Journal of Multidisciplinary and Translational Research (JMTR)

journal homepage: https://journals.kln.ac.lk/jmtr/

The Efficiency of Video Feedback as a Method for Teachers to Give Feedback During the Development of Writing Skills of the Learners Who Use English as a Second Language (ESL). Sector

Bhagya Nilakshani Thennakoon[1*]

[1]*Department of English Language Teaching, Faculty of Humanities, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka*

Abstract

Feedback given by teachers to students is one of the most productive ways of improving the performance of learners, including the learners who use English as a Second Language (ESL). However, there has been a continuing dispute over the efficiency of different feedback methods. Even though the written form of feedback is the most frequently used method of feedback used by teachers, studies have found that it has several disadvantages. This study investigated the efficiency of video feedback as a teacher feedback method during the development of paragraph writing skills of ESL learners. The study explored whether students who received video feedback reported a higher level of accuracy/ correctness in their written work when compared to those who received written feedback. It also investigated ESL learners' perceptions towards video feedback and whether video feedback could be used as an alternative to written feedback. The sample comprised 20 undergraduates enrolled in the Industrial Management degree program at the University of Kelaniya. Over a five-week period, a test group was provided with video feedback while a control group was provided with written feedback. In addition to a comparative analysis of the accuracy of paragraph writing, a questionnaire was given to the test group at the end of the study to study their perception on video feedback. The quantitative and qualitative data collected were analyzed using SPSS statistics and thematic analysis, respectively. The findings revealed that video feedback facilitated a higher level of accuracy in the paragraphs written by those who received video feedback from teachers. The study verified that video feedback is a method preferred by and convenient for learners. It helped them to interact easily with teachers and to revise the paragraphs they were writing. The findings showed that video feedback could be used as an alternative to written form of feedback.

Keywords: ESL learners, Writing skills, Teacher feedback, Written feedback, Video feedback

Article info

Article history:
Received 26th January 2023
Received in revised form 04th March 2023
Accepted 3rd April 2023
Available online 30th June 2023

ISSN (E-Copy): ISSN 3051-5262
ISSN (Hard copy): ISSN 3051-5602
Doi: https://doi.org/10.4038/jmtr.v8i1.61
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4215-7690
*Corresponding author:
E-mail address: tmbnt201@kln.ac.lk (B.N. Thennakoon)

Introduction

Writing skill is assumed to be of great significance to academic success since it is the stereotyped assessment measure for academics to evaluate the learners (Tan, 2011). Besides, writing skills have a distinctive position in language learning since the acquisition of it involves the practice and the knowledge of the other three skills: speaking, reading, and listening (Klimova, 2013). Nevertheless, there is little consensus among the researchers to give a clear explanation for writing. However, this lack of conformity reflects the complexity of the writing process (Darabad & Bahrebar, 2013). Thus, English Language Teaching (ELT) practitioners suggest that teaching to write is mostly shaped by three approaches; namely, product approach, process approach and genre approach (Hasan & Akhand, 2010).

Moreover, Coe (1988) signified that the learners spend more time on writing in the process approach. One of the most significant perspectives of this approach is rewriting and revision, which are integral to writing (Myers, 1997). Hence, writing is a process that needs to be practiced over time and improved with the help of the teachers. The learners receiving a form of feedback from teachers on their writing skills has been regarded as an indispensable part of language learning (Armagan et al., 2016).

Feedback is the information about current performance that can be used to improve future performance (Wang, 2006 as cited in Klimova, 2015, p.172). Providing feedback to students is often regarded as one of the most critical responsibilities of a teacher, as it offers a level of individual attention that is seldom achievable in typical classroom settings (Hyland, 2006). Feedback on the process approach can be provided in several ways. The teachers tend to provide written feedback, written feedback with oral explanations, and conferencing. Previous studies have indicated that the learners perceive the teacher as the primary audience due to the greater experience and ability to provide higher-quality feedback that the teachers have (Chen & Lin, as cited in Kunwongse, 2013; Zhang, 1995). Like any other teachers, the teachers who teach English as a Second Language (ESL) also should provide feedback to learners using an efficient form of feedback in the endeavor of improving their writing skills.

According to previous studies, teacher-written feedback had been the most widely used feedback method that the L2 students are likely to receive (Wen, 2013). While it is an essential aspect of process writing, the effectiveness of teacher-written feedback continues to be a topic of ongoing debate among educators and researchers. (Ozkul, 2014). Williams's (2003) study noted that teachers tend to provide vague and unclear comments, which leads to confusion and passive action. Lee (2003) explored that teacher-written feedback might not always be helpful due to misinterpretation of correction symbols and because of learners' low proficiency levels. Those findings showed the need to introduce a systemized and consistent form of feedback as an alternative to a written form of feedback.

Technology is continuously evolving, enabling the incorporation of interactive learning environments in language classrooms to meet the diverse needs of the learners (Deter et al., 2010). Computer technology has a method of feedback in improving writing skills.

More recently, Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology has been utilized to give feedback on student writing. However, while AI feedback offers immediate and data-driven responses, it often lacks the personalized touch and nuanced understanding that the human teachers provide. AI systems,

although efficient, may not fully grasp the individual learner's context or specific instructional needs (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

In contrast, video feedback allows the teachers to convey tone, emphasize key points, and offer tailored advice which considers the unique strengths and weaknesses of each student (Harper et al., 2012). Therefore, despite the advancements in the AI method of feedback, video-based feedback has the potential to act as a better alternative to teacher-written feedback. It combines the technological benefits of visual and auditory elements with the personalized insights of human instruction, making it a potent tool for enhancing ESL learners' writing skills.

Therefore, in lieu of the above-mentioned methods of feedback with their drawbacks and limitations, the video-based feedback method offers new ways of addressing the drawbacks and limitations. There have been only a few studies carried out to explore the pedagogical and practical appropriateness of video feedback in ESL learners' paragraph writing skills. The present study intended to investigate the effect of video feedback as a teacher feedback method for strengthening ESL learners' paragraph writing skills.

The present study investigated the effect of video feedback on ESL learners' paragraph writing. The study investigated whether the students who receive video feedback report higher levels of accuracy/ correctness in their written work when compared with the students who receive written feedback to grasp the effect of video feedback on learners' written work. The second research question was focused on the learners' perceptions regarding the use of video feedback in ESL learners' paragraph writing. The third research question was focused on determining whether video feedback can serve as an alternative to teacher-written feedback in teaching paragraph writing.

Materials and Method

Research Design

To address the aforementioned research questions, the present study adopted a true experimental research design. According to Bhattacherjee (2012), in a true experimental design, the researcher manipulates one or more independent variables as the treatment of the study and the results of the treatment on outcomes are observed as dependent variables. A sample is randomly drawn from a population and subjects for the study are randomly assigned to different treatment levels as treatment group and control group. Experimental research can be conducted in a laboratory or field setting. The unique strength of true experimental research is its internal validity due to its ability to link cause and effect through treatment manipulation. The internal validity of the research depends on how well the treatment was manipulated. External validity manifests how generalizable the findings are. In line with the above-mentioned basic concepts of a true experimental design, the present study was conducted in an authentic setting. The subjects for the study were randomly selected from a population, and the sample was split into the treatment group and the control group based on a random assignment. Thereby, the study manipulated feedback as the dependent variable and teacher written feedback and video feedback as independent variables. Furthermore, the current study was a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research components since the mixed method approach expanded and strengthened the conclusions. This integrated closed-ended and open-ended data within a single investigation. .

Setting and Sample of the Study

The research was conducted at the University of Kelaniya. The primary reason for selecting this university was its accessibility to the researcher, an academician at the institution, who had easy access to the study population. The sample was selected using random sampling to ensure representativeness.

Since most courses offered at the university are taught in English, undergraduates at the University of Kelaniya are expected to attend English language courses conducted by the Department of English Language Teaching (DELT). Thus, the Department of English Language Teaching offers a range of English courses for students which are beneficial for them in their future careers. Classes are scheduled after taking into consideration the level of English language proficiency.

To examine the impact of video feedback as a method of teacher feedback on ESL learners' paragraph writing skills, a cohort of first-year undergraduates at the intermediate proficiency level was selected. The undergraduates with intermediate proficiency levels were selected for the study because it focused on learners benchmarked at B1 and B2 levels of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). These proficiency levels were determined using a standardized placement test conducted at the beginning of the academic year, which was designed to align with CEFR standards. According to the CEFR, B1 learners are learners who can write clear, detailed texts on a variety of subjects related to their fields of interest, synthesizing and evaluating information and arguments from multiple sources (Council of Europe, 2001). B2 learners are the ones capable of writing straightforward, connected texts on familiar subjects within their fields of interest by linking a series of shorter discrete elements into a linear sequence (Council of Europe, 2001). This equivalence between intermediate proficiency and CEFR B1 and B2 levels is well-documented in literature on language education (North & Piccardo, 2016). The Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of the course also aligned with these CEFR descriptors, ensuring that students at these levels possess the requisite skills and competencies. Finally, a group of first-year undergraduates from the Department of Industrial Management of the Faculty of Science was selected, considering their relatively good attendance which made them a readily available sample for the study.

The study was conducted as a distinct segment within the allocated teaching hours. The sample of 20 undergraduates was randomly selected from those who study Industrial Management, and they were separated into the experimental group and the control group based on a random assignment. The test group consisted of 10 students which included 5 females and 5 males, while the control group consisted of 10 students which included 8 females and 2 males. All the students were between the ages of 21 and 23 and happened to be Sinhalese.

Research Instruments

Data Collection Instruments

The empirical data for the study was gathered from two sources: the participants' multiple drafts of writing paragraphs over a five-week period and a questionnaire provided to the test group at the end of the study.

The foremost data collection instrument was the participants' multiple drafts of writing paragraphs. The students were asked to develop a descriptive paragraph and a narrative

paragraph in two consecutive weeks to recognize whether the students who received video feedback reported higher levels of correctness in their written work when compared with the students who received written feedback. The first writing was a descriptive paragraph. Students were asked to select one topic from the given topics, including "A place of my childhood", "The view from my window", "My ideal room or apartment", and "A scene from a dream" with a 100 to 150-word limit that was to be completed within 20 minutes (Oshima & Hogue, 2006, p.73). The second writing was a narrative paragraph, and the students were instructed to write a paragraph on one of the given topics, including "An unpleasant personal experience", "The best achievement you have ever accomplished", "A person you are afraid to lose the most" and "If you had a time machine" with a 100 to 150 - word limit that was to be completed within 20 minutes (Good narrative essay writing topics, n.d.).

In addition, a questionnaire was given to the test group at the end of the study to understand students' perceptions on video feedback. The questionnaire was piloted with a small group of participants prior to the full-scale questionnaire study. Based on feedback from the pilot test, revisions were made to improve the effectiveness of the questionnaire and to ensure that it accurately collected the required information. The questionnaire consisted of 35 questions distributed across 07 distinct sections and incorporated both closed-ended and open-ended questions. The questionnaire survey was conducted both in the target language and the mother tongue to reflect better the nuances of the target language.

The application of video feedback in teaching how to write required integrating technology. The technology employed in the study involved a screen capture software named "Screencast-O-Matic" and a Learning Management System (LMS) named "Edmodo".

Edmodo was used to amplify personalized videos, as it is a free and secure social learning network platform with no installation setup involved.

Data Analysis Instruments

IBM SPSS Statistics were used to analyze the quantitative data from the two resources, and the qualitative data were analyzed using data-driven coding. IBM SPSS Statistics comes with an open-source version that fairly serves the process of statistics and formulation of data manipulation techniques. Consequently, data collected via the participants' multiple drafts of writing paragraphs and the close-ended questions in the questionnaire were investigated through SPSS statistics. The open-ended questions in the questionnaire were examined through data-driven coding. In data-driven coding, a researcher can look for concepts in the text without a preceding conceptualization and let the text speak for itself ("Qualitative coding", n.d.). The study employed data drive coding based on the facts that the concepts were recognized without any prior conception, and all the codes arose directly from the participants' responses.

Data Collection Procedure

After the Department of Industrial Management assigned a group of first-year undergraduates from the Faculty of Science, the researcher arranged a meeting with the participants to present them with the research procedure. Along with that, the researcher provided a guideline for each participant with further details about the study and instructions to follow during the study. Additional time after the explanation was given for the participants to clarify doubts about their participation in the study. Subsequently, each participant was asked for his/her consent to use and publish the findings.

The e-mail addresses of the participants of the test group were collected so that the researcher could add the participants to the LMS. Participants were asked to develop a descriptive paragraph on one of the given topics.

The researcher provided written feedback to the control group and video feedback to the test group. The writings of the participants were marked according to the rubrics developed by adapting the CEFR: Learning, teaching, assessment and Descriptive Paragraph Scoring Rubric. The researcher focused on both the content and the form of the writing. Accordingly, feedback for writing was provided to students under three criteria: content and organization, grammar and vocabulary and mechanics.

Feedback for the control group was delivered in the form of end notes and side notes on participants' writings. On the other hand, feedback for the test group was delivered in the form of videos with the help of a Screencast-O-Matic screen capture recorder and the LMS. The writings of the participants from the test group were evaluated, and the writings were captured in a snapshot so that the drafts were ready to be processed digitally. The Screencast-O-Matic screen capture recorder was used, and the researcher created a personalized video with the researcher's detailed feedback given about the writings. Subsequently, invitations to join the LMS were sent to the participants, so that the researcher could upload the videos to the LMS.

During the second week, all the participants received feedback on their initial writings, and copies of those writings were collected for subsequent data analysis. Concurrently, video feedback was uploaded to Edmodo, allowing the participants in the test group to have access to individual feedback they received. Participants were instructed to submit their revised drafts in the third week.

The researcher obtained the second draft by the subsequent week. An error analysis sheet was used for each participant to determine how participants interpreted and used different forms of feedback. The error analysis sheet included six categories to analyze how each participant used the feedback in their second drafts. The second drafts were collected by the third week and participants were called upon to develop a narrative paragraph on one of the given topics.

The same procedure was followed in the feedback provision process. The control group received written feedback while the test group received video feedback on their third writing in the fourth week and the participants were requested to submit their second drafts in the fifth week.

Error analysis was utilized to assess the two drafts. This analysis recorded the quantity of feedback items provided for the initial draft and measured the extent to which these feedback items were addressed and corrected in the subsequent drafts produced by each participant. The new errors that occurred in the second draft were recorded.

The fourth drafts were collected by the fifth week and a questionnaire was given to the test group to address their experience and perception towards the use of video feedback for their writing. Since the control group received only written feedback, the questionnaire was provided solely to the test group..

Ethical consideration

Given the importance of ethics in conducting research and the challenges around conducting the research, researchers go to great lengths to protect the dignity and safety of research participants (Silverman, 2009). Initially, the purpose of the study was explained to the participants verbally. The participants were then given the guidelines, which further explained the purpose of the study. To comply with ethical considerations in conducting the current research, the written consent of all participants was collected at the beginning of the study.

Results and Discussion

Impact of video feedback on ESL learners' written work

Whether the students received video feedback reported higher levels of correctness in their written work compared to those received written feedback was explored by evaluating data from participants' multiple drafts. The validity was examined with the parametric test, Independent Samples T-test via SPSS 16.

The total number of incorporated feedback in the second draft, out of the total number of feedback provided in the first draft was used to calculate the percentage of the extent the feedback provided by the researcher was incorporated in the learners' second drafts. The following formula was used to calculate the achievements of each participant.

$$\frac{Total\ amount\ of\ incorporated\ feedback\ in\ the\ second\ draft}{Total\ amount\ of\ feedback\ provided\ in\ the\ first\ draft} \text{ X } 100$$

The basis for employing this formula to calculate the overall performance of each participant was to avoid any bias in the results that may occur due to the varied number of feedback provided in the first draft. Those percentages were used as performance values in the overall analysis. Finally, the data was entered into SPSS to investigate whether the differences between the two feedback methods were significant. The data analysis employed A to T block letters to define each participant and the same participant will be defined by the same block letter in both writings because the researcher wished to guarantee the confidentiality of all records and agreed that no information that would reveal the identity of the respondents will be published. The incorporation of feedback in proceeding drafts in two separate writings by the two groups was addressed individually.

Table 1: Overview of the data analyzed from Independent Samples T-test

Group	Control Group	Experimental Group	Levene's test (P value)	Independent Sample T Test (P-value)
First Test	62.00 ± 8.35	79.40 ± 7.25	0.257	0.002
Second Test	58.40 ± 6.85	74.70 ± 8.10	0.236	0.029

Levene's test was conducted to assess the equality of variances between the control and experimental groups for each test. For both the first and second tests, the P-values obtained from Levene's test were greater than 0.05 (0.26 and 0.24, respectively), confirming that the assumption of equal variances holds.

Independent samples T-tests were then performed to compare the performance means between the control and experimental groups. For the first test, the T-test revealed a statistically significant difference in performance between the groups (P = 0.002 under equal variances). Similarly, the second test also indicated a significant difference (P = 0.03 under equal variances . These results indicate that participants in the experimental group outperformed those in the control group in both tests, with the differences being statistically significant (P<0.05). This finding suggests that the intervention applied to the experimental group was effective in enhancing performance compared to the control group. Data reported as Mean ± SD

Table 01 shows the statistical analysis of participants' incorporation of the feedback items provided in the first and second writings to their proceeding drafts. In the output of the pooled t-test, Levene's Test for Equality Variances perceives whether the variance of the two samples is equal or not. If Levene's test indicates that the variances are equal across the two groups and particularly if the p-value is greater than 0.05 (p>0.05), first determine whether the assumption of equal variances is appropriate by examining the results of the Independent Samples t-test under the section "t-test for Equality of Means." If the p-value is less than 0.05 (p < 0.05), it suggests that the variances between the two groups are not equal. In this situation, it is necessary to rely on the results of the Independent Samples T-test that does not assume equal variances. Conversely, if the p-value is greater than or equal to 0.05, the results based on the assumption of equal variances should be used.

According to the output of the first writing, Levene's test revealed that the p-value was 0.257, so that the variance of the two samples was equal as the p-value was greater than 0.05 (0.257>0.05). The p-value from the t-test for Equality of Means was reviewed to determine whether equal variances are assumed. Based on this p-value, either the results of the Independent Samples t-test assuming equal variances or those not assuming equal variances were used. 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 in that there is a significant difference in the means of the two sample populations tested. Though the p-value of Equal variances assumed was 0.001 (0.001 <0.05) and the p-value was smaller than 0.05, the results of the statistical analysis of the first writing showed that there is a significant difference between written feedback and video feedback.

According to the output of the second writing, Levene's test indicated that the p-value was 0.236, so that the variance of the two samples was equal as the p-value was greater than 0.05 (0.236>0.05). The p-value from the t-test for Equality of Means was examined to assess whether the assumption of equal variances is appropriate. Depending on this p-value, either the results of the Independent Samples t-test assuming equal variances or the results from the test that do not assume equal variances were applied. 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. Therefore, in accordance with the output taken from the error analysis of the second writing, the p-value was 0.026, a p-value smaller than 0.05 (0.026 <0.05). Hence, the results of the second writing revealed that there was a significant difference between written feedback and video feedback.

Accordingly, the statistical analysis of the Independent Samples t-test justified that there was a statistically significant difference between written feedback and video feedback.

In addition, as shown in Table 01, the mean values of the two independent variables expressed that there was a gap between the incorporation of feedback items provided to the control group and to the test group in their respective writings. According to the results, the first writing showed that the test group had incorporated the points given by the feedback in their writings with a mean of 79.40. In contrast the control group incorporated the items provided by feedback with a mean value of only 62.00. Further, according to the results of the second writing, the experimental group incorporated the feedback given to their writings with a mean value of 74.70. On the contrary, the control group incorporated a mean value of only 58.40.

Accordingly, the statistical analysis indicated that students who received video feedback exhibited higher levels of correctness in their written work when compared with those who received written feedback. The statistical analysis led to the rejection of the null hypothesis (H0), which posited that students receiving video feedback do not report higher levels of correctness in their written work relative to the writings of those receiving written feedback. This conclusion was based on the comparative analysis of how effectively the test and control groups incorporated in their writings the feedback provided to them.

The findings corroborated with the previous research on using video feedback as a teacher feedback method. Ozkul (2014) stated that the participants incorporated points indicated in video feedback more than those indicated in traditional feedback in three out of the five written assignments throughout the study. The null hypothesis of this study was rejected for assignments 2, 3 and 4 because the p values obtained from the non-parametric test, Mann-Whitney U Test were 0.32> 0.05; 0.004< 0.05; 0.007 < 0.05 respectively and the difference between how video feedback and traditional feedback incorporated into learners' second drafts was statistically significant. That means, video feedback provided for first drafts in assignments 2, 3 and 4 helped the learners to incorporate more feedback details correctly into their second drafts.

Ali's (2016) study on the effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing revealed findings similar to the present study. The results of that study conveyed that there was a statistically significant difference between the test and the control group's mean scores in favor of the test group. Regarding this interpretation, the mean scores of the test group (Mean=13.45, Standard Deviation=1.641) exceeded that of the control group (Mean=10.17, Standard Deviation=1.440) (df=61, t=8.468, p. <0.01).

The findings of the present study were in line with the findings obtained from the previous studies on using video feedback in ESL writing contexts. The statistical analyses convinced that there was a possibility of possessing a statistical difference between learners' incorporation of these two feedback methods in their written works.

To conclude, the null hypothesis (H0), that students who receive video feedback do not report higher levels of correction in their written work when compared with students who receive written feedback, was rejected. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H1), which stated that the students who receive video feedback report higher levels of correctness in their written work when compared with the students who receive written feedback, validated that video feedback positively affected ESL learners' paragraph writing skills.

Learners' perceptions towards video feedback

The research question (2) was used to explore learners' perceptions towards video feedback. The validity of video feedback was examined with a questionnaire given to the test group at the end of the study.

Table 2: Overview of participants' perceptions towards video feedback derived from open-ended questions

Main themes	Sub themes	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Engagement	Question 07	60%	40%	-	-	-
	Question 08	90%	10%	-	-	-
	Question 09	80%	20%	-	-	-
Revision	Question 11	50%	50%	-	-	-
	Question 12	40%	40%	20%	-	-
	Question 13	70%	30%	-	-	-
	Question 14	70%	30%	-	-	-
	Question 15	50%	50%	-	-	-
Quality and quantity	Question 16	70%	30%	-	-	-
	Question 17	90%	10%	-	-	-
	Question 18	80%	20%	-	-	-
	Question 19	90%	10%	-	-	-
	Question 20	60%	40%	-	-	-
	Question 21	60%	30%	10%	-	-
	Question 22	50%	30%	20%	-	-
	Question 23	70%	30%	-	-	-
Preference	Question 24	50%	40%	10%	-	-
Number of times video was viewed	Question 10	1 time	2 times	3 times	4 times	More than 4
		10%	20%	50%	-	20%
The information derived from the open-ended questions						
- Video feedback helps to integrate technology into the ESL lessons - Video feedback is accessible - Video feedback is user friendly - Video feedback helps to build a sense of closeness easily - Video feedback is a novel approach in ELT - A recommendation to integrate video feedback into ELT						
Potential drawbacks						
- Technical difficulties - A costly process - There are software which are difficult to access - Initial anxiety						

Note. See Appendix A for the questions

Table 02 presents an overview of learners' overall perceptions of video feedback. Previous research underscored the importance of high-quality feedback in improving learners' performance and learning outcomes (Evans, 2013; Ferguson, 2011; Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

By examining learners' perceptions, this study contributed to the understanding on how video feedback can enhance feedback quality and support ESL writing development.

However, as shown in Table 02, the present study identified that video feedback can be recommended as an alternative to teacher-written feedback overcoming the drawbacks of the latter. The results revealed that 90% of the total respondents strongly agreed that video feedback helped them to pay more attention to the instructor's comments, while the remaining 10% stated that they agreed with this perception, although not strongly like others. Further, the findings discovered that 80% of the respondents strongly agreed that video feedback assisted them in understanding how to revise their writing while the remaining 10% agreed with this conception, although not strongly like others. Similarly, 60% of the participants indicated that they strongly agreed with the perception that video feedback helped them to improve their writing skills in English and the remaining 40% agreed with this notion, although not strongly like others. These viewpoints stipulated that all the students had positive perceptions on the video feedback method.

Rust et al., (2005) pointed out that the written feedback was not even read by many learners, which is another weakness of the method. In contrast, as shown in Table 02, the present findings showed that most learners viewed the video feedback three times, while 20% of the respondents watched the video more than four times.

Moreover, Montgomery and Baker (2007) compared teachers' self-assessments with the actual performance of the learners who were given teacher-written feedback. They discovered that, throughout the writing process, the teachers tend to give only a little feedback on global issues like organization of the writing while paying more attention to local issues like grammar and mechanics. Keh (1990) pointed out that teacher-written feedback, which was often short, could cause problems in terms of not providing enough feedback to the students to revise their writing. On the contrary, as shown in Table 02, the outcomes of the present study showed that 50% of the total respondents strongly agreed that video feedback helped them to elaborate their writings while the rest of the 50% agreed with this notion, although not strongly like others. Furthermore, 80% of the participants believed that they gained a better understanding of how to organize their writing. 70% of the total participants strongly agreed that video feedback helped them to gain a better understanding of the issues with the written content while the remaining 30% agreed with this notion, although not strongly like others. The results also showed that 70% strongly agreed that video feedback helped them to understand the issues with grammar and vocabulary. The rest of the 30% agreed with this conception, albeit not agreeing strongly. Finally, 50% mentioned that they strongly believed that video feedback helped them to understand issues with spelling, punctuation and capitalization while the other 50% indicated that they agreed with it, though not strongly. Accordingly, the results of the present research clearly showed that all the students had positive perceptions of video feedback, though in different degrees.

Besides, according to Bakla (2017), there should be a significant amount of communication between the instructor and the learners, which is hard to establish through written feedback, even if it involves some degree of dialogue and discussion. As opposed to this perception, as shown in Table 02, the present study found that 80% of the total respondents strongly agreed that video feedback imposes a more conversational and interactive sense when working with the method of feedback. The remaining 20% too stated that they agreed with it. Some researchers

noted that students may not follow the instructions given in the form of written feedback (Norton & Norton, 2001), while some others reported that written comments are often "undecipherable" to students (LaFontana, 1996, p.71). It seems that students have an "uncanny persistence" in misunderstanding written responses on their compositions (Sperling & Freedman, 1987, p. 344). On the contrary, as shown in Table 02, the outcomes of the present study proclaimed that 90% of the respondents strongly agreed that video feedback is constructive while the remaining 10% too stated that they agreed with this conception. In addition, 70% of the respondents strongly admitted that video feedback helped them to better understand the feedback comments and improve their writing and while the remaining 30% acknowledged that they agreed with it. Further, 60% mentioned that video feedback offered them a clear impression of what was being commented on and assessed. The other 30% also agreed with this concept. According to the results of the present findings, written feedback can be replaced by video feedback thereby eliminating the drawbacks of written feedback.

According to Vengadasamy (2002), a corrected draft with red ink all over the paper may not be an effective way of providing feedback as it might have a negative impact on the students' comprehension level. As shown in Table 02, the learners mentioned that since they live in a technologically advanced era, it would be convenient for them if technology and ESL lessons are integrated. Similarly, the present study showed that if video feedback is accessible, it is a user-friendly option to reduce the stress given by the tense atmosphere in the classroom and not to depend upon inefficient methods of feedback, video feedback could serve as an indisputable alternative.

In developing countries like Sri Lanka, the young population is relatively large and consequently, both private and state sector educational institutions often must accept more learners than they can accommodate easily. Bitchener et al. (2005) suggested that learners will be able to make improvements in their writing if they are exposed to oral feedback frequently. Still, learners do not often have equal chances to meet their instructors to have oral feedback after teaching hours, a drawback which impedes the quality of their education (Ozkul, 2014). Traditional written feedback given by teachers has been identified as having several drawbacks in terms of efficiency. As shown in Table 02, according to the outcomes of the present study, it could be concluded that video feedback method too possesses some drawbacks, including technical difficulties, cost of the process and initial anxiety. Using software presents significant challenges in terms of accessibility. Nevertheless, the results showed that video feedback still can be used as an alternative to other feedback methods which have more drawbacks. The results of the present study justified that video feedback could eliminate the weaknesses of the existing feedback method of teacher-written feedback.

Accordingly, the outcomes obtained from the descriptive analysis and data-driven coding rejected the null hypothesis (H0) and the alternative hypothesis (H1) was validated through learners' positive perceptions towards video feedback..

Video feedback can serve as an alternative to teacher-written feedback.

According to the analysis of the first research question, the statistical analysis conveyed that the students who received video feedback reported higher levels of correctness in their written work when compared with the students who received written feedback. In relation to the second

research question, learners' positive perceptions towards video feedback indicated that video feedback can be used as an alternative to written feedback.

In conclusion, the null hypothesis (H0) that video feedback could not be used as an alternative to teacher-written feedback was rejected. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis (H1) that video feedback could be used as an alternative to teacher-written feedback was validated. The study demonstrated that video feedback positively impacted ESL learners' paragraph writing skill. This was evident through the higher incorporation of video feedback information into the subsequent drafts and the respondents' positive attitudes towards video feedback. These findings suggested that video feedback can effectively address the drawbacks associated with traditional teacher-written feedback.

It could be concluded that the results of the present study proved that video feedback, as a teacher feedback method, had a significantly positive effect on ESL learners' paragraph writing skills.

Conclusion

The study's findings indicate that video feedback has a significantly positive impact on ESL learners' writing when compared with traditional teacher-written feedback. Learners who received video feedback demonstrated higher levels of correctness/ accuracy in their subsequent writings and expressed more positive attitudes towards the feedback process. The descriptive analysis highlighted that the students found video feedback to be more engaging, comprehensive, and useful for their revisions.

Furthermore, thematic analysis revealed that video feedback effectively integrated technology into ESL lessons. The method was accessible and user-friendly and represented a novel approach in English Language Teaching (ELT). Learners in the test group showed a clear preference for video feedback and recommended its incorporation into ELT practices.

These outcomes suggest that video feedback can serve as a valuable alternative to teacher-written feedback, addressing its drawbacks and enhancing the overall feedback experience for the learners. It is recommended that the educators consider adopting video feedback methods to improve students' engagement, to facilitate more effective revisions, and to integrate technology in language teaching.

Conflict of Interest

The author confirms that she has no conflict of interest.

References

Ali, A.D. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(8), 106-121. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p106

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.

Bakla, A. (2018, December). An overview of screencast feedback in EFL writing: Fad or the future? Paper presented at the International Foreign Language Teaching and Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language, Bursa, Turkey.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language* Writing, *14*(3), 191-205.

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: Cambridge University Press.

Darabad, A.M., & Bahrebar, S. (2013). Writing in the foreign language classroom: The effects of prompts on the Iranian learners of English. *International Journal of English Language Education, 1*(3), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v1i3.3492

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.

Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research, 83*(1), 70-120. doi: https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350

Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes. An Advanced Resource Book.* London: Routledge.

Keh, C.L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294-304.

Klimova, B. (2015). The role of feedback in EFL classes. *Procedia -Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199*, 172 -177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.502

Kunwongse, S. (2013). Peer Feedback, benefits and drawbacks. *Thammasat Review, 16*, 277-288.

LaFontana, V.R. (1996). Throw away that correcting pen. *The English Journal, 85*(6), 71-73.

Lee, I., (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *ELSEVIER, 8*(3), 216-237.doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2003.08.002

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Myers, S. (1997). Teaching writing as a process and teaching sentence level syntax: Reformulation as ESL, composition feedback. *TESL – EJ, 2* (4).

Norton, L. S., & Norton, J. C. W. (2001, June). Essay feedback: How can it help students improve their academic writing? Paper presented at the first International Conference of the European Association for the Teaching of academic writing across Europe, Groningen, The Netherlands. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED454530.pdf

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Introduction to Academic Writing.* NY: Pearson Education.

Ozkul, S. (2014). Video Inclusive Portfolio (VIP) as a new form of teacher feedback in teaching writing (Master's thesis, Bilkent University). Bilkent University Institutional Repository. http://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/handle/11693/15655.

Qualitative coding. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.cessda.eu/Training/Training-Resources/Library/Data-Management-Expert-Guide/3.-Process/Qualitative-coding

Rust, C., O'Donovan, B., & Price, M. (2005). A social constructivist assessment process model: How the research literature shows us this could be best practice. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 30*(3), 233-241. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500063819

Silverman, D. (2009). *Qualitative Research. Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage Publications.

Sperling, M., & Freedman, S. W. (1987). A good girl writes like a good girl: Written response to student writing. *Written Communication, 4*(4), 343-369. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088387004004002

Tan, B. H. (2011). Innovative writing centers and online writing labs outside North America. *Asian EFL Journal, 13* (2), 391-418.

Vengadasamy, R., (2002). Responding to student writing: motivate not criticize. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 2*(3), 1-9.

Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher written feedback on L2 student writings. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(2), 427-431. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.2.427-431

Williams, J. D. (2003). Preparing to teach writing: Research, theory, and practice. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Zhang, Y. (2018). Analysis of using multimodal feedback in writing instruction from EFL learners' perspective. *English Language and Literature Studies, 8*(4), 21-29. https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v8n4p21