Providing feedback to students in higher education is a valuable tool because it is possible to engage in a degree of one-on-one instruction on academic writing that is situated within the context of the student's real text. This is consistent with the conception of academic writing as a "scaffolded" activity, in which teachers steer the growth of students' academic writing. This method reflects the Vygotskian theoretical

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

viewpoint of social learning (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978), which asserts that "growth happens in highly contextualized activities and partnership with a more competent person." Vygotsky's work was published in 1978. The expert has to supply the novice learner with the right help for growth to take place. The aid is internalized and utilized by the novice as their particular resource (Morton et al., 2014). When it is viewed through this particular theoretical prism, the feedback that students receive from their teachers and all of their advisors can be interpreted as being of the utmost importance in assisting them in the process of constructing their understanding of academic writing in order to enhance not only their writing abilities but also their final written products.

As a matter of fact, this study aims to benefit students by shedding light on the most helpful forms of feedback for enhancing writing. The ability to write effective academic texts significantly influences students' achievement in college and beyond (Borg & Deane, 2011). Students are more likely to do well on writing assignments and graduate from courses when they get constructive criticism that helps them to improve their writing. In addition, the development of technology and the use of blended learning also permit the teacher to use video in the class. When the teacher uses the video to give the students feedback, they get the input on how to write their writings better. This will lead the teachers to use the video in the classroom. Using video in giving feedback also leads us to observe what part of writing could be developed. By finding this, it means the students understand what should be revised and edited their drafts to make it better.

Although the concept of providing multi-modal corrective feedback (CF) via video, especially screencasting is very new, a substantial number of published research exists. All available studies on delivering CF using screencasting report that the students respond the feedback well. Note that screencasting is separate from webcams, which give an audio track but display the teacher as a "talking head" instead of the student's writing (Cheng & Li, 2020). With screencasting, students may see their work and the CF as the instructor verbally explains why the CF was assigned. Screencasting has been compared to text-only and audio-only feedback (Mathieson, 2012; Orlando, 2016; Silva, 2017). In every instance, the screencasting response was the overwhelming favorite of pupils.

Therefore, this study aims to benefit students by shedding light on the most helpful forms of feedback for enhancing writing. The ability to write effective academic texts has a significant influence on students' achievement in college (Borg & Deane, 2011). Students are more likely to do well on writing assignments and graduate from courses when they get constructive criticism that helps them improve their writing. The research question that proposes is how to conduct teacher video feedback and how the students' writing performance after up taking the feedback.

METHOD

This research aims to examine the deployment of teacher video feedback and the degree to which employing teacher video feedback improves students' academic writing skills. To

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

achieve the objective, the study was conducted in a natural context where the researcher had no influence over the factors. This was done to provide a more specific and accurate explanation in response to the research question. Consequently, the qualitative technique is deemed suitable for this research, since it requires the natural context and lack of intervention or modification of factors (Wiersma, 2000). This study utilizes a form of qualitative research known as basic qualitative study or basic interpretive study since it explains and interprets a phenomena or process (Ary et al., 2010). It is a kind of qualitative study that gives a descriptive account aimed at gaining an understanding of a phenomena via the collection of data in a number of methods. The subjects of this research were seventh-semester university students at a university in the city because it contained students from diverse backgrounds and had integrated video feedback from the instructor in their class. The data includes in this research are qualitative. Word-based information constitute qualitative data (Sharp, 2012). There were three data sources for this study: This study's primary source of data was field notes collected by the author during classroom observations of the writing-learning process. Second, video capturing of the classroom teaching and learning process. Third, the data was from students' academic writing after uptaking teacher video feedback.

FINDING

The Result of how the teacher use teacher video feedback

The teacher could provide the feedback by opening students' work on their screen and gave the evaluation to the document. Then, she activated the screen-capture software and recorded the screen while she surfed through the students' work, and highlight the important things, and narrates the voice feedback. The teacher showed grading rubrics and online classroom atmosphere. Then, the video feedback was sent to the students through link or sent the recorded ones via email or WhatsApp. The students could access the video feedback by clicking the link by using computer or handphones. They could see the video and listen to the teacher's comments while watching the movement of the cursor and highlight certain sections of text for feedback purpose.

The Result of how the students' writing after uptaking teacher video feedback

The researcher utilized just 10 students' works. He did a descriptive analysis of the writing's components. They included content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. The content could be evaluated based on the students' concepts in their academic writing. The organization of academic writings, including introduction and conclusion, thesis statement, and topic sentences, also could be observed. Language use was evaluated in terms of grammatical usage, including the use of past verbs, simple verbs, verbs following modals, and to infinitive. Mechanics was observed in terms of punctuation, such as comma, full stop, and capitalization after full stop. After receiving teacher video feedback, the researcher evaluated the academic writing skills of university students.

The students' academic writing was evaluated using a modified ESL Profile scoring rubric derived from MELAB (Hamp-Lyons, 1992). Content, structure, vocabulary, language usage, and mechanics were the components of writing skill. The researcher evaluated the students' writing skills based on their essays on academic writing, especially thesis writing. The following is a summary of the students' academic writing score.

Table 1 The Students' Academic Writing Score

Students	Content		Organization		Vocabulary		Language Use		Mechanics	
	R.D	F.D	R.D	F.D	R.D	F.D	R.D	F.D	R.D	F.D
Student 1	12	16	12	12	4	4	3	4	3	4
Student 2	12	16	9	12	3	4	3	4	3	4
Student 3	12	16	12	12	3	4	3	4	3	4
Student 4	12	16	9	12	3	4	3	4	3	3
Student 5	12	12	12	12	3	4	3	4	3	4
Student 6	12	16	9	12	4	4	3	3	3	3
Student 7	12	12	9	12	3	4	3	4	3	3
Student 8	12	12	9	12	3	4	3	4	3	3
Student 9	12	16	9	9	4	4	3	3	3	3
Student 10	12	16	9	12	3	4	3	4	3	3

Note: R.D=Rough drafts' Score

F.D= Final drafts' Score

On the basis of the students' academic writing, eight out of ten students (80 percent) could effectively develop the idea. They could articulate thoughts and arguments with precision. Two students' content evolution from rough draft to final writing was identical. Six students (60%) were able to reorganize the organization from the rough draft to the final draft. They were able to write in accordance with the right general structure of academic writings. In addition, seven students (70%) were able to rectify the errors in words from rough to final drafts. When they employed accurate spelling, they could effectively communicate their ideas to the audience. From rough to final drafts, eight students (80%) were able to correct errors in language usage and grammar. The components of writing, such as content, organization, vocabulary, and language usage, all received a high grade. However, only four students (40%) were able to correct the errors in mechanics from rough to final drafts. Overall, individuals may get a higher score on their final writings if they used teacher video feedback to revise and edit their rough drafts.

DISCUSSION

It has been discovered that the use of teacher video feedback, similar to the use of audio feedback, enables instructors to offer more information, as well as be more personal, easy, and helpful (Borup et al., 2015; Henderson & Phillips, 2015). In addition, a significant number of the students who took part in the study that was carried out by Henderson and Phillips (2015) claimed that they were concerned about seeing the face of their instructors, in particular if they would be getting constructive criticism. The employment of teacher video feedback, also known as screencasts, is yet another innovation in the domain of alternative methods to the process of delivering feedback to students. Screencasts are another name for screen capture videos. In a manner similar to that of auditory feedback, the effects of visual feedback may be very beneficial. In addition, the visual impediments that are inherent in audio-only feedback may be avoided by using screen-captured video feedback instead. The user records what is shown on their screen with the use of screen capture software. This finding is in line with students found value in both screencast and text feedback, but preferred screencast video feedback for its efficiency, clarity, usability, and enhanced comprehension (Cunningham, 2019). The procedure of receiving video feedback which was characterized as interesting, useful, helpful, clearer, encouraging, engaging, enjoyable and providing depth (Matthews, 2019) and also constructive feedback (Chan & Luo, 2022).

Content is the aspect of writing that improves in eight students. In term of organization, six students are able to organize their writings well. This means teacher video feedback also helps the students how to organize their writing properly. The students' vocabulary also improves in seven students. Teacher video feedback also helps the students to correct their vocabulary mistake. What students value in teacher video feedback is on global concerns such as content and organization as well as feedback on surface-level issues such as grammar, vocabulary, and accuracy (Silva, 2012), teacher video feedback may lead to impacted learning scores more than written feedback only (Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2012), Important revisions that improve overall and global features of writing, such as content, organization, and grammar (Ali, 2016). Some of the individuals in this study were also acquainted with the grammatical instruction they received in university. Mistakes in language use, particularly grammar, were straightforward to identify. In this case, the students used past verbs inconsistently. It was easy to identify the grammatical errors so teacher requested her students to modify it. By correcting their errors based on teacher video feedback, their work considerably improved in terms of language usage. This is consistent with finding that the students' language usage improved when they received teacher video feedback (Denton, 2014). The majority of students did not develop mechanics since they did not understand how to respond the teacher video feedback. Even though students had previously engaged in teacher video feedback as part of the teaching-learning process, they had trouble altering their papers based on their teacher video feedback in mechanics. They may have trouble to develop their drafts in term of mechanics because teacher might pay too little attention about mechanics. Overall, student writing improved as a result of teacher video feedback. It indicated that teacher video feedback reaction contributed positively to the students' writing.

CONCLUSION

The result of the research shows that the utilization of teacher video feedback on students' writings. Analyzing the academic writings of 10 students, teacher video feedback affects the students' scores in content for eight students (80%), organization for six students (60%), vocabulary for seven students (70%), language usage for eight students (80%), and mechanics

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

for four students (40%) due to the teacher's unconstructive criticism on mechanics. They revise and edit their writings more readily in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, and language use.

REFERENCES

- Ali, A. D. (2016). Effectiveness of Using Screencast Feedback on EFL Students' Writing and Perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 106–121.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. K. (2010). Introduction to research in education . Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 8(2), 115–129.
- Borg, E., & Deane, M. (2011). Measuring the outcomes of individualised writing instruction: a multilayered approach to capturing changes in students' texts. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(3), 319–331.
- Borup, J., West, R. E., & Thomas, R. (2015). The impact of text versus video communication on instructor feedback in blended courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63(2), 161–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9367-8>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Luo, J. (2022). Exploring teacher perceptions of different types of 'feedback practices' in higher education: implications for teacher feedback literacy. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 47(1), 61–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888074>
- Cheng, D., & Li, M. (2020). Screencast Video Feedback in Online TESOL Classes. *Computers and Composition*, 58, 102612. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612>
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019). Student Perceptions and Use of Technology-Mediated Text and Screencast Feedback in ESL Writing. *Computers and Composition*, 52, 222–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.003>
- Denton, D. W. (2014). Using screen capture feedback to improve academic performance. *TechTrends*, 58(6), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-014-0803-0>
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (1992). Holistic writing assessment for LEP students. *Proceedings of the Second National Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Student Issues: Focus on Evaluation and Measurement*, 2, 317–358.
- Hattie, J. (2007). Timperley (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 88–118.
- Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2015). Video-based feedback on student assessment: Scarily personal. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(1).
- Marrs, S., Zumbrunn, S., McBride, C., & Stringer, J. K. (2016). Exploring Elementary Student Perceptions of Writing Feedback. *Journal on Educational Psychology*, 10(1), 16–28.
- Mathieson, K. (2012). Exploring student perceptions of audiovisual feedback via screencasting in online courses. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 26(3), 143–156.
- Matthews, L. (2019). Should we use video technology for giving feedback? *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 4(1), 476–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2019.1669480>
- Morton, J., Storch, N., & Thompson, C. (2014). Feedback on writing in the supervision of postgraduate students: Insights from the work of Vygotsky and Bakhtin. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, 8(1), A24–A36.
- Orlando, J. (2016). A comparison of text, voice, and screencasting feedback to online students. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 30(3), 156–166.
- Rockinson-Szapkiw, A. J. (2012). Should online doctoral instructors adopt audio feedback as

Available online at <https://www.elitejournal.org/index.php/ELITE>

- an instructional strategy? Preliminary evidence. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 7.
- Sharp, J. (2012). Success with your education research project. *Success with Your Education Research Project*, 1–152.
- Silva, M. L. (2012). Camtasia in the classroom: Student attitudes and preferences for video commentary or Microsoft Word comments during the revision process. *Computers and Composition*, 29(1), 1–22.
- Silva, M. L. (2017). Commenting with Camtasia: A descriptive study of the affordances and constraints of peer-to-peer screencast feedback. *Research on Writing: Multiple Perspectives*, 325–346.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- Wiersma, W. (2000). *Research methods in education: An introduction*. Allyn & Bacon.

