

Students' Perception of Using Screencast Video Feedback in EFL Writing Class

Nato Pachuashvili¹

Abstract

The provision of feedback is an inseparable part of the learning-to-write process. It involves teachers' extensive engagement in responding to learners' written works by providing explanations of errors and offering suggestions for improvement. High-quality feedback, in return, promotes students' active participation and enhances their motivation in their writing performance. The advent of modern technology brought the necessity to reconsider traditional written corrective feedback practices and enabled the provision of audio and video feedback through screencast technology. The latter can offer alternative ways to written corrective feedback in writing instruction and provide instructors, as well as learners, with new opportunities for writing skill development. In light of the above-mentioned, the goal of this study is to investigate EFL students' perceptions of receiving screencast video feedback in their writing course. To explore students' perception of video feedback, an online questionnaire was applied to a group of 30 students studying English writing as part of the First Certificate in English course. The emphasis of the questionnaire was on the benefits of screencast technology in providing oral feedback and the challenges faced by the participants. It also investigated the participants' overall experience of receiving video feedback. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the participants perceived screencast video feedback positively highlighting its nature of being clear, individualized, supportive, and engaging.

Keywords: Screencast Video Feedback, Written Corrective Feedback, Oral Feedback, EFL Writing.

1. Introduction

Feedback provision on students' written work has always been an inseparable part of EFL writing class. Without feedback, learners' writing may become vain and lack the purpose of writing skill development (Armağan et al., 2016). High-quality feedback, in return, promotes students' active participation in their writing process and greatly enhances their writing performance. Moreover, timely feedback promotes a constructive learning process and develops teacher-learner relationship (Solhi & EğiNli, 2020). The traditional approach to feedback focuses on providing written commentary on students' assignments that often serves as a summative assessment. The focus of this type of feedback is on the linguistic components of a written assignment (Yu et al., 2020). This approach to feedback provision is known as written corrective feedback (WCF) which mainly focuses on the identification of linguistic errors and providing corrections. A distinction is made between direct and indirect written corrective feedback. The former refers to providing explicit corrections on students' written works, whereas indirect feedback deals with the identification of errors but leaving them for students to correct. The latter can be provided by using metalinguistic codes (e.g. WW for wrong word) or locating an error by underlining it (Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017). In both forms of corrective feedback, the emphasis is paid to identifying linguistic errors and providing corrections.

¹ School of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia. e-mail: npachuashvili@ibsu.edu.ge

It is argued that WCF is beneficial for students in drawing their attention to their errors and correcting them (Arrad et al, 2014). Some scholars believe that corrective feedback contributes to writing skill development and the enhancement of their lexical range as well as grammatical accuracy (Kang & Han, 2016; Russell & Spada, 2006). This type of feedback is also found to be thoughtful and easy since students can easily realise and address their errors indicated by the teacher (Parkin et al., 2012).

Despite a proliferated number of studies on the benefits of written corrective feedback (WCF), it has attracted criticism for not being able to respond to the ongoing changes in feedback provision practices. The latter is said to lack the purpose of serving effective learning or correcting mistakes (Armağan et al., 2016). What is more, this type of feedback often appears to be a time-consuming and very tiring process for both teachers and learners. It has also been reported that WCF does not always lead to successful self-corrections of errors and may trigger misunderstanding (Simard et al., 2015). WCF may lead to students' loss of engagement with their teachers since they often fail to internalize corrective feedback which is perceived as unclear and impersonal (Han & Hyland, 2019; Douglas et al., 2016; Crook et al., 2012;). Some scholars point out that corrective feedback lacks effectiveness and has a negative impact on students' writing (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019; Shintani & Ellis, 2013). What is more, written feedback may not yield any pedagogical value to enhance writing skills and is thought to sometimes fail to achieve the desired purpose (Cunningham & Link, 2021; Cunningham, 2019; Bush, 2020). In addition, some researchers regard corrective feedback as harmful and advocate for the abolishment of this feedback practice since it fails to improve students' academic accuracy (Gad et al., 2016).

The advent of technology that revolutionised the educational system and facilitated the English language learning process brought the necessity to reconsider the feedback provision practices; it enabled teachers to give oral feedback using screencast technology (Xie et al., 2022). Technology-enhanced feedback appeared in the form of audio and video that allowed teachers to record their screens while commenting on students' written work. Feedback in this form serves to be multimodal that can be listened to, watched or replayed unlimited times and beyond the boundaries of place (Özkul & Ortaçtepe, 2017). It is claimed that video applications provide learners with numerous opportunities to learn and create an interactive atmosphere promoting confidence and autonomy (ibid).

Although there are many studies conducted in the area of video feedback, screencast video feedback is still relatively new in EFL writing class. In light of the above-mentioned, this paper aimed to explore EFL students' perceptions of using screencast video technology for giving feedback, its benefits and challenges faced by the students in the process of feedback provision. This article also reviews recent research studies in the area of screencast video feedback and its implication in EFL writing.

2. Literature review

2.1 Benefits of screencast video feedback

The emergence of digital tools enabled educators to address the deficiencies in written feedback and switch to using different more of feedback provisions offered by technology. The iniquitous use of digital tools contributed to multimodal video feedback practice which has become a new area of research for many scholars in the EFL writing context (Cunningham, 2019). Since the advent of technology enabled the submission of students' written work electronically, teachers should respond to this practice appropriately and provide feedback in the same manner. Video feedback offers a combination of visual and aural modes in which students are exposed to the teacher's verbal comments addressed to them on their written assignments (Bush, 2020). Video feedback has become a new alternative to traditional written corrective feedback. It is also referred to as screencasting because

it is recorded using screencast technology (Cranny, 2016; Séror, 2013). The video is accompanied by the narration of the teacher that is then shared using a web link or an email. Video feedback aims to draw students' attention to their errors, provide comments and guide students in revision (Russell & Spada, 2006). Unlike written corrective feedback, the teacher does not correct students' written work directly, rather locates their errors and invites students to self-correct. In other words, through video feedback, the teacher indicates students' specific areas of improvement and gives recommendations for revision. The teacher may display a rubric and mark the criterion which is met by students (Whitehurst, 2021). Through video feedback, students are exposed to listening to the teacher talking directly to them and locating the errors in their assignments. Moreover, video feedback is flexible, students can rewind and watch it several times, and it can also be accessed at any time (Cranny, 2016).

Screencast video feedback is researched to have a number of benefits. According to Bush (2020), screencast video feedback contributes to boosting engagement in the writing process and enhances students' concentration on feedback. An increase in engagement through listening to oral feedback was also reported in the studies conducted by Ali (2016) and Cranny (2016). The scholars claim that a high degree of engagement can be attributed to screencast technology as being novel and innovative. What is more, engagement is also enhanced through the nature of video feedback as being multimodal and personal. In the video, the instructor not only explains errors but applies highlighting strategies to draw students' attention to their errors and gives clear guidance. With the support of these visual tools, video feedback becomes comprehensive and detailed.

Another important affordance of screencast video feedback is the rapport that is built between students and the teacher. Since video feedback is perceived as conversational and personal, students view it as a less formal mode of receiving feedback compared to written corrective feedback (Anson et al., 2016). Teachers' conversational manner of addressing students enables the establishment of interpersonal relationship that is seen as encouraging and supportive (Ali, 2016; Anson et al., 2016). In their study, Elola and Oskoz (2016) examined students' perceptions of using video feedback. The scholars argue that the conversational nature of video feedback leads to building interpersonal relationships that in return raise awareness of video feedback. Heightened awareness leads to making differences between video feedback and written corrective feedback and invokes greater respect for the former. Another study conducted by Cunningham (2017) investigated the primary differences between written corrective feedback and video feedback. The results of the study revealed that the students perceived teachers' written commentary as authoritative whereas video feedback was reported to have helped make the students more autonomous. The autonomy was reported to have been created by the instructor's supportive guidance and comments on students' written work; moreover, the teacher-student interpersonal relationship was built through video recording. It is argued that building interpersonal relationships is essential for language learning in the online environment (ibid).

Apart from being engaging and personal, screencast video feedback is believed to be time-saving for teachers. Stannard (2008) asserts that 2-minute video feedback can accommodate more than 400 words if they were written on paper. 400 words constitute a page which is impossible for the teacher to write while giving written corrective feedback. In situations in which the teacher is computer literate and familiar with the technology, screencast video feedback can save a substantial amount of time for the teacher.

2.2 Disadvantages of using screencast video feedback

Despite a number of affordances offered by screencast video feedback, there are some drawbacks to using this feedback practice in EFL writing classes. One of the challenges can be the degree of students' emotional readiness to accept teachers' critical comments (Voelkel & Mello, 2014). Listening to critical feedback might be more demotivating and frustrating than reading written comments on their assignments. Students may feel experience nervousness while listening to the teacher's comments, however, Bush (2020) believes that anxiety can be overcome once students become familiar with video feedback. Negative comments may also cause annoyance among students, therefore, the teacher needs to apply "a pleasant demeanour" and provide constructive feedback (Bush, 2020, p. 10).

Considering video feedback is a novel approach, many teachers may find it difficult to handle. Teachers might also find it challenging to allocate appropriate time and space to video recording. Although it saves time to give verbal feedback, video recording has to be uploaded or sent to a student which can be viewed as a time-consuming process (Ali, 2016). Most screencast technologies do not allow editing which might be another limitation. Some screencast software offers editing functions, but this requires extra time and commitment from teachers. In a situation where there is a large group, individual video feedback might require additional time. Moreover, recording and viewing videos might be technically problematic in some cases. Bakla (2017) argues that video format may not be compatible with some devices which may pose further challenges for learners. Using common platforms (i.e. cloud storage) may solve the problem, but another challenge may appear with sound. Low sound may impact a video's quality and undermine the value of video feedback. Moreover, background sounds might be distracting for students and may lead to a loss of motivation in viewing video feedback (Lee, 2017).

3. Methodology and Methods

This study is action research that enabled the researcher to apply immediate changes to feedback provision to enhance her teaching practice. The researcher implemented screencast video feedback at the beginning of her teaching course to investigate the students' perception of receiving recorded feedback and at the same time, apply changes to refine her feedback provision. In other words, by selecting action research, the researcher aims to improve her educational practices in action and further contribute to the development of screencast video feedback. Data for this research was collected through an online questionnaire that evaluated students' perceptions of receiving video feedback. The survey was purely quantitative and focused on students' overall experience of recording feedback, the advantages of the latter and technical issues faced by the participants in the feedback-receiving process. The data gleaned from the survey were inserted in SPSS for statistical analysis. Statistics helped understand students' attitudes to a new alternative to written corrective feedback and technical issues that they experienced along the process.

3.2. Research questions

To assess students' perception of using screencast video feedback, the researcher formulated the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the benefits of receiving screencast video feedback?

RQ2: How can EFL students assess their overall experience of using screencast video feedback?

RQ3: What are the challenges faced in the video feedback-receiving process?

3.1. Participants

The population from which the sample was drawn comprised a group of undergraduate students studying English writing as part of their First Certificate in English course at one of the private universities in Georgia. Females constituted nearly 93% of the participants whereas 7% of the sample were males. 97% of the population were freshmen students of the English Philology programme. The participants voluntarily took part in the research. The group was homogenous in terms of English language proficiency and according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR), their level was B2.

3.1. Data collection

A post-instruction online questionnaire was administered using Google Forms. The first part of the survey focused on the benefits of screencast video feedback, in particular, the students were asked to mark their responses to the following components: clarity of feedback, ability to revise, emphasising key points, receiving suggestions and feedback being personal. The second part of the questionnaire focused on the challenges that the participants might have experienced in the process, whereas the last part of the survey asked the participants to assess their overall satisfaction with using video feedback. The questionnaire items were assessed on a 5-point Likert scale involving 19 statements with the following ranges: 1 (totally agree), 2 (agree), 3 (neutral), 4 (disagree), and 5 (totally disagree).

The participants voluntarily took part in the research; they were informed about the purpose of the research and reminded of their rights to withdraw at any stage of the research. They were assured of confidentiality and anonymity of the responses. The survey statements were written in English. The data collected were computed in SPSS for statistical analysis.

3.3. Results and analysis

In the first part of the survey, the statements were focused on the benefits of screencast video feedback. Table 1 summarises the participants' responses.

Table 1. Benefits of receiving screencast video feedback

Statements	1 Totally agree	2 agree	3 Neutral	4 dis agr ee	5 Totally disagre e	Mean	St. Dev	Sig. 2 (taile d)
1. Video feedback was clear about what I have done in my assignment	90% (27)	3% (1)	3% (1)		3% (1)	1.23	.82	.000
2. Video feedback helped me rethink about my assignment	80% (24)	13 % (4)			7% (2)	1.4	1.04	.000
3. I found video feedback beneficial because I could go back to my assignment and revise	80% (24)	13 % (4)			7% (2)	1.4	1.04	.000
4. Video feedback encouraged me to understand my mistakes better	80% (24)	13 % (4)			7% (2)	1.4	1.04	.000
5. Video feedback was extensive where key points of my	83% (25)	10% (3)	3% (1)		3% (1)	1.3	.84	.000

	assignments were better emphasized							
6.	In video feedback, the teacher highlighted and praised me for my achievement	90% (27)	3% (1)	3% (1)	3% (1)	1.2	.82	.000
7.	Video feedback was supported by suggestions on what to improve	87% (26)	7% (2)	3% (1)	3% (1)	1.3	.83	.000
8.	Video feedback was personal and individualised	87% (26)	3% (1)	7% (2)	3% (1)	1.3	.89	.000

As it can be seen from the above table, the majority of the participants view video feedback as clear for their assignments (90%, n=27). The same number of the participants (80%; n=4) regard video feedback as helpful for enabling them to rethink about their assignments. They found video feedback very beneficial in revising written work and understanding their mistakes better, whereas only an insignificant minority of the participants (7%, n=2) completely disagree with the above-mentioned statements. Almost 95% (n=28) of the participants totally agree or agree that video feedback was extensive and emphasized the key points of their assignments. The significant majority of them feel positive about the teacher giving suggestions on what to improve (90%, n=28); they totally agree or agree with statement #7. The video feedback was also perceived as personalized and individualized and has been liked by 90% of the participants. In all the statements, a small minority of the participants can be observed who disagree with the listed statements. As regards the mean scores, they range from 1.2-1.4, which indicates an average value of the numbers. It can be interpreted that mostly selected response among the participants was 1 (totally agree) and the range (1.2-1.4) indicates the consistency across the statements. A standard deviation that varies from 0.82 to 1.04 indicates that data are scattered around the mean scores, here again, the consistency of the numbers across all statements can clearly be observed.

In the second part of the survey, the participants were asked to respond to the statements that dealt with the challenges of receiving screencast video feedback. Table 2 summaries the results gleaned from the questionnaire:

Table 2. Challenges of screencast video feedback

Statements	1 Totally agree	2 agree	3 Neutral	4 disagree	5 Totally disagree	Mean	St. Dev	Sig. 2 (tailed)
9. Video feedback was time-consuming	17% (5)	10% (3)	23% (7)	27% (8)	23% (7)	3.3	1.4	.000
10. The quality of the audio was not clear	3% (1)		7% (2)	40% (12)	50% (15)	4.3	.88	.000
11. Video feedback was easy to access	77% (23)	10% (3)		7% (2)	7% (2)	1.6	1.22	.000
12. I had difficulties opening the video feedback	3% (1)	3% (1)	13% (4)	23% (7)	57% (17)	4.2	1.1	.000
13. The teacher's tone was friendly and supportive	93% (28)		3% (1)		3% (1)	1.2	.81	.000
14. The teacher's language was easy to understand	93% (28)		3% (1)		3% (1)	1.2	0.8	.000

The above statistics indicate that one of the challenges that the participants faced was that video feedback appeared time-consuming. Almost 25% of the participants (n=8) totally agreed or agreed with statement #9. 23% of them remained neutral,

whereas exactly half of the participants (50%, n=15) disagreed or totally disagreed with the statement. This can be confirmed with a high mean score (m=3.3) that indicates that responses varied across the Likert scale. As regards #10, the highest mean score in this part of the questionnaire can indicate that the meaning is reversed. The statement is negative, but it yields positive responses. In other words, a higher mean score is an indication of the positive results, which can be seen through the percentages as well: 90% (n=27) of the participants did not perceive video feedback as unclear. Only an insignificant minority of the participants (10%, n=3), perceived it was not clear. As regards accessibility to recorded video, it was reported that almost 90% (n=26) of the participants had no difficulties accessing the video feedback, whereas almost 15 % (n=4) totally disagreed or disagreed with the statement (#11). Interestingly, 80% (n=23) of the participants totally disagreed or disagreed with the statements that dealt with difficulties with opening video feedback. Statistics yield positive responses to this statement (#12). The teacher's tone and instructional language received higher percentages (93%, n=28) and generated very positive responses among the participants. As regards standard deviation, it ranges between 0.8 -1.4 which indicates numbers are scattered around mean scores since these figures can be interpreted as low standard deviation. Sig. 2(tailed) across all the statements above indicate that means statistically significant.

The last part of the questionnaire explored the students' overall experience of using screencast video feedback. Table 3 summarizes the findings of the study:

Table 3. Overall experience of receiving screencast video feedback

Statements	1 Totally agree	2 agree	3 Neutral	4 disag ree	5 Totally disagree	Mean	St. Dev	Sig. 2 (tailed)
15. Video feedback makes my writing experience more interesting	87% (26)	7% (2)	3% (1)		3% (1)	1.3	.83	.000
16. Video feedback is engaging and interactive	83% (25)	10% (3)	3% (1)		3% (1)	1.4	.92	.000
17. Watching video feedback deepens my understanding of the topic	77% (23)	10% (3)	10% (3)		3% (1)	1.4	.93	.000
18. Video feedback encourages me to actively participate in writing process	83% (25)	3% (1)	10% (3)		3% (1)	1.4	.92	.000
19. Video feedback is beneficial for learning English writing.	77% (23)	13% (4)	3% (1)	3% (1)	3% (1)	1.4	.97	.000

As it can be inferred from Table 3, the participants had generally a very positive experience of receiving video feedback. The significant majority of them (93%, n=28) totally agreed or agreed with the statements that feedback had made their writing process more interesting. An exact number of the students reported video feedback as engaging and interactive (#16). Almost 85% (n=26) of the participants agreed or totally agreed with the statement on video feedback being helpful to deepen their understanding of the topic (#17), whereas 10% (n=3) of them remained neutral with 3% (n=1) against. Approximately 85% (n=25) of the participants were positive in response to question #18 and totally agreed that video feedback had encouraged them to actively participate in their writing processes, whereas exactly 10% (n=3) remained neutral. The majority of the participants also reported that video feedback had been beneficial for learning English writing. The mean scores range from 1.3 to 1.4 indicating the average value of

the numbers and consistency observed across the responses to the statements. The low standard deviation (.83-.97) demonstrates that numbers are scattered around mean scores. Here again, the consistency can be observed.

The last question of the survey asked the participants whether they would recommend using screencast video feedback in their future writing classes. Almost 95% percent responded positively to the question. A small minority responded negatively or possibly to the question.

3.4. Discussion

The above statistics revealed that screencast video feedback had been received positively by participants. The students saw feedback as clear and beneficial for their writing assignments. For the majority of them, screencast video feedback enabled them to rethink about their assignments, go back to them and revise. The responses revealed the students had understood their mistakes better since the teacher's comments were comprehensive and detailed. The feedback was also perceived as personalised and individual that was favoured by the significant majority.

As regard challenges, screencast video feedback appeared to have been time-consuming for almost 50% of the participants, however, the participants responded positively to the clarity and accessibility of feedback. The students also remained very positive about the teacher's positive tone and easily understandable language. The participants' overall experience of receiving screencast video feedback was revealed to have been very positive since they perceived video recording as engaging and beneficial in their writing process.

The results gleaned from this study is consistent with Ali's (2016) research that examined the effectiveness of screencast video feedback in EFL students' writing class. The scholar also investigated students' perceptions towards receiving video feedback. Mixed-method research that was carried out with freshmen students on their writing course in Egypt revealed that the majority of the participants received screencast video feedback as clear, personal, engaging and supportive. They also reported it as being engaging and multimodal. The scholar argues that statistical analysis of quantitative data revealed that students' reactions to video feedback were considerably high. Screencast video feedback appeared helpful in reshaping students' ideas and helped them organise their essays. Due to a replay feature, screencast video feedback was also perceived as extremely beneficial.

Another study conducted by Cunningham (2019) also investigated students' perceptions of receiving screencast video feedback and written corrective feedback. The participants' responses revealed their preference for video feedback over written corrective feedback since the former was seen as more individualized whereas the latter was perceived as being very specific. Cunningham (2019) argues that a combination of both modes of feedback would yield the best results, however phase 2 data analysis showed an increase in students' scores except for those assignments in which students received traditional written corrective feedback.

A more recent study conducted by Xie et al. (2022) looked at the impact of screencast video feedback on EFL students' writing performance and their perception towards it. 90 Chinese high school students at the intermediate level participated in the study. The researchers carried out an experiment in which one group of students received recorded feedback, whereas the second group was exposed to traditional written corrective feedback in their writings. The findings of the experiment revealed that experimental group students outperformed the control group regarding writing performance. As regards the participants' perception, their responses showed positive attitudes towards receiving screencast video feedback and described it as strengthening student-teacher interaction. The feedback was also thought to have contributed to boosting confidence among students.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The current study explored English language students' perception of receiving screencast video feedback on their writing assignments. The online questionnaire that was administered to a group of 30 students focused on the benefits of screencast video feedback, the challenges the students faced and their overall experience. Based on the findings received, it can be concluded that screencast video feedback has a positive influence on students. 90% of the participants perceived video feedback as beneficial. It is seen as engaging (93%) and interesting (94%) that enables students to revisit their assignments and self-correct their mistakes. Moreover, the participants' responses demonstrated that video feedback is easy to access and emphasized the instructor's friendly tone in the recording. This was reported by almost 95% of the participants. One of the challenges that was experienced was regarding time consumed watching video feedback (27%). Some participants reported difficulties opening it (6%). Overall, the participants were positive and recommended receiving video feedback in their future assignments.

Based on the above conclusion, the following recommendations can be drawn.

1. English language teachers should implement video feedback in their writing instructions since video feedback provides a more detailed and comprehensive assessment of students' written work.
2. Students who experience problems with accessibility can receive extra technical support.
3. Curriculum designers should update teaching practices and integrate screencast video feedback into formative assessments.

References

- Ali, A. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 106–121.
- Anson, C. M., Dannels, D. P., Laboy, J. I., & Carneiro, L. (2016). Students' perceptions of oral screencast responses to their writing: Exploring digitally mediated identities. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(3), 378–411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651916636424>.
- Armağan, S., Bozoğlu, O., Güven, E., & Çelik, K. (2016). Usage of video feedback in the course of writing in EFL: Challenges and advantages. *International Journal of Sciences*, 30(2), 95–102.
- Arrad, G., Vinkler, Y., Aharonov, D., & Retzker, A. (2014). Increasing sensing resolution with error correction. *Physical Review Letters*, 112(15), 1-14.
- Bush, J. C. (2020). Using screencasting to give feedback for academic writing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(5), 473-486.
- Cranny, D. (2016). Screencasting, a tool to facilitate engagement with formative feedback? *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 8(3), 2911–2938.
- 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.
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019). Student perceptions and use of technology-mediated text and Screencast feedback in ESL writing. *Computers and Composition*, 52, 222–241.
- Cunningham, K. J. (2017). Appraisal as a framework for understanding multimodal electronic feedback: Positioning and purpose in screencast video and text feedback in ESL writing. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 9(3), 457–485. <https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.31736>.



- Cunningham, K. J., & Link, S. (2021). Video and text feedback on ESL writing: Understanding attitude and negotiating relationships. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 52*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100797>
- Douglas, T., Salter, S., Iglesias, M., Dowlman, M. & Eri, R. (2016). The feedback process: Perspectives of first and second year undergraduate students in the disciplines of education, health science and nursing. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 13*(1), 1-19.
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(1), 58–74.
- Farjadnasab, A., & khodashenas, M. (2017). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 2*(2), 30–42. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.2.30>
- Gad, E. E., Li, Y., Kliewer, J., Langberg, M., Jiang, A. A., & Bruck, J. (2016). Asymmetric error correction and flash-memory rewriting using polar codes. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 62*(7), 4024–4038.
- Han, Y. & Hyland, F. (2019). Learner engagement with written feedback: A sociocognitive perspective. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 247–264). Cambridge University Press.
- Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal, 99*(1), 1–18.
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 45*, 46–60.
- Özkul, S., & Ortaçtepe, D. (2017). The use of video feedback in teaching process-approach EFL writing. *TESOL Journal, 8*(4), 862–877. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.362>
- Parkin, H., Hoplestone, S., Holden, G., Irwin, B., & Thorpe, L. (2012). A role for technology in enhancing students' engagement with feedback. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 37*(8), 963–973.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing Research on Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 133–146). Benjamins.
- Séror, J. (2013). Show me! Enhanced feedback through Screencasting technology. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(1), 104–116.
- Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(3), 286–306.
- Simard, D., Guénette, D., & Bergeron, A. (2015). L2 learners' interpretation and understanding of written corrective feedback: Insights from their metalinguistic reflections. *Language Awareness, 24*(3), 233–254.
- Solhi, M., & Eğinli, İ. (2020). The effect of recorded oral feedback on EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16*(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712628>.
- Stannard, R. (2008). *Screen capture software for feedback in language education*. [online]. Retrieved May 7, 2023 from https://www.academia.edu/72291549/Screen_capture_software_for_feedback_in_language_education
- Voelkel, S. & Mello, L.V. (2014). Audio feedback—better feedback? *Bioscience Education, 22*(1), 16-30.
- Whitehurst, J. (2021). *Screencast feedback for clear and effective revisions of high-stakes process assignments*. [online] Retrieved May 10, 2023 from <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/owi-open-resource/screencast-feedback>.
- Xie, X., Che, L., & Huang, H. (2022). Exploring the effects of screencast feedback on writing performance and perception of Chinese secondary school students. *Research and Advances in Education, 1*(6), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.56397/RAE.2022.12.01>
- Yu, S., Jiang, L., & Zhou, N. (2020). Investigating what feedback practices contribute to students' writing motivation and engagement in Chinese EFL context: A large scale study. *Assessing Writing, 44*, 1–15.