PASAA Journal
Volume 64, July – December 2022, 216–243

Reading Portfolio and Video-mediated Reflection Tasks: University Students' Engagement in Dialogic Reading

Reni Kusumaningputri

English Department, Faculty of Humanities, University of Jember, Jember, Indonesia
reni.fib@unej.ac.id

Article information	
Abstract	This article reports on a single case study investigating the adoption of reading portfolio and video-mediated reflection tasks so as to promote Indonesian university students' engagement in dialogic reading. Nested in a classroom ethnography design, data were collected through multiple interviews, teaching journals, and students' Facebook-mediated interaction records. Drawing on thematic and discursive analysis, the findings showed that the reading portfolio and video-assisted reflection tasks encouraged the students to invest their time and energy into and engage in dialogic reading where collective meaning making practices took place. As the students were engaged in the reading portfolio and video-assisted reflection tasks, they perceived their peers as co-meaning makers who viewed reading as a social and dialogical process in which they had the opportunity to negotiate meaning.
Keywords	dialogic reading, reading engagement, reading portfolio, video-mediated reflection
APA citation:	Kusumaningputri, R. (2022). Reading portfolio and video-mediated reflection tasks: University students' engagement in dialogic reading. *PASAA*, *64*, 216–243.

Introduction

Recent studies have shown that many university students were reported to be less engaged to read (Hoeft, 2012; Kerr & Frese, 2016) as they reported reading hours were lower than university authorities expected (Huang et al., 2014; St Clair-Thompson et al., 2018). This disengagement is due to their minimum language use (Brost & Bradley, 2006), exposure to instruction which is detached from realistic, active, and meaningful reading purpose (Tomasek, 2009) from which for instance readers could talk, write, listen, and reflect on the issue they read about (Mayers & Jones, 1993 as cited in Tomasek, 2009). Traditional reading instruction that gets students to answer reading questions in the form of reading quizzes or tests (Hoeft, 2012; Ryan, 2006; St Clair-Thompson et al., 2018) emphasizes cognitive activities only which are speculated to exist in most EFL reading programs (Cox & Assis-Peterson, 1999; Lo, 2011; Suarcaya & Prasasti, 2017). As reported by Widodo (2016), reading instruction conventionally requires students to do rigid question-answer exercises. This practice commonly takes the form of multiple-choice exercises where students are asked to respond to questions, and a teacher answers without further discussion (Widodo, 2015). It does not allow students to share and discuss what they read. Test-like reading activities do not promote reading as a social practice because students have no opportunity to construct and negotiate meaning from what they read (Barret, 2020). Such cognitively-laden instruction is irrelevant to what students experience in daily social interaction, participation, and engagement (Widodo et al., 2016). Reading as a social practice gives spaces for readers to construct meaning as it gives room for multiple voices and stands against the monologic view of meaning as it affords experiences of reading as social in nature.

The advent of digital technology has changed the way we read and learn to read, in which digital resources are ubiquitously available. As long as learners get connected with the Internet or digital devices that record digital resources, they can engage with these resources. They can be mobile readers who can have easy access to digital texts without any time and space restrictions. Recent research shows that when learners engage with digital texts, they experience multimodal reading practices where they encounter different features of digital resources (Barret, 2020; Liaw & English, 2017; Lim, 2018). There have been several practices to incorporate digital platforms for language learning engagement in

general, such as blog writing (Henry, 2019), Facebook (Ulla & Perales, 2020), and video (Jiang, 2017). Video, particularly student video-creation, among many technological tools, has been reported to enhance engagement in language learning (Engin, 2014; Ito et al., 2008; Hafner & Miller, 2011). Digitally video-creation draws learners' attention as it is connected with the world they live in beyond the classroom. This would maximize learners' potential for the meaning-making process. Meanwhile, a portfolio is a dynamic, ongoing assessment that aids in stimulating student thinking and promotes student independence (Thomas et al., 2005). It supports learners' autonomy as they reflect on, direct, and evaluate themselves (Lo, 2010), and it also acts as an evaluator of learners' reading understanding, increasing engagement (Hoeft, 2012; Ryan, 2006). Students who work on portfolios learn to set their learning goals, take actions, reflect on, monitor, and adjust their work and activity in which at the end they have learning products (Widodo et al., 2016). These two learning opportunities for reading activity when situated as social practice through social media platforms, present dialogic, multiliteracy reading experiences (Bollinger et al., 2020). Although both portfolios and student video-creation have commonly been used in instructional activities, how these two have impacts on reading engagement is scarcely documented, particularly when they involve EFL readers in higher institution settings in Indonesia. To fill this gap, this study examined this following research question: To what extent do EFL Indonesian readers engage and respond (or interact) in reading portfolio and student-created digital video activities?

Literature Review

Reading Engagement as a Dialogic Meaning-making Process

Much of the literature on reading does not solely adhere to a cognitive perspective. Widodo (2016) argues that reading should be seen as an activity that leads to meaning interpretation and the use of meaning communicatively. In line with this argument, Ivey and Johnston (2015) contend that engaged reading should be seen as evolving and interacting social systems in which individuals and communities reciprocally influence one another over time and across the breadth of human development. Following this stance, reading should be placed in a situated practice so that readers can experience texts and engage texts dialogically (Mickan, 2013, as cited in Widodo, 2016). One form of situated

reading is dialogical reading. Dialogic reading is operationalized as a social interaction with peers and teachers to enable learners to dialogically make meaning of target text. Aukerman (2013) argues that dialogic reading is a sense-making process undertaken by readers who interpret textual meaning and engage with others although they share no similar interpretation. In this process, a text is meant by a reader's anticipation of and response to the unfolding ideas of others.

A meaning-making process in dialogic reading is where readers, text, and context are intertwined. Through this lens, firstly, a text is seen as the representation of a writer where readers attempt to interpret a text through linguistic conventions (grammar, discourse structure, genre, vocabulary, and spelling) (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009). However, it must be understood that meaning is relational as texts as signs create meaning throughout their relationship with reality, which is socially constructed. Readers experiencing different realities would textually make meaning over text differently from others. These readers make sense of what they read within their 'context' which is not static and given but negotiable (Miller & Goodnow, 1995). Different readers engage a context differently, bringing their understanding to a similar text differently. Furthermore, readers do not come to an understanding in a vacuum. They bring along their interest and social purpose, such as a certain orientation toward an issue, for instance, a reader who is a Muslim would be more likely to agree on a newspaper issue. This is to say that readers negotiate text meaning differently because they do not share similar interests, social purposes, or social, cultural, and semiotic resources (Aukerman, 2013). To encourage dialogic meaning making, instructional activities should garner all of these elements for successful reading activities so that learners are likely to benefit most. Not only do students comprehend texts, they also dialogically make meaning of social practices allowing them to learn multiple voices and potentially help them see learning to read as an opportunity to engage in textual dialogues, to develop alternative viewpoints, and to challenge others' ideas.

Student Video-Creation and Portfolio as a 'Pot' for Reading as a Social Practice

The heart of reading as a social activity lies in the understanding that the construction of meaning and knowledge evolves through negotiation (Palinscar, 1998; Prawat & Floden, 1994). A dynamic interaction among readers, text, and activity in a socio-cultural context is carried out in relation to others (Wells, 2002) and is fostered by authentic and real-world environments (Kiili, 2012). Today's sociocultural as well as learning landscape is moving into the digital arena. New impetus from devises such as video recording in smartphones and cameras, free editing software, and engaging digital forms have increasingly impacted language learning (Barret, 2020; Meyer & Forester, 2015). A digital environment where readers interact with texts raises cognitive challenges for example difficulties in focusing while reading a text, decreasing inferential, analytical, critical, and reflective reading skills, and less engagement while reading (see Loh & Kanai, 2015). This is due to the presence of hypertext (Car, 2011), the ease of online resource retrieval (Ward, 2013), and the nature of multi-tasking behavior the Internet exposes readers to (Sana et al., 2013). However, despite these difficulties, readers today are immersed in the digital environment from which careful scaffolding in reading instruction is needed.

The use of video, especially student-created video in classroom instruction, becomes motivational, practical in distribution, and enjoyable through some platforms like wikis, blogs, podcasts, and social media such as Facebook (De Ramirez, 2010; Vesudevan, 2010). Video-authoring has been empirically tested to promote autonomous language use, engagement, and independent learning (Hafner and Miller, 2011). It caters for multimodality of language learning as students engage in meaning making experiences through their use of multiple skills, such as speaking and writing and incorporate this with audio-visual resources. The video-authoring enables them to make relevance between the media (video) and their learning of English (Jiang, 2017). Socially digital media authoring promotes peer and public-interaction where learners arouse a sense of participation in real issue's discussion through the dissemination of their self-made video (Engin, 2014; Navqi, 2015) because it gives voice to students' own understanding of the world.

To cater for today's language learner's enjoyment, this digital affordance needs to be carefully assigned along with another task that monitors and assesses the progress of learners as readers. Much research affirms that readers' engagement is increased when they get sufficient time to finish their reading (Sharma et al., 2019), when they read to prepare for quizzes, and when they are asked to write a summary and response on what they have read (Hoeft, 2012; Ryan, 2006). Although quizzes could boost learners' reading compliance and motivation, they also cause anxiety and a false motive to finish reading, which leads to superficial learning (Hatteberg & Steffy, 2013; Roberts, 2011). To address these issues, portfolios as an authentic assessment offer benefits for improved engagement in reading. Creating portfolios can also act as a task that does not pose high anxiety but engages students in reading (Meyer et al., 2013; Moore et al., 2014; Verlaan et al., 2016). Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) conceptualize engaged readers as having high motivation to read, displaying strategies to comprehend what they read, having knowledge to construct a text's meaning, and being socially interactive while reading (p. 602). In a study by Köse (2006) within the action research paradigm, on the use of portfolios for the reading of 43 university students in Cukurova ELT department, it was found that participants experienced high engagement in texts' selection and fed on responsibility for their reading growth. Another study by Araque and Blanco (2015) carried out with four participants in tutorial mode as tutees (first semester students) and tutors (senior university students assisting a research group that has a tutoring reading program) documented improved engagement in reading performed by the tutees. The forms of engagement were improved enjoyment of the reading process especially as a result of collaborative works between the tutees and tutors. Ivey and Johnston (2015) conceptualize engaged reading as social not only with others who are sharing the texts but also with the narrative of the texts. Kusumaningputri (2020) investigated five participants' experiences in a reading course involving portfoliosa and digital storytelling with a video show. Participants' engagement was exercised through reflection which encouraged intermental (dialogues between the text and the reader) and intramental (dialogues within the individual's psychological state). With video show, the products of both dialogues were given back to society or community beyond the readers. This kind of engagement is nested within constructive social networks (Moje et al., 2008). In addition, in EFL contexts, a portfolio can serve as

a checking tool to guarantee students read in English as students could simply read similar materials in their first language (Kusumaningputri, 2014). Taking these issues together, dialogic reading engagement is social as it provides spaces for self and others' language events (Ivey & Johnston, 2015).

Despite much previous research on both, video creation and portfolio creation, to engage language learners, there is a call for classroom ethnography (Henry, 2019) on how learners interact in cultural practice in reading from learners' perspectives from their real-world activities on digital platforms. This study documented video creation and portfolio creation together as reading tasks that describe reading as a social practice.

Methodology

Research Site and Design

This convenience sampling of six-month fieldwork was used to document and examine naturally occurring phenomena and classroom-situated lives of students in regard to reading engagement in three classrooms of one public university in East Java**,** Indonesia. It adopted an ethnographic classroom research design because it investigated natural phenomena that occurred in actual teaching and learning processes in which participants**'** perspectives on their own behaviors were taken into account (Hamilton, 1999; Watson-Gegeo, 1997). During the research, I was both a teacher and a researcher. I immersed myself as a teacher in these classrooms. This self-immersion allowed me to witness events and impacts of the reading activities which were actually happening in the classroom (Feldman, 2011; Widodo et al., 2016). I positioned myself as an insider in that I joined the Facebook group created for the courses where students could share their videos and interact with their peers and also with the public. This enabled me to observe students' digital participation as online routines and negotiated participation (Wang, 2013) and to build personal and professional rapport between students and me as a researcher. This also enabled me to keep track of students' lived experiences as a site of reflection. It is important to note that there were limitations to being a teacher-researcher. For instance, my greater closeness to students may have become a cause of losing objectivity and therefore considered a bias. My students might have also thought that they had to impress me, thus hiding their actual experience regarding the phenomena. To

overcome these problems, I deployed multiple data sources and conducted interviews informally multiple times. I was also aware of my position as a researcher and was committed to collecting data while doing my role as a teacher. This teacher-researcher role enabled me to build greater intimacy, data access, and student openness to experience, thus providing me with richer data and a thicker description of the phenomena.

Participants

The participants in the classrooms were 123 undergraduate students, 42 males and 81 females majoring in English Literature. They were between 18 and 19 years old and from various ethnic groups: 94 Javanese, 21 Madurese, three Chinese, as well as five Thais. This case study employed both initial and theoretical sampling (Gleason, 2014). Convenience sampling, sampling that is ready and convenient as the population is close and accessible, was used for initial sampling which acted as a starter in data collection as it allowed for categories to emerge from the phenomenon under investigation. The theoretical sampling, on the other hand, was used to fill out categories of codes and in exploring the legitimacy of the categories (Charmaz, 2006). They were 16 participants who were willing to join for elaboration and explanation of the categories.

Instructional Procedures

The participants enrolled in Reading 1 and Reading 3 courses. Reading 1 was a course offered for freshmen which focused on survival reading. It highlighted a requirement for students to read extensively and sharpen reading strategies such as scanning**,** skimming, and recognizing words and meanings. Reading 3 was a course offered for sophomores and focused on critical reading where students learned to evaluate texts. Some focuses were making inferences, generalization, as well as distinguishing facts from opinions. These classes, although different in their classroom objectives, share one similar target, enhancement of reading engagement. This similar objective was due to the fact that based on my 12 years of teaching reading, all levels of college students suffer from a lack of reading engagement as they lack enthusiasm and investment in reading activities. The two activities, portfolio and video creation, were outside classroom projects treated as extra reading activities. However,

some adjustments on level of difficulty of the texts students selected and issues raised in video creation were tailored based on their interest and objective of each course. The reading portfolio and student-video creation tasks were implemented weekly for a period of 16 weeks. The stages of the implementation are described in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Reading Instructional Activities with Video-creation and Portfolio

Stages	Details
Pre-tasks stage (3 weeks) *Portfolio and in-classroom activity*	In the first week, each class was asked to create one Facebook group account. The students selected texts that suited their interests. They read, made a summary, and wrote responses. The students' responses showcased students' discoveries of new things from the text. They also listed new vocabulary from the selected texts and used the vocabulary in complete sentences in their response writing. They presented their understanding of the texts to their peers when I invited them to do sharing in front of the class.
While-tasks stage (1 week) *Student-video creation activity*	After three weeks, the students selected one text out of three from the portfolio. The students created a video by planning the draft, recording, evaluating the production, and uploading the video onto Facebook.
Post-tasks stage (1 week) *Negotiation and reflection activity*	The students enjoyed their peer videos and made comments on the explanations which accompanied each video. Those who received comments answered questions and discussed unclear information from the video. This activity lasted for a week. At the end of the week, the students were told to print the Facebook interaction and put the printed screen shot in their portfolio.

These mediated tasks were done side by side with the department's agreed syllabus and materials. The texts the student chose were not restricted to specific genres or topic. They could take sports, education, entertainment, politics, technology, or fashion. There was no limitation to the sources of the texts that the students could use, such as magazines, news, the Internet, and books. In the pre-task stage, they selected a text, read, commented, printed it, and placed it in their portfolio. This stage lasted three weeks. Every week, the first 20 minutes were allocated for portfolio check. Each of the students had a

chance to be invited to share the information they learned from the text as a topic introduction with the other members of the class.

In the fourth week, the students were required to select a text and create a video using the resources available to them such as mobile phones, tablets, or notebooks. The video lasted less than five minutes. The students needed to complete the video creation outside of class each week. The video could take forms of retelling text (monolog) or conversing with other friends. When they chose to create a video in the form of conversation, the students could invite one or more friends into their video frame. For instance, a student had an idea of having a video on some backdrops of smoking cigarettes. He had a friend who was a heavy smoker. As he wanted his friend to learn that smoking was hazardous for the body, he asked that friend to be in the video with him.

After the video was ready, the students were asked to upload the video onto the Facebook group. It was in the end of the fourth week that the students did the video-upload. Beforehand, all the students had to join the Facebook group account created in the first week. At the post-task stage (the fifth week), the students were asked to view the videos, comment on each other's video posts, and see what they could learn from others. These three aforementioned stages were repeated until all the class periods were finished.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

Empirical data were collected through students' records of Facebook postings, interviews, and teaching journals. Students' Facebook e-postings were conceptualized as a dynamic social artifact that represented the interactions between the participants and between the participants and the author, as well as teacher-student engagement in online discussion. The interview data acted as verbal justifications for what was observed in offline and online learning interactions and for what was unknown in the classroom observation, such as their feelings and perspectives on the assigned tasks. The interviews took the form of semi-structured interviews as some emerging categories needed to be addressed further; however, the themes were still open for their personal interpretations and associations (de la Croix et al., 2018). Some parts of the interviews were audio-recorded, while other parts were manually recorded

because some of the interview sessions were conducted through online messaging. Another data source was a teaching journal, a research journal acting as documentation of particular achievements (students and the teacher), dead ends, surprises, feelings about what was happening, and some events that influenced me as a researcher (Dörnyei, 2007). For instance, I took notes on some participants' shared experiences on how many times they took a video before uploading it to Facebook. I realized that they made serious efforts to sound 'correct;' otherwise, they would feel embarrassed. This data artifact enriched the description of what was going on in offline and online classrooms.

The data from the interviews, the students' interactions, and teaching journal entries were analyzed qualitatively and narratively. Thematic analysis was employed to describe emergent and important themes concerning the participants' engagement in these mediated tasks. The steps included data familiarization, initial codes generation, the search for themes among codes, themes review, defining and giving names for themes, and report production (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data were classified on the basis of the phases of interactions while the teacher and students were engaging in classroom discussion or between students while they were in the online chats, values of the interactions, and patterns of the interactions. Drawing from the phases, responses were coded, and the recurring emergent codes became themes representing data relevant to research questions (Braun & Wilkinson, 2003; Widodo, 2016). Classroom discourse analysis was used to make sense of the categorized data.

Findings and Discussion

Based on the data analysis, there were three emerging themes about reading engagement resulting from the use of portfolio and student video-creation tasks: (1) building dialogic reading through the portfolio task, (2) experiencing and reflection activity mediated by the video-creation task, and (3) building affect-experience through reading for social purposes. These findings are presented in a narrative accompanied by discussion.

Building Dialogic Reading through the Portfolio Task

The students' perceptions of portfolio and student video-creation tasks were generally positive. All of the students agreed that both tasks enabled them to build learning ownership. In this section, how the portfolio shaped students' engagement in reading in the pre-task stage was reported. In this study, the process of selecting a reading topic for a weekly portfolio assignment was a dialogic meaning making process. When selecting a text, students related it to their own social experience. From the text selection process, the students personalized their own learning. In the interview, they expressed that their personal interest and currency of a topic impacted the selection of a particular reading text. They observed:

> Comment 1: When I ran into difficulty in understanding my text, I slowed my reading which always helped. I also asked my friends to learn their views on the issue.
>
> Comment 2: I usually look up a difficult word in my dictionary, and I read for the main idea. Afterward, I read my text again until I got a better understanding of the text. The video-creation project required me to learn how to pronounce each word in my article and trained me to learn how to deliver the information to others.
>
> Comment 3: I re-read the article until I got a complete understanding. I also believed that feeling difficult was because we lacked experience in reading texts and simply did not practice enough; therefore, I browsed for other sources to help my understanding.

These comments indicated that the tasks could build learner autonomy as they built ownership of learning. Learner autonomy to govern their learning and use of the language is paramount (Feryok, 2013). Van Lier (1996) describes choice and responsibility as central characters. In this study, during stages of reading activities, the students showed their ups and downs. In the interviews, they admitted that sometimes they chose an easy text to read. The text was only two or three paragraphs long and did not challenge their development of linguistic resources or content knowledge. There are several possible reasons for

this. For example, they might have wanted to seek easiness when completing the task or lacked knowledge on which text was appropriate for their reading level. The teacher's guidance on topic selection with its degree of sufficient linguistic challenges is therefore highly required in order to make reading more meaningful for the students' learning. As students might select some easy texts to read for the sake of doing the portfolio but not for the joy of reading, the teacher's checking activity has to guarantee that the students are challenged for their growth of the text's understanding.

The students did not always play safe by selecting texts based on what they thought easy in terms of topic comprehension, grammatical structures, and unfamiliar vocabulary. There were times when they picked the topic as they were driven more by the fact that the text gave significant information to them, and they could see themselves giving benefits to peers later when they created a video. Komiyama (2013) asserts that receiving recognition from others (peers), along with a drive to outperform others, supports students' motivation to read. Referring to this situation, the students found the task interesting to do because they were motivated by the appreciation derived from peers' responses. As pointed out by Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) that motivation exists in a social context, in this study, despite the difficulties the students may have faced when dealing with the text, they read and chose the text for weekly portfolios. They reported that the difficulties engaged them in reading to surmount the text. They navigated through search engines to learn more about the topic, consulted a dictionary, guessed unfamiliar words, asked friends for the words' meanings, and discussed the topics with peers, all of which were the methods they utilized to get involved with texts linguistically. Thus, it appeared that online and offline interactions cognitively built on students' investment to read more widely and more persistently and that complementing online reading and interaction with offline encounters could minimize distraction and push readers to read. Widodo's (2016) finding shows that self-initiated texts allow students to take responsibility for navigating texts and sharing such texts with friends. When students are free to choose what to read, they become more invested in what they read, more strategic with regard to problems they face in difficult texts, and more reactive to what they read (Guthrie et al., 2012; Kusumaningputri, 2020; Yamashita, 2015).

They also become more socially open (Ivey, 2014), which feeds on their autonomy.

In the classroom, the students were checked for their portfolio. Each of them, on a weekly basis, was invited to share their topic in front of the class to practice their understanding and mediate dialogic interactions. Through my teaching journal, I noted a time when a student caught peers' attention from his or her classroom presentation. There was one Thai student who presented about a traditional Thai dance. This engaged the whole class in a dialogue of cross-cultural questions about not only Thai dance, but also Thai food, traditional clothes, people, and songs. The student even ended up singing a Thai song to the class. This finding showed how the portfolio task mediated a dialogue of meaning making activity with texts and peers. Not only did portfolio build self-dialogic reading and peer-dialog experiences but it also provided cognitive feeds. Wolf (2010, 2018) investigated how readers' brain responded to online environments and electronic texts. She attested that the reading brain, which read in-print materials, enjoyed greater superiority compared to one reading screen text (Falling Walls Foundation, 2019). However, encouraging students to read in-print materials may not be relevant in today's Internet age. Through this mediated task, students who selected e-texts to read for a weekly issue successfully maintained interest and improved understanding by searching and reading other texts online. They were also invested because they projected their happiness and feeling of satisfaction on their success in answering peers' questions. In fac, students' investment leads to deep reading, which also sharpens critical thinking and empathy (Wolf, 2018). This is to say that the mediated tasks seem promising as classroom instruction that increases online readers' engagement where comprehension and investment are the goals.

Experiencing and Reflecting Activity through the Student Video-creation Task

When working with video-creation, students reported that they did drafting before executing the video-draft. Through this drafting, they focused on certain components such as the duration of the video, the content of information, the structure of the information presentation, the pronunciation, and technical challenges. In the interviews, almost everybody admitted that they should have

re-taken the video-creation three to five times to ensure the projected output. They also mentioned that they always evaluated what they had done before they uploaded the video in the classroom Facebook group. They explained that they needed the video to be correct and attractive because their friends and teacher would watch it. They perceived the video-creation as a kind of accumulation of their text comprehension. It reflected their understanding of what they had done. This finding suggested that video-creation can be a socially constructed instruction that activates reflection and drives the students to strive to excel.

The tasks were also reported to give the students an opportunity to learn reading from a new perspective. Through different stages, the students simultaneously activated their language skills: writing, listening, and speaking. After selecting a text to read every week, they read the text thoroughly for comprehension both linguistically and for information validity, as exemplified below.

> Comment 4: The tasks actually affected me in many particular ways. After I read the article, I got some new vocabulary, and I practiced my writing skill which required some essential grammar and structures and various writing styles. I even got a chance to practice my speaking skill as well. Even after the individual video creation was done, I got a chance to practice my listening skill with the help of my friend's fascinating videos. That was a full-time English package that started from reading. By all means, I enjoy my reading package very much nowadays.

> Comment 5: By working on the video creation, I could measure how much I had understood my reading text. If I could present it in the video well, it showed that I had really understood my reading texts. Reading portfolio could improve my reading activities. Now I read every week. I believe this task is helpful because I got more knowledge.

Empirical data showed that the tasks actively engaged the students' dynamic and reflective social interaction online. Through video-creation and friends' videos viewing, they learned from each other. Facebook was observed to

mediate social interaction for learning. Each student contributed to a classmate's video by asking detailed information in the video. Not only did they ask for an explanation, but they also shared experience about the topic, gave opinions, and challenged peers' stances on a topic (Figure 1). When a topic caught peers' attention, up to 40 comments were posted. The community of video-author and peer-as-audience enabled them to perceive that learning sources could come from peers and mediate negotiation of a text's meaning making. Below is one of the online posting artifacts from students' interaction in a video-enjoying activity and comments from the interview.

Figure 1

One Student's Learning Artifact from Facebook Posting

Comment 6: The tasks helped me interact online as we (friends and I) could correct each other in the Facebook column for responses, such as spelling mistakes. The video-creation project also connected me with friends online and offline because we talked about the text's topic which was so interesting that the interaction led to outside class talks.

Comment 7: Actually, they gave me some opportunities because I could communicate with friends by commenting on the videos of my friends. Sometimes, they commented on my video and I got the questions I

didn't know what the answers were. I tried to search on the Internet, and it actually gave me more words and information.

Reflecting from the interview data, the tasks gave the students social and cognitive benefits. Through the tasks, the students learned how to articulate their own views when their peers asked questions about details and content interpretation. They reflected on others' ideas and negotiated shared meaning. These dialogic activities enabled the students to broaden their learning by evaluating perspectives and seeing other alternative viewpoints, which eventually resulted in development of perspectives.

Building Affect-experience through Reading for Social Purposes

As pointed out earlier, the portfolio and video-creation tasks engaged the students to experience dialogic reading and reflective practices. Through the video-creation task, students learned that reading was not individual but social. When they worked through the video, they were asked to see themselves as giving others benefits. With this perspective, in the drafting process, they prepared the video for audiences (peers). Figure 2 is an example of how a student contextualized her reading for audiences. Driven by this motive and a desire for recognition, the students rehearsed over several challenges of linguistic resources, context, content, and techniques. At the end of the video-creation task, they felt that they became more invested in the reading, had increased self-confidence, and decreased anxiety. The students gave testimonies in their Facebook postings:

Comment 8: The effect of making this video project is that I am able to increase my self-confidence. I can learn how to deliver a message to the audience, and that is the main point. I can improve my reading activities in ways that are more interesting.

Comment 9: I can improve my confidence using English in public like posting comments and others' feedback. I also do not feel bored because the video project makes my reading activities more interesting.

Comment 10: Because of this video creation task, I learned specific strategies to overcome my speaking anxiety and to improve my speaking skills. The tasks also helped me be a more critical thinker and more aware of my word choice, body language, and communication skills.

Comment 11: I can decrease my fear of speaking in public, especially on social media like Facebook. I read my article; I learned to understand what I was going to say to my friends through this video. I am very proud that I did it without memorizing my material in detail because I have learned how.

Figure 2

One Student's Video Creation in the Form of a Teacher Giving an Explanation to Children

The interview data indicated that the tasks had a positive influence on students' reading engagement. They were seen as sources of motivation to push them to read harder and to give their best performance because their works were recognized, enjoyed, and negotiated by their teacher and classmates. In the interview, students mentioned that the teacher's involvement in the digital interaction was rated as supportive and motivating as the teacher recognized

students' work. This contributed to a positive classroom climate (Lin et al., 2016; Mazer et al., 2007). Additionally, positive comments made by peers on their successful performance, speech clarity, effective content presentation, and technical challenges were some of the factors contributing to enhancement of their self-confidence. Students' success in understanding texts and creating videos led to a feeling of accomplishment. In fact, this is a building block of self-confidence. Supported by a safe digital learning platform, through tasks, motivation is preserved. Anderson (2014) contends that motivation is crucial in the development of positive reading practices and behavior. Moreover, the feeling that the students in this study enjoyed the class impacted the way they perceived reading activities. They felt that extending what they had read in the video format was fun. Social interactions generated from the digital video in an extended classroom reflected the students' engagement and chances of social support. The tasks also contributed to their feeling of readiness to face another language skill class, like speaking. One of the reported benefits of these tasks was lessening anxiety when speaking in public, as they felt more prepared to enjoy speaking in class. They had opportunities to exercise their pronunciation, their lexical choice, and their way of presenting things. Simply put, the tasks helped them present their sense of being. Facilitating video-postings and online discussions, Facebook enhanced students' text understanding and communication skills. It positioned the students as writers, authors, and presenters of their stance. In this way, students constructed their identities as valid readers-presenters. This is in line with Hafner and others' (2015) concept of the affordances of digital tools for literacy.

Conclusion

This study has reported empirical evidence on how portfolio and video-creation mediated reading as a dialogic practice. The findings suggested that, firstly, portfolio and digital media authoring exercised students' autonomous textual meaning making. Secondly, they also facilitated opportunities for peer discussion and negotiation as students collaborated to construct meaning and understanding of an issue. From this opportunity, students with different proficiencies were enabled to fill in the gaps and complete the puzzle when responding through questions, disagreement, and deliberation. Thirdly, the tasks helped them gain affective support in their language and communication skills'

growth. Through interactions between peers and between students and the teacher, students displayed a good readers' attitude toward reading in that they felt that reading activity afforded them not only enhancement of knowledge but also a contribution to their immediate society and peers. Cognitively, the mediated tasks involving offline and online interaction with society (such as peers and digital public) contributed to preserving students' longer attention to and investment in reading, which eventually resulted in more in-depth reading.

Implications from this study include the following. First, daily offline and online interactions enhance students' sensory personal experiences. This is to say that the key to success in reading in EFL settings is the feeling that the task is important and that it can result in an immediate impact which, for example, may take the form of a score, teachers' appreciation, or comments from others. To optimize this reading, teachers can enhance the use of digital platforms for learning and create a support system in the form of more students or other people participating in online discussions. Secondly, the use of tasks as media for dialogic reading has proven to influence students as social readers. However, they may be more useful for extensive texts. Taking a different genre of text, such as an academic text like a journal article, will be interesting to extend the discussion of dialogic reading as social practice.

About the Author

Reni Kusumaningputri is a senior lecturer at the University of Jember. Her main research interests lie in English as a lingua franca/global Englishes, multilingualism, intercultural communication, and language acquisition and learning.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank the participants who allowed me to document their experiences. My sincere thanks also go to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful feedback on the manuscript.

References

Anderson, N. J. (2014). Developing engaged L2 readers. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 170–188). Heinle Cengage.

Araque, J. E. D., & Blanco, C. E. D. (2015). The Collaborative Portfolio: Exploring Reading Skills Through Peer Tutoring. *Enletawa journal*, *8*(1), 9–24.

Aukerman, M. (2013). Rereading comprehension pedagogies: Toward a dialogic teaching ethic that honors student sense making. *Dialogic Pedagogy: An International Online Journal*, *1*, 1–31. https://doi.org/10.5195/dpj.2013.9

Barret, N. M. (2020). Talking through the design: Supporting students' digital video composing processes through dialogic engagement. In P. M. Sullivan., J. L. Lantz, & B. A. Sullivan (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on integrating digital technology with literacies pedagogies* (pp. 32–51). IGI Global.

Bollinger, C. M. B., Lupo, S. M., & Sullivan, B. A. 2020. Nobody really does the reading: Rethinking reading accountability using technology tools. In P. M. Sullivan., J. L. Lantz, & B. A. Sullivan (Eds.) (pp. 431–453). *Handbook of Research on integrating digital technology with literacies pedagogies*. IGI Global.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*, 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Wilkinson, S. (2003). Liability or asset? Women talk about the vagina. *Psychology of Women Section Review*, *5*, 28–42.

Brost, B. D., & Bradley, K. A. (2006). Student compliance with assigned reading: A case study. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *6*(2), 101–111.

Carr N. (2011). *The shallows: what the Internet is doing to our brains*. WW Norton.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage.

Cox, M. I., & Assis-Peterson, A. A. (1999). Critical pedagogy in ELT: Images of Brazilian teachers of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*, 433–451. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587673

de la Croix, A., Barrett, A., & Stenfors, T. (2018). How to do research interviews in different ways. *The Clinical Teacher*, *15*(6), 451–456. https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.12953

De Ramirez, L. L. (2010). *Empower English language learners with tools from the web*. Sage Company.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation (2nd ed.)*. Longman.

Engin, M. (2014). Extending the flipped classroom model: Developing second language writing skills through student-created digital videos. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14*(5), 12–26. https://doi.org/10.14434/josotlv14i5.12829

Falling Walls Foundation. (2019, November 2019). *Neuroscience of reading* [Video]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j6TEiV49Fa4

Feldman, G. (2011). If ethnographer is more than participant-observation, then relations are more than connections: The case for nonlocal ethnography in a world of apparatuses. *Anthropological Theory*, *11*, 375–395.

Feryok, A. (2013). Teaching for learner autonomy: The teacher's role and sociocultural theory. *Innovation in language learning and teaching*, *7*(3), 213– 225. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2013.836203

Gleason, J. (2014). “It helps me get closer to their writing experience” Classroom ethnography and the role of technology in third-year FL courses. *System*, *47*, 125–138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.023

Guthrie J. T., Wigfield A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In P. B. Mosenthal, M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, Volume III* (pp. 403–422). Lawrence Erlbaum.

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S.L. Christenson et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 601–634). Springer.

Hafner, C. A., Chik, A., & Jones, R. A. (2015). Digital literacies and language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, *19*(3), 1–7. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44426

Hafner, C. A., & Miller, L. (2011). Fostering learner autonomy in English for science: A collaborative digital video project in a technological learning environment. *Language learning & technology, 15*(3), 68–86. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44263

Hamilton, M. (1999). Ethnography for classrooms: Constructing a reflective curriculum for literacy. *Curriculum Studies*, *7*(3), 429–444. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681369900200074

Hatteberg, S. J. & Steffy, K. (2013). Increasing Reading compliance of undergraduates: An evaluation of compliance methods. *Teaching Sociology*, *4*(4). 346–352. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0092055X13490752

Hedgcock, J. S., & Ferris, D. R. (2009). *Teaching readers of English: Students, texts, and contexts*. Routledge

Henry, A. (2019). Online media creation and L2 motivation: A socially situated perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, *53*(2), 372–404. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.485

Hoeft, M. E. (2012). Why university students don't read: What professors can do to increase compliance? *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *6*(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2012.060212

Huang, S., Capps, M., Blacklock, J., & Garza, M. (2014). Reading habits of college students in the United States. *Reading Psychology*, *35*(5), 437–467. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2012.739593

Ito, M., Horst, H., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P. B., …Trip, L. (2008). *Living and learning with new media: Summary of findings from the digital youth project the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Reports on Digital Media and Learning*. https://www.macfound.org/press/grantee-publications/living-and-learning-with-new-media-summary-of-findings-from-the-digital-youth-project

Ivey, G. (2014). The social side of engaged reading for young adolescents. *The Reading Teacher*, *68*(3), 165–171. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1268

Ivey, G., & Johnston, P. H. (2015). Engaged reading as a collaborative transformative practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *47*(3) 297–327. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1086296X15619731

Jiang, L. (2017). The affordances of digital multimodal composing for EFL learning. *ELT Journal*, *71*(4), 413–422. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw098

Kerr, M. M. & Frese, K. M. (2016). Reading to learn or learning to read? Engaging college students in course readings. *College Teaching*, *65*(1), 28–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2016.1222577

Kiili, C. (2012). *Online reading as an individual and social practice*. [Doctoral thesis, the University of Jyväskylä]. University of Jyväskylä. https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/38394/978-951-39-4795-8.pdf?sequence=1

Komiyama, R. (2013). Factors underlying second language reading motivation of adult EAP students. *Reading in a foreign language*, *25*(2), 149–169.

Köse, N. (2006). Effects of portfolio implementation and assessment on critical reading and learner autonomy of ELT students. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. *Çukurova Universitesi: Adana*.

Kusumaningputri, R. (2014). Indonesian learners' motivation in English reading classroom. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *4*(2), 134–149.

Kusumaningputri, R. (2020). Engaging Dialogues to experience a bigger picture: The potentials of portfolios, digital storytelling with video shows for reading activities. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, *17*(1), 21–37.

Liaw, M, -L., & English, K. Technologies for teaching and learning L2 Reading. In C. A. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.). *The Handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 62–76). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lim, F. V. (2018). Developing a systemic functional approach to teach multimodal literacy. *Functional Linguistics*, *5*(13), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40554-018-0066-8

Lin, V., Kang, Y., Liu, G., & Lin, W. (2016). Participants' interactions and experiences on Facebook group in an EFL course in Taiwan. *Asia-Pacific Education Research*, *25*, 99–109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-015-0239-0

Lo, Y. (2010). Implementing reflective portfolios for promoting autonomous learning among EFL college students in Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(1) 77–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168809346509

Lo, Y. H. G. (2011). "Learning English is like going to hell": Using learner stories to make critical pedagogical decisions. *TESOL Journal*, *2*(2), 240–258. https://doi.org/10.5054/tj.2011.234766

Loh, K. K., & Kanai, R. (2015). How has the Internet reshaped human cognition? *The Neuroscientist*, *22*(5), 506–520. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073858415595005

Meyer, E., & Forester, L. (2015). Implementing student-produced video projects in language courses: Guidelines and lessons learned. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, *48*(2), 192–210.

Meyer, E.J., Wade, A., & Abrami, P. C. (2013). Teaching with electronic portfolios to develop 21st century literacies. *LEARNing Landscapes*, *6*(2), 265–282. https://doi.org/10.36510/learnland.v6i2.616

Mazer, J. P., Murphy, R. E., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). I'll see you on "Facebook": The effects of computer-mediated teacher self-disclosure on student motivation, affective learning, and classroom climate. *Communication Education*, *56*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520601009710

Miller, P. J., & Goodnow, J. (1995). Cultural practices: Toward an integration of culture and development. In J. J. Goodnow, P. J. Miller & F. Kessel (Eds.), *Cultural practices as contexts for development* (pp. 5–16). Jossey-Bass.

Moje E. B., Overby M., Tysvaer N., Morris K. (2008). The complex world of adolescent literacy: Myths, motivations, and mysteries. *Harvard Educational Review*, *78*(1), 107–154. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.78.1.54468j6204x24157

Moore, N., Knight, G., & Kiburz, C. (2014). Developing an assessed reading portfolio to improve reading habits and raise test results. In H. Emery and N. Moore (Eds.), *Teaching, learning and researching reading in EFL* (pp. 214–237).TESOL Arabia.

Naqvi, S. (2015, September). Student created digital video and language learning: Voices from Omani classrooms. In *Third 21st CAF Conference at Harvard, in Boston, USA* (Vol. 6, No. 1). http://www.21caf.org/uploads/1/3/5/2/13527682/24_navqi.pdf

Palincsar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*(1), 345–375.

Prawat, R. S., & Floden, R. E. (1994). Philosophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *29*(1), 37–48.

Roberts, K A. (2011). Imagine deep learning. *Michigan Sociological Review*. *25*, 1–18. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41289188

Ryan, T. E. (2006). Motivating novice students to read their textbooks. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *33*(2), 135–141.

Sana, F., Weston T., & Cepeda N. J. (2013). Laptop multitasking hinders classroom learning for both users and nearby peers. *Computers & Education*, *62*, 24–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.10.003

Sharma, A., Van Hoof, H. B., & Ramsay, C. (2019). The influence of time on the decisions that students make about their academic reading. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417731200

St Clair-Thompson, H., Graham, A., & Marsham, S. (2018). Exploring the reading practices of undergraduate students. *Education Inquiry*, *9*(3), 284–298. https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2017.1380487

Suarcaya, P., & Prasasti, W. D. (2017). Investigating students; critical reading: Critical literacy in EFL setting. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *14*(2), 220–232.

Thomas, C., Britt, P., Blackbourn, J. M., Blackbourn, R., Papason, B., Tyler, J. L., & Williams, F. K. (2005). Portfolio assessment: A guide for teachers and administrators. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal-Electronic*, *23*(4), 1–8.

Tomasek, T. (2009). Critical reading: Using reading prompts to promote active engagement with text. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 127–132.

Ulla, M. B., & Perales, W. F. (2020). The adoption of Facebook as a virtual class whiteboard: Promoting EFL students' engagement in language tasks. *TESOL Journal*, *11*(3),1–4. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.515

van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Pearson Education

Verlaan, W., Shull, M., Mims, M., & Nelson, G. (2016). Using portfolios and students-led conferences to increase student motivation and parental engagement. In E. E. Martinez & J. Pilgrim (Eds.), 2016 Literacy summit yearbook (pp.43–51). http://www.literacyprofessional.org/uploads/4/8/0/3/48036385/2016_literacy_summit_yearbook.pdf

Vesudevan, L. (2010). Education remix: New media, literacies, and the emerging digital geographies. *Digital Culture & Education*, *2*(1), 62–82.

Wang, X. (2013). The construction of researcher–researched relationships in school ethnography: Doing research, participating in the field and reflecting

on ethical dilemmas. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26, 763–779. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2012.666287

Ward, A. F. (2013). Supernormal: How the Internet is changing our memories and our minds. *Psychological Inquiry*, *24*(4), 341–348. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2013.850148

Watson-Gegeo, K. (1997). Classroom ethnography. In N. Hornberger & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, Vol. 8: Research methods in language and education. Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4535-0_13

Wells, G. (2002). Learning and teaching for understanding: The key role of collaborative knowledge building. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints* (pp. 1–41). Elsevier.

Widodo, H. P. (2015). Designing and implementing task-based Vocational English (VE) materials: Text, language, task, and context. In H. Reinders & M. Thomas (Eds.), *Contemporary task-based language learning and teaching (TBLT) in Asia: Challenges, opportunities and future directions* (pp. 291–312). Bloomsbury.

Widodo, H. P. (2016). Engaging students in literature circles: Vocational English reading programs. *Asia Pacific Education Research*, *25*(2), 347–359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-015-0269-7

Widodo, H.P., Budi, B. A., Wijayanti, F. (2016). Poetry writing 2.0: Learning to write creatively in a blended language learning environment. *Electronic Journal of Language Teaching*, *13*(1), 30–48.

Wolf, M. (2010). *Our 'deep reading' brain: Its digital evolution poses questions Neiman summer report*. https://niemanreports.org/articles/our-deep-reading-brain-its-digital-evolution-poses-questions/

Wolf, M. (2018). *Reader, Come home: The reading brain in a digital world*. Harper Collins Publishers.

Yamashita, J. (2015). In search of the nature of extensive reading in L2: Cognitive, affective, and pedagogical perspectives. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *27* (1), 168–181.

Appendix

Questions for students in the interview sessions

1. Can you please share your experience on how you learn reading through the tasks in general?
2. Do you feel the tasks help you read more?
3. Can you tell me what you have learned in the portfolio and in the classroom activity?
4. What are the challenges you have when working on a portfolio and in the classroom activity?
5. Can you tell me what you have learned in the student-creation phase (when you created your videos for Facebook postings)?
6. Did you experience challenges in this phase? If yes, what were they?
7. Which part of the Facebook activities did you enjoy the most? Why?
8. What was the less favorite task/phase in the entire project? Why was it?
9. What was the most memorable experience regarding your reading and text's negotiation in this entire process? Why was it so?