



EXAMINING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNERS' (ESL) PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS VIDEO FEEDBACK ON PARAGRAPH WRITING

*Bhagya Nilakshani Thennakoon**

Department of English Language Teaching, Wayamba University of Sri Lanka

INTRODUCTION

Teaching in writing is mostly shaped by three approaches as product approach, process approach and genre approach (Hasan & Akhand, 2010). Thereby Coe (1988) signified that learners spend more time on writing in process approach. One of the most significant perspectives of this approach is that rewriting and revision are integral to writing (Myers, 1997). All in all, writing is a process that needs to be practiced over time, improved with the help of teachers and it is an indispensable part of language learning that demands learners to receive a form of feedback to improve their writing skill (Armagan, Bozoglu, Guven & Çelik, 2016).

Accordingly, "feedback is the information about current performance that can be used to improve future performance" (Wang, 2006 as cited in Klimova, 2015, p.172). Feedback in process approach can be provided in a number of ways. Students prefer to follow their teachers' comments and pay attention to teachers' feedback is regarded as effective (Montgomery & Baker, 2007). Therefore, teachers tend to provide written feedback, written feedback with oral explanation and conferencing. Even though teachers play an important role in students' learning process, the roles that peers play cannot be ignored. In particular, in ESL writing classrooms, teachers always ask students for peer feedback, so that teachers can cultivate students' independent learning (Bao, 2015). All in all, teacher feedback that can be provided using different channels. So that they manifest various pros and cons. Nevertheless, previous studies proclaimed that learners believe that teacher is the only audience who is more experienced and can give better quality feedback (Chen & Lin, as cited in Kunwongse, 2013). Previous studies emphasized that learners prefer teacher feedback over peer feedback (Zhang, 1995; Yang, Badger & Yu, 2006). Therefore, the question is how ESL teachers can provide more effective feedback to learners' writings.

According to the previous studies, teacher written feedback is the most significant feedback channel that L2 students expect to receive (Wen, 2013). Although it is an essential procedure in process writing, there is a continuing dispute over the efficacy of teacher written feedback (Ozkul, 2014). Williams's (2003) study probed that teachers tend to provide vague and unclear comments which lead to confusion and passive action and teachers need to develop a systemized and consistent form of feedback. In addition, Keh (1990) found that teacher written feedback that was short could cause problem as it did not provide enough feedback for the students to revise their writings. In teacher written feedback, students anticipate teacher comments for their errors and failure by the teacher in doing so will eventually lead to frustration (Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Leki, 1991).

Technology is continuously evolving and it allows the incorporation of interactive learning environment in language classroom to fulfil the needs of students (Deter, Cuthrell & Staplestone, 2010). Consequently, computer technology can also offer ways to improve the effectiveness of feedback in writing instruction. In this respect, ESL teachers used to provide feedback via audios and videos. Syncox (2003) found that audio feedback promotes students' coherent understanding of multiple redrafting of a work and enhances students' perception of instructor feedback. On the other hand, video feedback is perceived as being more personal, caring and conversational (Anson, 2015; Turner & West, 2013). Then, video feedback is an engaging technique (Hope, 2011; Seror, 2012). Similarly, learners strongly prefer video feedback than other forms of feedback (Anson, 2015; Hope, 2011; Turner & West, 2013).

Accordingly, one can conclude that not only is the teacher written feedback and its usefulness debatable but it is also a complicated and demanding process for the teachers. Even though teacher written feedback continues to be the most commonly used feedback form in all levels



of education, it was investigated that teacher written feedback is controversial (Konttinen, 2009). Therefore, in lieu of all the above-mentioned drawbacks and limitations, video-based feedback offers some new ways of addressing the aforementioned drawbacks and limitations in teacher written feedback. There is little research as yet exploring the pedagogical and practical appropriateness of video feedback in ESL learners' paragraph writing.

Thence, the present study investigates the following research question along with the subsequent hypotheses.

What are learners' perceptions towards video feedback in ESL writing?

H0 : Students do not incorporate more correction gained via video feedback into drafts, do not experience a progress in incorporating correction gained via video feedback into drafts than teacher written feedback and students have negative perceptions towards video feedback.

H1 : Students incorporate more correction gained via video feedback into drafts, experience a progress in incorporating correction gained via video feedback into drafts than teacher written feedback and students have positive perceptions towards video feedback.

Therefore, the present study intends to examine English as a Second Language (ESL) learners' perceptions towards video feedback on paragraph writing.

METHODOLOGY

This study used an experimental research design. A sample of 20 first year undergraduates of the Department of Industrial Management of University of Kelaniya was randomly selected and they were separated into the experimental group and the control group based on a random assignment. The empirical data for the study was gathered through the comparison of participants' multiple drafts of writing paragraphs over a five weeks period and a questionnaire administered at the end of the study to the experimental group. Students of both groups were asked to develop a descriptive paragraph and a narrative paragraph in two respective weeks. Written feedback was delivered for the control group and the experimental group received video feedback in the following weeks of writings.

An error analysis sheet was used for each participant to track how participants interpreted and used different feedback forms in two drafts and they only recorded the amount of feedback items provided in the first drafts and the amount how the addressed feedback items were corrected in the second drafts by each participant.

Ultimately, a questionnaire was administered to the experimental group to address their experience and feelings towards the use of video feedback in writing. Since the control group received only written feedback, questionnaire provided solely to the experimental group.

The questionnaire involved 35 questions in seven separate parts and it has been elaborated with both close ended and open-ended questions. The first section with three 'True - False' questions and three 'Likert scales' questions intended to perceive what the experimental group thought about the feedback predominantly. The second part with four 'Likert scales' questions meant to realize how students engaged with video feedback. The third section with four 'Likert scales' questions were aimed to determine how students revise their writings using video feedback. The fourth part with nine 'Likert scales' questions were designed to grasp students' conception on the quality and the quantity of video feedback. The fifth section with 'Likert scales' question was comprised to discover students' preference whether to receive video feedback or written feedback. The sixth part with six 'short - answer' open ended questions intended to perceive participants' knowledge, feeling and understanding about video feedback. The last section involved four 'factual questions' to construe certain demographic facts about the respondents.

Initially, the researcher enquired and identified that all the participants were Sinhalese. Consequently, the questionnaire was administered in both target language and mother tongue in order to better reflect the nuances of the target language.

IBM SPSS Statistics was used to analyze the accumulated quantitative data and close ended



questions in questionnaire. On the other hand, the open-ended questions in questionnaire were examined through data driven coding because the researcher recognized the concepts without any prior conception and all codes arose directly from the participants' responses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In a nut shell, accumulated quantitative data through participants' writings were employed to investigate whether students who receive video feedback report higher levels of correction into their written work as compared to students who receive written feedback. Accordingly, the validity was examined with the parametric test, Independent Samples T-test. In accordance with the outputs of the first and second writings, Levene's test revealed that the p values were 0.257 and 0.236 respectively, so that the variance of two samples were equal as the p values were greater than 0.05 ($0.257 > 0.05$, $0.236 > 0.05$). Therefore, depending on Equal variances assumed and should focus on the p values of t-test for Equality of Means. In statistical analysis, most studies are performed on a 95% confidence interval; thus, a p-value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) is to be taken as significant meaning, that there is a significant difference in the means of the two sample populations tested. Though, the p values of Equal variances assumed in first and second writings were 0.001 and 0.026 respectively ($0.001 < 0.05$, $0.026 < 0.05$) and the p values were smaller than 0.05. Consequently, the results of the first and second writings conveyed that there is a significant difference between written feedback and video feedback. In addition, the present work corroborated that the experimental group has incorporated the feedback items provided to their writings with a mean value of 79.40 in their first writing. In contrast to that, the control group has incorporated the provided feedback items with a mean value of 62.00 in their first writing. Further, according to the results of the second writing, it declared that the experimental group has incorporated the feedback provided to their writings with a mean value of 74.70. On the contrary, the control group has incorporated with a mean value of 58.40. Hence, the results grasped from the independent sample t-test and mean values convinced that students who receive video feedback do report higher levels of correction into their written work as compared to students who receive written feedback.

Based on the quantitative analysis, experimental group was manipulated to address learners' perceptions towards video feedback. Overall results of the first section of the questionnaire evinced that feedback is a significant component in learners' ESL writings. Therefore, all respondents have mentioned that they receive feedback for their written works and the findings specified that participants have never received video feedback for their written works. In accordance with the data gathered from the second section, majority of the participants believe that video feedback assists them to improve their writing skills and provides support to pay more attention to the instructor's comments. Furthermore, participants believe that video feedback helps them to understand how to review their writings and helps to spend more time reviewing the individualized feedback.

In accord with the findings gathered from the third section, almost all the respondents have declared that video feedback helps them to elaborate their writings, helps to understand issues related to content of the writing, helps to understand issues related to grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and capitalization of the writing. Apart from these positive perceptions learners have an average viewpoint on the theme that video feedback helps to understand how to organize the writing. Furthermore, the data collected from the fourth section declared that majority of the participants reflect that video feedback helps to understand the feedback of the writing obviously. Moreover, video feedback is considered as constructive, feels more conversational and interactive, contains more emotions, gives a clear impression of what is being commented and assessed and it helps to provide both positive comments as well as corrections. Apart from these positive perceptions, participants have an average viewpoint on the themes that video feedback is more time efficient and cost efficient.

The ultimate part of the closed ended questions indicates that 50% of the respondents strongly agree to receive video feedback rather than written feedback. 40% of the remaining



participants responded that they agree with this perception and the rest of the 10% declared that they were in a medial level.

The open-ended questions declared that how respondents have voiced their own ideas towards the use of video feedback. Three participants mentioned that we live in a technological era. Therefore, we use technology for our day today activities. So, if we can incorporate technology into our English lessons, then it will help us to study more. Another respondent stated that it is appropriate to integrate technology into English lessons because students are enthusiastic to learn through it. Thereby, through the thematic analysis preliminary codes were obtained and video feedback helps to integrate technology into the ESL lessons was emerged as a new perception. All the participants have mentioned that the software used to develop video feedback is reachable and that they can easily approach into the software. One respondent has mentioned that this Screencast-O-Matic screen recorder is easy to approach. The participant further informed that when the teacher provided this video feedback, she found it very interesting to work with it. In addition, the students perceived that video feedback is user friendly, allows to build a sense of closeness and it is a novel approach in ELT. Moreover, there was a recommendation to integrate video feedback into ELT.

Even though video feedback offers benefits being multimodal, detailed and more comprehensible feedback, respondents have devised potential drawbacks in adopting video feedback in ESL classrooms including technical difficulties, costly process and initial anxiety. Despite the aforementioned imperfections, the students' positive perceptions revealed through IBM SPSS Statistics and data - driven coding in this study rejects the null hypothesis (H0) and thus validates the alternative hypothesis (H1).

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The outcomes of this experimental study convey that teacher feedback delivered in the form of videos is pragmatic than teacher written feedback when ESL learners revised their subsequent written works. Learners possessed positive impression towards video feedback in terms of the engagement and revision with video feedback and its quality and quantity. In addition, learners voiced their positive vision and experience when engaging with video feedback. These findings of the study suggest a number of noteworthy implications for ESL writing. The findings retrieved from this study manifest that video feedback is a worthwhile practice in ESL writing. Hence, further research is needed to determine the viability of video feedback for large learner cohorts. Therefore, future studies can be conducted with a large sample size to examine the generalizability of the findings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was done as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the completion of Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Degree in Teaching English as a Second Language at University of Kelaniya.

REFERENCES

- Anson, I. (2015). Assessment feedback using screen-capture technology in Political Science. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 11(4), 375-390.
- Armagan, S., Bozoglu, O., Guven, E., & Çelik, A. (2016). Usage of video feedback in the course of writing in EFL: challenges and advantages. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 30(2), 95-102.
- Bao, Z. (2015). How should different types of feedback be administered to create more effective learning among advanced ESL writing students? A student perspective. *International Journal for Leadership in Learning*, 1(3), 1-25.



- Coe, R.M. (1988). Teaching writing: The process approach, Humanism and the context of "Crisis". In S. DeCastell, A. Luke & K. Egan (Eds.), *Literacy, Society and Schooling: A Reader* (pp. 270- 312). Cambridge University Press.
- Deter, F., Cuthrell, K., & Stapleton, J. (2010). Why Google Docs? Student perceptions of using Google Docs in online coursework. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 122-134.
- Hasan, M.K., & Akhand, M.M. (2010). Approaches to writing in EFL/ESL context: Balancing product and process in writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA*, 15(1-2), 77-88.
- Hedgecock, J. & Leftkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4, 141-163.
- Hope, S. A. (2011). Making movies: The next big thing in feedback? *Bioscience Education*. Retrieved from <http://journals.heacademy.ac.uk/doi/pdf/10.3108/beej.18.2SE>
- Keh, C.L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294-304.
- Konttinen, M. (2009). *The reality of teacher written feedback: A quantitative study* [Thesis]. University of Jyväskylä.
- Kunwongse, S. (2013). *Peer Feedback, benefits and drawbacks*. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/HP/Downloads/40748-Article%20Text-93526-1-10-20151009%20\(3\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/HP/Downloads/40748-Article%20Text-93526-1-10-20151009%20(3).pdf)
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.
- Myers, S. (1997). Teaching writing as a process and teaching sentence level syntax: Reformulation as ESL composition feedback. *TESL – EJ*, 2 (4).
- Ozkul, S. (2014). *Video Inclusive Portfolio (VIP) as a new form of teacher feedback in teaching writing* [Master's thesis]. Bilkent University.
- Seror, J. (2012). Show Me! Enhanced feedback through screen casting technology. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(1), 104–11.
- Syncox, D. (2003). *The effects of audio-taped feedback on ESL graduate student writing* [Master's thesis]. McGill University.
- Turner, W., & West, J. (2013). Assessment for 'Digital First Language' speakers: Online video assessment and feedback in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 25 (3), 288-296.
- Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher written feedback on L2 student writings. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 427-431.
- Williams, J. D. (2003). *Preparing to teach writing: Research, theory, and practice*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 179-200.
- Zhang, S. (1995). Re-examining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4(3), 209-222.