

INTEGRATING VIDEO IN THE CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PRACTICE: VOICES FROM INDONESIA

I Putu Ngurah Wage Myartawan
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
wmyartawan@gmail.com

Luh Diah Surya Adnyani
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
luh_diah@yahoo.com

Abstract: Written corrective feedback in the realm of ESL/EFL has gained more attention from researchers in the last 10 years, and the latest innovation in the practice is the integration of video in the delivery of written corrective feedback (Stannard, 2008). However, research on video-based written corrective feedback (VWCF) in EFL/ESL writing instructions so far has only revealed its qualitative strengths (Stannard, 2008; Mathisen, 2012)—that is, in terms of students' responses towards its application, a gap that the current paper intends to address. The present study reported in this paper is a classroom action research (CAR) aiming at increasing the writing accuracy of a group of students of a state university in Bali, Indonesia through the integration of video in the corrective feedback practice. The writing instruction in the study is carried out in a blended learning fashion combining the traditional learning mode with an email-based correspondence between the tutor and the students. The findings seem to indicate that video-taped orally-delivered direct corrective feedback has a relatively small impact on student accuracy improvement percentage. However, the integration of video in the feedback provision appears to have a potential in terms of increasing students' motivation in their learning of writing. The research results can provide some interesting insight to teachers who want to implement video-based feedback and future research on this type of feedback.

Keywords: *corrective feedback, video integration, accuracy improvement, writing*

The current classroom action research was initiated by the writers' observation on the phenomena that in an EFL (English as a foreign language) writing class in an Indonesian state university, it often occurs that the students may have sufficient ideas to develop a topic/idea into a written piece, but only because their lack of grammatical competence, the sufficiency of ideas result in a poor composition. For example, failure in producing a passive sentence "The man who killed by the tiger was buried near the zoo" can create puzzlement to the interlocutor in interpreting the real message. The study was also inspired by an observed practice of the teacher use of indirect written corrective feedback which appeared to provide very little help in dealing with the student accuracy problem in writing.

Feedback has been a long practice especially in language learning. Its existence had gained some controversy in language learning especially in the early of 90's. Some experts questioned the effectiveness of feedback especially error feedback or grammar correction in students' writing. Though many experts also assumed that error feedback was effective but it was not supported by strong evidence. This fact resulted in a number of studies on feedback that had been conducted by some experts around the world. Truscott (1996) stated firmly that grammar correction should be left behind because many studies showed that this kind of feedback was not effective. He also said that students often failed to understand their teacher's feedback and there was a tendency that the students would repeat their mistakes. On the contrary, another expert on feedback Ferris (2006) stated that even though many studies indicated that error feedback was not effective but a conclusion could not be derived yet because the design used in the studies were not consistent. His research result showed that feedback was able to improve the students' accuracy significantly in a long term. Thus, Ferris had objected Truscott's (1996) argument.

However, an expert on feedback, Stannard (2012) stated that many research found that many students do not understand the written feedback given by their teachers which finally results in their misinterpretation on their teachers' correction. This matter inspired the use of video feedback in language learning. Stannard (2008) explained that video is able to give a clearer feedback because the information given can be presented in oral or visual form.

Furthermore, Stannard (2012) also stated some other strengths of video-feedback, e.g.: 1) the learning process becomes more inclusive with the emphasis on the multiple learning style; 2) compared to text, more feedback can be given through video ; 3) this multimodal feedback is said to be more suitable for the students nowadays who are daily exposed by many kinds of audio and video media; 4) video feedback is possibly used

for long distance learning and is able to give a more personal feedback ; 5) the sound in video is said to be very useful, which cannot be given by written feedback ; and 6) more students prefer oral and visual feedback. Studies by Mathisen (2012) and Jones, Georghiadis, and Gunson (2012) also reported a positive response on the use of video-based feedback on the part of the students. However, almost no research deals with the effect of this innovative feedback on student accuracy in writing.

Methods

The study was a classroom action research (CAR) which was carried out in an writing class in the English Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha (Undiksha), Singaraja, Bali, Indonesia. The class comprised 23 students who were then at their fourth semester. Throughout the semester the students in the class would deal with a number of essay types, and the class met once a week, 100 minutes in every class meeting. Due to the pre-observation results, it was inferred that the teacher's application of indirect oral written corrective feedbacks via slide presentation on a selected number of students' essays in front of the class did not result in satisfying accuracy improvement on the students' revised essays. Therefore, a shift to direct written corrective feedback via video was decided to be applied as a treatment in the proceeding writing instruction—which dealt with narrative essay—in the class under study.

Basically the class procedure was relatively the same as that before the CAR treatment, that is, in the initial teaching session on the narrative essay the teacher would assure that each student could plan a good outline before they started writing their first draft in the next class meeting. As such, the first meeting was spent with a discussion on the nature of narrative essay: its purpose, structure, and language features, followed by a task on making an outline of a narrative essay—by typing it directly using their laptop—based on a topic that the students freely chose. When the students worked on their outline, the teacher moved around to assist the students when they encountered a problem. The students should finish their outline in the class, which they then had to submit via e-mail to the teacher immediately after the class. Before the class met in the next meeting session, the teacher had to have finished giving her feedback on the students' outlines. It was to assure that the students did not have much problem with content/idea in the second meeting since the focus of the CAR treatment was on their writing accuracy. In case that a student's draft was far from satisfactory, the teacher could invite the student for personal discussion through e-mail.

In the second meeting, the students were required to develop their first draft based on the outline that had been corrected—if any—by the lecturer which they should submit via email again to the teacher right after the class. During the week that followed, the teacher corrected the students' works—using direct corrective feedback—in her laptop which she video-taped by using a screen-capture software, Screencast-O-Matic. The video was made at maximum 5 minutes in duration so that it would be easy to be uploaded to Youtube. To make the commentary run smoothly during the recording, the lecturer marked the errors she would put forward with different color highlights. The link of the video correction to Youtube was sent to each student via email, so there would be no video attached in the email. This was deliberately planned in order to minimize the problem of poor internet connection that might occur due to big video sizes when working in e-mail. In the third meeting, the students would get the video correction link in their email, and based on the video, should revise their draft throughout the session. After the class, the students should submit their final draft via e-mail to the lecturer. Besides that, they were also asked to give their responses to the questionnaire sent by the lecturer which asked for their opinions related to the CAR treatment that they had had.

It is important to note down that even though the researchers and the teacher agreed upon the implementation of video-taped written corrective feedback, the teacher's real practice was that she used more the video-taped orally-delivered direct corrective feedback than the supposedly video-taped written direct corrective feedback. Whereas, a written direct corrective feedback really requires the teacher to write the correction next to the erroneous part in the student's piece, not to do so directly through commentary, without writing real correction next to the focused error. Therefore, the focus of the current study had a bit shifted to the utilization of video-taped orally-delivered direct corrective feedback.

For the sake of the current study, the grammatical errors committed by the students in their first draft after the second meeting were totaled and would be compared with the total of grammatical errors in their final drafts. There were four types of grammatical errors that were taken into consideration, namely verb errors which included missing verb, verb tense, subject-verb agreement, negative form, gerund, to infinitive, and passive voice; article errors which are pertinent to the use of article a/an, and the; pronoun errors which were associated with subject and object pronoun, possessive adjective, demonstrative, Wh-question word, and relative pronoun; and preposition errors. The error types were identified as the four biggest error categories that the students often made in their descriptive essays. On the other hand, the students' responses to the questionnaire were analyzed descriptively in order to find out the patterns of their responses to the application of video-based corrective feedback.

Findings and Discussion

The findings of the study are concerned with two things: the improvement of the students' writing accuracy after the treatment using video-taped orally-delivered direct corrective feedback and their responses towards the use of this feedback type in the writing instruction.

Improvement of the Students' Writing Accuracy

The relative comparison of the accuracy improvement in the pre-observation when the feedback type implemented was indirect written corrective feedback and after the CAR treatment using the video-based corrective feedback—that is, the video-taped-orally-delivered direct corrective feedback—is showed in Tabel 1 below.

Tabel 1 Accuracy improvement

| Student | Before treatment | | After treatment | |
|----------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| | Draft 1 | Final draft | Draft 1 | Final Draft |
| Total of error | 378 | 271 | 288 | 211 |
| Accuracy improvement | 28.31 | | 26.74 | |

What can be clearly seen here is that the percentage of accuracy improvement (descriptive essay) before treatment is slightly better than that after treatment (narrative essay). What can also be said here is that focusing feedback only to a smaller number of students' works (8 pieces only) as the model to the entire class by using indirect written corrective feedback seems to have a better effect than individualized feedback via video-taped orally-delivered direct corrective feedback in terms of student accuracy improvement percentage. The table clearly notes that the video feedback implemented only gives a relatively small impact on the student accuracy improvement percentage.

The Students' Response towards the Treatment Using Video-based Feedback

As far as the use of the video-taped-orally-delivered direct corrective feedback was concerned, the analysis of the student questionnaire indicated a positive response. First, almost most of the students (96%) contended that they preferred the video-taped feedback to the indirect written corrective feedback because the former was more challenging for them and allowed them more independent learning. All of them mentioned that the video feedback allowed more flexibility in learning since they could assess it anywhere and anytime; they also said that with video they could replay and pause several times—ranging from 1 to 10 times—the video to make them better understand the lecturer's correction. The majority of the students (96%) agreed that the video feedback could enable them to practice their listening and writing skills simultaneously, and make them feel as if the lecturer explained the correction directly in front of their face personally. Finally, they felt motivated to write better writing and felt that their writing got better after revising their drafts based on the video feedback.

What can be said from the findings is that the positive comments from the students do not correspond with the slight percentage of student accuracy improvement. This might indicate that the presence of video did serve as a source of motivation for them in their learning of writing, but the way in which the correction was given, on the other hand, presented a problem for them. It was so because even though the correction to an error was given directly, most of the time it was conveyed orally by the lecturer, and the problem was it was possible that not all of the students could easily catch the information in the direct feedback orally delivered. This can be said so, especially when many of the students admitted that they needed to pause and replay the video up to 10 times. This apparently is now a clear indication that the high frequency of pauses and replays should not be interpreted as a sign that they liked learning through the video, but a sign that they had a difficulty in understanding the message of the direct feedback orally given.

This finding can serve as useful information for the next cycle of the study or future research on the need to try at another alternative of video-based feedback in which the teacher video-tapes his directly writing the correct version next to the erroneous part on the student's writing piece. The finding that written corrective feedback—though indirectly given—was slightly better than the video-based orally-delivered direct corrective feedback also seems to suggest that spoken correction provides a bigger cognitive load than the written one to the students' processing mechanism in responding to teacher corrective feedback in their revising attempts. Therefore, an experiment comparing the efficacy of the orally-delivered direct corrective feedback and the written direct corrective one—both video-taped—is worth doing.

Conclusion and Suggestion

The results of the study seem to suggest that video-taped orally-delivered direct corrective feedback has a relatively small impact on student accuracy improvement percentage, and that indirect written corrective feedback limited only to a selected number of students' works is slightly better than the video feedback containing orally delivered direct corrective feedback. Yet, in terms of learning process, the presence of video appears to have a potential in terms of increasing students' motivation in their learning of writing.

The results of the study suggest that an investigation on the impact of using a really video-taped written-corrective feedback—as opposed to the orally-delivered one—on student accuracy improvement is worth doing. Of the same interest is to compare the efficacy of the orally-delivered direct corrective feedback and the written direct corrective one—both video-taped—towards the student writing accuracy.

References

- Ferris, D.R. 2006. Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland, *Feedback in second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, N., Georgiades, P. & Gunson, J. 2012. Student feedback via screen capture digital video: Stimulating student's modified action. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, 61(1), 3-17.
- Mathisen, P. 2012. Video feedback in higher education: A contribution to improving the quality of written feedback. *NORDIC Journal of Digital Literacy*, 7(2), 97-113.
- Stannard, R. 2012. *Simple tools that can revolutionize feedback we provide*. In Proceedings of the 3rd ICICTES 2012 (available at www.icicte.org/Proceedings2012/Papers/Keynote2-Stannard.pdf, accessed January 23, 2014).
- Stannard, R. 2008. A new direction in feedback. *Humanising Language Teaching*, 10(6). <http://www.http://www.hltmag.co.uk/dec08/mart04.htm>
- Truscott, J. 1996. Review article: The case against grammar correction in 12 writing classes. *Journal of Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-369.

Biodata

Both I Putu Ngurah Wage Myartawan and Luh Diah Surya Adnyani are currently working as full-time lecturers in the English Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha (Undiksha), a state university located in Singaraja, Bali, Indonesia. The first writer's article on learner autonomy has currently been published in TEFLIN Journal (Volume 24, No.1, 2013). Both writers have presented their papers in some international conferences such as TEFLIN International Conference, INASYSCON of Universitas Brawijaya, ICEAC of Undiksha, and Asia Creative Writing Conference of Politeknik Negeri Jember. Their research interests include such topics as EFL methodologies and the use of ICT in EFL classes.