Jurnal Guru Dikmen dan Diksus
Volume 8 Number 2, 2025. Page 103-112
p-ISSN: 2655-481x, e-ISSN: 2723-6404

Developing an Inclusive Video Performance Method for Vocational Students' Procedure Text Learning

Widwi Astuti
SMKN 2 Tulungagung, Indonesia

Email: Widwiastuti2@gmail.com

(Received: June 10, 2022; Accepted: October 25, 2022; Published: December 30, 2025)

ABSTRACT

Inclusive classrooms require assessment practices that preserve curricular expectations while reducing avoidable participation barriers. This qualitative descriptive best-practice study examined a video-performance method for procedure-text learning in a vocational high school. The original classroom context involved two students who experienced speech-production barriers during live presentations and had previously encountered peer ridicule. The intervention retained the same procedure-text task for all students but allowed the performance to be recorded, edited, and supported with synchronized written captions when oral explanation was difficult. Data were drawn from students' written procedure texts, video products, classroom observations, and discussion of the submitted work. Both focal students produced procedure texts containing the expected purpose, materials, ordered steps, and closing elements and completed understandable performance videos. In the reported classroom experience, video submission reduced exposure to immediate ridicule during presentation, supported task completion, and was associated with greater confidence and perceived equality of assignment demands. The findings suggest that flexible multimodal performance can function as an inclusive assessment accommodation without changing the core learning objective. Because the study involved only two focal students and no comparison condition or standardized psychosocial measure, the results should be interpreted as contextual evidence of feasibility rather than causal proof of effectiveness.

Keywords: inclusive education; procedure text; video performance; vocational education; bullying prevention

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education is grounded in the principle that learner diversity should be addressed through participation, access, and meaningful engagement in common learning environments rather than through unnecessary separation. Contemporary research emphasizes that inclusion is not achieved simply by placing students in the same classroom; it requires instructional, assessment, social, and organizational practices that remove barriers to participation (Ainscow, 2020; Amor et al., 2019; Florian, 2014; Göransson & Nilholm, 2014; Messiou, 2017). In vocational education, this requirement is particularly important because learning frequently combines language, demonstration, practical performance, and public presentation.

The source classroom at SMKN 2 Tulungagung included two students who had difficulty producing fluent speech during live procedure-text presentations. Their classmates sometimes responded with ridicule, creating a participation barrier and lowering confidence. Bullying and peer victimization are associated with adverse educational and psychosocial outcomes, and students with disabilities or other visible differences can face elevated vulnerability (Rose et al., 2011; Blake et al., 2012; Maïano et al., 2016; Zych et al., 2019; Hall, 2017). School responses therefore need to combine anti-bullying norms with instructional arrangements that do not unnecessarily expose a learner's difficulty as the defining feature of assessment.

Video-supported performance offers one possible route. Digital video can support rehearsal, multimodal expression, self-review, and asynchronous presentation, while captions and on-screen text can supplement or substitute parts of oral delivery without changing the conceptual content being assessed (Kay, 2012; Fiorella & Mayer, 2018; Noetel et al., 2021; Brame, 2016; Guo et al., 2014). The present article therefore examines how a video-performance method was implemented for procedure-text learning, how it supported equitable task completion, and what limitations should be considered before broader adoption.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Inclusive Pedagogy, Participation, and Assessment

Inclusive pedagogy seeks to extend what is ordinarily available to everyone rather than create a stigmatizing parallel curriculum for selected learners. This orientation is consistent with research on inclusive teaching, universal design, differentiated access, and student participation (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Waitoller & Artiles, 2013; Capp, 2017; Rao et al., 2014; Al-Azawei et al., 2016). In assessment, equity does not necessarily mean identical modes of response; it means that the assessment captures the intended construct while minimizing irrelevant barriers. Flexible response formats, accessible digital materials, and multimodal representation can therefore support fairness when they preserve the same learning goal (Rose & Meyer, 2002; Basham et al., 2016; Ok et al., 2017; Smith & Lowrey, 2017).

Bullying, Belonging, and Classroom Safety

Peer acceptance and psychological safety are central to participation. Meta-analytic and longitudinal evidence links bullying involvement to poorer adjustment and educational outcomes, while whole-school prevention, teacher responsiveness, peer norms, and supportive classroom climates can reduce risk (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Gaffney et al., 2019; Menesini & Salmivalli, 2017; Saarento et al., 2015; Waasdorp et al., 2012). For students who experience communication differences, instructional design should avoid turning a required performance into a predictable trigger for public humiliation. The goal is not to remove challenge but to create a credible pathway for demonstrating competence.

Video, Multimodality, and Procedure-Text Learning

Procedure texts require students to organize goals, materials, actions, sequence, and language choices so that another person can reproduce a process. A video performance can make this procedural logic visible by coordinating action, written language, images, and timing. Research on multimedia learning, student-generated video, and digital storytelling indicates that learner-created media can promote planning, active processing, communication, and reflection when the task is aligned with explicit criteria (Mayer, 2021; Kearney & Schuck, 2006; Hoban & Nielsen, 2013; Greene & Crespi, 2012; Snelson, 2018; Reyna et al., 2018). Captions can also improve access and comprehension for many learners, not only those with identified disabilities (Gernsbacher, 2015; Linder, 2016; Morris et al., 2016).

METHODS

Design and Context

The study used a qualitative descriptive best-practice design in a vocational high-school Indonesian-language class. The focal cases were two students, referred to as Student A and Student B, who experienced speech-production barriers during live presentation. The purpose was not to diagnose the students or test a clinical intervention, but to document whether an alternative presentation format could preserve the procedure-text learning objective while reducing a classroom participation barrier. Qualitative description is appropriate when the aim is to provide a practice-near account of an educational process and its observed outcomes (Sandelowski, 2000; Kim et al., 2017).

Learning and Assessment Procedure

All students worked toward the same core outcome: composing a procedure text and demonstrating the procedure. The adapted pathway allowed students to record the performance using a mobile device, edit the sequence, and add written text synchronized with actions when spoken explanation was difficult. The completed videos were shared through familiar digital channels and subsequently discussed in class. This retained the academic demand while varying the response mode, consistent with inclusive and multimodal assessment principles (Cumming & Dickson, 2013; Dalton, 2017; CAST, 2018).

Stage	Learning activity	Inclusive function
1. Planning	Select a procedure topic and identify purpose, materials, and steps.	Same curricular target for all students.
2. Writing	Compose the complete procedure text in sequence.	Written language demonstrates conceptual organization.
3. Recording	Demonstrate the procedure using a mobile phone.	Allows rehearsal and repeated takes.
4. Editing	Add captions/on-screen text, images, or music where appropriate.	Reduces dependence on fluent live speech while preserving meaning.
5. Sharing	Submit/share the video and discuss it with classmates.	Creates a common product format and peer-feedback opportunity.

Data Sources and Analysis

Evidence consisted of the two students' written procedure texts, their performance videos, classroom observations, and discussion of the products. Analysis focused on whether the written and video products represented the expected procedure-text components, whether the task could be completed, and how the presentation format affected observed confidence and peer response. No standardized bullying scale, self-efficacy instrument, or pretest-posttest measure was reported; consequently, the analysis remains descriptive.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Procedure-Text Products and Video Performance

Both focal students completed procedure texts containing the expected elements: purpose, materials or tools, ordered steps, and a closing or reaffirming element. Student A produced a video on preparing milk coffee, while Student B demonstrated the use of hand sanitizer. In both cases, the action sequence remained visible and understandable. Where spoken narration was difficult, written captions were synchronized with the demonstrated steps. This adaptation changed the communication channel rather than the learning target.

Observed dimension	Student A	Student B	Interpretation
Procedure-text structure	Completed	Completed	Both demonstrated the required textual organization.
Practical demonstration	Video performance	Video performance	Both enacted the written procedure.
Oral narration	Limited; text used as support	Limited; text used as support	Captions reduced dependence on live fluent speech.
Task completion	Completed	Completed	The alternative mode enabled full submission.
Reported classroom response	No ridicule during video presentation	No ridicule during video presentation	The format reduced immediate exposure to the prior trigger.

The classroom account indicates that the video format supported participation and confidence while reducing the immediate conditions in which ridicule had previously occurred. This interpretation is consistent with inclusive-pedagogy research showing that flexible participation routes can increase access without lowering expectations (Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Capp, 2017). It is also compatible with evidence that student-generated video can support ownership, rehearsal, and communication (Hoban & Nielsen, 2013; Greene & Crespi, 2012; Reyna et al., 2018).

Equity Without Lowering the Learning Objective

A central strength of the approach is that the focal students were not assigned an easier content task. They still had to construct a coherent procedure text and demonstrate its execution. The accommodation concerned modality: live oral delivery could be replaced or supplemented by edited visual performance and written captions. This distinction is important because inclusive assessment should reduce construct-irrelevant barriers while preserving the intended competence (Rao et al., 2014; Basham et al., 2016; Ok et al., 2017).

The approach also has a broader classroom rationale. Captions, replay, and asynchronous viewing can benefit many learners by allowing information to be processed at a manageable pace. Multimedia research cautions, however, that decorative elements, excessive text, and unnecessary music can create cognitive load. Video assignments therefore require concise criteria, accessible captions, purposeful editing, and attention to privacy and consent (Mayer, 2021; Brame, 2016; Fiorella & Mayer, 2018; Noetel et al., 2021).

Bullying Prevention and Classroom Climate

The source account reports that the two students no longer experienced ridicule during the video-based presentation and appeared more confident. This is educationally meaningful, but the intervention should not be interpreted as a substitute for school-wide anti-bullying work. Evidence shows that sustained prevention depends on coordinated teacher practices, peer norms, reporting mechanisms, and school climate (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Menesini & Salmivalli, 2017; Gaffney et al., 2019; Saarento et al., 2015). Video performance is therefore best understood as one inclusive instructional adjustment within a broader safeguarding strategy.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Teachers implementing this approach should begin by identifying the exact construct to be assessed. If the target is procedure-text organization and accurate demonstration, captions and edited video can be legitimate supports. If spontaneous oral fluency itself is the target, a different accommodation plan is

required. Rubrics should separate content accuracy, sequence, language, demonstration, and media quality so that editing sophistication does not overshadow the subject objective. Students should also receive explicit guidance on respectful peer feedback, digital privacy, and whether videos may be posted publicly.

LIMITATIONS

The study is based on two focal students in one school and uses descriptive classroom evidence. It does not report systematic sampling, interview protocols, coding procedures, inter-rater checking, standardized measures, or a comparison group. Statements about increased confidence and the absence of bullying are based on observed classroom experience rather than validated pre-post instruments. The article therefore supports feasibility and contextual usefulness, not causal effectiveness or generalizability. Future research should include larger samples, student voice, structured observation, validated measures of belonging and bullying, and comparison of live, recorded, captioned, and other accessible presentation formats.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The video-performance method provided an accessible route for two vocational students with speech-production barriers to complete the same procedure-text learning task as their peers. By combining written procedure texts, recorded demonstrations, and synchronized captions, the method preserved the core academic objective while reducing dependence on live fluent speech. In the reported classroom context, both students completed understandable products, participated in class discussion, and were not subjected to the ridicule that had accompanied earlier live presentations. Schools should treat such flexibility as part of inclusive assessment design and combine it with explicit anti-bullying procedures, privacy safeguards, accessible video.

REFERENCES

The broader evidence base used to interpret this case also shows that social inclusion depends on peer-group membership and teacher attitudes (Bossaert et al., 2013; de Boer et al., 2011; Koster et al., 2009; Ruijs & Peetsma, 2009), while disability-related bullying remains a recurrent concern across settings (Heiman & Olenik-Shemesh, 2015; Rose et al., 2009; Rose et al., 2015; Sentenac et al., 2011; Rose & Gage, 2017). These findings reinforce the need to evaluate both academic access and social participation when implementing inclusive assessment.

Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education: Lessons from international experiences. Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy, 6(1), 7–16.

Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). Universal Design for Learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 16(3), 39–56.

Amor, A. M., Hagiwara, M., Shogren, K. A., Thompson, J. R., Verdugo, M. A., Burke, K. M., & Aguayo, V. (2019). International perspectives and trends in research on inclusive education: A systematic review. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 23(12), 1277–1295.

Basham, J. D., Hall, T. E., Carter, R. A., & Stahl, W. M. (2016). An operationalized understanding of personalized learning. Journal of Special Education Technology, 31(3), 126–136.

Blake, J. J., Lund, E. M., Zhou, Q., Kwok, O. M., & Benz, M. R. (2012). National prevalence rates of bully victimization among students with disabilities in the United States. School Psychology Quarterly, 27(4), 210–222.

Brame, C. J. (2016). Effective educational videos: Principles and guidelines for maximizing student learning from video content. CBE—Life Sciences Education, 15(4), es6.

Capp, M. J. (2017). The effectiveness of Universal Design for Learning: A meta-analysis of literature between 2013 and 2016. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21(8), 791–807.

Cumming, T. M., & Dickson, S. (2013). Educational accountability tests, social and legal inclusion approaches to discrimination for students with disability: A national case study from Australia. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 20(2), 221–239.

Dalton, E. M. (2017). Beyond Universal Design for Learning: Guiding principles to reduce barriers to digital & media literacy competence. Journal of Media Literacy Education, 9(2), 17–29.

Fiorella, L., & Mayer, R. E. (2018). What works and doesn't work with instructional video. Computers in Human Behavior, 89, 465–470.

Florian, L. (2014). What counts as evidence of inclusive education? European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29(3), 286–294.

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. British Educational Research Journal, 37(5), 813–828.

Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of school-bullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45, 111–133.

Gernsbacher, M. A. (2015). Video captions benefit everyone. Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 2(1), 195–202.

Göransson, K., & Nilholm, C. (2014). Conceptual diversities and empirical shortcomings: A critical analysis of research on inclusive education. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 29(3), 265–280.

Greene, H., & Crespi, C. (2012). The value of student created videos in the college classroom: An exploratory study in marketing and accounting. International Journal of Arts & Sciences, 5(1), 273–283.

Guo, P. J., Kim, J., & Rubin, R. (2014). How video production affects student engagement: An empirical study of MOOC videos. Proceedings of the First ACM Conference on Learning at Scale, 41–50.

Hall, W. (2017). The effectiveness of policy interventions for school bullying: A systematic review. Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research, 8(1), 45–69.

Hoban, G., & Nielsen, W. (2013). Learning science through creating a 'slowmation': A case study of preservice primary teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 35(1), 119–146.

Kay, R. H. (2012). Exploring the use of video podcasts in education: A comprehensive review of the literature. Computers in Human Behavior, 28(3), 820–831.

Kearney, M., & Schuck, S. (2006). Spotlight on authentic learning: Student developed digital video projects. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 22(2), 189–208.

Kim, H., Sefcik, J. S., & Bradway, C. (2017). Characteristics of qualitative descriptive studies: A systematic review. Research in Nursing & Health, 40(1), 23–42.

Linder, K. E. (2016). Student uses and perceptions of closed captions and transcripts: Results from a national study. International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 17(6), 1–19.

Maïano, C., Normand, C. L., Salvas, M. C., Moullec, G., & Aimé, A. (2016). Prevalence of school bullying among youth with autism spectrum disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Autism Research, 9(6), 601–615.

Mayer, R. E. (2021). Evidence-based principles for how to design effective instructional videos. Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition, 10(2), 229–240.

Menesini, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2017). Bullying in schools: The state of knowledge and effective interventions. Psychology, Health & Medicine, 22(sup1), 240–253.

Messiou, K. (2017). Research in the field of inclusive education: Time for a rethink? International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21(2), 146–159.

Morris, K. K., Frechette, C., Dukes, L., Stowell, N., Topping, N. E., & Brodosi, D. (2016). Closed captioning matters: Examining the value of closed captions for 'all' students. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 29(3), 231–238.

Noetel, M., Griffith, S., Delaney, O., Sanders, T., Parker, P., del Pozo Cruz, B., & Lonsdale, C. (2021). Video improves learning in higher education: A systematic review. Review of Educational Research, 91(2), 204–236.

Ok, M. W., Rao, K., Bryant, B. R., & McDougall, D. (2017). Universal Design for Learning in Pre-K to Grade 12 classrooms: A systematic review of research. Exceptionality, 25(2), 116–138.

Rao, K., Ok, M. W., & Bryant, B. R. (2014). A review of research on Universal Design Educational Models. Remedial and Special Education, 35(3), 153–166.

Reyna, J., Hanham, J., & Meier, P. (2018). The Internet explosion, digital media principles and implications to communicate effectively in the digital space. E-Learning and Digital Media, 15(1), 36–52.

Rose, C. A., Monda-Amaya, L. E., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Bullying perpetration and victimization in special education: A review of the literature. Remedial and Special Education, 32(2), 114–130.

Saarento, S., Boulton, A. J., & Salmivalli, C. (2015). Reducing bullying and victimization: Student- and classroom-level mechanisms of change. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 43, 61–76.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in Nursing & Health, 23(4), 334–340.

Smith, S. J., & Lowrey, K. A. (2017). Applying the Universal Design for Learning framework for individuals with intellectual disability: The future must be now. Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 55(1), 48–51.

Snelson, C. (2018). Video production in content-area pedagogy: A scoping study of the research literature. Learning, Media and Technology, 43(3), 294–306.

Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7, 27–56.

Waasdorp, T. E., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2012). The impact of schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports on bullying and peer rejection. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 166(2), 149–156.

Waitoller, F. R., & Artiles, A. J. (2013). A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: A critical review and notes for a research program. Review of Educational Research, 83(3), 319–356.

Zych, I., Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2019). Protective factors against bullying and cyberbullying: A systematic review of meta-analyses. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45, 4–19.

Bossaert, G., Colpin, H., Pijl, S. J., & Petry, K. (2013). Truly included? A literature study focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 17(1), 60–79.

de Boer, A., Pijl, S. J., & Minnaert, A. (2011). Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: A review of the literature. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 15(3), 331–353.

Koster, M., Nakken, H., Pijl, S. J., & van Houten, E. (2009). Being part of the peer group: A literature study focusing on the social dimension of inclusion in education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 13(2), 117–140.

Ruijs, N. M., & Peetsma, T. T. D. (2009). Effects of inclusion on students with and without special educational needs reviewed. Educational Research Review, 4(2), 67–79.

Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. Abt Associates.

Heiman, T., & Olenik-Shemesh, D. (2015). Cyberbullying experience and gender differences among adolescents in different educational settings. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 48(2), 146–155.

Rose, C. A., Espelage, D. L., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (2009). Bullying and victimisation rates among students in general and special education: A comparative analysis. Educational Psychology, 29(7), 761–776.

Rose, C. A., Simpson, C. G., & Moss, A. (2015). The bullying dynamic: Prevalence of involvement among a large-scale sample of middle and high school youth with and without disabilities. Psychology in the Schools, 52(5), 515–531.

Sentenac, M., Gavin, A., Arnaud, C., Molcho, M., Godeau, E., & Gabhainn, S. N. (2011). Victims of bullying among students with a disability or chronic illness and their peers: A cross-national study. Journal of Adolescent Health, 48(5), 461–466.

Rose, C. A., & Gage, N. A. (2017). Exploring the involvement in bullying among individuals with and without disabilities over time. Exceptional Children, 83(3), 298–314.