ARTICLE

The impact of video and written feedback on student preferences of English speaking practice

Sheng-Shiang Tseng, Tamkang University

Hui-Chin Yeh, National Yunlin University of Science and Technology

Abstract

This study examined the differences in perceptions of the value of feedback for improving English speaking performance between students who received video feedback and those who received written feedback and their preferences for written or video feedback. A total of 43 English as a foreign language students participated in this study to produce a video clip to which their peers responded with either written or video feedback. The collected data included (a) students' video clips before and after receiving peer feedback, (b) the video and written feedback they received, and (c) a survey which the students completed after receiving video or written feedback to examine their own English speaking performance in terms of pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word usage. The findings showed that both written and video feedback was useful for English speaking skill development. Written feedback helped the students learn grammar rules and word usage to achieve greater linguistic accuracy in their English speaking performance. Video feedback helped students improve their intonation. However, neither video feedback nor written feedback could help them significantly improve their pronunciation and fluency. The students also preferred written over video feedback due to its efficiency and clarity.

Keywords: Written Feedback, Video Feedback, English Speaking Performance, EFL Students

Language(s) Learned in This Study: English

Introduction

English speaking is an important skill for students of English as a foreign language (EFL), because it is an international medium of communication that enables them to share their thoughts and ideas with foreigners. However, constraints in Taiwan's educational environment—including exam-oriented syllabi, large class sizes, limited class time, lack of suitable teaching methods, and unqualified teachers (Butler, 2011; Hsieh, 2016)—have limited students' opportunities to develop adequate English speaking skills. According to global TOEFL reports, the English speaking skills of EFL students in Taiwan are lower than those of students in other Asian countries (Ministry of Education of Taiwan, 2016). Furthermore, the annual report of the Educational Testing Service (2017) reported that Taiwanese students' average score on the 2016 TOEIC speaking test was 134, indicating difficulties due to limited vocabulary size and inaccurate pronunciation. These reports strongly suggest that most EFL students in Taiwan have not reached a level of English speaking proficiency required in many professions.

To overcome the shortcomings in Taiwanese English instruction, effective teaching methods need to be introduced. Video feedback, grounded in Paivio's (1986) dual coding theory, has been used by EFL teachers to improve students' English speaking skills. The dual coding theory posits that language processing is composed of linguistic elements, such as text, and non-linguistic elements, such as images. Video feedback is therefore used to combine linguistic and non-linguistic elements to benefit students' English speaking practice. The beneficial features of video feedback include (a) an enriched format for speaking practice that

features images, spoken words, body language, and facial expressions; (b) demonstration of linguistic elements, such as pronunciation and intonation; (c) authentic interactions with peers; and (d) archiving feedback for replaying (Crook et al., 2012; Godwin-Jones, 2003; Goldstein, 2008; Walker & White, 2013). Recognizing these benefits, researchers (e.g., Hung, 2016; Hung & Huang, 2015) have implemented video feedback in language classrooms using video technology or blogs. For example, Hung (2016) investigated the effect of video on EFL learners' engagement in and strategies for providing peer feedback and found that while receiving and producing video feedback, students became more interactive and more engaged in improving their English speaking skills. Similarly, Hung and Huang (2015) examined English oral presentation performance and the effects of video blogging by asking students to upload four presentation files and exchange peer feedback. They found that the students improved in the areas of pronunciation, intonation, projection, posture, introduction, conclusion, and purpose. In a similar vein, Shih (2010), who integrated video blogging with face-to-face instruction in an English public-speaking class, also found that video feedback helped students improve their public speaking performance. These studies suggest the positive effects of video feedback on English speaking skills, such as promoting interaction, fostering engagement, and enhancing presentation skills and speaking performance.

The shortcoming of previous studies is that they used video feedback alone to improve EFL students' English speaking performance, not examining the power of written feedback in English speaking performance training. Written feedback has been used effectively to provide clear and detailed information that students can readily comprehend and interpret. However, few studies have either investigated the benefits of using written feedback in English speaking skill training (e.g., Crook et al., 2012; Hung, 2016; Hung & Huang, 2015; Shih, 2010) or compared the effects of video and written feedback practices on EFL students' English speaking performance. In addition, no studies have explored students' preferences for video or written feedback for training in English speaking skills. Rather, the focus of previous research has been on teachers' perceptions of video and written feedback (e.g., Orlando, 2016). Given the lack of substantive evidence for EFL teachers on which they can base pedagogical suggestions to improve students' English speaking performance, this study investigates the differences in English speaking performance between students who received video feedback and those who received written feedback by proposing the following three research questions (RQs):

1. What is the difference in students' perceptions of their English speaking performance between students who receive written feedback and those who receive video feedback?
2. How do video and written feedback practices help students improve their English speaking performance?
3. What are the students' preferences regarding video and written feedback?

Literature Review

One of the theories supporting the use of peer feedback is Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural theory, claiming that language learning takes place through social interaction. From this perspective, peer feedback can be viewed as a method that allows students to receive and provide constructive knowledge in a socially-interactive learning environment. As Benson (2015) indicated, "the cognitive processes involved in learning are stimulated and supported by communicative interaction and … that cognition is embodied in interaction" (p. 89). Through interaction, students can negotiate meaning, gain multiple perspectives, refine their original understanding, and improve their skills, enabling more comprehensive and deeper thinking toward language learning (Yanguas, 2010). Another construct supporting peer feedback is Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development, meaning that students can move toward their own optimal level of learning through collaboration with more-advanced peers (Lee, 2008; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976). From Vygotsky's theoretical perspective, therefore, peer feedback is a collaborative activity with the potential to improve students' English speaking performance.

Two major forms of peer feedback practice are written and video feedback. Written feedback refers to

written comments or suggestions for improving performance given by peers (Hyland, 2003). The use of written feedback to improve EFL students' English proficiency is based on the noticing hypothesis, arguing that students acquire language when they pay attention to linguistic forms (Schmidt, 1990). The written feedback allows students to explicitly analyze linguistic forms and notice the differences in language forms between their own language productions and the target language input they receive to enhance their language proficiency (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010). In language teaching, written feedback has been used mainly to improve EFL students' English writing (e.g., Kamimura, 2006; Yastıbaş & Yastıbaş, 2015). For example, Kamimura (2006) found that written peer feedback had overall positive effects on both high- and low-achieving students' writing performance, as it provided visible linguistic information that students could consume and interpret at their own learning pace. Likewise, Yastıbaş and Yastıbaş (2015), who investigated the effects of written peer feedback on Turkish EFL students' writing anxiety, found that students perceived that peer feedback decreased their writing anxiety and increased their confidence. These studies support the use of written peer feedback to enhance EFL students' English writing skills.

Another form of feedback practice is video feedback, which emerged during the rapid development of learning technologies. Among studies on the influence of video feedback on EFL students' English speaking skills, Toland, Mills, and Kohyama (2016) found that most EFL Japanese university students agreed that mobile-video reflective feedback could help enhance the quality of presentation performance and speaking proficiency. Similarly, Xu, Dong, and Jiang (2017)—who had students watch five video clips, record a retelling of each story, and receive feedback in the form of multimedia through a social communication app called WeChat—found that students with positive attitudes toward the feedback process gained more confidence when speaking English. In the same manner, Huang and Hung (2013) attempted to explore how a video-based online discussion forum enhanced the English competence of Taiwanese EFL learners. In their study, 17 students participated in a voice-based online discussion forum on the platform Facebook, in which they provided feedback for their classmates' videos. The results showed that the video-based forum activity offered Taiwanese EFL learners additional speaking practice and cultivated their public speaking skills. Overall, these studies all indicated that video feedback could facilitate students' English-speaking skills.

While the research has provided evidence of the effectiveness of the two types of feedback for EFL learners' writing skills (e.g., Kamimura, 2006; Yastıbaş & Yastıbaş, 2015), there is still a need for studies to investigate the extent to which written feedback can facilitate speaking skills. Also, even though some research has investigated how video feedback can benefit EFL learners' speaking skills (e.g., Toland et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2017; Huang & Hung, 2013), little attention has been paid to evaluating (a) the effectiveness of both written and video feedback on EFL learners' English-speaking skills, (b) how the effects of the two types differ, and (c) whether one type is more effective than the other. It is still unclear which aspects of students' English speaking proficiency can be promoted by each feedback practice (written or video). Of the few studies comparing the two types in terms of their effects on students' writing skills, Özkul and Ortaçtepe (2017) found that video feedback was more beneficial in developing EFL learners' writing skills than was written feedback. In addition, Luck, Lerman, Wu, Dupuis, and Hussein (2018) investigated whether students in a teacher-training program preferred written, vocal, or video feedback. They found that all the participants preferred receiving vocal feedback. Again, these studies did not address the effects of feedback type on students' speaking skills—a critical target area in communicative language teaching. To fill this gap, this study investigates the differences in English speaking performance between students who received video feedback and those who received written feedback. It also investigates student preferences for the type of feedback and examines the benefits of both video and written feedback on English speaking performance.

Method

Participants

Participants included 43 third-year EFL college students enrolled in an 18-week undergraduate course,

Multimedia English. The course was designed for practicing speaking and writing skills in the Department of Applied Foreign Languages at a national university in central Taiwan. The first language of the students was Mandarin Chinese. The age of the students ranged from 21 to 22. Among the 43 students, 30 were female and 13 were male. The students were assessed as having upper-intermediate level speaking ability by the General English Proficiency Test (GEPT). The GEPT is a criterion-referenced test developed in 1999 that provides self-assessment and focuses individually on listening, reading, writing, and speaking. The test is used nationwide for assessing English proficiency of EFL learners in Taiwan, so it was deemed appropriate for the evaluation of students' oral proficiency in this study.

Research Design

The 43 participants were divided within the course into 10 video feedback groups ($N = 21$) and 11 written feedback groups ($N = 22$). After the course introduction, from Week 2 to Week 8, each feedback group created a 20-minute video related to cultural topics of Taiwan (see Table 1). The groups then uploaded the videos for peers to review and to provide feedback during Week 9 and Week 10. An oral presentation rubric was distributed to them for peer practice, comprising five categories: pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word usage. Feedback was given to written feedback groups in the form of written texts and to the video feedback groups as a 2-minute video. The recipient students then revised their videos based on the feedback received and submitted revised videos in Week 18 for a second round of feedback. The students used the same oral presentation rubric to assign scores to the revised videos and to give comments and feedback.

Table 1. *Timeline of the Written and Video Feedback Practices*

Week	Activities	Collected Data
Week 1	The instructor introduced video and written feedback practices.	
Weeks 2–8	Students produced and uploaded videos to receive peer feedback.	Videos before the written and video feedback practice
Weeks 9–10	Students provided written or video feedback on videos based on the rubric.	
Weeks 11–17	The written feedback group received the feedback as paper texts and revised their original videos. The video feedback group received video-recorded feedback and revised their original videos.	Records of written and video feedback
Week 18	Students uploaded revised videos for a second round of feedback. Students provided written or video feedback on videos based on the rubric. Students filled out a survey and responded in writing to open-ended questions regarding their perceptions of the usefulness of the written or video feedback for their English speaking performance.	Revised videos after the first round of feedback and the survey

After the second round of feedback, the students filled out a survey and wrote a reflective essay responding to the following open-ended questions:

- Please talk about the feedback you received.
- How did you perceive the usefulness of the feedback for your pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word usage?
- What is your preference between written and video feedback?

Data Collection and Analysis

The data included records of the written and video peer feedback, the students' videos before and after they received feedback, and the completed surveys which the students filled out after receiving video or written feedback to self-examine their own English speaking performance. The speaking performance survey was adapted from Hung's (2016) instrument, designed to elicit students' perceptions of the usefulness of the feedback. The survey comprised 20 Likert-scale items rated from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The items were grouped into five aspects of English speaking performance: pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word usage. Sample items include the following:

- The feedback helped me to improve my pronunciation.
- The feedback I received helped me understand where to stress in a sentence.
- The feedback I received helped to identify my grammar errors.

To ensure the reliability of the 20 Likert scale items, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated, and a value of .83 was obtained, indicating a highly reliable survey (Hung, 2016). The survey scores of the two groups for each variable were compared and analyzed using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) to examine the difference in students' perceptions of their English speaking performance between the video and written feedback groups (RQ1).

The students' written and video feedback, their initial videos, and their revised videos after receiving peer feedback were qualitatively analyzed to triangulate the survey results and explore how video and written feedback improved students' English speaking performance (RQ2). The records of written and video feedback, the initial and revised videos, and the survey results were analyzed using Glaser's (1965) constant comparative method "which occurs throughout the whole research experience from initial data collection through coding to final analysis and writing" (p. 437).

The reflective essays were analyzed using content analysis to determine students' preferences for written or video feedback (RQ3). The analysis included the stages of coding, categorization, description, and interpretation (Patton, 2002). In the coding phase, the research team read students' responses to the open-ended questions thoroughly and highlighted meaningful statements from which several codes were generated and then collapsed into categories. In the description phase, the main ideas of the categorized units were summarized and documented. Finally, in the interpretation phase, the research team interpreted the predominant themes by providing possible explanations, reaching conclusions, and drawing inferences from each main idea. Reliability was established through regular discussions between the two coders on emerging themes, and the means of the inter-rater reliability for different sets of data reached .88.

Results

Perceptions of Feedback Practices on English Speaking Performance

All participants completed a survey to evaluate their own English speaking performance after receiving video or written feedback. The survey included pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word usage. The means and standard deviations of each delivery variable for the two groups are shown in Table 2. The multivariate results indicated that there was a significant difference between the video feedback groups and the written groups in the delivery category (Wilk's lambda = .47, $F_{(5, 37)}$ = 9.14, p = .00; see Table 3). The effect size of the delivery variables, 34%, was associated with the feedback practice.

Table 2. *Means and Standard Deviations for Each Delivery Variable*

Delivery Variable	Groups	M	SD	N
Pronunciation	Written feedback group	3.86	0.64	22
	Video feedback group	4.14	0.66	21
Intonation	Written feedback group	3.32	0.78	22
	Video feedback group	4.24	0.83	21
Fluency	Written feedback group	3.50	0.74	22
	Video feedback group	3.33	0.91	21
Grammar	Written feedback group	3.77	0.81	22
	Video feedback group	2.90	0.63	21
Word usage	Written feedback group	3.91	0.61	22
	Video feedback group	3.38	0.81	21

Table 3. *Multivariate Effects for the Peer Feedback Practice*

	Delivery Variable	Wilk's Lambda	F	p	η^2
Peer Feedback Practices	Pronunciation	.47	9.14	.00	.56
	Interpretation scores				
	Intonation				
	Evaluation scores				
	Fluency				

Univariate ANOVAs were further performed to investigate the differences between the video feedback groups and the written feedback groups in the delivery category (see Table 4). The results showed that there were significant differences in intonation ($p = .01$), grammar ($p = .00$), and word usage ($p = .02$), with small effect sizes ($\eta^2 = .26$, $.27$, and $.13$, respectively). These findings suggested that video feedback was more useful for improving intonation, while written feedback was more beneficial for grammar and word usage. There were no significant differences between the two groups for pronunciation and fluency.

Table 4. *Univariate Effects for the Feedback Practice*

Delivery Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p	η^2
Pronunciation	0.84	1	0.84	2.00	.17	.05
Intonation	9.09	1	9.09	14.02	.01	.26
Fluency	0.71	1	0.71	1.04	.31	.03
Grammar	8.09	1	8.09	0.60	.00	.27
Word usage	3.00	1	3.00	5.92	.02	.13

Improving English Speaking Performance Through Video and Written Feedback

To triangulate the self-reported survey results and explore how video and written feedback improved students' English speaking performance, the students' feedback, their initial videos, and their revised videos were analyzed. Participants S4, S10, S20, and S28 were selected as representative cases to illustrate the differences between the video and written groups in intonation, grammar, and word usage. These students were selected because their English performance scores were the closest to the mean scores of their

respective groups (see Table 5).

Table 5. *Selected Students' English Speaking Performance for Each Delivery Variable*

	Pronunciation	**Intonation**	**Fluency**	**Grammar**	**Word Usage**
S4 (Written feedback group)	3	3	3	4	4
S10 (Written feedback group)	3	2	3	4	4
S20 (Video feedback group)	4	4	3	2	3
S28 (Video feedback group)	3	4	3	3	3

Intonation

Table 6. *Examples of Written and Video Feedback on Intonation*

	Written Feedback Group	**Video Feedback Group**
Excerpt from the Initial Video	S4: //→Taiwanese meatball is one of Taiwanese favorite food, and people cannot live without it. // //→What makes these meatballs unique is its translucent chewy outside, which is made with rice flour and sweet potato flour. //	S20: //→The second one is the Lance62 hostel. The public transportation is very convenient in this area. // //→There are three specialties in this youth hotel. // //→First, … Second, it holds different kinds of activities like music performance. //
Sample Feedback	The narration sounds like just reading or memorizing the script. You can emphasize on some words and sentences such as "people cannot live without it," "what makes these meatballs unique is…" If you can show your emotions and feeling through the words, that would be the icing on the cake!	The narrator spoke too fast, and the tone was also too blending so I could not get the point easily. I think you could speak slowly and emphasize some words with high or low tones. For example, you can say like this: "The public transportation is very convenient in this area" by emphasizing the word "convenient."
Analysis of the Initial Feedback	Identify intonation problems. Identify problematic sentences.	Identify intonation problems. Demonstrate the intonation of a sentence.
Excerpt from the Revised Video	S4: //→Taiwanese meatball is one of Taiwanese favorite food, and people cannot live without it. // //→What makes these meatballs unique is its translucent chewy outside, which is made with rice flour and sweet potato flour. //	//→The second one is the ↗Lance62 hostel.// //→The public transportation is very ↗convenient in this area. // //→There are ↗three specialties in this youth hotel. // //→Second, it holds different kinds of activities like music ↗performance//
Analysis of the Revised Feedback	Retain the original intonation.	Slow the speech speed. Emphasize key messages by raising the tone.

The video feedback was more useful for improving intonation, because it provided an aural-phonetic model of English intonation. As Table 6 shows, S4 received written feedback commenting that she read as if "memorizing the script" and she was given examples of sentences in which she could stress some words.

However, S4 did not follow the written feedback in the revised prompted video.

Unlike S4, S20 changed her speech intonation after receiving video feedback suggesting that her tone was too even to emphasize the main points of her speech and advising her to speak more slowly and emphasize keywords by altering her pitch. After hearing her peer's concrete phonetic modeling of the suggested intonation, S20 raised the pitch and volume of the key words in their revised video.

As this comparison shows, without an aural-phonetic model, which was possible in the video but not in the written feedback, students had difficulty conceptualizing the accurate intonation. In her reflective essay, S4 stated that it was hard to conceptualize intonation in the written feedback, which making it much less useful than auditory feedback:

> "Watching a real person's demonstration is needed for the improvement of intonation" (S4).

> "I can learn about the use of stress in sentences from video feedback" (S11).

> "Intonation is hard to learn through reading peers' written feedback" (S27).

> "It is hard to imagine the correct intonation from reading written feedback" (S28).

> "I have no ideas which parts of the sentence I should raise my tone from written feedback" (S3).

Grammar and Word Usage

Conversely, video feedback was reported to be less effective than written feedback for two reasons. First, when providing video feedback, the students tended to focus on visual and auditory effects or the video editing rather than on grammatical and lexical improvements:

> "It is not easy to learn grammar from watching video feedback" (S5).

> "In video feedback, few people would mention about the grammar usage" (S8).

> "We learn grammar through reading rather than listening" (S30).

> "Written feedback works better in identifying my grammar errors" (S34).

> "Written feedback is more clear in explaining grammar rules and word usage" (S41).

Second, grammar rules and word usage were difficult for students to understand in the video feedback. As Table 7 demonstrates, S24 received the video feedback asking him to correct the phrase *which dish will he recommended* to *which dish does he recommend*, since he was performing the interview with a person in the video. However, S24 did not correct the grammar errors in the revised video, because his peer talked too fast and he was confused with some grammatical terms used in the video feedback such as *third-person subjects* and *past tense*. S10 was able to correct his grammar errors in the use of nouns after receiving his peer's written feedback that *argument* is a countable noun and *seafood* is a collective noun. After he fixed the two errors in the revised video, S10 stated that he appreciated the clarity of the written feedback.

The comparison of S10 and S24 showed that students found written feedback more helpful for grammar and lexical advice, which was hard to follow in the video feedback because of the students' speech and the complexity of grammar rules. As students commented, grammar was learned through reading rather than through listening to the videos. The peer reviewers could provide explicit instructions and written models of correct grammar.

Table 7. *Examples of Written and Video Feedback on Grammar and Word Usage*

	Written Feedback Group	**Video Feedback Group**
Excerpt from the Initial Video	S10: Although they have *argument, they are both involved in making pizza. S10: Every morning, we buy vegetables and *sea foods at the market.	S24: Which dish will he recommended?
Sample Feedback	In 2:14, the argument is countable. You should add "s" to the noun. In 2:45, seafood is a collective noun and uncountable. And, it's seafood, not sea food. You shouldn't separate it into two words.	"Dish" should be plural. You should also use "what" instead of the "which" since you are asking the person the question in the interview. Which are the relative pronouns used to name things you already know.
Analysis of the Initial Feedback	Correct the countable noun. Correct the uncountable noun.	Speak too fast about the grammar errors.
Excerpt from the Revised Video	S10: Although they have arguments, they are both involved in making pizza. S10: Every morning, we buy vegetables and seafood at the market.	S24: Which dish will he recommended?
Analysis of the Revised Feedback	Fix the error by adding -s to the noun argument. Fix the error by removing -s.	Stick to the original sentence.

Pronunciation and Fluency

There was no significant difference in pronunciation and fluency between the two feedback groups. This can be attributed to two factors. The first was that neither form of feedback supported improvement of students' pronunciation and fluency, as they are aspects that require long-term and consistent speaking practice. The other reason was that little written and video feedback on pronunciation and fluency was given, although pronunciation errors or dysfluency markers were still found in the students' English speech. Because such errors did not hinder comprehension, they did not elicit correction. S4 stated, "Pronunciation and fluency do not really matter as long as we can understand their talk." The results suggested that the students regarded comprehensibility as a more significant criterion than correct pronunciation and fluency:

"You cannot change your pronunciation immediately by receiving video and written feedback" (S18).

"Video feedback and written feedback were not helpful because pronunciation and fluency need practiceing" (S14).

"I did not receive much written feedback about pronunciation and fluency" (S29).

"Correcting pronunciation and fluency errors might not be the priority in video and written feedback" (S6).

Students' Preferences for Written and Video Feedback

Most of the students (70%) preferred to receive written feedback for the following reasons: First, compared to video feedback, written feedback provided more constructive, informative, and organized information. As S21 stated, "Video feedback is not that clear for me to understand what my peers want to convey. However, writing one or two paragraphs in an organized or logical manner helps me understand quickly and clearly." Because video feedback involved speech that was often disorganized, repetitive, and redundant, it was difficult for students to process the message being conveyed. Written feedback, on the other hand, involved a more systematic mode of thinking in which the reviewers critically reflected on and

analyzed their peers' English speech and shared personal experiences in a logical manner. This made the feedback more comprehensible and useful.

Another problem with video feedback was that students found the process of locating and reviewing peers' comments, which involved replaying the video several times, inefficient. Written feedback, however, could easily be consulted, and as EFL learners, the students were better at processing textual information. In addition, written feedback allowed the students to use keywords to search for the comments they needed and highlight comments to review later.

The last problem with video feedback was its clarity. Speed of speaking, frequently low volume, and background noise became obstacles for students to comprehend the video feedback. As S16 stated, "Sometimes I can't hear clearly what the speakers said. Maybe they speak too fast or there are other sounds interfering with the recording." In addition, the students complained that they had to spend too much time figuring out video feedback because the speakers did not have good pronunciation. They also strongly suggested providing subtitles.

"Written feedback is more detailed and specific than video feedback" (S33).

"Information in written feedback was presented in a logical way" (S29).

"In written feedback, we can review the information we need easily" (S36).

"Some people speak too fast when they give video feedback" (S14).

"Reading written texts is easier than listening to video feedback" (S40).

The students identified some benefits of video feedback, although these benefits were not usually related to English speaking ability. First, the students indicated that they felt encouraged when seeing their peers' faces and hearing their voices. Such features as facial expressions, speech tones, and body language in video feedback established emotional connections, fostering engagement while watching the video feedback to identify English speaking errors. In addition, facial expressions and body language made video feedback more conversational. S8 indicated, "Video feedback is more interesting and interactive as I can see and hear them." Because facial expressions and speech tones in video feedback allowed the students to feel connected to their peers, video feedback could be more persuasive than written feedback. These features also made feedback on intonation more effective. The benefits of video feedback showed that its power lay in its visual and auditory capacity to build an interactive and socialized environment that promoted students' engagement in the peer feedback process.

"Video feedback could turn suggestions into more persuasive reasoning using body language" (S8).

"I can understand what people want to express through their tone of voice" (S16).

"Visuals are more interesting and engaging than text" (S20).

"Images are more persuasive than words" (S11).

"Video feedback is more interactive as I can hear their voices" (S8).

Discussion and Conclusion

This study investigated differences in the perceptions of students who received written feedback and those who received video feedback on English speaking performance. Speaking performance was comprised of five variables: pronunciation, intonation, fluency, grammar, and word usage. The findings showed that video feedback was useful for improving students' intonation. In addition, and unlike previous studies that investigated only the effects of video feedback on English speaking skills (e.g., Crook et al., 2012; Hung, 2016; Hung & Huang, 2015; Shih, 2010), this study found that written feedback played a substantive role in supporting students' English speaking performance especially in the areas of grammar and vocabulary. However, neither written feedback nor video feedback significantly benefitted students' fluency and

pronunciation, which contradicts findings by Hung and Huang (2015) that video feedback has positive effects on pronunciation. To triangulate the self-reported results, students' written and video feedback, their initial and revised videos, and their responses to open-ended questions were analyzed and reported anecdotally.

This study found that written feedback was more helpful than video feedback for improving grammar and word usage, mainly because it made the suggestions more explicit and easily accessible for students to monitor and remember their own errors. This finding aligns with Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis and the suggestion by Sachs and Polio (2007) that the saliency of written feedback could help students pay attention to their grammar or lexical errors and consciously remember corrections to avoid repeating errors. However, video feedback could not promote the linguistic awareness of the students due to its timely feature and the exigencies of real-time conversation. Because peers in video feedback talked too fast, the students had a hard time revising grammar and word usage errors. Thus, they preferred to receive more written feedback, as it helped them learn grammar rules and word usage and maintain the accuracy of their English speaking.

Video feedback had its strength in helping students improve their English intonation by watching their peers' demonstrations. This result was in line with the finding by Crook et al. (2012) that the major benefit of video feedback for English speaking practice lay in its auditory and visual features. However, the demonstration in video feedback had little effect on English pronunciation—an inconsistency with the findings of Hung and Huang (2015). This contradiction may be explained by the greater difficulty for Taiwanese students to master pronunciation than to master intonation. Several English phonemes do not exist in Chinese, creating difficulties for EFL students when distinguishing between some minimal pairs. Therefore, mastering pronunciation is a long and arduous journey for most native Chinese speaking learners of English. Additional teaching activities taught by native English speakers are suggested to provide instructional support in video feedback to help students improve and internalize pronunciation.

Finally, this study found that the students preferred written over video feedback because of its efficiency and clarity. For efficiency, written feedback allowed the students to quickly locate the information they needed, sometimes by referencing key words. Video feedback often required multiple viewings—something students found tedious. These results conflicted with those of Crook et al. (2012), who found that the advantage of video feedback was to allow students to archive and reply. The present study did however confirm the usefulness of written feedback for developing English speaking skills and suggested that written feedback should not be downplayed.

Pedagogical Implications and Future Research

Most importantly, this study concluded that both written and video feedback helped students to improve English speaking performance. Teachers are therefore encouraged to use video feedback to improve students' intonation. Written feedback is preferable for improving grammar and word usage. Second, the results showed that written feedback represented a more reflective thinking process than oral feedback, suggesting that practicing written feedback could train students to think critically and produce speech in a logical manner. Third, although video feedback can help students identify their pronunciation errors, improving pronunciation and fluency requires long-term and consistent speaking practice. A teaching approach targeting language learners' speaking proficiency, such as communicative language teaching (Nunan, 1987), can be complemented with video feedback throughout a semester to help students improve and internalize pronunciation and speaking fluency.

The current study investigated the effects of written and video feedback on students' English speaking skills and emphasized the importance of using both methods together. However, further research on feedback practices is needed. First, the current study evaluated the effectiveness of video and written feedback only from the feedback receivers' perspectives. Similar studies could investigate the feedback providers' perceptions of the two types of feedback for a more complete understanding of potential benefits for

students in both roles. Second, this study involved 43 Taiwanese college students with upper-intermediate level speaking in the central Taiwan. Similar research in different contexts or with more participants at various levels of proficiency would allow for comparisons among findings for a more detailed picture. Third, the potential of peer feedback in other skill areas requires further exploration. Future studies can investigate the effects of written and video peer feedback on skills such as reading comprehension, intensive listening, and extensive listening.

Acknowledgements

References

Benson, P. (2015). Commenting to learn: Evidence of language and intercultural learning in comments on YouTube videos. *Language Learning & Technology*, *19*(3), 88–105.

Butler, Y. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 36–57.

Crook, A., Mauchline, A., Maw, S., Lawson, C., Drinkwater, R., Lundqvist, K., Orsmond, P., Gomez, S., & 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.

Educational Testing Service. (2017). *Newsletter 45*. Retrieved from http://www.toeic.com.tw/file/17251052.pdf

Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social Problems*, *12*(4), 436–445.

Godwin-Jones, R. (2003). Blogs and wikis: Environments for on-line collaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, *7*(2), 12–16.

Goldstein, B. (2008). *Working with images*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hsieh, H. C. (2016). High school students' topic preferences and oral development in an English-only short-term intensive language program. *English Language Teaching*, *9*(9), 116–133.

Huang, H. T. D., & Hung, S. T. A. (2013). Exploring the utility of a video-based online EFL discussion forum. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *44*(3), 90–94

Hung, S. T. A. (2016). Enhancing feedback provision through multimodal video technology. *Computers & Education*, *98*, 90–101.

Hung, S. T. A., & Huang, H. T. D. (2015). Video blogging and English presentation performance: A pilot study. *Psychological Reports*, *117*(2), 614–630.

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

Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese context. *TESL Canada Journal*, *23*(2), 12–39.

Lee, L. (2008). Focus-on-form through collaborative scaffolding in expert-to-novice online interaction. *Language Learning & Technology*, *12*(3), 53–72.

Luck, K. M., Lerman, D. C., Wu, W. L., Dupuis, D. L., & Hussein, L. A. (2018). A comparison of written, vocal, and video feedback when training teachers. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, *27*(1), 124–144.

Ministry of Education of Taiwan. (2016). 亞洲國家托福成績概況分析. Retrieved from http://stats.moe.gov.tw/files/brief/%E4%BA%9E%E6%B4%B2%E5%9C%8B%E5%AE%B6%E6%89%98%E7%A6%8F%E6%88%90%E7%B8%BE%E6%A6%82%E6%B3%81%E5%88%86%E6%9E%90.pdf

Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: Making it work. *ELT Journal*, *41*(2), 136–145.

Orlando, J. (2016). A comparison of text, voice, and screencasting feedback to online students. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *30*(3), 156–166

Özkul, S., & Ortaçtepe, D. (2017). The use of video feedback in teaching process-approach EFL writing. *TESOL Journal*, *8*(4), 862–877.

Paivio, A. (1986). *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *29*(1), 67–100.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158.

Shih, R. C. (2010). Blended learning using video-based blogs: Public speaking for English as a second language students. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *26*(6), 883–897.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 303–334.

Toland, S. H., Mills, D. J., & Kohyama, M. (2016). Enhancing Japanese university students' English-language presentation skills with mobile-video recordings. *JALT CALL Journal*, *12*(3), 179–201.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, A., & White, G. (2013). *Technology enhanced language learning: Connecting theory and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*, *17*(2), 89–100.

Xu, Q., Dong, X., & Jiang, L. (2017). EFL learners' perceptions of mobile-assisted feedback on oral production. *TESOL Quarterly*, *51*(2), 408–417.

Yanguas, I. (2010). Oral computer-mediated interaction between L2 learners: It's about time! *Language Learning & Technology*, *14*(3), 72–93.

Yastıbaş, G. Ç., & Yastıbaş, A. E. (2015). The effect of peer feedback on writing anxiety in Turkish EFL (English as a foreign language) students. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *199*, 530–538.

About the Authors

Sheng-Shiang Tseng is an assistant professor in the graduate program of curriculum and instruction at Tamkang University. His research focuses on computer-assisted language learning, online learning, and teacher professional development. He is currently working on the topics related to annotation tools, online

learning engagement, multimodality, augmented reality, and virtual reality.

Email: u9241346@gmail.com

Hui-Chin Yeh, the corresponding author, is currently a Distinguished Professor and Chair in the Department of Applied Foreign Languages and Associate Dean in College Humanities and Applied Science at National Yunlin University of Science and Technology in Taiwan. Her research interests center on EFL teacher education, computer-assisted language learning, and EFL reading and writing. She has published more than 40 articles on these topics. She received distinguished young scholar awards from the Ministry of Science and Technology in 2011 and 2017, a 2016 Yunduo award in teaching and mentoring, a 2014 research excellence award, a 2011 excellent mentor award, and a 2010 teaching excellence award from her university. Her multimedia English course has been certified as a quality e-learning course from the Ministry of Education of Taiwan. In addition, in recognition of several different language systems developed, five patent achievements were honored with the TWPatentDB. She hopes her efforts in different aspects can contribute to academia.

E-mail: hyeh@gemail.yuntech.edu.tw