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Effective Writing Conferences

Writing conferences improve student revisions (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997).

- Significantly improves rule-governed language errors (Bitchener, Young and Cameron, 2005).

Key elements of writing conferences (Ewert, 2009):

- negotiation
- scaffolding
No time for writing conferences!?! 

So, what are my options?
Effective Writing Conferences

Writing conferences improve student revisions (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990; Patthey-Chavez & Ferris, 1997).

- Significantly improves rule-governed language errors (Bitchener, Young and Cameron, 2005).

Key elements of writing conferences (Ewert, 2009):
  - negotiation
  - scaffolding

Audio recordings can provide some of these elements.
Audio Feedback on Writing

Significantly affects both revision of content and grammar revisions (Morra & Asiss, 2009)

Affective influences (Ducate & Arnold, 2012)

• Improves student-teacher relationships (Olesova et al., 2011; Mellen & Sommers, 2003)

• Improves sense of community (Ice et al., 2007)
Situation

- Students aren't making meaningful changes to their essays during the revision process.
  - They are focusing on formal, grammar revisions.
  - They are sometimes frustrated that their essay grade does not greatly improve on the final draft.
Pilot Project

Research questions

• Does screencast/written feedback improve students' revision of text-based changes more than written feedback alone?
• Which form of feedback (written or screencast/written) is more beneficial to students' revision process overall?
• What are students reactions to screencast/written feedback?
Pilot Project

Participant selection

• 17 students
  • 14 participants
• All students from Intermediate Reading and Writing Class at INTO OSU in Mitchell’s section
• Students are working towards a BA at Oregon State University and are taking English language classes.

Students were randomly placed into two groups.
Pilot Project

Participant Selection

Screencast & Written Feedback

Written Feedback (indirect coded)

Blind coding using Faigley and Witte (1981)
Written feedback using "track changes" in Word

• Indirect coded feedback
  • Errors were marked in text with codes:
    • vt verb tense
    • wf word form
    • cap Capitol
  • Some in-text comments
  • Wholistic notes at end of paper
  • Rubric and grades copied into the document
Screencast

- Screencasts recordings are video recordings of the actions on the computer screen paired with audio.
  - Used most often for demonstrating processes on the computer.
  - Easy to use.
The free version of Jing allows you to:

- Create five-minute videos
- Save videos to your computer
- Post those videos on screenshare.com
- Share those videos by providing a link
Pilot Project

Students revise paper

- One week to complete revision
- Revision worth 50% of essay grade
Analysis- Types of Revisions
Faigley & Witte, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyzing Revision</th>
<th>403</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Revision Changes**

- **Surface Changes**
  - Formal Changes
    - Spelling
    - Tense, Number, and Modality
    - Abbreviation
    - Punctuation
    - Format
  - Meaning-Preserving Changes
    - Additions
    - Deletions
    - Substitutions
    - Permutations
    - Distributions
    - Consolidations

- **Text-Base Changes**
  - Microstructure Changes
    - Additions
    - Deletions
    - Substitutions
    - Permutations
    - Distributions
    - Consolidations
  - Macrostructure Changes
    - Additions
    - Deletions
    - Substitutions
    - Permutations
    - Distributions
    - Consolidations

Figure 1. A Taxonomy of Revision Changes
Formal Changes

Government need to help people...

*The* government *needs* to help people...
Meaning Preserving Changes (Style) really hurt the people… a big problem for people…
Both **micro** and **macrostructure changes** affect the meaning, although macrostructure revisions change the overall meaning of a text.
Pilot Project

Result
- Screencast video watched on average 1.3 times.
  - 3 students watched the videos twice.
  - 3 students watched the videos once.
  - 1 student did not watch the video.
Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Written Feedback</th>
<th>Screencast + Written Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microstructure*</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrostructure</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant (p< .05)
Pilot Project

Results excluding the user who did not view the video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Written Feedback</th>
<th>Screencast + Written Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microstructure</strong>*</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macrostructure</strong></td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>37.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant (p< .05)
### Pilot Project

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Written Feedback</th>
<th>Screencast + Written Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal</strong></td>
<td>16.86</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microstructure</strong>*</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Macrostructure</strong></td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>37.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistically significant (p< .05)

This is the real data because we are not going to get all of our students to watch the videos.
Pilot Project

Microstructure revisions

• Add details
• Add entire paragraphs
• Delete off-topic sentences/paragraphs
• Expand conclusion
Pilot Project

Result

- Student feedback on the effects of screencast videos
  - 83% thought helpful (4.3)
    - 75% thought improved learning overall (4.1)
    - 75% thought improved grammar in writing (4.1)
    - 66% thought improved content and organization (4.3)
  - 92% improved perception of teacher (4.6)
    - 75% more comfortable discussing paper with teacher (4.2)
Pilot Project

Results

Teacher Perspective

- Minimal time commitment
- Quiet place needed for recording
- Felt more personal
Conclusions

• These screencast videos encouraged students to:
  • make microstructure revisions.
  • engage with the feedback.
  • view the teacher positively.

But, this is a small study done by a teacher-researcher.
Conclusions

- Teaching implications:
  - Small time commitment
  - Improves teacher view
  - Improves revision of microstructure elements
  - Irrelevant to some students
Pilot Project

Conclusions

• Questions remain:
  • What factors affect the number of times a screencast video is watched?
  • What types of revisions are best addressed in this CMF format?
  • Do the screencast videos affect the student-teacher relationship more than other types of feedback?
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Other uses of Jing

- Demonstration videos
- Student-created informative videos
  - Directions
  - Tour
Pilot Project

Questions