# InCoTEPD 2016
# International Conference on Teacher Education and Professional Development

Tuesday - Thursday, 17 – 19 May 2016

The Eastparc Hotel Yogyakarta, Indonesia 2016

**YOGYAKARTA STATE UNIVERSITY**
**INDONESIA**

## Table of Contents

Plotting parallel session
Keynote Speakers
    Teacher education policy in Indonesia"
    *M. Nasir*

Invited Speakers
    Teacher initiative and continuous professional development in Indonesia
    *Suwarsih Madya*
    Teacher Education and Teacher's Professional Development in Finland: Myths
    and Realities
    Teacher Professional Development in Australia and Asia: A Comparative Study
    Successes and Challenges in the Development of Excellent Teachers in the
    United States
    Model of teacher education and in-service in Hong Kong
    *Ng Shun Wing*
    Model of Teacher Education And In-Service Professional Development In
    Indonesia
    *Sunaryo Kartadinata*

Paralel Session Speakers
I. Sub Themes:
Teacher Education – Pre-Service Training
I.1 Coursera for English Students Teachers: A Foundation for Skill and Professional
    Development
I.2 TheUse Of Digital Video To Assess Students' Speaking Skill
I.3 Islamic Education Teachers Curriculum: Comparative Study Between IAIN
    Surakarta And UPI Bandung
I.4 Teachers' Beliefs And Mathematics Teaching Practices Regarding Successfull
    Implementation Of Curriculum
I.5 Dealing with Differentl Learning Behaviours: The Scope of Nuero Linguistic
    Programming in the Classroom
I.6 The Use Of Think Pair Share And Two Stay- Two Stray Techniques In Improving
    Students' Speaking Skill

# THE USE OF DIGITAL VIDEO PROJECT AND ITS ASSESSMENT

Noni Agustina

*Primary Teacher Education Department, Esa Unggul University, Arjuna Utara Street No.9*
*West Jakarta, Indonesia*

This study aims to explore and describe the use of digital video in learning process and its assessment. Students' speaking skill that is recorded will be assessed using the rubric. Teaching and learning process involve the assessment. Assessing speaking skill requires much time. Speaking is different from the other skills. It cannot be assessed by one right answer. Students' answers can be various. They use many kinds of expressions or phrases. This study employs fifty college students from different majors in the classroom. It is impossible to assess one by one student in one time. Therefore digital video made by students enables to be conducted. The study uses content analysis method with qualitative approach. The data are gathered from the analysis of students' speaking rubrics and open-ended questionnaire. Speaking rubrics undertaken are adopted and adapted from some linguists' rubrics. The finding of this study shows that students can explore more their speaking skill by concerning on their comprehensibility, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. The implication of the study is students learn to speak up and express their idea by using the digital video they make. This study is also beneficial for the teachers or lecturers to implement digital video in the class as one of learning strategy.

# THE USE OF DIGITAL VIDEO PROJECT AND ITS ASSESSMENT

NONI AGUSTINA

*Primary Teacher Education Department, Esa Unggul University, Arjuna Utara Street No.9*
*West Jakarta, Indonesia*

## Abstract

This study aims to explore and describe the use of digital video in learning process and its assessment. Students' speaking skill that is recorded will be assessed using the rubric. Teaching and learning process involve the assessment. Assessing speaking skill requires much time. Speaking is different from the other skills. It cannot be assessed by one right answer. Students' answers can be various. They use many kinds of expressions or phrases. This study employs fifty college students from different majors in the classroom. It is impossible to assess one by one student in one time. Therefore digital video made by students enables to be conducted. The study uses content analysis method with qualitative approach. The data are gathered from the analysis of students' speaking rubrics and open-ended questionnaire. Speaking rubrics undertaken are adopted and adapted from some linguists' rubrics. The finding of this study shows that students can explore more their speaking skill by concerning on their comprehensibility, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. The implication of the study is students learn to speak up and express their idea by using the digital video they make. This study is also beneficial for the teachers or lecturers to implement digital video in the class as one of learning strategy.

## 1. Introduction

In twenty-first century, the information and communication technology grow rapidly almost in all aspects, including education field. It can be seen from the use of technology in the classroom nowadays (Shrosbree, 2008: 75). The use of technology affects the way of teaching and learning (Nikitina, 2009:166; Aksel and Kahraman, 2014:319). It is one of innovative ways in undertaking teaching and learning process (Koc, 2010:98). There is a shift learning process from traditional to modern ways. Moreover, applying technology gives some benefit in teaching and learning process. The technology can be used to support learning process. It also can be used to reach educational objectives (Reinders and White, 2001cited in Aksel and Kahraman, 2014:319).

One of technology that can be used in language learning is digital video. The use of video is popular in education recently because it can be accessed easily, does not need high cost, and is user-friendly (Masats and Dooly, 2011:1152). The digital video gives good impact for the students. Their language skills especially speaking and listening have an improvement. They enjoy their project because they can practice outside the formal context and learn to work with their peers as well make the video creatively (Aksel and Kahraman, 2014: 323). Hafner and Miller (2011:75) find that students also have high motivation and new challenging to make

the video. Even though making video is new for them, they are excited to try hard to learn the technology and are satisfied to do it. Nikita (2009:168) adds that making the video can involve the students taking actively and improve students' confidence, autonomy, and communicative skill.

Integrating the technology in language classroom is beneficial; therefore it is possible to answer the problems faced by the researcher. The problems are teaching Business English course with big size class. It is an impediment to be solved. The preliminary class observation in Business English class was undergone when the students introduced themselves in front of the class; however the time was not enough to finish the activity. It occurred because it had forty-seven students. Ehrenberg, et.al. (2001:1) reveals that the class size influences teaching and learning process. They describe the class size as the number of students in the classroom. The class size contributes to the way of teachers. Teachers will consider the time allocation in teaching, choose the best learning strategies will be implemented to the class, and how much attention is given to the students. The smaller class size, the more exposure teaching and learning activities in the class and more focus attention is given to the students.

Even though Business English course has big size class, the goal of its course must be reached. One of the goals is to engage students to have a good communication skill. The good communication skill is represented by having English speaking skill. To

1

overcome the problem and achieve the learning goal, it requires the replication study conducted.

The aim of the study is to describe and explore deeply the use of digital video project and its assessment in Business English course in Esa Unggul University. The research questions for this study are:

1. How is the use of digital video project in learning process?

2. How is the assessment of digital video project in learning process?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. *Digital video project*

Koc (2010:98) describes digital video consisting graph and audio as well non-verbal expressions. Digital video also provides opportunity for students to manipulate and share their video data.

Digital video project gives some advantages. It can promote autonomous learning and emphasize on student-centered learning. Therefore, the students are asked to make a video. The digital video project encourages the students to learn technology and practice their English. They also work in a team so they divide and share the job. Each member of group is aware to their role and they work collaboratively. They think together to find out the content of the video and strive to make good sentences to make appropriate English script. They also have opportunity to reflect their digital video by looking at their work result and think that they have an authentic experience in making that project (Hafner and Miller, 2011:78-82). Nikita (2009:168-174) expresses that the authentic experience gives the meaningful learning to the students because they can link what they learn with the real context. It can make them more fun, confident, and interact each other in one team.

Smaldino et.al. (2008:404-418) reveal that the use of digital video can facilitate all aspects of students' learning. The aspects are cognitive, affective, psychomotor and interpersonal. Moreover, assigning students to make a video can build their technology skill, develop their creativity, and gain their writing skill to make a script.

There are three types of video based on its purposes. They are assessment video, teacher-made video, and student-made video (Shrosbree, 2008:77). The assessment video is used to assess students' performance. Teacher-made video is created to give the learning model for the students while student-made video is produced by students to demonstrate their performance or work.

Shrosbree (2008:80-82) explains that making the digital video project is easy and simple. There are some steps to make the digital video as follows:

1. Capturing the video
   Take the video by using camera or hand phone camera

2. Editing the video
   Windows movie maker is one of application that can be used to edit the video.

3. Distributing the video
   After editing the video, it can be saved or stored in computer hard drive, CD-ROM, flash memory or internet by uploading it.

### 2.2. *Assessment*

Assessment has close relationship with teaching and learning. Those components cannot be separated (Eggen dan Kauchak, 2007:476). Teachers undertake teaching and learning process then assess students' activities. Reynold, et al.(2009:2) argue that teachers spend a third of their professional time to assess students.

Reynold et.al (2009:248) and Brown (2007:462) divide the assessment into two, traditional and alternative assessment. Traditional assessment refers to the standardized test or paper-pencil based test. Alternative assessment has various forms such as performance, portfolio, conference, journal, and so on.

Lombardi (2008:6) identifies the differences between traditional and alternative assessment. The traditional assessment emphasizes on cognitive development and memorization route and product oriented. On the other hand, alternative assessment focuses on interactive and various performances, skill development related to the real life context and meaningful learning and give the opportunity to the students to have critical thinking and process oriented.

Making a digital video is one of project-based learning. Shrosbree (2008:75) reveals that the digital video is used to record and assess students' project such as speaking performance. Klein et al. (2009:17) proposes rubric to assess students' performance.

### 2.3. *Speaking skill assessment*

Speaking skill can be assessed by employing rubric (Luoma, 2004: 52-82). Wolf and Stevens (2007:5-9) explain the components of the rubric. The rubric consists of performance criteria, performance level, and performance descriptions. A performance criterion refers to expected outcomes. Performance level can be varying. It depends on the purpose of the assessment. The examples of performance level are below

proficient, proficient, and beyond proficient. Performance description demonstrates clear and detail information about performance criteria.

Some linguists describe some speaking rubric with various performance criteria, performance level, and performance descriptions. Wolf and Stevens (2007:9) use delivery, content, language, and physicality as the performance criteria. It can be seen from the table below:

Table 1. Speaking rubric (Wolf and Stevens)

|  | Below proficient | Proficient | Beyond proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| Delivery | Audience is hard to hear. | Audience is easy to hear | Audience engages clearly |
| Content | The content is not relevant to the topic. | The content is relevant to the topic. | The content is comprehensive and relevant to the topic. |
| Language | Vocabulary is not appropriate and speech is not clear. | Vocabulary is appropriate and speech is clear. | Vocabulary is rich and appropriate. Speech is clear with careful pronunciation |
| Physicality | Little eye contact to audience | Some eye contact to audience | Varied and attractive eye contact to audience |

Ur (2012:180) makes the criteria for speaking rubric encompassing six performance criteria. The speaking rubrics as follows:

Table 2. Speaking rubric (Ur)

| 1 | is not able to speak |
|---|---|
| 2 | is able to respond with single words and is not understandable in conveying the message |
| 3 | is able to respond with short sentence and often hard to understand the message |
| 4 | is able to use longer sentences/longer responses but limited messages |
| 5 | is able to use longer sentences/responses with clear messages and sometimes has hesitation |
| 6 | is able to speak fluently and clearly |

Fairfax County Public Schools classifies rubric for speaking skill into six criteria. They are task completion, comprehensibility, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary and language control. Each of them has some performance description and level.

According to Alderson (1991) cited in Luoma (2004:60), each rubric is different because it depends on the purpose and audience target. Therefore in this study, speaking rubric is adopted and adapted from those criteria above. It consists of comprehensibility, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary as follows:

Table 3. Speaking rubric

| Criteria | Level Performance | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Comprehensibility | Reponses are hard to be understood by the listener | Responses are understandable but some of them are hard to be interpreted by the listener. | Listener pauses two or three times to understand the responses | Respons are understc by the listener smoothl (without pausing |
| Fluency | has lot of hesitation and stopping as well incomplete thoughts. She or he pauses after a short response. | has frequent pause and hesitation. | almost completes all thoughts but has some pause and hesitation. | speaks fluently effortles |
| Pronunciation | has a lot of phonemic errors | has frequent phonemic errors | has some phonemic errors | has less phonem errors |
| Vocabulary | uses lacks of variety of vocabulary and expressions, frequently repeats words or expressions, and responds briefly (single word responses) and inappropriate vocabulary | uses minimal variety of vocabulary and expression, some repetition of words and expression and some inappropriate vocabulary. | uses adequate of vocabulary and expression. Most vocabulary is appropriate. | uses ricl variety vocabul and expressi and excellen vocabul |

## 3. Research Methodology

This study employs qualitative approach and content analysis as a research method. Neoundroft (2002: 26-33) argues that the content analysis is applicable for all contexts. It is applied for many disciplines such as psychology, social sciences, politics, journalism, communication, and so on. It can be applied in analyzing the message referring to scientific methodology.

### 3.1. Setting and Participants

The study was conducted in Business English class at Esa Unggul University. It is a compulsory course that must be taken by all students from all faculties in that

university. The data source is college students in Business English class consisting of 17 males and 33 females. The data consists of the speaking rubrics and questionnaire data.

### 3.2 Data collection procedure

According to Cresswell (2008:220), collecting data meant gathering the information to address the research questions. Some steps to collect the data are as follows:

1. Student-made videos are transcribed and assessed into speaking rubrics in order to get students' speaking score. Those speaking rubrics are analyzed by looking at the speaking criteria such as fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary.

2. Questionnaire sheets

   Sugiyono (2013:230) revealed that questionnaire is the instrument which the respondents

   Questionnaire consisted of open-ended questions. The open-ended questions provide the opportunity to the respondents to answer the questions without the constraint. They can express their feeling, opinion, or perception (Kuncoro, 2003:156).

This study employed more than one instruments to collect the data. They were speaking rubric and questionnaire sheet. This collection data is called triangulation. Triangulation is the process to collect the data by applying the multiple sources. It aims to build the accurate and credible data. (Sugiyono, 2013:397-399; Cresswell, 2008:266).

### 3.3 Data analysis and interpretation procedure

After collecting data, the analysis and interpretation data are conducted (Cresswell, 2008:244). Sugiono (2013:405-412) presents some procedures in analyzing the data consisting of data reduction, data display and draw the conclusion. Data reduction means taking the important and necessary data. Data display refers to the presentation of data in many forms such as table, graph, chart, and so on. The analysis and interpretation data of this study were as follows:

1. Speaking rubric and questionnaire sheet were used as analysis data.
2. The data were reduced
3. Those data were displayed in table and short description
4. The data were interpreted and concluded

### 4. Research Finding and Discussion

Students-made video showed their speaking skill. Their speaking skill was assessed by using speaking rubric consisting of comprehensibility, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. Each of those performance criteria had

different levels. They were represented by number 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), and 4 (excellent).

Based on the data, students' speaking performance were mostly in good and excellent level. It can be seen from the table as follows:

Table 4. Speaking rubric of student-made video

| Level | Comprehensibility | Fluency | Pronunciation | Vocab |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 (poor) | 0% | 0 % | 4 % | 0 % |
| 2 (fair) | 14% | 12 % | 18 % | 16 |
| 3 (good) | 24% | 70 % | 24 % | 82 |
| 4 (excellent) | 62% | 18 % | 54 % | 2 % |

Comprehensibility was measured from the responses that were understood by the listener. 62% the responses were understood by the listener. 24% responses were required time to understand. 14% were hard to be interpreted and understood because their voice is low and not clear as well they used inappropriate vocabulary that was hard to catch or guess the meaning.

Fluency referred to how the students deliver the message smoothly and effortlessly without pause or hesitation. Mostly their fluency was in good level. It is 70%. Only 18% spoke fluently and the rest was 12 % in fair level. It was found that some of the students read the text when they had some interview.

The result showed that two students (4%) had a lot of phonemic error. It could be found from student A that had mistake in pronouncing some words such as *graduated, university, management, as, both, improve, fresh, graduate, first, apply, appropriate, well, due to, strength, learn, weakness, and excuse.* Student B had inappropriate pronunciation such as *your, introduce, briefly, apply, strength, weakness, hire, salary, result, and waiting.* 18 % of students had fair pronunciation. 24% of students had some phonemic errors and 54% less phonemic errors.

Mostly, students had good vocabulary. It was 82%. Only 2% of students used rich and excellent vocabulary and expression. The rest was fair. It was 16 %. Inappropriate ones that were found were "Okey, i will call you later *the governing body settle on a choice*" or "what is your *strengthness* and weaknesses?

The result was also found from the analysis of open-ended questionnaire. It can be seen from the frequency of students' responses. Mostly the students learnt speaking skill (31), interview knowledge (12), video making (9), vocabulary (9), and teamwork (9) by making the digital video project.

When making digital video project, all students faced the problem. The main problems mostly they had were speaking problem (20), memorizing of the script

(17) and time management (15). The rest were editing video and lack of vocabulary.

They tried to solve the problems they faced by trying hard to practice (speaking, pronouncing, vocabulary, memorize) and deciding best time to make the video. Mostly they made the video when they had free time or weekend.

They felt that making video gave some beneficial for them. They could gain their speaking skill and spoke more fluently (17). They were more brave and confidence to speak English (10). Some of the students responded that even though it was exhausting, they were happy to learn interview and make video.

## 5. Conclusion

Assigning students to make video was beneficial for the students. They not only learn how to make the video but also can gain their speaking skill comprising the comprehensibility, fluency, pronunciation, and vocabulary. They also can work in team in making the video. It can build their interpersonal skill too. A further research is required to conduct because this study does not cover all performance criteria of speaking skill.

## References

1. Aksel, Aynur and Fatma Gurman-Kahraman. (2014). *Video project assignment and their effectiveness on foreign language learning.* Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com

2. Bahanshal, Dalal A. (2013). *The effect of large classes on english teaching and learning in Saudi secondary schools.* English Language Teaching; Vol. 6, No. 11; 2013. Retrieved from www.ccsenet.org/elt English

3. Brown, H. Douglas. (2007). *Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* Third Edition. NY: Pearson Longman

4. Cresswell, John W. (2008). Educational research. Planning, conducting,and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Third edition. New Jersey: Pearson

5. Eggen, Paul and Don Kauchak. (2007). *Educational psychology. Windows on classrooms. Seventh edition.* New Jersey: Pearson Merril Precentice Hall.

6. Ehrenberg, et.al. (2001). *Class size and student achievement.* American Psychological Society Vol. 2, No. 1, May 2001

7. Fairfax County Public Schools.2013.*Foreign Language Program of Studies.* Retrieved from www.fcps.edu

8. Hafner and Miller. (2011). *Fostering learner autonomy in English for science: a collaborative digital video project in a technological learning environment.* Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu

9. Klein et al. (2009). *School students to engage in deep and active learning.* NY: NYC Department

10. Koc, Mustafa. (2010). *Let's make a movie: Investigating pre-service teachers' reflections on using video-recorded role playing cases in Turkey.* Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com

11. Kuncoro, Mudrajad. (2003). *Metode riset untuk bisnis dan ekonomi.* Yogjakarta:Erlangga

12. Lombardi, Marylin M. (2008). *Making the Grade: The Role of Assessment in Authentic Learning.* ELI Paper 1: 2008 January 2008. Retrieved from net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/eli3019.pdf

13. Luoma, Sari. (2004).*Assessing Speaking.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

14. Masats, Dolors and Melinda Dooly. (2011). *Rethinking the use of video in teacher education: A holistic approach.* Retrieved from www.elsevier.com

15. Monks, James and Robert Schmidt. (2010). The impact of class size and number of students on outcomes in higher education. Published by the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute, Cornell University. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/workingpaper.

16. Neuendorf, Kimberly A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook.* London: Sage publication.

17. Nikitina, Larisa.(2009). *Student video project as a means to practice constructivist pedagogy in the foreign language classroom.* Jurnal Pendidik dan Pendidikan, Jil. 24, 165–176, 2009

18. Reynold, Cecil et.al. 2009. *Measurement and assessment in education.* New Jersey: Pearson

19. Shrosbree, Mark. (2008). Digital video in the language classroom. The JALT CALL Journal Vol.4 No.1.

20. Smaldino et.al.,(2008). *Instructional technology and media for learning.* Pearson Prentice Hill

21. Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode penelitian manajemen.* Bandung:Alfabeta

22. Ur, Penny. (2012). *A course in English language teaching.* UK:Cambridge University Press

23. Wolf, Kenneth and Ellen Stevens. (2007). *The role of rubrics in advancing and assessing student learning.* The Journal of Effective Teaching, Vol. 7, No. 1, 2007 3-14