Scholarly teaching should be driven by our goal to maximise students' learning through effective teaching (Potter & Kustra, 2011). Effective teaching practices, I believe, can only be achieved by our constant thinking and rethinking about our own strengths and weaknesses in teaching, observing students' engagement in the tasks we set to meet the learning objectives, and monitoring students' progress. This, of course, means we are required to fine-tune our teaching philosophy, and draw explicit links between the evidence-based effective pedagogies stated and the way we operationalise these conceptual pedagogies in our teaching. In practice, we must continue to reflect upon and implement teaching methods that enable students to explore their learning in a student-centric learning environment, see a gap in their knowledge/skills and learn how they can reach their potential, see relevance in what they learn and, most importantly, recognise how they can competently transfer their learned skills to other modules at NUS and beyond (Olivos et al., 2016). Through constantly reflecting on my own teaching practices, I have learned that the biggest impact I could make in my students' learning is in the way I provide feedback using technology.

> **Commented [MC1]:** Introduction: covers scholarly teaching, need to reflect and teaching philosophy.

In my first year of teaching the English for Academic Purposes course (EAP, ES1102) at CELC, I stated in my teaching philosophy that my aim was to "arouse students' interest in learning the English language and improving on their academic writing accuracy". I spent a long time preparing lessons and put in tremendous effort in providing written feedback for all my students. However, I discovered very quickly that simply teaching through 'telling' in the classroom was ineffective and my effort in writing feedback for students prior to/after my one-to-one conferencing sessions did not successfully help students understand their errors. I learned this because many students repeatedly made the same mistakes despite being taught and reminded in class. Students were also not able to correct many of the more technical errors prior to, and after, the conferencing sessions. I always knew giving feedback was a critical part of teaching and learning, particularly in writing, but I was somewhat surprised when I learned the three problems I had encountered in the feedback/student consultation process were also reported in the literature—namely, timeliness and the quality of feedback, time constraints of consultations, and a lack of engagement by students (Ahmadi, Maftoon & Mehrdad, 2012; Crook et al., 2012; Orsmond & Merry, 2011; Parr & Timperley, 2010), as explained below:

> **Commented [MC2]:** Earlier teaching philosophy
>
> **Commented [MC3]:** Problems I discovered in my teach and the way I taught and gave feedback.

1. ***Timeliness and quality of feedback***

The provision of feedback is a highly repetitive, time consuming, and often laborious task. Like many CELC instructors, I teach between 12 and 16 hours per week and have between 55 and 70 students. I allocate on average 25 minutes of consultation time per student for each assignment, totalling 25 to 33 hours over 3 to 5 days. It is highly likely that we experience fatigue towards the end of the day or week, thus the quality of feedback is likely to be adversely affected. The repetitiveness of giving feedback and the amount of time the process takes means the quality of the teachers' feedback may be sacrificed (Chanock, 2000; Crook et al., 2012; Orsmond & Merry, 2011; Poulos & Mahony, 2007).

> **Commented [MC4]:** Points 1, 2 and 3 explain in depth problems I faced.

2. ***Time constraints of consultations***

A few days prior to the consultations, I, like other instructors, typically provide students with explicit and/or implicit written feedback on the content, organisation and language of their essay drafts, and raise questions that would prompt them to think about what the errors are, and what needs to be done to improve their performance on their individual essays. The problem with this is that, during the consultation, students often report that they do not understand the brief comments written on the drafts. I then provide explicit explanations on errors and, if time permits,

encourage students to think about correcting them. As such, there is insufficient time for students to ask questions, as well as for the instructors to go through examples of good and poor writing to raise students' awareness of the 'gap' in their work and highlight to students what needs to be done to achieve the desired performance.

3. Lack of engagement by students with feedback

Due to time constraints, student consultations tend to be more teacher-centred than student-centred. Students would often just sit and listen passively to explicit feedback. Students are often overwhelmed by the amount of information given and find it difficult to make all the corrections suggested. As a result, many are still unable to make the changes highlighted to them in the next draft. This is not surprising as second language acquisition/educational researchers (e.g. Fullan & Langworthy, 2014; Schmidt, 1990) have established that for any deep learning to occur, learners must receive input that points out students' performance, the required standard of performance, and how to fill the gap between students' own performance and the required standard.

In my attempt to improve the quality of my feedback and facilitate the teacher-student interaction in the feedback process, I investigated other means of providing feedback and discovered that teachers have reported screen-capture video recordings as an effective way of presenting content. This is because teachers are able to provide demonstrations of the content, and students can literally see what needs to be done to improve on subsequent coursework (Abrahamson, 2010). Teachers are also receptive to using videos for teaching and providing feedback because with video recordings, they are able to articulate the assessment criteria and explain key points clearly while minimising potential misinterpretations of content and feedback due to illegible handwriting (Crook et al., 2012). Recent research also suggests that using technology to provide feedback can further enhance learners' performance by promoting deeper learning and higher order thinking (Nicols & Milligan, 2006), and increase students' capacity for self-regulated learning (Parr & Timperley, 2010).

> **Commented [MC5]:** Solution: use technology

Thus, I began to use a user-friendly application called Explain Everything, a screencasting software on the iPad, that is easy to download and access, easy to use, has no time restrictions on the length of the video recording. The best part about the app is that it allows users to write or type comments on the work in Microsoft Word or the app itself while providing audio narration simultaneously in the video recordings. This, of course, means users will save time and avoid the rigmarole of having to import and transport files between software. The video is then exported as a movie and uploaded to Dropbox/Google Drive, which they can replay as frequently as is necessary. In addition, I provide a video with written comments and an audio narrative of good and bad essay samples. The video could then be uploaded to YouTube. Both files can be accessed anytime and anywhere by students when they are correcting their drafts, and they can replay their work prior to their consultations which will focus on reflection and improving their understanding of the work. This enables me to provide more student-centred rather than an instructor-centred sessions.

> **Commented [MC6]:** Use of technology: Explain Everyth

The research study I conducted on the effectiveness of using multimodal online feedback revealed the depth of the explanations provided through online multimodal feedback allows students to understand/correct their errors, promote higher order thinking skills and, more importantly, enable students to actively engage in the learning as they would feel a stronger sense of connection to the

> **Commented [MC7]:** Results for this research study

course and the instructor. Essentially, the research study revealed these four key findings (Cook, 2016):

1. What forms of feedback are most useful for students?

All the students who participated perceived online multimodal feedback to be more effective than just having written comments on their essays. Students who had a stronger command of the language felt that some comments which related to language did not require explanations. Moreover, students reported that they depended more on online multimodal feedback than just written feedback to solve content-, organization- and language-related problems in their essays (though they were less depended on language-related problems).

2. Does online multimodal feedback enhance students' accuracy in making changes?

Students benefitted from online multimodal feedback in a way that receiving only written feedback could not provide. Traditionally instructors would be able to comment on individual sentences. However, the explanations lacked depth so students were often unclear about what to change and how to correct the errors. The audio and visual annotations allowed students to understand their errors across sentences and paragraphs, and improved significantly on accuracy of their writing.

3. Does it improve students' confidence in writing?

The benefits of online multimodal feedback go far beyond increasing accuracy. As the explanations of the students' errors are provided in greater depth, students could re-play the explanations and think about how best to correct the errors before they submit the next draft. The results of this study show that students who received online multimodal feedback were more confident in making changes related to the content, organisation and language compared to those who only received written. It also suggested that the depth of the audio explanations enabled students to make changes with confidence, especially for problems related to the organisation of ideas which may be impossible to reference across the text.

4. Does written or online multimodal feedback promote higher order thinking and feed-forward?

Though multimodal feedback did not save marking time, it has changed the way I conduct consultations with students, and the feedback I provide is able to promote higher order thinking and empower students to feed-forward the skills that they learnt from the essay-writing process. Students' ability to transfer skills can be promoted by our guidance in the feedback process. Consistent with the meta-cognitivism teaching/learning theory (Boekaerts, Pintrich, & Zeidner, 2000), the results indicate that tutors' comprehensible feedback that enables students to see the gap in their knowledge and provides students an opportunity to onus to revise their work can promote self-regulated learning. This process makes it more possible for students to transfer their skills/knowledge to other modules at NUS and beyond.

In the 4.5 years that I have been at CELC, I have learned an effective teacher is one who is able to identify for students their strengths, weaknesses and improvements as they progress through their learning journey. My responsibility as a facilitator is to help students see the gap in their knowledge,

Commented [MC8]: Reflection on teaching experience and my next step.

3

and help them reach their full potential/desired performance by allowing them the opportunity to explore their learning through feedback, as is also reported by Parr & Timperley (2010) as good feedback practices.

Through learning more about the importance of tutor and peer feedback in students' learning (e.g. Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; DeGuerrero & Villamil, 2000; Ferry, 2009; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Paulus, 1999), and exploring ways in which I can further improve on my teaching, I continue to explore other platforms for my students to learn. Students should be engaged in the feedback process because having an active role in learning throughout the feedback process can provide them opportunities to clarify any misunderstanding/reinforce their understanding of the taught skills, which leads to the improvement in their writing performance (Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006). According to Bloom's Taxonomy (1956), too, higher order thinking skills such as applying, evaluating, creating can only occur once students are able to understand. With this in mind, my students are now also heavily involved in providing peer feedback, and I actively engage in students' peer feedback process to facilitate further learning.

I have conceptualised further the meaning of what I need to do to become an effective scholarly teacher. For instance, I have changed from stating in my teaching philosophy that: **"my aim was to arouse students' interest in learning the English language and improving on their academic writing accuracy"** to a teaching philosophy that links explicit conceptual evidence-based effective pedagogies to my teaching practices and, of course, my intention to conduct further research on the feedback process. Based on what I have learned about the importance of feedback, I am now focusing on 'tutor-guided' peer feedback in students' learning, which can be implemented in any writing or oral communication course. Below is an excerpt from my last teaching philosophy:

> An excellent teacher is one who is able to identify for students their strengths, weaknesses and improvements as they progress through their learning journey. I believe my responsibility as a facilitator is to help students see the gap in their knowledge, and help them reach their full potential/desired performance by allowing them the opportunity to explore their learning through feedback (Parr & Timperley, 2010). Furthermore, students should be engaged in the feedback process because having an active role in learning throughout the feedback process can provide them an opportunity to clarify any misunderstanding/reinforce their understanding of taught skills, which leads to the improvement in their writing performance (Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006). With this in mind, my students are also heavily involved in peer feedback as researchers have also found students can see the value and become more motivated to learn through giving and receiving peer feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; DeGuerrero & Villamil, 2000; Ferry, 2009; Gielene et al., 2010; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Paulus, 1999). Therefore, the biggest impact I could make in my students' learning is through the implementation of both tutor-guided peer feedback and tutor feedback, where I provide students a chance to think about the best ways to correct their mistakes for the set tasks, apply evaluative skills and, very importantly, transfer the learned skills to other modules at NUS and beyond.

Scholarly teaching requires us to constantly re-adapt the materials used and the way we deliver content to students in order to meet the teaching/learning objectives. What we write down in our teaching philosophy should include teaching pedagogies that can be supported by literature and, very importantly, can be operationalise/implemented in our teaching.

Commented [MC9]: Example of how I have fine-tuned teaching philosophy.

From general statement to being able to link explicit conceptual evidence-based effective pedagogies to my teaching practices (and should prompt further research)

Commented [MC10]: Brief conclusion

4

References

Abrahamson, D., & Chase, K. (2015). Interfacing practices: Domain theory emerges via collaborative reflection. *Reflective Practice*, *16*(3), 372-389.

Ahmadi, D., Maftoon, P., & Mehrdad. A.G. (2012). Investigating the effects of two types of feedback on EFL students' writing. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 2590-2595.

Bloom, B.S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Vol. 1: Cognitive Domain.* New York: McKay, 1956. Retrieved from http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/bloom.html

Boekaerts, M., Pintrich, P., & Zeidner, M. (2000). Self-Regulation: An Introductory Review. In M. Boekarts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 1-9). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Chanock, K. (2000). Comments on essays: Do students understand what tutors write? *Teaching in Higher Education*, *5*(1), 95–105.

Cook, M. (2016). Explain Everything™: What Can Students Gain From Online Multimodal Feedback? *AJSOTL*.

Crook, A., Mauchline, A., Maw, S., Lawson, C., Drinkwater, R., Lundqvist, K., Orsmond, P., Gomez, S., & Park, J. (2012). The use of video technology for providing feedback to students: Can it enhance the feedback experience for staff and students? *Computers and Education*, *58*(1), 386-396.

De Guerrero, M. C. M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, *84*, 51–68.

Ferry, C. (2009). Online peer review to promote reader–writer interaction. *Hawa'ii Pacific University TESOL Working Papers Series, 7*(1), 2–13.

Fullan, M. & Langworthy, M. (2014). *A Rich Seam: How New Pedagogies Find Deep Learning*. London: Pearson.

Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction*. *20*(4). 204-315.

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*, 30–43.

Nicol, D. J. & MacFarlane-Dick (2006). Formative assessment and self–regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*, 199–218.

Nicol, D. J. & Milligan, C. (2006), Rethinking technology–supported assessment in terms of the seven principles of good feedback practice. In C. Bryan and K. Clegg (Eds), *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*, Taylor and Francis Group Ltd, UK: London. Retrieved from http://ewds.strath.ac.uk/REAP/public/Papers/Nicol_Milligan_150905.pdf

Orsmond, P., & Merry, S. (2011). Feedback alignment: Effective and ineffective links between tutors'and students' understanding of coursework feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *36*(2), 125–136.

Olivos, P., Santos, A., Martínc, S., Canas, M., Gómez-Lázaroc, E., & Mayad, Y. (2016). The relationship between learning styles and motivation to transfer of learning in a vocational training programme. *Suma Psicológica*, *23*, 25–32.

Parr, J.M., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing, 15*(2), 68-85.

Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 265–289.

Potter, M.K., & Kustra, E.D.H. (2011). The relationship between scholarly teaching and SoTL: Models, distinctions, and clarifications. *International Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *5*(1), 1-18.

Poulos, A., & Mahony, M.J. (2008). Effectiveness of feedback: The students' perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *33*, 143–54.

Schmidt, R.W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*. *11*(2): 129-158.