Video Inclusive Portfolio (VIP) as a New Form of Teacher Feedback in Teaching
Writing

The Graduate School of Education

of

Bilkent University

by

Sertaç Özkul

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Art

in

The Program of

Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Bilkent University

Ankara

February 2014

BİLKENT UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

MA THESIS EXAMINATION RESULT FORM

February 13, 2014

The examining committee appointed by the Graduate School of Education

for the thesis examination of the MA TEFL student

Sertaç Özkul

has read the thesis of the student.

The committee has decided that the thesis of the student is satisfactory.

Thesis Title: Video Inclusive Portfolio (VIP) as a New Form of

                       Teacher Feedback in Teaching Writing

Thesis Advisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe

                       Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

Committee Members: Asst. Prof. Dr. Louisa Buckingham

                       Bilkent University, MA TEFL Program

                       Prof. Dr. Arif Altun

                       Hacettepe University, Department of Computer and

                       Educational Technologies

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

_____
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ortaçtepe)
Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

_____
(Asst. Prof. Dr. Louisa Buckingham)
Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

_____
(Prof. Dr. Arif Altun)
Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Graduate School of Education

_____
(Prof. Dr. Margaret Sands)
Director

ABSTRACT

VIDEO INCLUSIVE PORTFOLIO (VIP) AS A NEW FORM OF TEACHER
FEEDBACK IN TEACHING WRITING

Sertaç Özkul

M.A. Department of Teaching English as a Foreign Language
Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Deniz Ortaçtepe

February, 2014

Feedback provision is an important duty of foreign language writing teachers. Yet, the attitudes of teachers and the feedback channels they use might affect the amount of correction students can incorporate into their written work. For example, learners incorporate more correction when they have the opportunity to have short conferences with their teachers. However, holding conferences with the learners might not always be possible due to crowded classroom settings. Then, writing teachers provide their learners with feedback traditionally, mostly by indicating learners' errors and mistakes, and commenting on their written work. While some learners utilize teacher feedback delivered traditionally, some others cannot benefit from the teacher feedback equally as it either includes too much metalinguistic explanation, learners interpret teacher comments incorrectly, correction symbols are confusing, or etc. Therefore, this study investigated whether a new form of teacher feedback delivered through videos might be an alternative to traditional feedback.

To explore whether computer technology might be used as a new method, the researcher formed two groups of learners: an experimental group and a control group. The sample included students in the foundation course at Kadir Has

University, the researchers home institution. While the experimental group received video feedback, the control group received traditional feedback for five of their weekly assignments. Since the feedback videos were part of a portfolio writing task, the researcher named the feedback videos "Video Inclusive Portfolio" (VIP).

The data were collected and analyzed in three steps. Firstly, the amount of overall correction incorporated by the experimental group and the control group was calculated and analyzed with a Mann-Whitney U test. The findings revealed that video feedback helped learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts. Secondly, the study also investigated whether video feedback helped learners incorporate more correction for feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit feedback, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback). A second Mann-Whitney U test analyzed how learners of the two groups utilized feedback from different categories. The findings indicated that while the form of feedback (video feedback or traditional feedback) did not exhibit any statistically significant difference for explicit feedback category, video feedback enabled learners to incorporate more correction in terms of simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback. Finally, learners' perceptions were investigated through a questionnaire administered to the experimental group at the end of the study. The findings of the questionnaire also confirmed that video feedback might be an alternative to traditional feedback in teaching writing skill.
Key Words: Video Feedback, Teacher Feedback, Feedback in Teaching Writing

ÖZET

YAZMA BECERİSİ EĞİTİMİNDE YENİ BİR DÖNÜT YÖNTEMİ OLARAK
VİDEO İÇERİKLİ PORTFOLYO (VİP)

Sertaç Özkul

Yüksek Lisans, Yabancı Dil olarak İngilizce Öğretimi Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Deniz Ortaçtepe

Şubat, 2014

Yabancı dilde yazma becerisi derslerine giren öğretmenlerin en önemli görevlerinden biri öğrencilerin yazılarına dönüt verilmesidir. Ancak, öğretmenlerin tutumları ve kullandıkları dönüt verme yöntemleri öğrencilerin yazılı çalışmalarında gerçekleştirebilecekleri düzeltme miktarını etkileyebilmektedir. Örneğin, öğretmenleriyle kısa yüzyüze görüşme fırsatına sahip öğrenciler çalışmalarını yeniden yazarken daha çok düzeltme yapabilmektedirler. Fakat, kalabalık öğrenci kitlelerinin varolduğu durumlarda öğretmenlerin herzaman öğrencileriyle görüşerek yüzyüze dönüt verme şansı bulunmamaktadır. Bu durumda öğretmenler, öğrencilerin kağıtları üzerinde birtakım düzeltme, işaretleme ve yorumlar yapmak suretiyle öğrencilerine geleneksel olarak dönüt verirler. Bazı öğrenciler öğretmenlerince verilen geleneksel dönütü başarılı bir şekilde kullanarak yazılı çalışma taslaklarını iyileştirebilirken, bazı öğrenciler düzeltme sembollerinin karmaşık olması, öğretmen tarafından verilen dönütü doğru anlamama ve verilen dönütün çok fazla dilötesi ifadeler barındırması gibi sebeplerle öğretmenlerinden aldıkları dönütten aynı oranda faydalanamamaktadır. O nedenle, bu araştırma videolarla iletilen öğretmen

dönütünün geleneksel dönüt verme yöntemine alternatif bir uygulama olup olamayacağını incelemiştir.

Video dönüt yönteminin yeni bir uygulama olarak kullanılıp kullanılamayacağını anlamak için araştırmacı biri deney, diğeri kontrol grubu olmak üzere iki grup kurmuştur. Bu gruplardaki öğrenciler, araştırmacının çalışmakta olduğu kurum olan Kadir Has Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce hazırlık eğitimi almaktaydılar. Uygulama beş hafta sürdü ve araştırmacı haftalık ödevler için deney grubuna video dönüt, kontrol grubuna ise geleneksel olarak kağıtları işaretlenerek dönüt verilmiştir. Dönüt videoları bir portfolyo yazma çalışmasının parçası olduğundan, araştırmacı uygulamaya "Video İçerikli Portfolyo" (VİP) adını vermiştir.

Toplanan veriler üç aşamada incelendi. İlk olarak, deney grubu ve kontrol grubunun, araştırmacının verdiği dönütten sonra ne kadar düzeltme yaptığı hesaplandı ve bir Mann-Whitney U testi ile analiz edildi. Bulgular, öğrenciler bir sonraki taslaklarını yazarken video dönüt onlara daha çok düzeltme yapabilme imkanı verdiğini ortaya koymuştur. İkinci olarak, video dönütün dört dönüt kategorisinde (doğrudan düzeltme, basit-mekanik, karmaşık-mekanik, organizasyonel dönüt) daha çok düzeltme yapılmasını sağlayıp sağlamadığı da incelemiştir. İkinci bir Mann-Whitney U testi iki gruptaki öğrencilerin farklı kategorilere ait dönütü nasıl değerlendirdiklerini analiz etmiştir. Bulgular ışığında, doğrudan düzeltme kategorisinde video dönüt ve geleneksel dönüt yöntemi arasında istatistiksel olarak önemli bir fark ortaya koymazken, basit-mekanik, karmaşık-mekanik ve organizasyonel dönüt kategorilerinde video dönüt istatistiksel olarak önemli farklarla öğrencilerin daha fazla düzeltme yapmalarını mümkün kılmıştır. Son olarak, öğrencilerin video dönüt uygulaması hakkındaki görüşleri araştırmanın

sonunda deney gurubuna verilen bir anketle incelenmiştir. Anketten elde edilen bulgular da İngilizce yazma becerisi eğitiminde, video aracılığıyla verilen dönütün geleneksel olarak verilen dönüte alternatif olabileceğini teyyid etmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Video Dönüt, Öğretmen Dönütü, Yazma Becerisi Eğitiminde Dönüt, Geleneksel Dönüt

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have materialized without the support and the faith of some professors, colleagues, classmates, and family members of mine.

I am deeply grateful to my thesis advisor, Asst. Prof. Deniz Ortaçtepe. She has always been extraordinarily constructive, tolerant, and supportive, and her meticulous comments and feedback were an enormous help to me. I have greatly benefited from Asst. Prof. Dr. Julie Mathews-Aydınlı, too. Her guidance and persistent help, and the discussions in her classes have been insightful.

I consider it an honor to have had Proffessor Arif Altun, Assist. Prof. Louisa Buckingham, and my advisor Asst. Prof. Deniz Ortaçtepe on my jury at my defense. Their insightful comments, criticism, and questions have provided me with new horizons for future research and study.

I am particularly grateful for the assistance and support given by my colleague and a Bilkent University MA TEFL graduate, Ayşe Engin. I owe a very important debt to her as she encouraged me to attend this program, and she was there for me whenever I needed help.

I would particularly like to thank Dr. Erdem Öngün, another colleague of mine at my home institution, Kadir Has University. Beside his intellectual contribution at all stages of my thesis, Dr. Erdem Öngün has always been a trusted colleague, a true friend, and a guiding light since I met him.

My heartfelt appreciation goes to my classmates Fatma Tanrıverdi Köksal, Dilara Yetkin, Selin Müftüoğlu, Fatma Gürman Kahraman, Tufan Tığlı, Işıl Ergin, Ahu Burcu, and Ufuk Keleş. They have always been cooperative and friendly, and I cannot pass over the fact that our classroom discussions and presentations were insightful, facilitating intellectual development in our profession. I would like to

offer my special thanks to Ufuk Keleş. He has been greatly supportive, and while I was writing this thesis, his comments and suggestions were invaluable. Being classmates with him was a great experience, now being friends with him is a real privilege. Apart from this thesis, he is another asset that remains from my study at Bilkent University.

I deeply appreciate Pelin Konuk's kindness and company: but for Pelin, I could have been lost in the statistical tests of this study. I wish her all the best, and know that she will become a great teacher of mathematics when she finishes her masters at Bilkent University.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Kadir Has University for their financial support. By supporting me to attend this program, Kadir Has University has one more time shown that they valued knowledge and professional development.

Finally, I want to thank my sister Selin Süzgün and my cousin Fulya Akgüner, who were always supportive and my saviors in the mornings of sleepless nights in Ankara.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Writing and speaking are the two productive skills in a language; however writing is different from speaking because developing the writing skill requires systematic training (Yule, 1986, p. 212). In order to handle a writing task, learners need to be able to "produce grammatically accurate sentences, connect and punctuate those sentences, select and maintain an appropriate style, signal the direction that the message is taking, and anticipate the readers' likely questions so as to be able to structure the message accordingly" (Thornbury, 2006, p. 248). To help learners develop those fundamental writing sub-skills, and improve their writing ability in a second or foreign language, writing lessons are mostly planned in accordance with a product or a process approach.

A product approach to writing instruction means providing the learners with a model to reproduce it. By contrast, a process approach focuses on some critical processes of writing such as "drafting, structuring, reviewing, focusing, generating ideas, and evaluation" (White & Arndt, 1991, p. 5). In the process approach, feedback emerges as the most essential reinforcement while learners try to refine their work through multiple drafts.

Feedback in process approach can be provided in a number of ways: (a) teachers can meet learners for short conferences where they negotiate for how learners can improve their current drafts; (b) teachers may comment on and indicate errors and/or mistakes on learners' submitted written work; or (c) teachers may arrange classroom activities where peers provide feedback to each other. With all these different channels of feedback, the primary aim is correction. It can be positive or negative; implicit or explicit. However, the widespread concern is about the effect

that feedback produces. Feedback has proven to be valued by learners of second/foreign language writing, so teachers spend a lot of time to provide learners with feedback. Then, the question is how teachers of English can provide more effective feedback.

The advancement of computer technology and its present contribution to language learning cannot be underestimated. This technology offers various tools to make the language learning/teaching experience more effective, entertaining, and favorable. Therefore, computer technology can also offer ways to improve the effectiveness of corrective feedback in writing instruction. In this respect, video-capture tools might give opportunities for language learners to improve their writing skill through recorded videos where their instructors comment on, or offer corrections to their mistakes and/or errors. These videos can be watched and replayed beyond the boundaries of time and place. The collection of feedback videos also serves learners as a portfolio to track their own writing performance.

Therefore, this study intends to explore how learners respond to video inclusive writing portfolios (VIPs), and in return, what effect the VIPs create on learners' writing development. The research is conducted in an experimental design to examine the difference, if any, between the writing development of the learners from the experimental group and the control group. While quantitative analysis sought possible statistically significant findings about how learners respond to teacher feedback, the qualitative analysis investigated learners' perceptions of the VIPs.

Background of the Study

The process approach to writing instruction is a common practice in teaching writing. The most distinguished characteristic of this approach is that student writers write across multiple drafts, follow strategies with which they form the structure of their writing, review what they write at several different points, generate ideas to refine their work, and finally evaluate their draft (White & Arndt, 1991). The central idea is on the process of revision, and learners are given time to write multiple drafts along with the feedback provided by teachers and/or peers (Brown, 2001).

Feedback is an important aspect of multiple draft second language (L2) or foreign language (FL) writing settings. Teachers respond to learners' written work by showing and defining errors, and offering formative ideas so that learners can improve their work while revising their papers for the following draft (Johnson, 2008). Particularly, when a process approach is adopted, feedback becomes a fundamental element to provide input to learners from the reader for revision (Keh, 1990). This type of input teaches the learner writers what to change and/or add in their following drafts.

Although it is an essential procedure in process writing, there is continuing dispute over the efficacy of corrective teacher feedback. Truscott (1996) argues that grammar correction in second language writing is ineffective and should be abandoned. That is, learners' corrections in subsequent drafts might not mean they learned from their mistakes and the mistakes will not be repeated. This claim is evidenced by Truscott and Hsu (2008) in an experimental study investigating the effectiveness of corrective writing feedback in a multiple-draft setting. At the end of a writing course of 11 weeks, although they receive corrective feedback for the first writing task, and improve their work in the subsequent draft, no significant

improvement is recorded in the experimental group's writing performance in the second writing task (Truscott & Hsu, 2008). That is, the experimental group, which is provided corrective feedback, fails to do better than the control group, which is not provided any feedback, resulting in the conclusion that learners do not learn from corrective feedback.

However, despite a considerable body of research against corrective teacher feedback in English as Foreign Language (EFL) and English as Second Language (ESL) writing contexts, there have been noteworthy studies where teacher feedback proved to be helpful. For example, Yang, Badger and Yu (2006) found that students value and depend on teacher feedback more than their peers'. Other studies suggest that learners embrace corrective feedback, and revisions after corrective feedback improve the quality of learners' written work (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009, 2010; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Evans, Hartshorn, & Strong-Krause, 2011; Ferris, 1997; F. Hyland, 1998).

Teacher feedback for writing can be provided in a number of ways. Keh (1990) and Hyland (2003) pronounce written teacher feedback and conferencing as two common practices. In written teacher feedback, the teacher comments on the errors and the organization of learners' submitted writings, which is, most of the time, done by a formulated set of codes to address some specific errors and mistakes (Johnson, 2008). In conferencing, on the other hand, the teacher meets a learner or a small group of learners to focus on some individual errors. Conferences involve more feedback input with higher accuracy, and the teacher becomes a part of the writing process rather than a grader by manipulating the process and eliciting corrections from learners (Keh, 1990).

Teachers can also benefit from computer technologies to provide corrective writing feedback (Stannard, 2006). Video feedback, in this respect, can successfully combine the elements of aforementioned teacher feedback techniques. According to Bitchener et al. (2005), corrective feedback is most effective when it is provided with individual corrective feedback. This kind of feedback seems possible with the use of recorded videos where teachers can not only reflect on learner errors by using all forms of traditional written feedback (e.g. comments, rubrics, correction codes, etc.) enriched by the audio-visual aids of multimedia, but also humanize the feedback procedure as in conferencing (Stannard, 2008).

Statement of the Problem

Feedback is a fundamental component of the process approach to writing instruction (Brown, 2001; Harmer, 2001; Keh, 1990; White & Arndt, 1991). Although the value of corrective feedback on L2 writing has came under question as a result of Truscott's (1996) article that claimed corrective feedback was ineffective and harmful, there is a growing body of research that suggests corrective teacher feedback is valued by learners (e.g., Ekşi, 2012; Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998; Keh, 1990; Yang, et al., 2006; Zhang, 1995; Zhao, 2010) and improves learners' L2 writing (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Bitchener, et al., 2005; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1997; F. Hyland, 1998; Lee, 2003). However, the research also reveals that even when useful, there are factors that can limit the effectiveness of written corrective feedback. For example, scheduling one-on-one conferences with students takes a lot of time at crowded teaching settings (Keh, 1990), and the written teacher feedback might not always be helpful due to misinterpretation of correction symbols, or because of learners' low proficiency levels (Lee, 2003).

Computer technology, such as screen-capture videos, offers some new ways of addressing the aforementioned limitations of corrective feedback. While there is growing interest in the idea that screen-capture videos can be helpful in giving written feedback (Crook et al., 2012; Stannard, 2006, 2008), there is little or no research as yet exploring the pedagogical and practical appropriateness of video feedback in second/foreign language writing context.

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in Turkey do not have the opportunity to have individual conferences on their written work due to crowded classroom sizes. At Kadir Has University English Preparatory School, where this study was conducted, the students are supposed to rely on the written teacher feedback because the timetable and the writing syllabus rarely allow the teachers to work with students individually. While students can ask for an appointment with the teacher during an office hour, or go to the writing center, again due to the large student population, or sometimes because the students do not want to stay at school after classes, most students do not benefit from conferencing with the writing teacher, a reality which clashes with the idea of offering equal opportunities to each and every learner at the school. As a result, there is a clear need for a meaningful and appealing means of providing written feedback that can improve learners' L2 writing beyond the boundaries of time and place; thus, this study focused on video feedback as a possible alternative to traditional feedback methods in foreign language writing. In that sense, this study addressed the following research question(s):

Can the video-feedback be an alternative for traditional feedback in EFL writing?

a. Does video-feedback help learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts than traditional feedback?

b. Does the form of feedback (video or traditional) effect how correctly learners incorporate explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback in their subsequent drafts?

c. What are learners' perceptions of video feedback in EFL writing?

Significance of the Study

Recent studies have focused mostly on the effectiveness and different forms of corrective feedback, and how feedback is perceived by teachers and learners of English. However, there is little research on how computer technology can improve current feedback practice in foreign language writing. Therefore, this study intends to explore implications on the extent of improvement video feedback can yield. Next, the study also investigates whether student writers learn from the feedback and improve their writing skill over time, or whether they just achieve short-term success. Finally, the conclusions of this study may reveal whether video feedback can help meet the needs of learners and teachers of English stemming from the limitations of current writing feedback practice.

In developing countries like Turkey, the young population is large. As a result of this large young population, most educational institutions, both private and state, have to accept more learners than they can accommodate. Therefore, learners do not always have equal chances to meet their instructors after teaching hours for one-on-one conferences, which impedes the quality of their education. In this respect, implementing video feedback into curricula might create opportunities for instructors

to provide quality teacher feedback on learners' written work, and in return, learners might improve their writing skills.

Conclusion

This chapter introduces the study with a statement of the problem, research questions, and the significance of the study. The next chapter reviews the relevant literature thoroughly. In the third chapter, the methodology of the study is explained by considering the sample, the setting of the study, and the data collection procedures. The data collected is analyzed and reported in the fourth chapter. Finally, the fifth chapter discusses the findings by referring to the existing literature. Pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research are also considered in chapter five.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter consists of five main parts, each of which explores research to understand the practice of feedback in teaching English in second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) contexts. The first part describes two main approaches in writing instruction, product and process writing. The second part sheds light on the importance of feedback in process approaches. This part is followed by a review of issues that concern the effectiveness of teacher feedback in learners' writing revisions. The fourth part, then, outlines two controversial perspectives over providing written corrective feedback to English language learners. The final part investigates how computer technology is used to provide feedback, and in what ways it has improved the current practice of offering feedback to learners of English.

Writing in English as a Second/foreign Language Classroom:

Common Approaches

The teaching activities in writing instruction are largely shaped by three approaches: product, process, and genre. Badger and White (2000) explain that product-based approaches emphasize structural knowledge of language, and according to them, development of the writing skill is the result of imitation of input provided by the teacher. In this approach, writing instruction has four distinctive stages: 1) familiarization, which exposes the particular features of a text, 2) controlled writing, 3) guided writing, and 4) free writing. The last three stages give student writers gradually increased freedom while they practice the skills they learned in the familiarization stage. Genre approaches are considered to be new in English language teaching. However, they are quite similar to product approaches in some aspects. For example, writing is again regarded as a linguistic competence as in

product approaches, but unlike product approaches, the social context of the written work is emphasized (Badger & White, 2000). Process approaches, on the other hand, emphasize the linguistic skills like planning, pre-writing, and drafting instead of linguistic knowledge, such as grammar and text organization (Badger & White, 2000). The process approaches to writing instruction do not include explicit language teaching, but learners develop their writing skills similar to that of L1 acquisition, during which children develop their mother tongue. That is, they do not learn the language but develop useful strategies to use it. Therefore, throughout the cyclical stages of prewriting, composing/drafting, revising, and editing, "teachers draw out the learners' potential" (Badger & White, 2000, p. 154). As a result, Badger and White (2000) suggest that a blend of process and genre approaches can foster L2 writing because a mixture of linguistic input and skills instruction can be considerably effective.

The approach employed in a writing class shapes the stages, teaching activities, and the learning outcomes of a writing lesson. Therefore, the choice of appropriate approach is crucial, and has become a disputable issue (e.g., Badger & White, 2000; Horowitz, 1986; Murray, 1972; Watson, 1982). Watson (1982) advocates the process approaches because product approaches have too much emphasis on mechanics and since learners merely imitate others' writing, they cannot learn the necessary writing skills. However, there are still some advantages of using the most distinguished feature of product approaches: the models, which show learners how the end product should be (Watson, 1982). Writing teachers can exploit models in their classes because they 1) provide a wide range of targeted lexical items, patterns, rules, and conventions; 2) exhibit a variety of styles, audience, and rhetorical organization; 3) and offer insight into different cultures, customs, values,

ideas, and attitudes from all around, especially when the text is authentic (Watson, 1982). Yet, the use of models is more helpful when they are introduced in a process of writing after learners produce their drafts. If done so, learners first focus on the communicative purpose of the work and the linguistic skills that are necessary, and then, they compare their work with the model to see what modification they need (Watson, 1982). That is, instead of imitation, learners read the model for comparison.

Horowitz (1986), on the contrary, criticizes process approaches in teaching writing for a number of reasons. First, he argues that there is not only one unique process for all kinds of writing. For example, the process approach of writing lessons does not prepare learners for the academic essays they compose in written examinations, where they only submit one single draft whereas they revise multiple drafts over a semester. In addition, Horowitz (1986) is concerned about the suitability of process approach to the writers. He argues that most university writing assignments and examinations require data analysis procedures, so learners do not need the essential stages of prewriting and outlining prescribed by process approaches. In short, Horowitz (1986) draws attention to the fact that some writing genres, such as examinations and university essays, have some distinguished features, and they can be written without the requirements of a given approach. Therefore, teachers should be careful while they adopt techniques to teach skills that do not resemble to the ones the learners will use in practice.

According to Murray (1972), one of the earliest proponents of process approaches, adopting a process approach to writing in classes is markedly better than adopting a product approach because it is only in process writing that learners discover the language and become better writers. Murray (1972) says, "instead of teaching finished writing, we should teach unfinished writing" (p. 4). Murray's

(1972) advice is to 1) give learners ample opportunity to practice writing and be patient, 2) accept learners' text as the subject of writing courses, 3) encourage learners to write with a focus on purpose, not a focus on mechanics, and 4) grade learners' papers at the end of the process, not during the process because a grade finishes a work. If teachers can apply these simple principles learners will benefit a lot from lessons and they will be able to improve their writing skill.

Feedback in Process Writing

Responding to learners' work in multiple-draft writing is an essential feature of process writing. In her study, Keh (1990) defines feedback as "input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision", and she explains "feedback is a fundamental element of a process approach to writing" because it is a fundamental component of multiple-draft writing settings (p. 294). According to Keh (1990), there are three forms of feedback which are peer feedback, conferencing, and written teacher comments, all of which have different advantages. For example, peer feedback is of great value because the learners reach a wide audience, conferences prevail a better atmosphere where learners can interact with their teachers, and written teacher comments can focus on specific problem, explain, and make suggestions to these problems.

Revision has been accepted as an indispensible part of process writing that can improve L2 learners' writing skills (Ferris, 2003a; Keh, 1990; White & Arndt, 1991). Nevertheless, student writers' ability to incorporate the provided feedback into their succeeding drafts is not the only determining factor for better revisions. The quality of feedback is as important as learners' ability to use it appropriately. Therefore, researchers and theorists have also investigated the nature and the effectiveness of the two feedback channels, teacher and peer feedback.

Peer Feedback

Although a great amount of data come from L1 research, L2 writing teachers and theorists are now paying more attention to peer feedback (Ferris, 2003a). Peer feedback has found its practice in L2 writing settings because it brings some educational advantages. For example, 1) it can save teachers' time in some activities, 2) feedback is provided in a more natural language that learners can process, 3) learners address to a greater audience, and thus take the writing task more seriously, and finally, 4) readers learn more about their own writing by critically analyzing their peers' papers (Keh, 1990).

In addition, peers also provide useful feedback. The study of Mendonca and Johnson (1994) shows that student writers revise their work effectively according to the feedback from their peer readers. Mendonca and Johnson (1994) set their study to investigate how L2 nonnative speakers of English use their peers' comments, and their perceptions about the peer reviews. The analysis of the peer reviews and the written papers of the learners together with post-interviews reveal that learners incorporated 53% of revisions offered by their peers. These findings are in line with Caulk's (1994) study which investigates how student writers respond to their peers' reviews by comparing their first and second drafts. Thirty randomly chosen papers from different assignments suggest some crucial pedagogical implications about learners' perceptions and use of peer feedback. According to Caulk's (1994) findings, 84% of the peer comments were utilized in learners' subsequent drafts. Furthermore, 60% of peer feedback includes suggestions that Caulk (1994) does not mention in his feedback. As a result, peer feedback creates valuable opportunities for students writers to refine their work: 1) the amount of feedback increases, 2) peers can provide different feedback than that of the instructors', and 3) peers provide

specific feedback without an authoritative position, unlike the teacher who is seen as an assessor most of the time (Caulk, 1994). These findings, in that sense, concur with previous research that confirm the positive impact of peer feedback (e.g., Ferris, 2003a; Leki, 1990; Mendonca & Johnson, 1994).

Peer feedback may also have its drawbacks. Rollinson (2005) discusses three problematic aspects of peer feedback: 1) peer feedback may consume a lot of time which can be used for learning activities, and training the learners to provide peer reviews also requires some considerable time; 2) some students may need persuasion to get them value peer feedback, some others may feel uncomfortable due to their personalities or cultural backgrounds, and/or the age or the language proficiency level of learners may also outweigh the benefits of peer feedback; and finally 3) the teacher may feel uncomfortable to leave such an important and demanding responsibility to learners.

Teacher Feedback

Since teachers have been investing a lot of their time responding to learners' work, written teacher feedback has been a main area of research in the literature. Researchers have rigorously investigated the extent to which as well as ways they should attend to submitted the work of learners', the ways learners respond to teacher feedback, the efficiency and problems of feedback provision, and the comparison of teacher feedback with peer feedback as the other main feedback channel.

Montgomery and Baker's (2007) research not only investigates teachers' and learners' perceptions of written teacher feedback, but also explores the quality and quantity of teacher feedback integrated in learners' written work. This comprehensive research also explains the procedure of teacher feedback. The questionnaires were administered to both learners and teachers, and the analysis of

results reveal three important findings about written teacher feedback: 1) learners value the feedback provided by the teacher; 2) teachers do not always provide the same amount of feedback to learners; and 3) teachers give a greater amount of local feedback and a rather limited amount of global feedback.

Emphasizing the importance of teacher feedback in multiple-draft process writing settings, Ferris (1997) investigates what characteristics of teacher commentary influence student revision, and how learners respond to teacher commentary in their subsequent drafts. She examines the marginal comments and endnotes of a teacher in 110 pairs of first and second drafts of 47 ESL students enrolled in a composition course at a Californian public university. The analysis of the data was two-fold: 1) the teacher commentaries are grouped in accordance with the comment length, comment type, use of hedges (e.g., lexical hedges, syntactic hedges, and positive softeners), and text-specific comments, and 2) first and second drafts of the learners are systematically analyzed to see how they utilize the comments in their revisions. The findings show, in terms of teacher commentaries, that students value and pay a lot of attention to teacher feedback, and teacher feedback helps them refine their drafts. In terms of the overall effect on learners' papers, it has been reported that the changes suggested by the teacher improved the subsequent drafts, and although teacher comments have positive effects on the whole, questions, positive comments, and hedges almost do not lead to any improvement. Ferris (1997) concludes that teacher commentary in response to student writing is very helpful as long as teachers are careful with their responding strategies, and the learners are trained to process the feedback efficiently.

Hyland's (2003) research investigating the practices of L2 writing teachers is similar to that of Ferris' (1997). Likewise, Hyland (2003) tries to understand the

general feedback practice and how learners incorporate teacher feedback into their subsequent drafts. As for the students, they all value the teacher feedback and try to improve their following drafts with it. However, unlike Ferris (1997), Hyland (2003) explores what effect form-focused feedback creates on learners' writing practice. One of the findings of this study suggests that teachers attend to issues related to form more than issues related to content and organization while giving feedback. According to Hyland (2003), this kind of feedback is appropriate because form-focused feedback can foster immediate improvements in learners' writing. Although there are some studies that emphasize controversy over form-focused feedback (e.g., Zamel, 1985; Hendericksen, 1978; Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996 as cited in Hyland, 2003), Hyland (2003) argues that learners want their errors to be corrected (Radeki and Swales, 1988; Leki 1991; Ferris, 1995; Cumming, 1995 as cited in Hyland, 2003).

Ashwell (2000) evaluates the effect that teacher feedback can create with a detailed study model. His study compares how learners in three different groups with three different feedback patterns respond to teacher feedback. The first group is given content-focused feedback on the first draft and form-focused feedback on the second draft; the second group is given the vice versa, and the final group is given no feedback. Ashwell (2000) reports that there is no significant difference in the improvement recorded between the first and the second feedback groups. This result is interesting as it contradicts with some previous research. For example, Zamel (1982, 1985) advices a focus on content first, and a focus on form later between the drafts of learners, otherwise, learners might pay more attention to linguistic features than the content and the communicative purposes of their work. Another finding of Ashwell's (2000) study is in line with some other research which emphasize that

giving feedback helps learners increase the formal accuracy of their writing (e.g., Bitchener, 2008, 2009; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Ferris, 1997, 2003b; F. Hyland, 1998; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Yang, et al., 2006; Zhao, 2010).

Conferencing. The delivery of teacher feedback can appear in different forms, such as the aforementioned teacher comments in the form of marginal notes and endnotes, and conferencing. Conferences are great assets to student writing because 1) they enable interaction between the student writer and the teacher-reader, 2) the teacher is real, and can ask for clarification, check comprehensibility of the feedback provided, and assist the learners with the problems and their decisions, and 3) conferences contain more feedback, and since the learners can negotiate for meaning, more accurate feedback (Keh, 1990).

The importance of conferencing as a means of providing corrective feedback by teachers is illustrated in Mukundan and Nimehchisalem's (2011) study. The researchers aim to observe what effects peer feedback and tutor conferencing create on learners' subsequent drafts. Results indicate a paramount effect of tutor conferencing on learners' writing performance while peer feedback fails to create the same effect. Another study that stresses the fundamental importance of conferencing is Chia-Hsiu's (2010). The researcher claims that teacher feedback might not always be comprehensible to lower level learners who might need to be supported with individual oral feedback for better revisions of their written work. Goldstein and Conrad's (1990) study is equally important to understand how teacher conferences on learners' writing contribute to their development as better writers. The importance of this study lies in the fact that, while other relevant studies investigate teachers and learners' perceptions toward conferences, Goldstein and Conrad (1990) investigate what happens in teacher conferences and how learners corporate the feedback they

are given during those conferences. The analysis of the taped conferences reveals that learners are much more likely to incorporate the necessary modification successfully into their writing. However, some of their findings contradict with the existing literature. For example, previous research suggests that learners establish the agenda of conferences, and they provide the majority of the input (Cornicelli, 1980 and Zamel, 1985 as cited in Goldstein & Conrad, 1990). Yet, that is not the case in Goldstein and Conrad's (1990) study because the interaction patterns of learners with their teachers offer variety. Therefore, not only do learners need to know why conferences are held and how they can benefit from them but also teachers need to examine their practice especially with regard to personal and cultural differences of their learners.

Issues concerning the effectiveness of teacher feedback

Responding to learners' writing is one of the most important responsibilities of writing teachers. Providing student writers with written feedback offers them individual attention which cannot always be given during the actual contact hours. As the aforementioned literature suggests, with teacher feedback, learners are given the opportunity to unlock their potential in L2/FL writing. However, without careful strategies, and if it is not provided systematically, teacher feedback might not amplify the desired constructive effects.

There is convincing evidence that teacher feedback can be misinterpreted by learners. Hyland (1998) carries out her research with two writing instructors and a group of mixed proficiency level learners in an academic writing setting. Throughout a rich collection of data, (e.g., questionnaires, interviews, think-aloud protocols, collection of written data and classroom observations), Hyland (1998) comes to a number of conclusions. First, if learners are given solely corrective feedback without

any positive comments, they can lose their confidence in their writing ability.
Second, individual students may have different understanding of useful feedback; for
example, learners might value negative feedback because it helps more to improve
their writing; and getting bad results from tests despite being given positive feedback
on their written work, or vice-versa, may change the extent to which learners value
feedback.

Hyland and Hyland (2001) draw attention to a similar issue. They believe that
teachers' response style can manipulate how the feedback is processed by learners. In
their study, Hyland and Hyland (2001) pronounce two teacher acts, praise and
criticism, in end-comments of writing teachers. They argue that these two acts are
important to provoke the desired effect on student writers. However, both of them
carry risks. For example, although praise means help and attention, it can undermine
teachers' authority. Similarly, while criticism intends change for the good, it can
damage learners' confidence. Hence, the observed amount of negative comments in
their study is rather limited; 76% of all criticism and 64% of all suggestions in the
papers they investigated are mitigated in the forms of paired-patterns, hedges,
personalization, and questions. As a result, it can be concluded that while teachers try
to mitigate the language they use, they can create misunderstanding and confusion.

Additionally, Lee's (2011) recent study reveals a wider range of issues
regarding the execution of teacher feedback. According to Lee (2011), firstly, if
writing teachers provide mainly form-focused feedback, and that is the case in her
study, student writers may have the false impression that good writing is grammatical
writing. That is, learners may start thinking that the purpose of writing is producing
grammatically correct texts (Leki, 2001 as cited in Lee, 2011). Second, the writing
teachers in Lee's (2011) study mark errors and mistakes extensively. This practice

suggests that student writing needs to be error free, which is unrealistic because that is against the nature of L2 learning. It should be remembered that some errors are developmental, and they are simply part of learners' interlanguage (Ellis, 1985 as cited in Lee, 2011). Next, providing direct error feedback does not guarantee learning. Nevertheless, most teachers cannot refrain themselves from correcting all the mistakes in learners' papers. Lee (2011) also mentions the possible hazards of grading learners' work because grades can distract students' attention from the purpose of the writing task. In order to overcome such problems, writing teachers can 1) use a genre-specific criteria so as to address all the components of writing; 2) focus on specific errors, or invite learner to choose the component of form or content, and as a result the feedback can serve best to learners' individual needs; and 3) involve learners into the assessment procedure, which not only eases the teachers work, but also raises the awareness of good writing (Lee, 2011).

Although the indirectness of teacher feedback can lead to confusion, and this confusion may negatively affect how learners attend to the feedback provided, there is also a considerable body of research that suggests writing feedback should be indirect (Lalande, 1982; Semke, 1984). Lalande's (1982) study, for example, reports that learners who use an error correction rubric while revising their writing improve much better than those who rest on the direct feedback provided by the writing teacher. Semke (1984) emphasizes that feedback can create some reverse effects if it is direct. That is, the quality of learner writing, and learners' attitudes toward writing in L2 can change for the worse. Therefore, there is a higher possibility for learners to retain feedback and incorporate the suggestions into their language abilities if the feedback is indirect, thus, encourage a problem-solving procedure for learners (Corder, 1981; Brumfit, 1980 as cited in Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, (1986). However,

Chandler's (2003) experimental study reports some contradictory findings suggesting that direct correction and even simple underlining of errors are more beneficial for better revision, and learners prefer this kind of feedback because it makes sense and saves time while revising.

Another study regarding the issues of feedback provision considers the proficiency levels of learners while attending to teacher feedback (Chia-Hsiu, 2010). The researchers' 18-week experimental study is important because the findings show that error correction via teacher feedback is most effective for intermediate or above proficiency level learners. The researcher also concludes that students with low to intermediate proficiency levels should be supported with individual oral feedback in order that they utilize the feedback provided.

In short, there are some underlying assumptions about how quality feedback can be provided to learners of English. That is, the procedures of providing teacher feedback, the content of the feedback in terms of the suggestions provided, learners' proficiency levels and how they might interpret teacher feedback, the extent to which teacher feedback focuses on form, and being whether implicit or explicit are the key factors for quality teacher feedback. The following part will now explore an ongoing argument over whether to provide corrective feedback on L2 learners' written work or not.

The Role of Feedback in Writing Instruction

According to Ferris (1999), "Error correction in L2 writing is a source of great concern to writing instructors and of controversy to researchers and composition theorists" (p. 1). Although some issues regarding teacher feedback are still disputable, its constructive effects on L2 learner writing have been justified. This

part of the chapter reviews the arguments for and against the practice of teacher feedback.

Argument against Written Corrective Feedback

Truscott (1996) argues that corrective feedback is "harmful, ineffective, and there is no research showing it is helpful" (p. 327). He explains that written feedback mostly focuses on grammar correction, and grammar correction has nothing to do with teaching writing. He grounds this argument both on the first language (L1) acquisition and the second/foreign language learning research. Accordingly, Truscott (1996) discusses that neither L1 acquisition theory nor the L2 learning research can suggest convincing evidence for corrective feedback. He concludes that corrective feedback does not improve writing proficiency for a number of reasons. First, while most teachers, intuitively, believe feedback improves learners' writing, this belief comes from an intuition, and corrective feedback barely addresses the "surface manifestations of grammar, and ignores the process by which the underlying system develops" (p. 344). Second, correcting all errors is against the natural order hypothesis, which suggests some language systems are learned before others, and some cannot be learned before others. Third, learners' correcting their own mistakes might mean "pseudolearning" as well (Truscott, 1996 p. 346). Last but not least, providing feedback is futile because it does not mean learners learn from their mistakes. The impracticalities of corrective feedback are also mentioned: the teachers might not be able to recognize errors, or be inconsistent while providing feedback. Consequently, Truscott (1996) continues to advocate that feedback might be harmful for learners, and thus, should be abandoned.

Argument for Written Corrective Feedback

Teachers and theorist have long been investigating the potential benefits of written corrective feedback, and the ways to improve this practice. Truscott's (1996) article seems to have ignited the continuing debate, and thus, the discussion over the efficiency of written feedback in L2 writing has reached its peak in the past 15 years.

In an attempt to answer Truscott's (1996) conclusions about the ineffectiveness and harms of corrective feedback, Ferris (1999) suggests three reasons to continue error correction in L2 writing: 1) there are convincing studies that show learners value teacher feedback and they find it important for their writing development (e.g., Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994 as cited in Ferris, 1999); 2) academic studies from universities prove that typical ESL errors are not tolerated in students' papers, which may interfere with objective evaluation of learners' papers in higher education; and 3) without error correction, there is no way student writers improve their skills in editing their own writing because they will not feel the need to revise their writing.

One of the studies that investigate the usefulness of corrective teacher feedback is Chandler's (2003) article. The results of the experimental study, which explored the improvement of the grammatical and lexical errors in learners' subsequent drafts over a semester, show that corrective teacher feedback has an important role in reducing the occurrences of errors without any loss of quality or fluency. In another study, Bitchener (2008) reflects on the findings of research with 75 L2 learners from New Zealand. The study that lasted over a two-month period reports the performance of different feedback groups by comparing the pre and post-test results. The results indicate a significant difference between the pre and post-test results of corrective feedback groups. Most importantly, the level of accuracy of the

targeted language function is retained two months later without any further feedback or teaching. This finding refutes the claim that learners' correcting their errors in subsequent drafts is "pseudolearning" (Truscott, 1996, p. 346).

The studies listed in Table 1, on the other hand, uncover direct evidence in support of corrective teacher feedback. In fact, those studies listed are not primarily intended to investigate whether corrective teacher feedback improved learners' writing skill, but they all suggest similar findings in contrast to Truscott (1996):

Table 1

Research in Support of Corrective Teacher Feedback

Study	Main focus	Finding for corrective teacher feedback
Zamel (1985)	understand the attitudes of writing teachers while providing written feedback	Learners benefit from corrective teacher feedback as long as the feedback is relevant, clear, and comprehensible
Ferris (1997)	explore the nature of teacher comments and how learners respond to those comments	Learners manage to incorporate a significant amount of corrections into their revisions
Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2005) Bitchener and Knoch (2009)	explore the effects of different types of written corrective feedback on learners' writing skill	Learners benefit from corrective teacher feedback: some linguistics structures are used more accurately with the help of feedback provided by teachers
Chia-Hsiu (2010)	investigate the effects of different feedback forms in an experimental research	Error correction is significantly effective in improving the overall quality of learners' written work.
Evans, Hartson and Stron-Krause (2011)	evaluate dynamic written corrective feedback	dynamic written corrective feedback provided by the course teacher improves the accuracy of learner writing

In short, the literature provides sufficient amount of data from a wide variety of research on corrective feedback. The following section will review how computer technology has taken its place to improve the quality of feedback practice.

Computer Technology in Written Corrective Feedback

Computer technology has already found its place in English language teaching in several different forms. There is no doubt that computer technology does, and can, improve the quality of education, and provide enriched input for language learning. In fact, there is nothing more natural than adopting computer technology into the English language teaching classrooms since "our learners are digital natives" (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007, p. 9). Henceforth, the review chapter has focused on the traditional practice of providing learners of English with written feedback in a number of forms. This part of the chapter will now explore how computer technology has served, and can serve, learners for better revisions of their written work.

Word Processors

When computer technology is considered, probably the first tool to name is word processors. Bangert-Drown's (1993) meta-analysis of word processing in writing instruction yields deep insights into the contributions of word processors to student writers. The researcher investigates a considerable number of studies, and draws conclusions under four categories; the quality of writing, number of words, writing conventions, and frequency of revisions. The findings are as follows: 1) two thirds of the 28 studies analyzed suggest that the use of word processors during writing instruction improved the overall quality of learners' writing; 2) all the studies but one suggest that learners with access to word processors write significantly longer than those who do not have access to word processors; 3) in four studies out

of nine, learners confirmed more positive perception toward writing, and two studies emphasized a direct link between having access to word processors and positive attitudes toward writing task; and 4) there is no significant evidence that learners with word processors make more revisions, but in the study of Frase et.al (1985 as cited in Bangert-Drown, 1993) learners incorporated more revisions than the control group when they were asked to revise a 470-word passage (Bangert-Drowns, 1993).

Audio Feedback

In their article, Lunt and Curran (2009) express learners' dissatisfaction with the quality, the timing, and the detail of the feedback they are given. Departing from learners' discontent with the current written feedback practice, they investigate the effectiveness of audio feedback compared to written feedback. In their study, 60 students are given feedback through MP3 files which are recorded by the audio software Audacity. The participants are then administered a survey to investigate their overall perceptions on audio feedback. The result is encouraging because the findings of the survey show that the learners think the teacher cared more about them when learners are given audio feedback. Although the study does not come from a second/foreign language writing instruction context, it provides insights into the practicality of making use of technology to provide quality feedback on the written work of learners.

Video Feedback

There is convincing evidence that word processors and audio feedback can improve L2 writing (e.g., Bangert-Drowns, 1993; Lunt and Curran, 2009), and they are available and applicable tools and/or methods in language teaching environments. These two tools can be combined with videos to provide richer and quality teacher feedback.

In his internet article, Stannard (2006) suggests video feedback for improved drafts of learner work. By introducing screen-capture software as a new method of providing corrective feedback to learners of English, Stannard (2006) explains that learners can submit their work in any form of electronic document, and teachers can record videos by using all the tools of their word processors while they speak to their microphones and the webcam of their computers record their video image into the screen-capture video. In another article, Stannard (2008) elaborates on the disadvantages of traditional written corrective feedback: 1) written corrective feedback is sometimes misunderstand by learners because what the instructor writes or corrects is not always clear or meaningful; 2) revising is not a favorable stage for all the learners, therefore, a new technique can be asset to motivate student writers; 3) students want conferencing; 4) traditional practice of feedback is text based, hence, it only appeals to learners with linguistic intelligence, especially those who like reading; and finally, 5) feedback that is delivered in written form have a rather limited information. As a result, learners can be provided with rich feedback reinforced by audio-visual elements of computer technology. It is also in this article that Stannard (2006) recommends further study to investigate the extent of improvement video feedback can exhibit.

As a matter of fact, video feedback has found its place in higher education. Crook et al.'s (2012) research reports on the findings of a recently piloted study at Reading University. In order to evaluate the faculty professors' and the learners' perceptions about video feedback, the researchers collect data through pre and post questionnaires administered to the staff and the participating students. Findings show that: 1) the majority of staff members' (75%) attitudes toward feedback has changed positively; 2) 80% of the participating students enjoyed being addressed with videos;

3) most students are actively engaged with the feedback in videos and 60% of the students find video feedback more encouraging than the traditional feedback; and finally, 4) 61% has revisited their video feedback (Crook et al., 2012).

As a result, computer technology offers a vast potential for improving the quality and the standards of teacher feedback in teaching writing. This technology has already found its place in language classrooms serving different purposes. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, there is limited research investigating how teachers of English, as well as learners, can benefit from computer technology to achieve desired objectives for writing skill in their language classrooms through teacher feedback improved by technological tools.

Conclusion

This chapter summarizes the existing literature about writing feedback in five main parts, which accordingly 1) explain two main approaches to writing instruction, 2) explore the importance of feedback in process approaches to writing instruction, 3) review the issues that might influence the effectives of teacher feedback, 4) outline two controversial perspectives over providing written corrective to English language learners, and 5) investigate how computer technology is used to provide feedback.

The following chapter will describe the methodology of the study by focusing on the setting and the sample, the data collection procedures, and the data analysis techniques.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study aims to investigate whether video feedback can be an alternative for traditional feedback practice in foreign language writing classes. To explore whether video feedback can be used as an alternative method in writing instruction, the study sought answers to the following research question and its sub-questions:

Can video-feedback be an alternative for traditional feedback in EFL writing?

a. Does video-feedback help learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts than traditional feedback?

b. Does the form of feedback (video or traditional) effect how correctly learners incorporate explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback in their subsequent drafts?

c. What are learners' perceptions of video feedback in EFL writing?

The answers of these research questions were pursued in an experimental design over a five-week period. The students from two classes of the same language proficiency level were randomly assigned to one experimental group and one control group. Throughout the study, while the former was provided with VIPs, the latter received feedback traditionally (see the Data Collection Procedure section for more details). Consequently, in order to answer the main research question, the researcher 1) analyzed the extent of correction made in the learners' second drafts after they were provided feedback for their first drafts; 2) compared how feedback from different categories was utilized by the learners; and 3) explored perceptions of the

learners in the experimental group through a questionnaire administered at the end of the study.

This chapter will now relate the methodology of the study through five sections in detail: setting and sample, instruments, data collection procedure, and the techniques employed in the data analysis.

Setting and Sample

The research was conducted at the English Preparatory School of Kadir Has University (KHU), İstanbul, Turkey. The ultimate reason for conducting the research at this university is because it was a readily available resource to the researcher. The researcher is an instructor at this university, and the school management encourages professional development through academic studies.

Since most courses offered at the university are taught in English, students at KHU are supposed to attend a full-year English language preparatory program before they can start their majors. The students who can show evidence of English proficiency are exempt from the English preparatory program. Accredited evidence of English proficiency means obtaining the minimum passing score which is the equivalent of B2 level in Common European framework. According to this criterion, learners are supposed to obtain a minimum of 5.5 from IELTS (Academic), 70 from TOEFL IBT, or 60 out of 100 from the KHU English Proficiency Test. When students attend the English preparatory program, they take the KHU English Proficiency Test at the end of their studies, and continue their faculty education if they can meet the exit criteria.

The education at the English preparatory school is delivered in two semesters, and the curriculum integrates four skills, and puts emphasis on academic English. That is, unlike a skill-based program, the courses offered are interrelated. The weekly

syllabi involve a theme which develops activities to teach the four language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) along with grammar, vocabulary, and academic English skills altogether.

This study was conducted as part of the writing lessons. In fact, students learn writing in two different courses. Genres like writing emails, preparing CVs, writing summaries, reviews, and postcards which belong to the everyday use domain of the target language are covered in main-course lessons, whereas the more academic genres like paragraph and essay writing (e.g., comparing and contrasting, opinion paragraph/essay, argumentative paragraph/essay, etc.) are covered in the reading-writing course. The instructors of these two courses can be the same or different according to their availability for scheduling. The writing tasks of the main-course are generally product-oriented and most of the time learners are not expected to write multiple drafts. However, the reading-writing course introduces a theme through reading activities, and adopts a process approach to teach a new academic genre with the introduced theme. At this stage, teacher feedback is of paramount importance since learners go through the cycles of multiple-draft process writing.

As for the execution of the reading-writing lessons, the weekly syllabuses follow these steps: 1) The reading content is presented to initiate discussion and teach lexical items, 2) following writing activities in the text book are covered, and 3) the first draft of writing portfolio task is done in the classroom. Writing portfolios are an important part of writing courses at the English preparatory school. Each week, students are given the writing task in their classrooms as if they were given a writing test, and they are asked to revise it in another teaching hour after the teacher reads all the papers to give feedback with correction symbols. In this way, students

are expected to develop a portfolio of their writing with which learners' writing performances can be monitored closely.

Since the research was designed to investigate how learners utilize teacher feedback provided via two different forms, video feedback and traditional feedback, the empirical data came from the drafts of students from two different classes. The researcher contacted the school management and requested permission to conduct the study with two groups of learners of the same proficiency level. The management allocated two B1 level (intermediate) classes of the same proficiency level from the class of 2013, Spring Semester. These classes were being taught by two different instructors, but they both followed the same syllabuses, and they were of similar academic backgrounds. The researcher randomly assigned one of these classes as the control group, and the other as the experimental group.

The control group, which was known as BP3, consisted of 24 students, 14 of who were males, and 10 of who were females. On the other hand, the experimental group, which was known as BP1, consisted 23 students, 14 of who were females and 9 of who were males. The students were all young adults, whose ages varied between 17 and 23. They all had different social and educational backgrounds.

Instruments

There were two sets of instruments used in this study; the instruments that were used to collect data for analysis, and the computer technology instruments to make and deliver VIPs.

Data Collection Instruments

The empirical data for this research was obtained from two sources: 1) the participants' multiple drafts of in-class writing assignments over a five-week period and 2) a questionnaire (Appendix 1) administered at the end of the study to

investigate the experimental groups' perception of the video feedback practice. The questionnaire involved 17 questions in three separate parts. The first part with seven questions intended to explore what the experimental group thought about the traditional teacher feedback provision in their writing classes. The second with nine questions intended to understand how video feedback provision was perceived by the learners. Finally, the last part, which involved only one gap-filling item, intended to note the sample's ideas for how video feedback could be improved, and what video feedback lacked during the five-week practice.

Computer Technology Instruments

The application of this new kind of feedback as part of the writing program over five weeks at the English Preparatory School of KHU required the use of some technology. The computer technology employed involved a screen capture software, a PDF file editing software, and a YouTube account to post videos to students.

The screen-capture software. There were several alternatives for the software that could be used to record the screen video while providing feedback. Most screen video capture software come with similar default tools and properties. For example, almost all the software enables the user to insert a real time camera image of the speaker, texts, indicators, banners, highlighters, and other images into the video, which improves the interactivity of the recordings. However, Screencast-O-Matic seemed to be the best software to serve this study for a number of reasons: 1) the software was license-free to record screen capture videos for 15 minutes, which was enough for video feedback provision as videos longer than 15 minutes would be too long for students, and make them lose their interest; 2) the software was easy to use and did not require any specialization/training in computer

technology; 3) the software allowed a wide variety of setting options to adjust the screenshot size and video size.

The PDF file editing software. A PDF file editing software was needed to mark the first drafts of the experimental group's papers before the video feedback was recorded for each and every student. The researcher a freeware software called PDF-Xchange Viewer to mark and highlight the errors on the scanned PDF files of the experimental group's papers. This software was also used as the default screen image for the feedback videos.

A YouTube account. www.youtube.com was used to broadcast videos to the sample. The fact that YouTube is entirely free and lets its users to publish unlimited number of videos which are not longer than 15 minutes was the reason for using a video sharing website like YouTube. Furthermore, Youtube enabled the researcher to send videos privately to the students as the "publish to a group or a person" option restricted the audience for the videos, and notified the recipients with an email when a video was uploaded for them. Another asset of publishing videos on Youtube was that the number of visits to the videos could be tracked as the website generated reports on how frequently and when the videos were watched, which helped the instructor to send a reminder to the learners with another email when the video was never watched.

Data Collection Procedure

Right after the school management approved of the research and assigned two classes to conduct the study, the researcher arranged a meeting with the participants to present the research procedure, and asked for their consent (see Appendix 2 for the informed consent form) to use and publish the findings of the study. During this

meeting, the researcher also collected the email addresses of the participants so that he could send them private video feedback via YouTube.

Next, the researcher met with the writing teachers of the control group and the experimental group to brief them about the logistics of the study. The first drafts of the weekly writing portfolio assignments were sent to the researcher over a five-week period. The researcher provided the control group with traditional way of feedback. That is, the researcher just marked the errors in learners' papers according to the correction symbols (see Appendix 3 for correction symbols) which was a standard policy in feedback provision at the school, and gave overall comments. On the other hand, the experimental group was provided with the same kind of feedback (e.g., correction symbols and overall comments), but with a different technique. The feedback for the experimental group was delivered in the form of videos with the help of computer technology. The papers of the students from the experimental group were first scanned to create PDF files so that the drafts were ready to process digitally. With the help of Xchange Viewer, the PDF editing software, those files were then marked and commented on according to the correction codes (see Appendix 3), and after this step, the videos in which the researcher indicated both the structural and organizational errors as if he were speaking to the students were shot. The final step was publishing the video files individually on YouTube.

After all the learners-both control and experimental groups- were provided feedback on their first drafts, and a copy of their papers were taken for data analysis, they were requested to submit their second drafts within a week. The second drafts also received feedback from the researcher, but the students were not asked to submit a third draft. The researcher obtained the copies of first and second drafts for data analysis. Finally, the researcher used a cover sheet (Appendix 4) for each learner to

record the amount of feedback provided in the first draft and how much of it was incorporated into the second draft. The number of drafts analyzed each week in this study was not equal to the number of students in each class because some students were reported to be absent on the days of written work submission. Therefore, only the papers with two drafts were used in the data analysis. Table 2 shows the number of papers retrieved in two drafts at the end of the study:

Table 2

The Number of Students' Drafts Submitted throughout the Study

	Experimental Group (Class size: 23 learners)		Control Group (Class size: 24 learners)	
	1st Draft	2nd Draft	1st Draft	2nd Draft
Week 1	15	15	14	14
Week 2	14	14	15	15
Week 3	13	13	10	10
Week 4	11	11	14	14
Week 5	12	12	16	16

The cover sheet was divided into four main categories so as to track how learners interpreted and used different feedback forms. The first category was used to record the explicit feedback items. These items involved the researcher's explicit corrections for the learners' errors and mistakes. Feedback for capitalization, pluralization, word order, and unnecessary word were also accepted as explicit feedback because the researcher's feedback did not require any complex language ability to incorporate. The second category addressed some simple mechanical errors and mistakes, and the third category involved complex mechanical mistakes and errors. Mechanical mistakes were recorded in two separate categories because while some of them did not require complex metalinguistic knowledge (e.g., spelling, punctuation and articles), the others required some metalinguistic awareness and

grammatical processing (e.g., missing word, subject-verb agreement, fragment, reference, etc.) in order to incorporate the feedback provided. The final category recorded feedback on organizational issues (e.g., length of text, missing/extra paragraphs, supporting ideas and examples, thesis statement and the introduction, repetition, etc.)

Filling out the cover sheets was an important step before the data analysis because it enabled the researcher to convert the written data coming from drafts into numeric data. Cover sheets were administered for papers with two drafts, and they only recorded the amount of feedback items provided in the first draft and the amount how the addressed feedback items were corrected in the second draft of each learner. That is, neither the errors and mistakes which the researcher did not address in a first draft nor the new ones that occurred in a second draft were recorded.

At the end of the five-week video feedback process, a questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was administered to explore the experimental group's perceptions of traditional feedback they were provided before the study and the video feedback they were provided during the study. Since the control group did not receive any video feedback, the questionnaire was solely given to the experimental group.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data of this research were obtained from two different channels: the students' drafts and the questionnaire. In order to analyze the data coming from these two data sources, SPSS 18, the software to run descriptive and inferential statistical analyses was used. The initial step of the analysis was performing two Mann-Whitney U tests to investigate which treatment, VIPs or traditional feedback, was better. While the first tests analyzed the overall amount of correction incorporated into learners' second drafts (sub-research question a), the second test examined how the learners in the experimental and the control groups processed and used feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and

organizational) in their following drafts (sub-research question b). Due to the small sample size, the Mann-Whitney U test, the non-parametric equivalent of independent samples t-test, was employed.

The data from the questionnaire, on the other hand, were analyzed more qualitatively to explore the perceptions of the learners in the experimental group (sub-research question c). The questions in the first set (1-7) were compared and contrasted with the questions in the second set (8-16) through descriptive statistics. The last item in the questionnaire, question 17, investigated what the learners thought the video feedback lacked, and how it could be improved, and the answers to this question were interpreted in terms of the content analysis of the ideas suggested by the learners.

Conclusion

This chapter first described the setting, participants, instruments used for data collection, and the data collection procedure. Then, the data analysis techniques used to seek answers for the research questions are outlined. The following chapter will give a detailed account of the data analysis procedure and the findings.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This experimental study investigated whether VIPs can be an alternative for traditional feedback. In order to explore to what extend and how VIPs can help learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts, the study intended to answer the following research question and its sub-questions:

Can the video-feedback be an alternative for traditional feedback in EFL writing?

> a. Does the video-feedback help learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts than the traditional feedback?
>
> b. Does the form of feedback (video or traditional) effect how correctly learners incorporate explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback in their subsequent drafts?
>
> c. What are learners' perceptions of video feedback in EFL writing?

Data Analysis Procedure

This study was conducted at the English Preparatory School of Kadir Has University (KHU) in İstanbul, Turkey. The sample consisted 47 EFL learners of the same proficiency level from two different classes. After assigning the experimental group and the control group randomly, the study took place in two folds: 1) feedback provision over a five-week period, and 2) analyzing the data coming from the instruments, which were the learners' drafts and the questionnaire (Appendix 1) administered at the end of the study.

After the orientation meetings with the sample and the writing teachers of the two classes, the researcher was delivered the weekly writing assignments of the learners. The researcher then provided the control group with traditional feedback in accordance with the correction symbols (Appendix 3) which were already in use at the institution. The experimental group, on the other hand, was provided with video feedback (VIPs). That is, the researcher recorded screen-capture videos in which he indicated and commented on the errors and mistakes of the learners. The VIPs included the PDF images of the learners' first drafts, the video image and the voice recording of the researcher as well as a pointer on the screen (Appendix 5). Before recording the videos, the learners' papers were also marked with the same codes in the correction symbols list (Appendix 3) as was done for the control group. Those videos were than uploaded to Youtube.com so that the learners could watch them while they wrote their second drafts. During this procedure, the researcher kept a copy of all the incoming and outgoing drafts for the analysis step.

As for the data analysis, the researcher transferred the raw data retrieved from the first and second drafts into the cover sheets (Appendix 4) where the types of feedback items and whether these items were incorporated into the following draft correctly were tracked. The numeric data retrieved were then entered to SPSS to investigate whether there were statistically significant differences between the two feedback practices. The questionnaire was only administered to the experimental group at the end of the study since it 1) involved questions which compared the two feedback types, and 2) the control group never received video feedback.

The main research question is answered through three sub-questions so as to evaluate the data retrieved from different channels (e.g., learners' drafts and questionnaire) from different perspectives. For example, although one feedback form

would have helped learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts, the learners might have benefitted from the other feedback form in one or more feedback categories. Therefore, while sub-question a allowed an overall comparison of video feedback and traditional feedback, sub-question b investigated whether the form of feedback effected how correctly the learners used the feedback from different categories. In other words, sub- question b searched if any one of the feedback forms could be a better option while addressing particular issues in learners' written work. However, sub-question a sought a more general answer to diagnose which feedback form was beneficial to reduce errors and mistakes in learners' second drafts.

In order to answer sub-question a, two hypotheses were suggested, and their validity was tested with the Mann-Whitney U test via SPSS 18. The test checked whether the null hypothesis (H_0) would be rejected or not according to the comparison of how adequately the experimental and the control groups incorporated the feedback they were provided. The hypotheses were as follows:

H_0: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, does not affect the amount of feedback the learners incorporate correctly into their subsequent drafts;

H_1: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, affects the amount of feedback the learners incorporate correctly into their subsequent drafts.

Before performing the tests, the researcher calculated the total amount of feedback provided and the total amount of feedback incorporated correctly into the proceeding drafts. Then, the sums were used to calculate the percentages of to what extent the feedback provided by the researcher took place in its corrected form in

learners' second drafts. These percentages were used as achievement values in the overall analysis. Finally, the data were entered to SPSS to investigate whether there were any significant differences between the two feedback forms.

The sub-question b was pursued to investigate how correctly teacher feedback from different categories was incorporated into the learners' subsequent drafts. Therefore, in order to answer this question, the researcher ran another Mann-Whitney U test to explore possible statistically significant differences between the two feedback forms in regards to different feedback categories. This second test checked the following hypothesis:

H_0: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, does not affect how correctly feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, organizational) is utilized by learners;

H_1: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, affects how correctly feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, organizational) is utilized by learners.

For this second Mann-Whitney U test, the data from the learners' drafts were used in a different manner to observe how feedback from different categories was incorporated by the learners into their subsequent drafts. The researcher first calculated the amount of feedback items each learner was provided. Then, the amount of correction was calculated to find the ratio of correction to the amount of feedback provided. The results were used as achievement values, and the data were entered into SPSS to look for significant statistical differences the two feedback forms.

Finally, the questionnaire administered at the end of the study was analyzed descriptively to answer sub-question c. The questionnaire was comprised of three distinct parts. The questionnaire items in the first two parts intended to explore what the learners in the experimental group thought about the video feedback provided during the study and the traditional feedback which they used to receive before the study. As for the third part of the questionnaire, the researcher conducted a content analysis so as to explore what the learners thought the VIPs lacked according to their experience.

The Effect of Different Feedback Forms on Learners' Subsequent Drafts

This section presents the findings related to the sub-question a of this study. The descriptive statistical results obtained from the Mann-Whitney U test is as follows:

Table 3

Mann-Whitney U Test 1 Descriptive Statistics

	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Assignment 1 Feedback Incorporation	Experimental	15	15.97	239.50
	Control	14	13.96	195.50
	Total	29		
Assignment 2 Feedback Incorporation	Experimental	14	18.04	252.50
	Control	15	12.17	182.50
	Total	29		
Assignment 3 Feedback Incorporation	Experimental	13	15.15	197.00
	Control	10	7.90	79.00
	Total	23		
Assignment 4 Feedback Incorporation	Experimental	11	17.00	187.00
	Control	14	9.86	138.00
	Total	25		
Assignment 5 Feedback Incorporation	Experimental	12	17.46	209.50
	Control	17	13.26	225.50
	Total	29		

Note. N= number of participants
*Mann-Whitney U Test

The findings in Table 3 show that the mean ranks of the experimental group are greater than the mean ranks of the control group in all the assignments. That is, if all the learners' scores, which were calculated by measuring the percentage of correct feedback incorporation into the second drafts (see the Data Analysis Procedure section), are ranked from the highest value to the lowest, the mean ranks for experimental group are higher than the control group. These findings also mean that the learners in the experimental group incorporated more feedback into their second drafts than the learners in the control group. Validity of our hypotheses was checked according to the findings of the first Mann-Whitney U test presented in Table 4:

H_0: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, does not affect the amount of feedback the learners incorporate correctly into their subsequent drafts;

H_1: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, affects the amount of feedback the learners incorporate correctly into their subsequent drafts.

Table 4

Mann-Whitney U Test 1 Statistics

Test	Assignment1 Feedback Incorporation	Assignment2 Feedback Incorporation	Assignment3 Feedback Incorporation	Assignment4 Feedback Incorporation	Assignment5 Feedback Incorporation
Mann-Whitney U	90.500	62.500	24.000	33.000	72.500
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.527	.063	.010	.016	.191
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.533[a]	.063[a]	.010[a]	.015[a]	.195[a]
Exact Sig. (2-tailed)	.540	.064	.009	.015	.198
Exact Sig. (1-tailed)	.270	.032	.004	.007	.099
Point Probability	.007	.002	.000	.001	.003

Note. *p< .05
*Mann-Whitney U Test

Since the population of each group was less than 20 (see Table 2 and/or 3), the test was performed to observe the exact significance values. Out of the three exact significance values, 1-tailed Exact Significance values are used to test the validity of the null hypothesis (H_0) because the assumption suggests equality of the two feedback forms. Therefore, if the 1-tailed Exact Significance values are less than .05 (Exact Sig. (1-tailed) < .05), it means that the null hypothesis is rejected. Such results also confirm statistically significant differences.

In regards to the abovementioned interpretation, the null hypothesis is rejected for Assignments 2, 3, and 4 (accordingly, .32; .004; .007 < .05), and the difference between how video feedback and traditional feedback was incorporated into learners' second drafts was statistically significant. That is, the VIPs the experimental group was provided for their first drafts in assignments 2, 3, and 4 helped the learners in this group incorporate more feedback correctly into their second drafts.

However, the null hypothesis is not rejected for assignments 1 and 5 (accordingly, .27; .099 > .05). These findings suggest that there is no statistically significant difference between VIPs and the traditional feedback for the first and the fifth assignments. In other words, for two assignments, the form of feedback did not make any difference when the learners were asked to write their second drafts in accordance with the feedback they were provided.

To conclude, the results of the Mann-Whitney U test show that the learners in the experimental group benefitted from the video feedback more than the learners in the control group who received traditional feedback in all of the five assignments throughout the study. Nevertheless, although the experimental group's mean ranks for the first and the fifth assignments are higher than the control group's, no

significant difference is observed. On the other hand, three of the assignments show that there is significant difference between the amount of feedback incorporated into the second drafts in the experimental and the control groups because the learners in the experimental group incorporated more teacher feedback into their subsequent drafts with more accuracy.

Why the VIPs did not help the learners with the first and the fifth assignments as much as the second, third, and the fourth assignments can be explained with a number of factors. First of all, since the learners in the experimental group received video feedback for the first time and they were not accustomed to this new form of feedback delivery, they might have found it challenging. Therefore, the amount of correction they incorporated into their second drafts might have remained relatively restricted. Similarly, the amount of feedback incorporated correctly leveled off in the fifth assignment resulting in no statistically significant difference. The reason for this decline might have occurred because the learners were tired of writing assignments, or the assignment topic (writing about charities) was more challenging, which required them to employ more complex language and ideas, and in return, less correction in their second drafts.

The Effect of the Feedback Form on How Learners Incorporate Feedback from Different Categories into their Subsequent Drafts

Sub-question b intended to answer how video feedback and traditional feedback affected the way learners incorporated feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical and organizational) into their subsequent drafts. This section presents the findings related to each feedback category.

In order to observe how feedback from different categories took place in learners' consequent drafts, the researcher calculated the sum of all the categorical feedback items provided for learners' first drafts and the feedback items incorporated correctly by learners in their second drafts. The ratio of correct incorporation of feedback was calculated as the achievement by dividing the amount of correctly incorporated feedback in the second drafts by the amount of feedback provided in the first drafts, and multiplying the result by 100 (achievement= number of correctly incorporated feedback items / number of teacher feedback items x 100). This formula was used to investigate how the learners from the experimental group and the control group utilized the feedback provided by the researcher.

The achievement values for each learner in two groups were entered into SPSS for statistical analysis. Again, the researcher used the Mann-Whitney U test as the populations are small, they have no relation to each other, and their sizes are different. Table 5 illustrates the descriptive statistics of the test.

Table 5

Mann-Whitney U Test 2 Descriptive Statistics

	Group	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Explicit Feedback	Experimental	15	17.33	260.00
	Control	17	15.76	268.00
	Total	32		
Simple Mechanical	Experimental	15	19.70	295.50
	Control	17	13.68	232.50
	Total	32		
Complex Mechanical	Experimental	15	21.30	319.50
	Control	17	12.26	208.50
	Total	32		
Organizational_Feedback	Experimental	15	21.17	317.50
	Control	17	12.38	210.50
	Total	32		

Note. N= number of participants
*Mann-Whitney U Test

As shown in Table 5, while the experimental group involved 15 learners, the control group involved 17 learners. Mean ranks and sum of ranks illustrate that experimental group utilized more teacher feedback because bigger numbers mean higher achievement scores. On the other hand, while the figures are close for explicit feedback, the difference grows with simple mechanical feedback category, and almost doubles in complex mechanical and organizational feedback categories. Findings with statistically significant differences are demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 6

Mann-Whitney U Test 2 Findings

	Explicit Feedback	Simple Mechanical	Complex Mechanical	Organizational Feedback
Mann-Whitney U	115.000	79.500	55.500	57.500
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.632	.069	.007	.008
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.655a	.069a	.005a	.007a
Exact Sig. (2-tailed)	.643	.070	.006	.007
Exact Sig. (1-tailed)	.321	.035	.003	.003
Point Probability	.007	.001	.000	.000

Note. *$p < .05$
*Mann-Whitney U Test

As was explained in the previous section, the test was performed to observe the exact significance values because the population of each group is less than 20. Therefore, out of the three exact significance values, 1-tailed Exact Significance values are credited to test the validity of the null hypothesis (H_0) as the assumption suggests the treatments are the same. As a result, if the 1-tailed Exact Significance

values are less than .05 (Exact Sig. (1-tailed) < .05), it means that the null hypothesis is rejected and the finding is statistically significant.

In the following, the validity of the hypotheses of the second Mann-Whitney U test is illustrated:

H_0: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, does not affect how correctly feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, organizational) is utilized by learners;

H_1: The form of feedback, whether video inclusive or traditional, affects how correctly feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, organizational) is utilized by learners.

Explicit Feedback

The researcher categorized some feedback items (e.g., the immediate provision of correct answers, indicating capitalization mistakes, indicating pluralization mistakes for nouns, showing the correct word order pattern, and crossing out the unnecessary words) as explicit feedback items because such feedback does not require thorough systematic training or metalinguistic knowledge to incorporate.

According to the findings illustrated in Table 6, the feedback provided for the learners' first drafts were mostly incorporated correctly into the second drafts no matter what the feedback form was. As $p > .05$, no statistically significant difference is observed. This finding was also confirmed by the abovementioned descriptive statistics of the test as the mean ranks of the two groups for explicit feedback were similar (Table 5; 17.33 and 15.76 accordingly).

Consequently, it was found that the form of feedback did not make a difference in how correctly learners incorporated explicit teacher feedback into their

subsequent drafts. It can be concluded that the learners trust the corrections suggested by their teacher, and they immediately incorporate these corrections into their subsequent drafts. As for the explicit feedback items (e.g., capitalization and pluralization) apart from the direct teacher corrections, integrating the correction is not challenging if the learners are of a certain language proficiency level (e.g., the sample were B1 level learners getting ready for the upcoming proficiency test, and incorporating such corrections is not expected to be challenging for them).

Simple Mechanical Feedback

Three feedback items on spelling, punctuation, and articles were categorized as simple mechanical feedback because the occurrences of errors and mistakes related to this category were believed to be incidental most of the time, and they could be corrected just by eliciting reaction.

According to the test results in Table 6, p value is smaller than .05 ($p < .035$). Since this finding is against the null hypothesis, H_1 is validated, indicating a statistically significant difference for video feedback. In other words, the amount of correction for simple mechanical feedback items incorporated by the learners in the experimental group was statistically more important than the amount of feedback items incorporated by the learners who were provided traditional feedback.

One reason why the learners in the experimental group were able to incorporate more correction with the feedback in this category can be the fact that VIPs delivered more visual stimuli to encourage correction. Another reason can be the researcher's speech emphasizing the frequency of the mentioned errors and mistakes in the videos.

Complex Mechanical Feedback

The researcher identified errors and mistakes related to missing words, verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, use of wrong words, fragments, and etc. as complex mechanical mistakes and errors. The feedback on such items was categorized as complex mechanical feedback because incorporating such feedback into one's subsequent draft correctly required some metalinguistic awareness and autonomous efficacy. Therefore, the aforementioned issues in learners' written assignments were regarded to be more complex, at least than the ones in the simple mechanical feedback category.

The Mann-Whitney U test showed that the mean rank of the experimental group almost doubled the mean rank of the control group (Table 5; 21.30 to 12.26 respectively). This finding also resulted in a statistically significant difference between the two treatments (Table 6; $p < .003$). These findings suggest that VIPs helped learners integrate more correction of some complex mechanical issues into their consequent drafts; therefore, VIPs offered a considerable advantage while they were redrafting their written assignments. Conversely, it can also be concluded that traditional feedback failed to create the same effect as almost only the half of the feedback provided for the control group was incorporated into the learners' second drafts correctly.

Feedback on Organization

This category involved comments of the researcher on the organization of the sample's assignments. Thus, the feedback items addressed the length of texts, eligibility of supporting ideas and examples, repetition, and the organization of the introductory, body, and concluding paragraphs. That is, unlike the aforementioned

feedback categories, the feedback items in this category were concerned more with the content rather than the form of the sample's written assignments.

Like the complex mechanical feedback items, feedback on organization resulted in more accuracy and correction in the experimental groups subsequent drafts. While the experimental group's mean rank almost doubled the control group's mean rank (Table 5; 21, 17 and 12.38 respectively), the Mann-Whitney U test results indicated a statistically significant difference (Table 6; $p < .003$). The null hypothesis was rejected one more time, indicating the superiority of the video feedback as per organizational feedback. It is concluded that VIPs encouraged student writers to include more corrective alterations and modifications into their drafts. In other words, traditional feedback failed to stimulate learners to incorporate feedback related to the content of their work less than the VIPs did.

Overall, the results indicate that the form of feedback, VIPs or traditional, influence how accurately the feedback from certain categories is incorporated into learners' subsequent drafts. Obviously, according to the statistical data analyzed to answer sub-question b in this part have revealed that the errors and mistakes related to complex mechanical issues and the organization of learners' writing are more prone to correction with VIPs. Student writers benefited from VIPs more mostly because the researcher was talking to them, explaining where the mistakes stemmed from and implying how these mistakes could be corrected. More importantly, it is noteworthy that the gap between the two feedback forms became apart when the feedback categories became more implicit. That is, when feedback was more direct as in explicit feedback category, the form of teacher feedback delivery did not result in a statistically significant difference. However, when feedback was more implicit

as in complex mechanical and organizational feedback categories, the form of feedback resulted in statistically significant differences.

Learners' Perceptions of Video Feedback in EFL Writing

The last sub-question is answered with the data retrieved from the questionnaire (Appendix 1) administered to the experimental group at the end of the study. The questionnaire investigated the learners' perceptions of the traditional feedback they were provided before the study as well as their perceptions of the VIPs. The questionnaire also sought ideas to improve the practice of VIPs as an alternative form of teacher feedback in writing instruction. Therefore, the questionnaire administered was structured in three parts. The first part involved seven questions to explore what the learners thought about written corrective feedback in general and the traditional feedback provision on their writing assignments prior to the study. The second part investigated learners' perceptions of video feedback with nine questions directly. The last part involved only one gap-filling question to investigate what learners thought the VIPs lacked.

The distribution of the data from the first two parts of the questionnaire was analyzed in terms of descriptive statistics with the use of SPSS 18. The findings of the last part were obtained by analyzing the commonalities in learners' responses through content analysis. The findings for each questionnaire item are presented in three sections below.

Questionnaire Part 1

Table 7 shows the summary of the findings gathered from the experimental groups' answers to the first seven items of the questionnaire administered at the end of the study:

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequencies of the Questionnaire (Part 1)

Question		Totally Disagree	Disagree	Largely Disagree	Largely Agree	Agree	Totally Agree
1	f	0	2	9	10	1	0
	%	0	9.1	40.9	45.5	4.5	0
2	f	1	3	3	7	6	2
	%	4.5	13.6	13.6	31.8	27.3	9.1
3	f	0	1	4	7	5	5
	%	0	4.5	18.2	31.8	22.7	22.7
4	f	4	8	3	5	1	1
	%	18.2	36.4	13.6	22.7	4.5	4.5
5	f	2	3	1	0	7	9
	%	9.1	13.6	4.5	0	31.8	40.9
6	f	0	0	0	0	5	17
	%	0	0	0	0	22.7	77.3
7	f	1	9	7	0	5	0
	%	4.5	40.9	31.8	0	22.7	0

Note. N=22; f= frequency; %= percentage of the answer

The first and the second items were designed to explore whether the learners valued corrective teacher feedback. The first item asked learners whether they believed teacher feedback helped them improve their writing skill. While nine students (40.9%) responded that they largely disagreed, ten (45.5%) students responded that they largely agreed. Broadly, the results show that the learners seem to have different perspectives on corrective teacher feedback. However, since the

most repeated answer is 4 (largely agree; mode=10), it is concluded that learners'

perception of general feedback provision is slightly more positive than negative.

The response to the second item was positive by far. 68.2% of the participants

believe that the more errors and mistakes marked by their teachers in their drafts, the

more they can develop their writing skills.

The third and the fourth items of the questionnaire explored whether or not

learners believed that teacher feedback helped them improve their writing skill

through more correction. 77.2% of the learners agreed that the teacher feedback

enabled them to prioritize their learning needs in order to improve their writing

ability in English. However, 68.2% believed that the correction symbols used while

they were provided feedback did not help them at all. This finding can be interpreted

as the learners found the correction symbols challenging when they are to

incorporate the feedback they received into their subsequent drafts.

The following three items, 5, 6, and 7, investigated learners' insights about

the form of feedback. The findings of item 5 presented that while 72.7% of the

learners preferred more explicit feedback, the rest was content with the current ratio

of explicit and implicit feedback they were provided. Item 6 was more intended to

evaluate the form of delivery of the teacher feedback. When learners were asked

whether conferencing would be a better way to negotiate their mistakes and errors,

they agreed 100%. Lastly, item 7 surveyed whether they were able to benefit from

the opportunity to have conferences with their teachers, which they agreed 100% in

item 6 that conferencing would help them improve their written work, 77.2% implied

not having the chances for meeting their teachers for conferencing on their written

work.

In short, the first part of the questionnaire revealed some keynotes about how learners perceived the general feedback practice. One initial finding is that learners prefer more direct contact with their teachers to negotiate their errors and mistakes in their written work. Yet, the majority of the learners believe that they do not have the opportunity to meet their instructors for conferencing. In addition, most learners think increased amounts of explicit feedback can truly improve their writing skill because correction symbols do not always help them. Lastly, may be the most importantly, there is no prevailing consensus over the utility of the traditional feedback practice.

Questionnaire Part 2

Table 8 summarizes the findings obtained from the answers of the experimental group to the second part of the questionnaire. This part included nine questionnaire items to assess the learners' perception toward various aspects of video feedback.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the Frequencies of the Questionnaire (Part 2)

Question		Totally Disagree	Disagree	Largely Disagree	Largely Agree	Agree	Totally Agree
8	Frequency	2	0	0	1	6	12
	Percentage	9.5	0	0	4.8	28.6	57.1
9	Frequency	0	0	1	3	7	10
	Percentage	0	0	4.8	14.3	33.3	47.6
10	Frequency	2	0	6	4	4	5
	Percentage	9.5	0	28.6	19	19	23.8
11	Frequency	0	0	0	0	9	13
	Percentage	0	0	0	0	40.9	59.1
12	Frequency	0	1	1	3	9	7
	Percentage	0	4.8	4.8	14.3	42.9	33.3
13	Frequency	0	4	4	5	2	5
	Percentage	0	20	20	25	9.1	25
14	Frequency	12	6	3	0	0	0
	Percentage	57.1	28.6	14.3	0	0	0
15	Frequency	9	8	4	0	0	0
	Percentage	42.9	38.1	19	0	0	0
16	Frequency	0	0	2	1	4	14
	Percentage	0	0	9.5	4.8	19	66.7

Note. Number of participants (N)= 22.

Questionnaire items 8, 10, and 12 were designed to inquire about the extent to which learners valued the video feedback. While 85.7% said they watched the feedback videos recorded for their assignments more than once, and 90,5% tended to

be more careful while redrafting their assignments because the teacher/researcher addressed them in person, only 61.8% stated that they enjoyed redrafting their work with the help of videos. Although the majority of the learners valued teacher feedback as suggested by the findings of the items 8 and 12, a considerable number of learners (38.1% of all the learners who answered this item, namely eight learners) said they did not enjoy the use of VIPs while writing their second drafts, indicating a controversy.

Item 11 demonstrates the teacher/researcher was 100% believed to have spent much more time for the learners when they were provided with video feedback instead of traditional feedback.

The practicality of the VIPs was questioned in item 13. According to the results, not all the students think that being able to watch VIPs wherever and whenever they wanted is an advantage. 12 students (60%) agreed that the video feedback convenient. However, eight students (40%) opposed this idea by showing negative perception.

Three questionnaire items (9, 14, and 15) were meant to compare and/or contrast video feedback to/with traditional feedback. The learners believed that video feedback was better than traditional feedback because it offered more information than the correction symbols did (95.2%). Furthermore, when they were asked whether they agreed that there were no differences between the two feedback forms, 100% of them disagreed. Similarly, when they were asked whether they would mind the form of feedback they were to be provided for their subsequent drafts, again 100% responded that they would. The findings of these three items (9, 14, and 15) suggest that the learners recognize the differences between the VIPs and traditional feedback, and they value video feedback more.

The last questionnaire item in this group, 16, explored the learners' computer literacy so as to understand whether there were any undermining factors against the provision of the VIPs. While 90.5% of the learners replied that they were equipped with fundamental computer literacy, two learners responded negatively.

As a result, this part of the questionnaire revealed some remarkable insights toward video feedback. First of all, computer literacy does not constitute an impediment for learners to process VIPs, which is important because computer literacy is key to this form of feedback. Furthermore, when the learners were asked to compare the two feedback forms, nearly all of them sided for video feedback. This finding indicates that VIPs appeal to learners' interest. Besides, learners value video feedback more than traditional feedback because they believe the instructor spent more time to provide feedback. On the other hand, some learners stated that they did not enjoy writing their second drafts with VIPs; however, this finding might have occurred as some learners do not enjoy writing classes and tasks in general.

Questionnaire Part 3

The third part of the questionnaire investigated how content the students in the experimental group were with the VIPs. The gap-filling item format was designed to elicit answers from the sample without restricting them, so instead of a Likert-scale design, the participants were invited to voice their own ideas. Since the item asked the participants to report their own opinions and experience with regards to VIPs they were provided, the item mainly investigated what learners thought the VIPs lacked. Out of the 22 students who were present on the day the questionnaire was administered, three students did not respond to this item (N= 22-3=19). The content analysis of the participants' responses revealed some fundamental shortcomings

Nine answers draw attention as the participants complained that they received their VIPs late. Because the researcher was not the teaching instructor of the study groups, the delivery of the drafts to the researcher, and back to the learners, required careful logistics, however, loss of time was inevitable. Consequently, it is clear that this loss of time created some general dissatisfaction as nine students represent almost the half of the population.

Three students reported that the videos recorded for them were lengthy. The screen-capture software enabled the research to record feedback videos of 1-15 minutes long. However, the length of videos depended on the amount of feedback that was first marked on the learners' first drafts. That is, the papers of those learners required longer videos because they were given more feedback. As a result, it can be concluded that some learners are concerned with the length of VIPs.

One participant stated that she was not good with the internet, and she preferred seeing her original first draft while redrafting her assignment. Therefore, this participant was in favor of traditional feedback.

Another participant emphasized that he could not benefit from VIPs greatly because the duration of the study was not enough to get accustomed to VIPs as the practice was completely new to him.

Four students suggested that the VIPs included more details. For example, one student wanted to see more explanation and examples given in a different window while the videos were recorded. Another student explained that some more explicit feedback along with the implicit feedback would have been much more helpful. One response from these students also mentioned the need for more feedback related to the content of their writings.

On the other hand, learner responses also included some positive assets of the VIPs. For example, five students explicitly stated that they were happy with the video feedback practice, and three of them mentioned that they would prefer to be provided with VIPs onwards.

As a result, this last item in the questionnaire enabled the researcher to collect more in-depth data to shed light on how learners perceived VIPs and how they thought VIPs could be improved.

To conclude, the findings of this study present convincing evidence in favor of video feedback in writing instruction through the analysis of learners' written work and the questionnaire administered at the end of the study.

Conclusion

This chapter analyzed the findings of the research conducted to investigate the effects of video feedback and traditional feedback on the sample's subsequent drafts, and the learners' perceptions of the two feedback practices. The data were obtained from two sources, learners' first and second drafts, and the questionnaire administered at the end of the five-week study.

In conclusion, to answer the research questions, the data analysis procedure followed three main steps. Firstly, the data from the learners' weekly assignments were investigated through the Mann-Whitney U test for an overall comparison of the two feedback practices. Three assignments out of five demonstrated statistically significant difference, which meant VIPs helped learners incorporate more feedback into their subsequent drafts than the traditional feedback. In the next step, how learners utilized feedback from different categories was investigated with another Mann-Whitney U test to observe possible relationships among the feedback categories and the form of feedback. It was concluded that while the form of

feedback had little effect on how accurately the feedback from explicit category was incorporated into learners' second drafts, VIPs helped learners incorporate more correction when they used the feedback from complex mechanical and the organizational feedback categories. Finally, the statistical analysis of the learners' answers to the questionnaire yielded considerable insight into the experimental groups' perceptions of the two feedback practices.

    The next chapter discusses the findings, pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further studies.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This experimental study investigated whether VIPs can be an alternative for traditional feedback. In order to explore to what extend and how VIPs can help learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts, the study intended to answer the following research question and its sub-questions:

Can the video-feedback be an alternative for traditional feedback in EFL writing?

      a. Does the video-feedback help learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts than the traditional feedback?

      b. Does the form of feedback (video or traditional) effect how correctly learners incorporate explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback in their subsequent drafts?

      c. What are learners' perceptions of video feedback in EFL writing?

This study took place at Kadir Has University (KHU) in Istanbul, Turkey. The sample came from two B1 language proficiency level classes at the English Preparatory School of KHU. The experimental group involved 24 learners, and the control group involved 23. In order to answer the research questions, the researcher investigated how learners used the feedback provided in two different forms over a five week period. During this period, the experimental group received feedback on their first drafts through videos produced by the researcher and published on youtube.com. Then, the learners were asked to revise their written work with the video feedback they were provided. The control group, on the other hand, received

feedback traditionally as they used to be given prior to the study. For both groups, the researcher used a set of correction symbols which were already in practice at the institution. Throughout the study, the researcher saved a copy of all the learners' assignments for data analysis.

The first and second sub-questions were answered with the quantitative data retrieved from the learners' first and second drafts (106 first, and 106 second drafts in total). The researcher first analyzed whether the form of feedback had an effect on the amount of correction incorporated in the learners' second drafts. Next, the learners' first and second drafts were investigated to detect whether the form of feedback and the feedback categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational) influenced the amount of correction in the learners' subsequent drafts.

The third sub-question was answered through the analysis of a questionnaire (Appendix 1) administered to the experimental group at the end of the study. The learner responses to questionnaire items were analyzed in three sub-categories to evaluate how learners perceived the video feedback they received during the study and the traditional feedback they used to be provided prior to the study.

This chapter will now discuss and evaluate the findings of the research with regards to the research questions and the related literature. The chapter will be concluded with a broader discussion of pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research.

Findings and Discussion

The Effect of Different Feedback Forms on Learners' Subsequent Drafts

The most outstanding finding of this study is that teacher feedback helped learners reduce the number of their mistakes and errors in their subsequent drafts no matter what form of feedback they were given (e.g., video feedback or traditional feedback). That is, teacher feedback is a real asset to learners' writing as it helps them to become better writers in English. This finding is consistent with numerous findings in the literature. Ferris (1997), for example, found that teacher feedback helped learners refine their work. She stressed that learners saw their teachers as a reliable source of knowledge, and tended to benefit from the feedback delivered from that source. Similarly, Bitchener (2008) also proved that learners who were given corrective teacher feedback in his pre test and post-test design did better than the no-feedback group. Furthermore, teacher feedback played an important role in reducing the amounts of errors and mistakes in student writing without any loss of quality or fluency (Chandler, 2003). Therefore, teachers' feedback provision seems to be a meaningful practice for learners to become better writers in English. More importantly, as Ferris (1999) explained, learners would feel no need to revise their written work if they were not provided with feedback.

When it comes to the main concern of this present study, the results suggested that teacher feedback delivered through videos appeared to be better than traditional teacher feedback. The study found that the learners in the experimental group did better than the learners in the control group in all the assignments in terms of incorporating the feedback provided by the researcher. There was a statistically significant difference in three of the five assignments (assignments 2, 3, and 4; see Chapter 4), indicating that providing learners with VIPs was a viable alternative to

traditional feedback provision while teaching EFL writing. This finding can be explained in a number of ways.

To begin with, VIPs include the elements of conferencing. Although the interaction in the video feedback was single-sided, the learners were addressed by the researcher in person as if it were a spoken session. The role conferencing has been stressed in the literature because it creates opportunities for learners to negotiate their errors and mistakes in their written work. While Mukundan and Niemehcisalem (2011) reported that tutor conferencing encouraged more correction in learner writing than peer feedback, and Goldstein and Conrad (1990) confirmed that learners took tutor conferences more seriously and incorporated the majority of the necessary modification they were advised, which suggest that conferences reinforce the possible constructive effects of teacher feedback.

Apart from conferencing, the need for a newer form of feedback mentioned by Lunt and Curran (2009) might also have resulted in the superiority of video feedback in this study. Lunt and Curran (2009), expressing the learners' displeasure with traditional feedback (e.g., quality, timing, and the detail of the feedback), used audio feedback as a treatment which satisfied the learners in their study. Similarly, video feedback might have directly appealed to the participants' needs, as they complained about similar issues regarding the traditional feedback (these issues are discussed in relation with the questionnaire results below).

Another asset of video feedback might be its multiplicity of components. VIPs involved speech, videos, learners' written work, referencing tools like digital dictionaries, pointers, markers, and graphic organizers. Therefore, it is not solely text-based, and it does not only appeal to linguistic intelligence (Stannard, 2008).

Instead, the abovementioned components of video feedback suit multiple-intelligences, and hence, provoke more learner involvement and more correction. As a result, the audio visual feedback delivered via VIPs must have turned into an enjoyable experience when redrafting a piece of written work. Likewise, Crook et.al. (2012) reported that the 80% of the learners in their study enjoyed to have been addressed by videos, and therefore, most students were actively engaged with the video feedback they received. Again, in this study, the questionnaire results revealed that the students were content with VIPs, and they would like to be provided with VIPs for their future assignment (see Learners' Perception of Video Feedback in the following for further discussion).

To sum up, the research design of this study not only verified the positive effects of teacher feedback on learners toward writing better in their subsequent drafts but also revealed that teacher feedback delivered through videos produced successful outcomes when learners were asked to redraft their written work.

The Effect of the Feedback Form on How Learners Incorporate Feedback from Different Categories into their Subsequent Drafts

This study also investigated whether the form of feedback, video or traditional feedback, enabled learners incorporate more correction with feedback from different categories (e.g., explicit, simple mechanical, complex mechanical, and organizational feedback). This investigation not only revealed which feedback form encouraged more correction as for different feedback categories but also identified the general tendency of the researcher while providing feedback for learners' written work.

Similar to the previous research suggesting that teachers tend to focus more on mechanical issues than organizational issues (e.g., F. Hyland, 2003; Lee, 2011;

Montgomery & Baker, 2007). The findings of this study showed that the researcher dealt mostly with form-focused issues in learners' drafts. The descriptive analysis showed that explicit feedback, simple mechanical feedback, and the complex mechanical feedback categories constituted most of the teacher comments. This tendency might have occurred due to the correction symbols as most of them are dealt with mechanical issues rather than organizational issues. In addition, the language proficiency levels of the sample should not be neglected because the participants were all intermediate level learners who were familiar with fundamental paragraph/essay writing conventions. As a result, not many of them received feedback from the organizational category.

The next sections will discuss the findings related to different feedback categories.

Explicit feedback. The findings showed that almost all learners utilized teacher feedback and incorporated maximum amount of correction into their subsequent drafts when the feedback was explicit. Interestingly, both video feedback and traditional feedback were effective when suggested correction was provided explicitly to the learners. This finding may also imply that learners accepted any explicit correction provided by the teacher without any hesitation. The findings of the existing literature also confirm the role of explicit feedback as Ferris (1997; 1999), Hyland (2003), and Montgomery and Baker (2007) underlined that learners valued teacher feedback more than any other channel. More importantly, direct correction and simple underlining of errors are more preferred by the learners since that kind of feedback was more beneficial, timesaving, and made more sense to them (Chandler, 2003).

Simple mechanical feedback. According to the findings of this study (Table 6; Chapter 4), VIPs were able to encourage more correction in terms of simple mechanical mistakes and errors. Feedback items fell into this category were related to spelling, punctuation, and articles. This meant that learners had to choose the correct use among some alternatives, and while making this choice, VIPs might have yielded some advantages because the researcher, for example, indicated the initials of words when there was an article error. Even the intonation and mimics of the researcher might have revealed clues about the correct language use. For example, the way the researcher read a sentence with a missing comma might probably have revealed where the comma was needed. Then, the difference between video feedback and traditional feedback might have resulted from the fact that video feedback carries more information and gives learners clues when they were to correct what they did incorrectly in their first drafts.

Complex mechanical feedback. Another statistically significant difference was observed when the learners processed feedback for their complex mechanical mistakes and errors (e.g., verb tense, subject-verb agreement, missing words, prepositions, word collocations, etc.). It was found that the learners in the video feedback group incorporated more correction into their subsequent drafts than the learners in the control group who received traditional feedback. This finding verifies that video feedback offers some definite advantages to student writers while they revise their written work. Lee (2003) argued that teacher feedback was sometimes misinterpreted by learners in traditional practice because in most cases, the suggestion was no more than a correction symbol on learners' papers. Therefore, this kind of feedback is always susceptible to misinterpretation. On the other hand, according to Stannard (2006; 2008), teacher feedback delivered through videos was

more reliable because it carried more information. In video feedback, while the error and/or mistake is marked with the same kind of correction symbols as in traditional feedback, teacher can comment on the source and/or possible solutions of the problem. This procedure, as it was in this study, involves the advantages of graphic organizers and indicators as well. Presumably, learners detect the reasons for errors and mistakes more accurately and easily, and they take the necessary action required.

Organizational feedback. When the amount of teacher feedback and the correction incorporated by learners were analyzed, it was found that VIPs again achieved more success in encouraging learner to incorporate more correction into proceeding drafts. On the contrary, traditional feedback failed to create the same positive effect. One reason why video feedback was superior to traditional feedback again might be the fact that feedback related to organization of a written work requires more visualization and negotiation of learners' errors and mistakes. That is, delivering this kind of feedback can be rather complicated as the causes of mistakes, errors, or deficiencies related to organization cannot always be indicated with limited correction symbols, or footnotes. However, the VIPs recorded by the researcher in this study, involved elements of conferencing, during which the students received comments with rich input. For example, when the issue was related to paragraphing and/or essay organization, the researcher was able to scroll up and down the page to give ideas for better organization, elicit new ideas, and/or show why some ideas or supporting examples were irrelevant. Thus, video feedback might be adopted as a standard method to deal with ESL and EFL learners' errors and/or mistakes.

To sum up, this study reveals that video feedback has some added advantages when learners deal with errors and/or mistakes related to simple mechanical, complex mechanical and organizational issues in EFL writing. The proceeding part

will evaluate the findings of the questionnaire that was administered to investigate the experimental group's perceptions of the two feedback forms.

Learners' Perceptions of Video Feedback in EFL Writing

Sub-question c was answered with the data retrieved from the questionnaire (Appendix 1) administered to the experimental group at the end of the study. The questionnaire included three sub-categories with questions that served different purposes: 1) exploring learners' overall perceptions of traditional teacher feedback, 2) exploring learners' overall perceptions of video feedback, and 3) detecting the weakness of VIPs. Thus, the findings are evaluated under three subtitles.

Questionnaire part 1. This part of the questionnaire explored the learners' overall perceptions regarding the traditional teacher feedback accompanied by correction codes prior to this study. One finding is that not all the students thought teacher feedback helped them improve their writing skill in English. The fact that 50% of the learners responded negatively is contradictory to the existing literature which emphasized the role of teacher feedback in refining learners' written work (Ferris, 1997). This negative perception can be explained by a number of factors. First of all, some participants of this study might not have embraced the idea of using correction codes instead of explicit feedback. Learners probably had different learning habits, so while some of them enjoyed the process of deciphering correction codes, some found it challenging. In addition, some learners might have been in different developmental stages, and thus, had difficulty in understanding and interpreting the teacher feedback correctly. Also, teachers' different practices while providing feedback might have created a negative perception in learners. In other words, although mostly limited to correction codes, teachers can always detect and focus on

different mistakes and errors with different amount of feedback. As a result, the learners might have lost their faith in teacher feedback.

Another finding was that the more mistakes were marked on their papers, the more content the students were. This finding is markedly the same as Hyland's (2003) views: learners want their mistakes to be corrected. Therefore, it can be concluded that learners valued teacher feedback, and they believed teacher feedback helped them improve their writing skill in English. That is to say, learners stated that they benefited from teacher feedback. Teachers marked their errors and mistakes, and in return, they revised their written work in accordance with the feedback they were provided. It is obvious that learners used their teacher as a guide while they did the necessary revision.

This part of the questionnaire revealed some other important findings, too. For example, learners complained about not having enough opportunities to have conferences with their teachers. Goldstein and Conrad (1990) found that learners incorporated more correction when they had conferences with their teachers. In addition, learners were aware of the fact that they can incorporate the necessary modification if they had conferences instead of traditional feedback, but they said they could hardly have conferences with their teachers. On the other hand, this questionnaire surveyed what form of feedback was preferred by the learners. It was found that learners want more explicit feedback. This finding is consistent with Chandler's (2003) study, which explains that explicit feedback is timesaving and meaningful, thus, learners preferred explicit feedback. However, even though the findings suggest that learners prefer explicit feedback, the findings should be interpreted with caution since the literature suggests the opposite. Lalandale (1982) reported correction symbols were more useful for long-term learning, Semke (1984)

warned that direct corrective feedback could create adverse effects, and Hyland (1998) argues that if learners are solely given explicit feedback, they could lose their confidence in writing. As for the findings, what learners want and what the literature suggests do not match, so to what extent feedback should be explicit or implicit remains inconclusive.

Questionnaire part 2. This part of the questionnaire explored the learners' overall perceptions regarding the video feedback they were provided with during the study. Most findings are in line with Stannard's (2008) study: 1) learners found VIPs appealing because the researcher had addressed them in person; 2) great majority of them watched the videos more than once; 3) most thought the teacher had spent more time, and thus they were more careful while writing their second drafts.

Nevertheless, as opposed to Stannard (2006; 2008), not all the students enjoyed writing their second drafts while/after watching their feedback videos, and some of them did not consider being able to watch VIPs wherever and whenever they wanted as an advantage. These different attitudes can be explained by different intelligences. It is true that the learners participated in this study were already equipped with fundamental computer skills, which was also confirmed by the questionnaire administered at the end of the study (see Learners' Perception of Video Feedback in EFL Writing; Chapter 4). Yet, this finding does not mean they are all audio-visual learners. Some learners like to work with pen and paper while others prefer visual aids. Similarly, some learners may have access to their computer and the internet 24 hours a day, whereas others might not have access to their computers, and thus they might not consider being able to watch their feedback anytime they want as a true advantage.

When learners were asked to compare the traditional feedback and the video feedback, almost all of them confirmed that video feedback was better because this form of feedback delivered more information. This finding showed that learners recognized the distinctive features of the VIPs, and thought these features of their VIPs helped them incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts. More importantly, the findings indicated that if the learners were allowed to choose anyone of the two feedback forms for their future assignments, all the learners would favor video feedback. In short, since learners have embraced video feedback enthusiastically, it can be used as a standard method to provide written feedback.

Last finding in this part confirms Dudeney and Hockly's (2007) definition that "the learners in our classrooms are digital natives" (p. 9). When students were asked how comfortable they were with the computer technology while viewing their feedback videos, almost all of them replied that they had easy access to their videos. That is, the learners participated in this study, and perhaps all their peers of the same and younger generations, are equipped with essential computer skills to reach their videos. As a result, it can be concluded that there is no harm in delivering the teacher feedback through computer technology. It is obvious that computers have become an integral part of our lives, and especially for the learners in our classrooms, computer literacy does not impose a constraint.

Questionnaire part 3. This part of the questionnaire pursued how the provision of video feedback would be improved. The findings indicated some shortcomings of the video feedback. First of all, some learners complained that they received their feedback videos late. The delay was especially because the researcher was not the practicing teacher during the course of the study. Yet, the learners wanted to access their videos as early as possible, and this shows that teacher feedback makes more

sense when it is instant. Therefore, this finding suggests that the sooner teacher feedback is received the more motivated students are. Next, although none of the feedback videos were more than 15 minutes long, few students reported that their videos were lengthy. Those learners might have found their videos long due to their expectations. As pointed in the future suggestions section in the following, another study which focuses on specific feedback categories can be conducted. In this way, VIPs will be shorter and more precise. Finally, few students also mentioned that the duration of the study was not long enough to adapt to VIPs as a new feedback form. Again, a new longitudinal study can overcome this shortcoming as well. The relatively positive answers obtained in this part of the questionnaire are in line with the findings of the previous parts (e.g., learners value VIPs, they want to be given VIPs for their future assignments, etc.).

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this experimental study show that teacher feedback delivered in the form of videos is more helpful than traditional feedback when learners of English revised their written work in a process writing task. The study confirms that video feedback delivers more information, and in return, results in more correction in learners' subsequent drafts. This form of feedback is also superior to traditional feedback when practicing teachers address issues regarding complex mechanical errors and/or mistakes, and organizational problems in learners' written work. Moreover, learners favor video feedback over traditional feedback because they recognize the added advantages that VIPs can offer. These findings of the study suggest a number of noteworthy pedagogical implications for writing instruction in EFL and ESL contexts.

First of all, practicing teachers of English should look for, and embrace, new ideas and methods that may improve their students' learning experiences. In that sense, video feedback is a good example since video feedback not only involves the elements of traditional teaching methods but also blends technology into teaching curricula. The analysis of the questionnaire items also makes it clear that learners are equipped with necessary computer literacy, and they can use VIPs comfortably with ease of access. Thus, the possible benefits technology might offer should never be underestimated as the learners in our classrooms are "digital natives" (Dudeney & Hockly, 2007, p. 9). That is, for today's learners, technology, especially computer technology, is a part of their lives, and while they are involved in technology this much, using technology in language classrooms is an asset. As this study affirms, when computer technology is used for meaningful tasks, it reinforces learners' motivation and provides opportunities for accelerated development in learners' writing skill. To conclude, according to the findings of this research, video feedback is an eligible practice during multiple-draft process writing tasks.

Next, the findings of this study reveal that a newer form of feedback is needed as most students were discontent with the current practice of traditionally given written feedback. The findings also indicated that learners want more conferencing. They want more conferencing because they need their teachers to devote more time on their written work so that they have more input for their subsequent draft, and they improve faster. The results of the questionnaire confirm that not many students have enough time to have conferences with their teachers, and that video feedback provides them with more feedback than traditional feedback can. Therefore, teachers should review the efficiency of their current feedback provision, and consider video feedback as a solution that can enhance their students' writing

ability. It is also true that video feedback is not necessarily the same as conferencing as the interaction is still one-dimensional, from teacher to student. However, this study notes that VIPs are able to deliver more language input in the form of feedback.

Another finding suggests that VIPs can truly be used as a treatment for certain feedback categories. The study indicates that learners incorporate more correction into their proceeding drafts when feedback related to simple mechanical issues (e.g., punctuation, spelling, and articles), complex mechanical issues (e.g., missing words, verb tenses, wrong forms of words, fragments, references, etc.) and organizational issues (e.g., length of the task, paragraph organization, thesis statements, supporting ideas, topic sentences, repetition, etc.) are delivered through videos. As a matter of fact, aspects related to these three feedback categories are the most troubling issues for learners. Therefore, video feedback can be used in particular to address issues concerning writing organization and mechanical errors and/or mistakes.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that the findings of this study contradicts with Truscott's (1997) argument, which calls for abandoning feedback because the corrections incorporated into subsequent drafts are not real learning. Nevertheless, learner responses to the questionnaire items verify their need for feedback from a reliable source, which is, of course, the teacher. In other words, the majority of learners believe correction is vital for better writing; and the more feedback they are given, the more correction they can incorporate into their following drafts. Thus, abandoning feedback provision in writing instruction should not be a matter of question.

Lastly, the findings also clarify that learners prefer more explicit feedback. Although Lalande's (1982) findings encourage using a rubric with correction codes

because these correction codes trigger more learner involvement and foster learning while revising, learners in this study think explicit feedback is more helpful, and this kind of direct feedback encourages more correction as it makes more sense. It is true that correction codes may sometimes result in misinterpretations of teacher feedback, and instead of the change for the good, learners may change their writing for the worse. Therefore, the findings are noteworthy to understand how learners can utilize teacher feedback best. If they can incorporate more correction with explicit feedback, then keeping learners busy with deciphering is not necessarily a must. As matter of fact, this perspective can also clarify why learners favored video feedback more, and why they incorporated more correction into their subsequent drafts as well. They probably did so because the feedback was more intelligible, easier to process, and thus, easier to incorporate.

Limitations of the Study

Since this study was conducted with available resources to the researcher, the overall study may suggest some limitations. In different settings with a different sample, the study may reveal some different findings, and/or more insights into the practice of video feedback in teaching EFL/ESL writing.

One of the limitations is the fact that the study was integrated into an ongoing teaching program. The sample involved learners in a one-year foundation course at the researcher's home institution, hence this study was integrated into the existing curriculum of the school. As a result, the researcher had to collect the data from the assignments that were previously planned by the curriculum unit of the school. This condition restricted the research design because different writing topics might have offered different input for the data analysis. For example, the writing topic of the third assignment asked learners to write a summary of a reading text in their course

book, and in response to this writing task, most learners had tended to copy bits of sentences from the course book instead of producing their own. Had it been a different task, more genuine data would have been retrieved. More importantly, as it was an ongoing program, the researcher had to provide feedback with the same method as was done for other classes. The only change had to be the delivery method. However, if more flexibility was possible, this study could also have focused on some specific mistakes and/or errors of learners in detail.

Another limitation stems from the research design in terms of its length. If the researcher had had more time for the research, for example one or two semesters, the findings would have offered more insight as to whether learners learn from feedback or not. As mentioned previously, whether feedback teaches learners or it simply means learners' correcting their written work for the time being is a long discussion (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007, 2009). This study confirmed that video feedback helps learner incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts. However, the study did not investigate whether learners learned from their mistakes. Namely, the study could have investigated whether the number of certain errors and/or mistakes decreased over a period of time. Such findings would provide considerable evidence for or against the aforementioned argument.

In addition, the study was confined to five assignments investigated over a five-week period. The same investigation with a longitudinal design might have revealed deeper insights into the provision of teacher feedback through videos.

Finally, the researcher was not a practicing teacher at the institution where the study was conducted. That is, he gave feedback to the sample as an outsider. It was probably because of this fact that some learners never responded to the feedback

provided by the researcher. If the researcher had been the practicing teacher during the study, perhaps more students would have responded to the writing tasks, both the first and the second drafts, and perhaps the researcher would have been able to build the necessary rapport as learners were going to know who they were writing to.

Suggestions for Further Research

The findings retrieved from this study indicate that video feedback is definitely a worthwhile practice while teaching writing. However, the limitations of the study have left some questions unanswered.

A similar study can be conducted with a slightly different design which eliminates the limitations this study imposed. For example, the study can be replicated in a longitudinal design with a practicing class teacher. In this way, a newer study can reveal more reliable conclusions about the nature of the existing feedback practice, and video feedback as an alternative.

Another study could also investigate whether students learn from their corrections. As mentioned previously, Truscott (1996) argues that learners' incorporating corrections with the help of teacher feedback into their subsequent drafts does not mean learners do really learn from their mistakes and corrections. Therefore, a longitudinal study can be a great contribution toward answering such a disputed question. A study that investigates whether the occurrences of errors and mistakes related to specific categories increase, decrease, or stabilize after an extended period of time can reveal considerable pedagogical implications, and contribute to the existing literature.

Prospective researchers might also consider replicating this study with a careful attention to the findings of the questionnaire part 3. Some learners reported that 1) their VIPs had arrived late, 2) videos were too lengthy, and 3) the study was

not long enough to get accustomed with VIPs. Addressing those issues in a future study might free researchers so that they concentrate on data collection rather than logistics and satisfaction of their sample.

The design of this study can largely be altered in future research as well. Instead of an experimental design with two, or more, groups of learners, researchers and practicing teachers from all around the world can conduct action research to deal with some specific sorts of problems related to learners' writing ability. This approach might contribute immensely to the existing literature by providing findings from a variety of teaching settings. Consequently, the findings will also include cultural perspectives, which indicate how learners from different backgrounds utilize video feedback.

Another idea for future research could be the investigation of video feedback in distant learning. Today, distance education is an accelerating trend in foreign language teaching, and to the knowledge of the researcher, there is no relevant research regarding video feedback in foreign language education delivered through computer technology. It is also true that distance learning and video feedback use the same technology and the tools. However, to the knowledge of the researcher, there is no clear evidence whether they fit together or not. That is to say, statistically significant findings for video feedback in distance learning might be great contribution to the practice of distance learning, and it can even become an integral part while teaching English, especially writing, online.

Conclusion

This study investigated video feedback as an alternative to traditional feedback in writing instruction. The research questions pursued intended to answer 1) whether video feedback helped learners incorporate more correction into their

subsequent drafts; 2) whether video feedback was more helpful for learners when they dealt with certain errors and/or mistakes; and 3) when compared with traditional feedback, how learners perceived video feedback.

The sample, 47 university-level foundation course students, were divided into one experimental group and one control groups so as to analyze whether, and if yes, to what extent teacher feedback delivered in the form of videos helped learners refine their written work while redrafting in a second draft. Over a five-week period, the researcher provided both groups with feedback. While the control group was given traditional feedback, the experimental group was given video feedback. At the end of the study, the experimental group was given a questionnaire (Appendix 1) in order to assess learners' perceptions of the feedback provision through videos.

The results showed that video feedback was superior to traditional feedback because receiving this form of feedback helped learners incorporate more correction into their subsequent drafts. When how learners utilized feedback related to errors and/or mistakes from different categories was investigated, it was found that video feedback enhanced the amount of correction as for complex mechanical mistakes and errors, and for organizational issues. The data retrieved from the questionnaire indicated that the learners benefited from teacher feedback delivered through videos. The learners from the experimental group reported that VIPs involved more information, that the video feedback was more comprehensible and helpful, and that they would prefer this form of feedback for their future assignments.

All in all, the findings of this study imply that video feedback is an effective alternative method to provide learners of English with teacher feedback. Therefore, video feedback is eligible for classroom practice, and of course, for future research.

References

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 227-257. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8

Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 153-160.

Bangert Drowns, R. (1993). The word processor as an instructional tool: A meta-analysis of word processing in writing instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 63*(1), 69-93. doi: doi: 10.2307/1170560

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 102-118. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Bitchener, J. (2009). Measuring the effectiveness of written corrective feedback: A response to "Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Bitchener (2008)". *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(4), 276-279. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.001

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System, 37*(2), 322-329. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2008.12.006

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(4), 207-217. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002

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. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2 Ed.). New York: Longman.

Caulk, N. A. T. (1994). Comparing teacher and student responses to written work. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(1), 181-188. doi: 10.2307/3587209

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 267-296. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Chia-Hsiu, T. (2010). The effect of error correction on EFL student writing. *Journal of Education Studies,* 45(1), 89-110.

Crook, A., Mauchline, A., Maw, S., Lawson, C., Drinkwater, R., Lundqvist, K., . . . Park, J. (2012). The use of video technology for providing feedback to students: Can it enhance the feedback experience for staff and students? *Computers and Education, 58*(1), 386-396. doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.08.025

Dudeney, G., & Hockly, N. (2007). *How to teach English with technology*: Pearson/Longman.

Ekşi, G. Y. (2012). Peer review versus teacher feedback in process writing: How effective? *International Journal of Applied Educational Studies, 13*(1), 33-48.

Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K., & Strong-Krause, D. (2011). The efficacy of dynamic written corrective feedback for university-matriculated ESL learners. *System, 39*(2), 229-239. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2011.04.012

Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 315-339. doi: 10.2307/3588049

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. (2003a). Responding to Writing. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 119-140). Cambridge: Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Ferris, D. (2003b). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 443-460.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd Ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Horowitz, D. (1986). Process, not product: Less than meets the eye. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 141-144.

Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 255-286. doi: 10.1016/s1060-3743(98)90017-0

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217-230.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S.-Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 307-317. doi: 10.1016/s1060-3743(98)90019-4

Johnson, K. (2008). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching* (2nd

Ed.). Harlow: Longman.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for

implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294-304.

Lalande, J. F., II. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern

Language Journal, 66*(2), 140-149. doi: 10.2307/326382

Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding

error feedback. *Assessing Writing, 8*, 216-237. doi:

10.1016/j.asw.2003.08.002

Lee, I. (2011). Working smarter, not working harder: Revisiting teacher feedback in

the L2 writing classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue

Canadienne des Langues Vivantes, 67*(3), 377-399.

Leki, I. (1990). Potential problems with peer responding in ESL writing classes.

CATESOL Journal, 3, 5-19.

Lunt, T., & Curran, J. (2009). 'Are you listening please?' The advantages of

electronic audio feedback compared to written feedback. *Assessment &

Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(7), 759-769. doi:

10.1080/02602930902977772

Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision

activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(4), 745-769.

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. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Mukundan, J., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2011). Effect of peer review and tutor

    conferencing on english as a second language learners' writing performance.

    Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 19(1), 25-38.

Murray, D. (1972). Teach writing as a process not product. *The Leaflet, 71*(3), 11-14.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its

    effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 83-96.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal,*

    59(1), 23-30.

Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals, 17*(3), 195-

    202.

Stannard, R. (2006). The spelling mistake: Scene one, take one. Retrieved from

    http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode

    =207117

Stannard, R. (2008). New Directions in Feedback. *Humanising Language Teaching,*

    (6). Retrieved from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/dec08/mart04.htm

Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A-Z of ELT: A Dictionary of terms and concepts used in*

    English language teaching. Oxford, UK: Macmillan.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against gramar correction in L2 writing classes.

    Language Learning, 46(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing

    classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2),

    111-122. doi: 10.1016/s1060-3743(99)80124-6

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write

    accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(4), 255-272. doi:

    10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003

Truscott, J. (2009). Arguments and appearances: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(1), 59-60. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2008.09.001

Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y.-p. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 292-305. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003

Watson, C. B. (1982). The use and abuse of models in the ESL writing class. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(1), 5-14. doi: 10.2307/3586558

White, R. V., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing.* London; New York: Longman.

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*(3), 179-200. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004

Yule, G. (1986). *The Study of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(2), 195-209.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 79-101.

Zhang, S. (1995). Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4*(3), 209-222. doi: 10.1016/1060-3743(95)90010-1

Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing, 15*, 3-17. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Yazma Dersinde Verilen Dönüt Uygulaması Anketi

1-16 no'lu sorularda uygun bulduğunuz cevabı, aşağıdaki ölçeğe göre işaretleyiniz.

Kesinlikle katılmıyorum					Kesinlikle katılıyorum
1	2	3	4	5	6

*Yazma dersinde öğretmeninizin kompozisyonlarınıza **geleneksel yöntemler ile (kağıdınız üzerinde düzeltme işaretleri kullanarak)** verdiği dönütlerle ilgili düşünceleriniz:*

1. Öğretmenin verdiği dönütler yazma becerimi geliştirmeme yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Öğretmenin okuduğu kompozisyonlarımda ne kadar çok hatam işaretlenirse, yazma becerimi o kadar çok geliştirebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Öğretmenin kompozisyonlarıma verdiği dönütler yazma becerimi geliştirmek üzere önceliklerimi belirlememde yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Öğretmenin kullandığı düzeltme sembolleri yazma ile ilgili hatalarımı düzeltmeme yardımcı olur.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Öğretmenin kâğıt üzerinde hatalarımı işaretlemesi yerine doğruları yazmasını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Öğretmenle kompozisyonumdaki hatalarım hakkında konuşmak, söz konusu hatalarımı düzeltmek için daha etkili olur.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Öğretmenle kompozisyonlarımda yaptığım hataları düzeltmek için görüşme olanağım her zaman vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6

*Yazma dersinde öğretmeninizin kompozisyonlarınıza **video-dönüt yöntemi** ile verdiği dönütlerle ilgili düşünceleriniz:*

8. Öğretmenin benim için kaydettiği video-dönütleri birden fazla kez izledim.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Video-dönüt yöntemi, düzeltme sembollerinden daha çok bilgi verdiğinden, hatalarımı düzeltmemde geleneksel yöntemlerden daha faydalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Video-dönüt yöntemiyle kompozisyonlarımın ikinci taslağını yazmak hoşuma gider.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Video-dönüt verirken öğretmenin normalden daha çok vakit harcadığını düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Öğretmen video-dönüt yöntemini kullanırken bana bireysel olarak hitap ettiği için kompozisyonlarımın ikinci taslağını yazarken dikkatli olurum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Öğretmenin verdiği dönütleri istediğim zaman ve istediğim yerde izleyebiliyor olmam video-dönüt yönteminin önemli bir avantajıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Kâğıt üzerinde verilen dönütler ile video-dönüt yöntemi arasında fark olduğunu düşünmüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Kompozisyonumun ikinci taslağını yazarken, öğretmenin kulandığı dönüt yöntemi (video yada geleneksel yöntem) benim için pek fark yaratmaz.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Video-dönüt yönteminden faydalanmak için yeterli bilgisayar becerisine sahibim. (Örneğin; kendi adıma yeni bir mail hesabı açabilirim, vb.)	1	2	3	4	5	6

Aşağıdaki soruda, boşluğu kendi ifadelerinizle tamamlayınız.

17. Eğer _____

_____

_____

_____ (olsaydı), video-dönüt yöntemi daha faydalı olabilirdi.

Appendix 2: The Consent Form

Bilgilendirilmiş Onam Formu

Araştırmanın Adı:	VIP (Video Inclusive Portfolio)
Araştırmanın Niteliği:	Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Araştırmanın Amacı:	İngilizce yazma derslerinde öğretmen tarafından verilen dönütün niteliğinin artırılması; alternatif olarak sağlanacak vidyo-dönütün öğrencilerin yazma becerisine ne derece etki edeceğinin araştırılması ve öğrencilerin bu dönüt yöntemi hakkındaki görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi
Araştırma Süreci:	Araştırmacı 04.02.2013-08.03.2013 tarihleri arasında katılımcıların beş adet sınıf ödevine vidyo kayıt teknolojisini kullanarak dönüt verecektir. Böylelikle kullanılan yöntemin öğrencilerin yazma becerisi öğrencilerin etkisi gözlenecektir. Uygulamadan elde edilen veriler istatistik programında yorumlanarak araştırmacının yüksek lisans tezinde değerlendirilecektir.
Araştırmacı:	Sertaç Özkul Okutman, Kadir Has Üniversitesi İngilizce Hazırlık Okulu Öğrenci, Bilkent Üniversitesi MA TEFL Programı
İletişim Bilgileri	sertac.ozkul@khas.edu.tr 05065953660

Araştırmacı Sertaç Özkul tarafından, araştırmaya konu olan çalışma hakkında bilgilendirildim ve bu araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum. Bu araştırmadan elde edilecek veriler basılabilir ve yayınlanabilir.

Ad-Soyad:

Tarih:

İmza:

Telefon:

E-posta

Appendix 3: Correction Symbols

Correction Symbols

Symbol	Meaning	Example of Error	Corrected Sentence
P	punctuation	I live^P and go to school here^P	I live and go to school here.
∧	missing word	^{am} I working in a restaurant. ∧	I am working in a restaurant.
cap	capitalization	It is located at ^{cap}main and ^{cap}baker ^{cap}streets in the ^{cap}City.	It is located at Main and Baker Streets in the city.
vt	verb tense	I never ^{vt}work as a cashier until I ^{vt}get a job there.	I had never worked as a cashier until I got a job there.
s/v agr	subject-verb agreement	The manager ^{s/v agr}work hard. There ^{s/v agr}is five employees.	The manager works hard. There are five employees.
pron agr	pronoun agreement	Everyone works hard at ^{pron agr}their jobs.	All the employees work hard at their jobs.
⌢⌣	connect to make one sentence	We work together. So we have become friends.	We work together, so we have become friends.
sp	spelling	The ^{sp}maneger is a woman.	The manager is a woman.
sing/pl	singular or plural	She treats her employees like ^{sing/pl}slave.	She treats her employees like slaves.
✕	unnecessary word	My boss ~~she~~ watches everyone all the time.	My boss watches everyone all the time.
wf	wrong word form	Her voice is ^{wf}irritated.	Her voice is irritating.
not //	not parallel	Most of our regular customers are ^{not //}friendly and generous tippers.	Most of our regular customers are friendly and tip generously.
Ⓣ	add a transition	The new employee was careless. [Ⓣ]She frequently spilled coffee on the table.	The new employee was careless. For example, she frequently spilled coffee on the table.

ww	wrong word	The food is delicious. ww Besides, the restaurant is always crowded.	The food is delicious. Therefore, the restaurant is always crowded.
ref	pronoun reference error	The restaurant's ref specialty is fish. They are always fresh.	The restaurant's specialty is fish. It is always fresh.
		The food is delicious. ref Therefore, it is always crowded.	The food is delicious. Therefore, the restaurant is always crowded.
wo OR ∽	wrong word order	Friday always is our busiest night.	Friday is always our busiest night.
ro	run-on sentence	ro [Lily was fired she is upset.]	Lily was fired, so she is upset.
cs	comma splice	cs [Lily was fired, she is upset.]	
frag	fragment	She was fired. frag [Because she was always late.]	She was fired because she was always late.
		frag [Is open from 6:00 p.m. until the last customer leaves.]	The restaurant is open from 6:00 p.m. until the last customer leaves.
		frag [The employees on time and work hard.]	The employees are on time and work hard.
prep	preposition	We start serving prep dinner 6:00 p.m. ^	We start serving dinner at 6:00 p.m.
conj	conjunction	Garlic shrimp, fried conj clams, broiled lobster ^ are the most popular dishes.	Garlic shrimp, fried clams, and broiled lobster are the most popular dishes.
art	article	Diners in the United art States expect glass ^ of water when they first sit down.	Diners in the United States expect a glass of water when they first sit down.

Appendix 4: Cover Sheet

CONTROL GROUP   WEEK: . . . . . .

NAME:

Feedback Category	Type of feedback	First Draft	Second Draft
Explicit	Direct answer		
	Capitalization		
	Sing./Pl.		
	Word Order		
	Unnecessary word		
Simple Mechanical	Spelling		
	Punctuation		
	Article		
Complex Mechanical	Missing word		
	Verb tense		
	S/V agreement		
	Pronoun agreement		
	Connect to make one sentence		
	Wrong form		
	Not parallel //		
	Add a transition word		
	Wrong word		
	Add a conjunction		
	Add a preposition		
	Fragment		
	Reference		
	Run-0n sentence		
	Comma splice		
Organizational	Too short/too long		
	Missing/extra paragraph		
	Supporting ideas and examples		
	Thesis statement and introduction		
	Conclusion		
	Irrelevant information/ examples / ideas		
	Repetition		

Appendix 5: VIP Screenshot