

Using screencasting to give feedback for academic writing

Jerome C. Bush

To cite this article: Jerome C. Bush (2020): Using screencasting to give feedback for academic writing, Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, DOI: [10.1080/17501229.2020.1840571](https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1840571)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1840571>



Published online: 05 Nov 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 26




View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Using screencasting to give feedback for academic writing

Jerome C. Bush 

Department of English Language Teaching (ELT), MEF University, Istanbul, Turkey

ABSTRACT

This article reports on student reactions to a relatively new method of giving feedback using a technique called ‘screencasting’. Screencasting is a technique where the computer screen is captured in a video while an audio recording is being made. In this way, students can receive oral feedback in conjunction with written corrective feedback. Forty-four freshman students from an advanced writing class in the ELT department of a small private university in Istanbul participated in the study. During the semester, three high stakes essay assignments were given. For the first essay only written corrective feedback was given, but for the subsequent two essays students received a combination of written and oral feedback through screencasting. Screencasting was originally used because it was purported to be more efficient than written corrective feedback. While it wasn’t found to be more efficient for the teacher, it was enthusiastically embraced by the students. To gauge the students’ perceptions, a survey was given at the same time as the final exam. The survey included a section for demographics, four open-ended questions, and 28 Likert scale-type questions. The Likert-type questions represented nine categories of inquiry including both practical and affective factors. The results indicated overwhelmingly that the students perceive screencast feedback as more pleasant and more effective than written corrective feedback alone. The technique is appropriate to the twenty-first century classroom and the learning styles of modern students. It is recommended that this technique be adopted in academic writing classes.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 25 July 2019

Accepted 21 August 2020

KEYWORDS

Corrective feedback; feedback; screencasting; technology; ELT; writing; university

1. Introduction

Technology has changed writing in many ways (Crystal 2011). As an example, a recent study found that a text messaging app was used by 32.25% of the participants ($N = 549$) at least 12 times per hour (Sultan 2014). This type of writing would not have been done ten or fifteen years ago, yet now it is ubiquitous. Indeed, the writing processes of today are far different from those of even a few years ago (Sampson, Ortlieb, and Lueng 2016). In most modern writing classrooms, assignments are often paperless. An assignment will be posted on a learning management system (LMS), completed on a word processor, and submitted electronically. The students of today are more familiar with technology than previous generations, and they use technology in a variety of ways (Lin et al. 2019).

This current study examines a relatively new way to use technology to give corrective feedback (CF). This new method is called ‘screencasting’ and it allows one to capture what is on the computer screen into a video file while simultaneously recording audio, such as a voice. This provides the student with multi-modal CF by giving written and oral feedback simultaneously. Initial results,

from this current study and others, show that students are extremely positive about screencast CF. More effective CF can help students learn how to revise their papers better. This will not just improve the current assignment, but develop long-term autonomous writing skills.

2. Literature review

The common thread in all models of writing is revision, which has become widely recognized as a crucial skill for emerging writers to develop (Stevenson, Schoonen, and de Gloppe 2006). Corrective feedback assists students in making revisions that improve their papers and eventually leads to an increase in general writing ability. However, revisions can be made at any level, from fixing spelling errors to reorganizing the entire text. In studies on L2 writing, it was found that writers struggled with concepts such as rhetorical structure, audience, clarity, cohesion, and unity, but were able to focus on grammatical and lexical accuracy (Cumming 1989; Chenoweth and Hayes 2001). Writing instructors generally agree that revising is integral to the effective teaching of writing and current methodology blends skills instruction with process writing (Cutler and Graham 2008). However, written corrective feedback is generally seen as a focus-on-form approach to linguistic development with instructors focusing mostly on surface forms and sentence formation (Ellis 2005). Disagreement exists on the value of giving written feedback on grammar. In fact, the effectiveness of teacher written feedback has been hotly contested, most notably by Truscott (1996), who advocated abandoning grammar correction entirely. Truscott made a strong case that teacher feedback is often incomplete or inaccurate and that time spent in error correction would be better spent in additional writing practice. However, it seems that many teachers are still giving structural CF and that much of it is indeed accurate (Ferris 2006). Feedback on grammatical form is given because accuracy is valued in the academy and students want and expect quality feedback about the accuracy of their work from their teachers. However, CF that focuses solely on grammar and sentence structure may not be the best way to develop long-term writing skills.

Additionally, some research indicates that correcting every error can be overwhelming and demotivating to students. This line of research recommends giving feedback on only certain persistent errors (e.g. Kao 2013; Bitchener and Knoch 2009). This type of feedback is called 'focused feedback' and research has shown it leads to long-term improvement in writing (Bitchener and Knoch 2010a). Comprehensive written feedback, where every error is pointed out, was found to have a greater impact on the current text being produced than on long-term writing ability. While the debate continues, the current consensus is that both teachers and students see written corrective feedback as necessary and valuable (Hyland and Hyland 2006).

Corrective feedback may also be delivered orally. Much of the research on one-to-one conferences regarding L2 student writing has been done at writing centers instead of in the classroom. However, individual conferences done either in a classroom or a writing center have been found to be beneficial to writing development because they are individualized, flexible, and provide cultural, rhetorical, and linguistic information (Eckstein 2013). A collaborative environment between students and teachers is seen as most productive. However, some students, especially those who are at a lower level, are reluctant to question teachers or tutors and tend to accept advice uncritically. Research on student-teacher conferences is sparse and usually includes small samples (Hyland and Hyland 2006). However, the available research indicates that negotiation and personalization in the feedback process contributes to writing improvement. Screencasting provides students with both written and oral CF which has the potential of being both detailed and personal.

2.1. Studies of feedback given through screencasting

Although the technique of giving multi-modal CF through screencasting is relatively new, a fair number of studies are available. All the research found on giving CF through screencasting indicates positive responses by students. It should be noted that screencasting is distinct from webcams,

which provide an audio track, but shows the instructor as a ‘talking head’ rather than the student’s writing. With screencasting, students can see their writing in the video and see the written CF while the teacher is explaining orally why the CF was given. Screencasting has been compared to audio only feedback and text only feedback (Orlando 2016; Silva 2017; Mathieson 2012). In all cases the overwhelming preference of students was for the multi-modal screencasting feedback.

Orlando (2016) compared text, voice, and screencast CF through surveys given to six teachers and thirty students. The teachers gave textual CF for a third of their assignments, recorded oral CF for a third, and screencast CF for a third. The surveys revealed that four of the six teachers preferred screencasting, while two chose oral. One of the teachers who chose oral feedback stated it was not because she felt screencasting was less effective but because it took more time. The students reported several advantages but felt the most important one was being able to clearly understand the written feedback.

Students gave each other peer-feedback via screencasting in one interesting study (Silva 2017). The study found that students were better able to focus on issues such as content, audience, and purpose when using screencasting, rather than issues of grammar and spelling. Silva noted students being able to make macro-level comments while scrolling among paragraphs. However, Silva also mentioned a steep learning curve with most of the students complaining of technical problems.

Research has shown that students prefer screencast feedback not just because it is effective at improving their papers, they report a greater sense of community, rapport with the teacher, and a general sense of belonging (Mathieson 2012). Text-only CF is seen as the norm, but screencast CF shows that the teacher cares. However, it was also mentioned that students cannot ask questions during a screencast recording. Mathieson also found that screencasting took almost twice as much time as text-only and felt it would not be possible to implement in larger classes.

As with most new technologies, it seems teachers have a learning curve before efficiently using screencasting (Seror 2012). Additionally, time is required to encode the file and prepare it for upload (McCarthy 2015). McCarthy found screencasting takes almost twice as long as recording an audio-only file using *Audacity* (10–15 min vs. 20–25 min respectively). However, when students were asked about the most effective feedback method, audio only was the least popular. An additional problem is slow internet connections which have been found to cause substantial delays for instructors who would like to use screencasting (Seror 2012). However, Seror also observed that as instructors become more familiar with the technology, the process of giving feedback becomes faster and more efficient.

Most of the screencasts were used for formative feedback, but those who use screencasting for summative feedback indicated that the feedback was more likely to be considered than written feedback alone (Cranny 2016; Tekinarslan 2013). All studies reported an increased likelihood of uptake by the students. This seemed to be due an increased quantity of feedback, increased understandability, the personal tone, and the ability of students to review the feedback multiple times. Orlando (2016) found that the most often mentioned benefit from students was the ability to hear an explanation while see the portion of the text in question. Orlando also reported increased student autonomy as a result of screencast feedback.

Researchers have pointed out that screencast feedback can be easier to understand than hand-written comments by teachers (McGarrell and Alvira 2013; O’Malley 2011). Not only is the written feedback typed, the narration provides insight into why the teacher made the comments and corrections. The feedback is perceived as more personal and students note the benefits of being able to view the video as often as they like. It was also found that teachers give more feedback on organization and vocabulary when using screencasts. Written only feedback tended to focus on grammatical errors.

Clear patterns of results emerge when the available screencasting research is considered as a whole. The consensus is that screencasting is preferred over other types of feedback by students, who have been reported to be enthusiastic about it. It is most often used for formative feedback but is also useful for summative feedback. Although it adds slightly to the burden of writing

instructors, the value added is substantial. Advances in cloud computing, internet speeds, and familiarity of multimedia applications make screencasting easier to use for all stakeholders. Therefore, it seems likely that this form of feedback will increase in use and become a common best practice in a few years.

3. Method

3.1. Context and participants

The study was conducted in an advanced writing class at a fairly small university (approx. 3300 students) in Istanbul, Turkey (Studyportals 2019). The advanced writing class investigated here was in the department of English Language Teaching (ELT) in the college of education. Students enter the program through the preparatory school or by testing into the program. Students in ELT tend to be more motivated to learn English than students from other programs. However, due to the university selection process, not all of the students aspire to become English Language Teachers. For some students, ELT was a second or even a third choice. Therefore, it cannot be said that the motivation level was universally high.

The class consisted of 44 undergraduate students, 32 of whom were female and the remaining 12 were male. Of the 44 students, 38 took the survey. The respondents were primarily female ($n = 29$) and nine were male. Three of the respondents were excluded. One was excluded because six (the highest choice) was circled on all of the items. The other two were excluded because it was found that they had not done the assignments and consequently did not receive screencast feedback. An additional two respondents gave answers to the open-ended questions but did not make selections for the Likert-type statement. The final sample size for the Likert-type statements was 33, but it was 35 for the open-ended questions. Not all of the Likert-type statements were responded to by every student, so some of the statements (1, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, and 25) only had 32 responses.

The average age of the participants was 21, but the median age was 19. Two outliers were included in the data, one was 45 years old and the other was 40. Exactly half of the students who filled out the survey ($n = 19$, 50%) reported having attended the preparatory program at the university where the study was conducted. The others, who tested into the program, reported coming from public high schools ($n = 9$, 23.8%), private high schools ($n = 7$, 18.4%), another university's preparatory program ($n = 1$, 2.6%), other origin ($n = 1$, 2.6%), and one student failed to report ($n = 1$, 2.6%).

3.2. Procedure

As part of the course requirements, students were required to write three high stakes academic essays. This was done using a six-stage process method that included pre-writing, rough draft, instructor feedback, a second draft, a peer review, and the final version. The feedback given at the third stage was extensive and is considered formative. The students only received marks on the final version to allow students to experiment and develop a personal approach to writing. However, students who did not turn in a final draft were graded on the quality of their rough drafts.

The current study used a commercial application called Camtasia that had been purchased to make videos for flipped classroom lessons. Although the program was familiar to the instructor, screencasting feedback was a little different procedurally than creating pre-class videos and some mistakes were made. Eventually, a pattern was established where the paper would be marked with written corrective feedback electronically using MSWord and then a screencast would be made explaining the written feedback to the student. The video would be saved on a cloud platform and a link would be copy-pasted to the top of the student paper. The student received their paper via email with written corrective feedback and a link to a short video explaining the feedback. The target length of the video was three to five minutes and most of the videos fell within that range.

This technique was not done for every student on the first high-stakes essay, but it was done on the subsequent two. The screencasts that were done on the first essay allowed the instructor to get used to the product and develop a procedure. It was decided not to send the screencasts of the first essay to the students, and they were all deleted. Screencasting was only used during the instructor feedback step (the third step) of the writing process, it was not used to explain the summative grade because of time constraints. Therefore, each student received screencast feedback twice, once for each of two essays. At the end of the course they were given a survey asking about their experience with screencasting.

3.3. The survey instrument

The survey (Appendix) was given at the same time as the final exam. Students who chose to participate could get 10 points of extra credit on the exam, which amounted to 1.5 points towards the final grade. Although names were collected for allocation of the extra credit, students were notified that names would not appear when the research was written up. The survey included four numbered sentences at the beginning, as follows:

1. Participation is entirely voluntary, there is no penalty for not doing the survey
2. Honesty is important – positive comments or marks get you no benefit
3. Everyone who fills out the survey completely will get 10 points of extra credit on the final exam
4. Anonymity is guaranteed. Your name will not be used in the study.

These points were included to minimize bias. Additionally, bias might be reduced because the class was over, and all the grading had been completed except the final exam. Also, the final exam was only 10% of the total grade. In other words, the students had nothing to gain by reporting high scores. However, a tendency towards agreement, which is known as ‘positivity bias’, ‘agreement bias’ or ‘acquiescence bias’ may be assumed despite the four sentences at the start of the survey, (e.g. Klar and Giladi 1997). Although it may have had an impact on the survey results, there is no clear consensus on how to measure and control for this bias (Kam 2016). Some evidence exists for the use of statistical equation modeling as a way to control acquiescence bias, but it is more useful when making comparisons across several groups with cultural differences (Welkenhuysen-Gybels, Billiet, and Cambre 2003). Therefore, because the group was relatively small and culturally homogenous, and a reliable method of controlling for acquiescence was unavailable, the results in the current study were not adjusted in any way. Although the Likert scale is very common in the social sciences, the reader is cautioned that any study using a Likert scale instrument is prone to this type of bias. The current study is no exception. The four sentences previously mentioned were included to reduce acquiescence bias, but it is unknown exactly how effective they were in meeting this goal.

Several items were reverse coded to increase internal reliability. Reversing the polarity of items is a common procedure to identify and control for positivity bias (sometimes called acquiescence bias). For example, item 2 was ‘It was easy to understand my instructor and the feedback in the video’ and item 24 was ‘I couldn’t always understand what my instructor was talking about in the video’. For item 2, students selected ‘strongly agree’ (6) 22 times out of 33 surveys, while for item 24 ‘strongly disagree’ (1) was selected 22 times. This indicates that the majority of students were thoughtfully completing the survey, or at least reading the statements before making a selection. This also justifies the exclusion of the one student who simply circled all sixes.

Their survey contained three sections. The first was simply demographics – name, sex, age, and educational experience. The second section contained four open-ended questions with space for a two to three sentence response. The third section consisted of 28 statements with Likert-type responses ranging from one (Strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree). The choice to use six

categories instead of five was done to remove the ‘neutral option’ so that a definitive choice would be made for each statement.

Nine categories were represented in the 28 statements with several statements that were related to each construct, or general topic. The categories were adapted from the survey used by Orlando (2016), with some modifications. These categories were further combined into three themes representing overall areas of inquiry. The current study adds to the research by categorizing students into 3 themes and 9 constructs rather than just reporting general positive feelings. Additionally, the survey instrument made use of negative coding to increase reliability. The open-ended questions provided rich data from which assertions could be made. The statements, associated constructs, and themes are summarized in Table 1 with response details in Table 3. The results of these responses do not just indicate that students are satisfied with the method, they suggest several reasons *why* the students are satisfied with it.

4. Results

Parametric tests including determining descriptive statistics were not done on these data as they are ordinal data. The results, which you can see in Table 2, are given here in tabular form as frequency counts.

In Table 3, the results have been organized according to construct and theme. For example, the construct of understanding includes two levels. One is at the level of sound and includes things like volume, accent, and pronunciation. The second level of understanding is more conceptual and includes things like unfamiliar vocabulary and specific corrective feedback both for grammar and organization. The construct of interaction has to do with the ways and extent to which the student engaged with the screencast. The construct of Technical Problems is not just about the available infrastructure, but the student’s ability to work with and understand the technology. All of these are grouped under the theme of ‘Access’ which is essentially how easy and how well the student was able to access the feedback both conceptually and physically.

The theme of Effectiveness is perhaps the most important theme in this current study. This theme has been divided up into several constructs or main ideas. The first of which is retention of information. This pertains as much to procedural development as the correction of specific errors. The individual items include words such as ‘useful’ and ‘effective’ and consider oral and written corrective feedback both individually and in tandem. The construct of autonomy is closely related and has to do with the students developing general writing skills that can be used for assignments in a variety of courses and do not apply to any particular rhetorical mode.

Anecdotally, motivation was the main topic of hallways discussion about this method. However, it isn’t clear whether the motivation is high just because it is a new technological technique or whether the students are genuinely more excited about writing. Even though the items were written to elicit a long-term perspective, it may be true that the students are simply excited by the novelty of the technique. It seems only time will tell. The final construct in this theme investigated whether and how the students used the feedback.

Table 1. Statements and associated constructs.

Statements	Associated construct	Group
2,10,16, 24 15, 22	Understanding the Feedback Interaction	Access
1, 7, 14	Technical Problems	
4, 21, 27, 28 5, 18	Retention of Information Autonomy	Effectiveness
8, 13, 20	Motivation	
3, 12, 19	Using the Feedback	Affective Factors
9, 17, 25	Personal Connection	
6, 11, 23	Emotional Factors	

Table 2. Likert-type responses tabulated by frequency.

	RESPONSE →	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	It was easy to get the video and watch it.	0	0	1	1	6	24
2	It was easy to understand my instructor and the feedback in the video.	0	0	1	0	10	22
3	I used the feedback right away and made some corrections and improvements on my paper.	0	0	1	1	9	22
4	I found it easier to remember the feedback when it was given in written and spoken forms.	1	0	1	0	5	26
5	The video helped me to think about writing in a general way.	0	0	0	1	8	24
6	I was excited and happy when I received my video feedback.	0	0	2	1	9	21
7	I had some technical problems while I was trying to watch the video. (inverse #1)	23	5	2	1	1	1
8	Getting video feedback motivated me to study more and learn more about writing.	0	0	1	6	10	16
9	I felt connected to my instructor as a result of the video feedback.	0	0	1	2	4	26
10	I could understand the feedback on my paper and didn't need the video feedback. (inverse #27)	10	7	9	5	1	1
11	I felt the feedback was very negative and didn't like hearing about it in the video. (inverse #6)	25	4	2	1	1	0
12	I came back to the video several times as I was rewriting my paper.	2	2	2	5	10	12
13	I felt like I could talk about my essay more because of the video feedback.	0	1	3	3	12	13
14	I was sent a Word file with text feedback and a link that was easy to understand and follow.	2	2	0	3	8	18
15	I accessed and watched the entire video	0	0	1	3	4	24
16	My instructor used some highlighting in the video and this was very helpful.	0	0	0	1	4	27
17	I think the written feedback provides a good connection with the instructor.	2	1	3	4	4	18
18	The video help me with more than just this paper, it helped me improve as a writer.	0	0	1	2	9	21
19	The feedback I received on my paper helped me with my later papers.	0	1	3	6	5	18
20	I hope my instructor continues to use this form of feedback in the future.	0	0	0	1	4	27
21	I remember what is written on my paper more than what is said in the video	4	11	5	6	2	5
22	I watched the video several times to make sure I understood the feedback.	1	4	2	5	6	15
23	The video feedback made me feel uncomfortable. (inverse #25)	24	6	1	2	0	0
24	I couldn't always understand what my instructor was talking about in the video. (inverse #2)	22	8	1	1	1	0
25	When I heard my teacher's voice, I felt he really cared about me.	0	0	1	0	5	26
26	The instructor spend too much time on the video feedback. He should have graded our other papers instead.	10	4	5	6	3	5
27	I thought it was really useful to have the video feedback along with the written feedback.	0	0	0	2	8	23
28	I did not find the video more effective than just written feedback	20	7	2	2	1	1
		146	63	51	71	150	436
		124					

Table 3. Results organized according to construct and themes.

	Understanding the Feedback								
ACCESS	2	It was easy to understand my instructor and the feedback in the video.	0	0	1	0	10	22	
	24	I couldn't always understand what my instructor was talking about in the video. (inverse #2)	22	8	1	1	1	0	
	10	I could understand the feedback on my paper and didn't need the video feedback.	10	7	9	5	1	1	
	16	My instructor used some highlighting in the video, and this was very helpful.	0	0	0	1	4	27	
	Interaction								
	15	I accessed and watched the entire video	0	0	1	3	4	24	
	22	I watched the video several times to make sure I understood the feedback.	1	4	2	5	6	15	
	Technical Problems								
	1	It was easy to get the video and watch it.	0	0	1	1	6	24	
	7	I had some technical problems while I was trying to watch the video. (inverse #1)	23	5	2	1	1	1	
	14	I was sent a Word file with text feedback and a link that was easy to understand and follow.	2	2	0	3	8	18	
EFFECTIVENESS	Retention of Information								
	4	I found it easier to remember the feedback when it was given in written and spoken forms.	1	0	1	0	5	26	
	21	I remember what is written on my paper more than what is said in the video	4	11	5	6	2	5	
	27	I thought it was really useful to have the video feedback along with the written feedback.	0	0	0	2	8	23	
	28	I did not find the video more effective than just written feedback (inverse #4)	20	7	2	2	1	1	
	Autonomy								
		5	The video helped me to think about writing in a general way.	0	0	0	1	8	24
		18	The video help me with more than just this paper, it helped me improve as a writer.	0	0	1	2	9	21
	Motivation								
		8	Getting video feedback motivated me to study more and learn more about writing.	0	0	1	6	10	16
	13	I felt like I could talk about my essay more because of the video feedback.	0	1	3	3	12	13	
	20	I hope my instructor continues to use this form of feedback in the future.	0	0	0	1	4	27	
Using the Feedback									
	3	I used the feedback right away and made some corrections and improvements on my paper.	0	0	1	1	9	22	
	12	I came back to the video several times as I was rewriting my paper.	2	2	2	5	10	12	
	19	The feedback I received on my paper helped me with my later papers.	0	1	3	6	5	18	
AFFECTIVE FACTORS	Personal Connection								
		9	I felt connected to my instructor as a result of the video feedback.	0	0	1	2	4	26
		17	I think the written feedback provides a good connection with the instructor.	2	1	3	4	4	18
		25	When I heard my teacher's voice, I felt he really cared about me.	0	0	1	0	5	26
	Emotional Factors								
		6	I was excited and happy when I received my video feedback.	0	0	2	1	9	21
	11	I felt the feedback was very negative and didn't like hearing about it in the video. (inverse #6)	25	4	2	1	1	0	
	23	The video feedback made me feel uncomfortable. (inverse #25)	24	6	1	2	0	0	
	26	The instructor spent too much time on the video feedback.	10	4	5	6	3	5	

The theme of Affective Factors looks at how the students felt while receiving the feedback and how it impacted their impression of the professor. The construct of connection explored whether this technique help students create a working alliance with the instructor. Positive classroom relationships foster a learning environment beneficial to the student while providing enhanced job satisfaction for instructors (Frisby et al. 2016). As a related construct, the students were asked how the felt when receiving the feedback. The goal was to make the students feel supported and not judged, but at the same time provide corrective feedback. It seems that goal was met.

4.1. Qualitative data

The open-ended questions were analyzed using the open-coding method (Glaser and Strauss 1967). That is, recurring patterns were sought out without first developing a hypothesis. As patterns appeared a theory grounded in the data was developed. The data were taken from 36 surveys as some students did not respond to the open-ended questions.

The first question was ‘What are your opinions of the **disadvantages** of video feedback?’ This was the first question to try to stem a tide of positive bias. The class was aware that research was being done on the screencasting technique and a positive buzz permeated conversation of screencasting. Despite the attempt to get students to think critically, the overwhelming response was ‘screencasting has no disadvantages’ ($n = 20, 61\%$). This was followed by responses that the main disadvantage is the difficulty it poses the teacher ($n=5, 14\%$). This was matched by technical problems ($n = 5, 14\%$). Two students (5%) felt the screencasting feedback wasn’t detailed enough and a few ($n=3, 8\%$) mentioned potential nervousness and anxiety, but indicated that they were personally neither nervous nor anxious.

The questions about the **advantages** of screencasting produced more writing. The top response here was that screencasting allowed students to see their mistakes ($n = 20, 56\%$). This was followed by a feeling that the feedback was clear ($n = 12, 33\%$). These students also noted that they had a chance to correct the mistakes they saw. Some students mentioned that it was like a face-to-face conference ($n = 5, 14\%$) and it made them feel cared about ($n=4, 11\%$). Five of the students (14%) mentioned that being able to watch the video multiple times is an advantage. Other responses included that it was more enjoyable, easy to manage, easy to remember, had more details, and the visual combined with auditory was seen as an advantage.

When the students were asked for ideas about improvements, most of the responses indicated that no improvements were necessary ($n = 17, 47\%$). However, several students wanted more and or better information from the teacher including more details, more examples, a follow-up session, and generally longer messages ($n = 8, 22\%$). Other responses included better graphics such as picture-in-picture or short explanatory videos. A few students asked for the sound to be improved ($n = 3, 8\%$).

The final open-ended asked students ‘what did you do when you got the feedback?’ The expected response would have had something to do with usage and incorporating the feedback into subsequent versions of the assignment. The most common responses were ‘found or noticed my mistakes’ ($n = 5, 42\%$) and ‘made corrections’ ($n = 17, 47\%$). While this was not so surprising, the number of students who wrote about emotional reaction was. Twelve responses (33%) indicated happiness, excitement, or surprise and four responses (11%) indicated a negative emotional reaction such as anger or a sad feeling. An impressive ten responses (28%) reported taking notes on the feedback. An additional five responses (14%) told of watching the video multiple times.

5. Discussion

The responses on all parts of the survey were overwhelmingly positive, which is consistent with other research (Orlando 2016; Mathieson 2012; Silva 2017). It is clear that the overall response is strongly in favor of screencast feedback. The frequencies are almost all weighted towards six except for the

reverse coded items. Perhaps the students struggled with a few of the items. Particularly item 10 seems to have mixed responses and that may be because it was poorly written or wasn't fully understood. The statement for item ten was 'I understood the written feedback and didn't need the video.' The intent of the item was to ask if the oral component is unnecessary, but in doing so it asks if the written feedback was understood. This may have made it difficult for some students to respond. However, when considered with the other items in the construct of understand, the ambiguity disappears. Similar to the results reported in West and Turner (2016), the students in the current study reported that the feedback was easy to understand.

Item 16 is about using the highlight tool in a word processor. Before or during the making of the screencast certain parts of the text were accentuated by using color. These parts of the text were then discussed, and any issues were explained to the student. This was particularly useful for organization problems. It was often used to show that two ideas were competing for primacy in a single paragraph. Students could see clearly that they needed to create separate paragraphs for each idea. The students reported that this method was very 'helpful', which may be construed to include both ease of understanding and an effective way to increase the unity of an academic essay.

It seems that students watched the entire video and many of the watched the video several times. It was a surprise finding that students were taking notes while watching the videos. This level of engagement is far beyond what one would expect from written corrective feedback alone. Increased engagement had been noted by other researchers (West and Turner 2016; Ali 2016; Cranny 2016). However, it was surprising to see students so involved in the feedback. It should be noted that students received written corrective feedback in addition to a link to the screencast. However, they certainly did not ignore the link and simply concentrate on the written feedback. Not a single student reported skipping the video. West and Turner (2016) surmised that the engagement could be partly due to the novelty of screencasting. While novelty was probably a substantial factor in the student's engagement of the current study, it also seemed that the students genuinely appreciated the detail and personal connection of the multimodal feedback.

The reports of nervousness before watching the screencast seem fairly normal and will probably be reduced when students become more familiar with this type of feedback. However, some of the students reported negative emotions while watching the screencasts. Those who screencast should remember that comments are not always received in the way the sender intends and every effort should be made to be pleasant. Students who said they became angry at corrective feedback also said that the anger dissipated when the student realized that the instructor was right and was just trying to help improve their paper. Therefore, the instructors who use this method should remember to have a pleasant demeanor and to give accurate and valuable feedback.

The responses to both the Likert-type items and the open-ended questions indicate that students have few problems accessing and understanding the screencasts. Students have been found to be comfortable with using technology and appreciate it when teachers use it (Lin et al. 2019). However, instructors should make sure that all the students have working computers, internet access, and are able use them effectively. It is dangerous to assume that all students have access to computers and know how to use them. It may be possible that some students lack the skills and/or resources to access the screencast feedback. Such students need to be identified and accommodated.

The students indicated that screencast feedback not only improves the paper they are currently working on, it improves their overall ability to write. Bakla (2017) noted that the initial research on screencasting is promising and indicates that it helps students to write better. Interestingly, the motivation responses were not as high except for statement 20, 'I hope my instructor continues to use this form of feedback in the future.' This may have to do with the intense and highly cognitive nature of academic writing itself. On the other hand, the ways in which the students reported interacting with the feedback made them seem like motivated students. They were taking notes and watching the videos several times. This type of behavior will almost undoubtedly lead to improved papers and substantial gains in writing ability.

Most of the studies that claim screencasting is more effective than other forms of feedback, are based on self-reported measures, such as Likert-type surveys (Ghosn-Chelala and Al-Chibani 2018; Orlando 2016; Mathieson 2012; Seror 2012). Few studies were found reporting that students who have received feedback via screencasting show more improvements than a comparison group (Tekinarslan 2013; Ali 2016). However, the quasi-experimental or intervention studies assert that screencasting is an effective learning tool. The lack of studies indicating the effectiveness of this method is disconcerting. Clearly it is preferred by students and growing in popularity so more research on the effectiveness of this method should be done.

An interesting aspect of this current study is the emotional component. This is consistent to what has been reported elsewhere in the literature (Ali 2016; Cranny 2016; Ghosn-Chelala and Al-Chibani 2018; Mathieson 2012). In fact, much of the literature reports that students have a positive orientation towards screencasting. In the current study, when students were asked what they 'did' with the feedback, 44% wrote about how they felt instead. The propensity of those emotions was positive. The students also reported an increase of rapport with the instructor as a result of screencast feedback, which is similar to the findings of Silva (2017). A quote, often attributed to Theodore Roosevelt goes, 'people don't care how much you know until they know how much you care'. This shows the importance of rapport and affective factors in education. In short, the students loved the screencasts which in turn caused positive feelings about the instructor and brings about more engagement in the instructional objectives.

6. Conclusion

It seems screencasting could be highly effective for giving feedback in academic writing classes. Although it took a little extra time, the time was well spent because of the ample rewards it brought. The instructor and the students were all able to come closer and meet their goals as a result of screencasting. Unfortunately, the current study did not have a group in a similar class that was not receiving screencast feedback. It would have been nice to make comparisons.

It is not easy to tell if screencast feedback will be effective in the long term. Perhaps the novelty of the method helped elevate the responses. It may be that as students become accustomed to it, they may not report such positive responses. If screencasting were to be the norm, perhaps the response to it would be more muted. However, if the method can be shown to facilitate writing development, it may very well be adopted into the best practices for teaching academic writing. Based on the current results and what is being reported elsewhere in the literature, screencasting as a current best practice is not unthinkable.

For the widespread adoption of this method, however, the issue of time remains a concern. Three or four extra hours of giving feedback is not such a huge burden if it occurs only three times per semester, but those with multiple writing classes or more students may find it impossible to invest such time. The original objective was to simultaneously grade and record a screencast, which would not take any additional time. However, the amount of concentration required for marking a paper may make giving simultaneous feedback impossible. The current study took place over one semester. Perhaps with more experience instructors could become more efficient at the process and it wouldn't consume much time. If it works for the practitioner to use screencasting, the benefits for the students seem clear.

As with all studies, this one has its limitations. The sample size was not large, and it was a relatively homogenous and coherent community of learners. Many of the statements could have been worded better. Particularly statements 10, 11, 14, and 16 seem ambiguous in retrospect. The type of data collected did not lend itself to inferential statistics. However, the strongest limitation is that the study relies on self-reported measures. Further research is necessary to determine that this technique is in fact as effective as students perceive. Such studies are difficult in the social sciences because of the difficulty of controlling confounding variables. Additionally, it raises ethical questions for the students in the control group. All students should be treated

equally and receive the best possible instruction. Studies on the effectiveness of this technique will have to be carefully designed. The effectiveness of the technique is likely due to the ways in which students engage with the feedback, but the effectiveness should still be verified. Instructors and researchers are therefore encouraged to use this technique and if time permits, verify the effectiveness of screencasting. Such studies are required to establish screencasting as a new best practice.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Dr Jerome C. Bush is an assistant professor in the department of English Language Teaching (ELT) at MEF University's Faculty of Education located in Istanbul, Turkey.

ORCID

Jerome C. Bush  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6897-9209>

References

- Ali, A. D. 2016. "Effectiveness of Using Screencast Feedback on EFL Students' Writing and Perception." *English Language Teaching* 9 (8): 106–121.
- Bakla, A. 2017. "An Overview of Screencast Feedback in EFL writing: Fad or Future?" *International Foreign Language Teaching and Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language*, pp. 319–331, Bursa, Turkey, April 27–28.
- Bitchener, J., and U. Knoch. 2009. "The Value of a Focused Approach to Written Corrective Feedback." *ELT Journal* 63 (3): 204–211.
- Bitchener, J., and U. Knoch. 2010a. "The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten-Month Investigation." *Applied Linguistics* 31 (2): 193–214.
- Chenoweth, N., and J. Hayes. 2001. "Fluency in Writing: Generating Text in L1 and L2." *Written Communication* 18 (1): 80–98.
- Cranny, D. 2016. "Screencasting, a Tool to Facilitate Engagement with Formative Feedback?" *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 8 (3): 1–27.
- Crystal, D. 2011. *Internet Linguistics: A Student Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Cumming, A. 1989. "Writing Expertise and Second Language Proficiency." *Language Learning* 39 (1): 81–141.
- Cutler, L., and S. Graham. 2008. "Primary Grade Writing Instruction: A National Survey." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 100 (4): 907–919.
- Eckstein, G. 2013. "Implementing and Evaluating a Writing Conference Program for International L2 Writers Across Language Proficiency Levels." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 22: 231–239.
- Ellis, R. 2005. "Principles of Instructed Language Learning." *System* 7 (2): 209–224.
- Ferris, D. 2006. "Does Error Feedback Help Studentwriters? New Evidence on the Short-and Long-Term Effects of Written Error Correction." In *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*, edited by K. Hyland and F. Hyland, 81–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frisby, B., A. Beck, A. S. Bachman, C. Byars, C. Lamberth, and J. Thompson. 2016. "The Influence of Instructor-Student Rapport on Instructors' Professional and Organizational Outcomes." *Communication Research Reports* 33 (2): 103–110. doi:10.1080/08824096.2016.1154834.
- Ghosn-Chelala, M., and W. Al-Chibani. 2018. "Screencasting: Supportive Feedback for EFL Remedial Writing Students." *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology* 35 (3): 146–158.
- Glaser, B., and A. Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hyland, K., and F. Hyland. 2006. "Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing." *Language Teaching* 39 (2): 83–101.
- Kam, C. 2016. "Further Considerations in Using Items with Diverse Content to Measure Acquiescence." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 76 (1): 164–174.
- Kao, C.-W. 2013. "Effects of Focused Feedback on the Acquisition of Two English Articles." *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language* 17 (1): 1–15.
- Klar, Y., and E. Giladi. 1997. "No One in My Group Can Be Below the Group's Average: A Robust Positivity Bias in Favor of Anonymous Peers." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 73 (5): 885–901.

- Lin, X-F, C. Deng, Q. Hu, and C-C Tsai. 2019. "Chinese Undergraduate Students' Perceptions of Mobile Learning: Conceptions, Learning Profiles, and Approaches." *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 35 (3): 317-333.
- Mathieson, K. 2012. "Exploring Student Perceptions of Audiovisual Feedback via Screencasting in Online Courses." *The American Journal of Distance Education* 26: 143-156.
- McCarthy, J. 2015. "Evaluating Written, Audio and Video Feedback in Higher Education Summative Assessment Tasks." *Issues in Educational Research* 25 (2): 153-169.
- McGarrell, H., and R. Alvira. 2013. "Innovation in Techniques for Teacher Commentary on ESL Writers' Drafts." *Innovative Practices in Computer-Assisted Language Learning*, 5, 37-55.
- O'Malley, P. 2011. "Combining Screencasting and a Tablet PC to Deliver Personalised Student Feedback." *New Directions in the Teaching of Physical Sciences* 5: 27-30.
- Orlando, J. 2016. "A Comparison of Text, Voice, and Screencasting Feedback to Online Students." *American Journal of Distance Education* 30 (3): 156-166. doi:10.1080/08923647.2016.1187472.
- Sampson, M., E. Ortlieb, and C. Lueng. 2016. "Rethinking the Writing Process: What Best-Selling and Award-Winning Authors Have to Say." *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 60 (3): 265-274. doi:10.1002/jaal.557.
- Seror, J. 2012. "Show Me! Enhanced Feedback Through Screencasting Technology." *TESL Canada Journal*, 104-116.
- Silva, M. L. 2017. "Commenting with Camtasia: A Descriptive Study of the Affordances and Constraints of Peer-to-Peer Screencast Feedback." In *Research on Writing: Multiple Perspectives*, edited by S. Plane, C. Bazerman, F. Rondelli, C. Donahue, A. Applebee, and C. Bore, 325-346. Metz, France: The WAC Clearinghouse, CREM.
- Stevenson, M., R. Schoonen, and K. de Glopper. 2006. "Revising in two Languages: A Multi-Dimensional Comparison of Online Writing Revisions in L1 and FL." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 15 (3): 201-233.
- Studyportals. 2019, February 24. MEF University. Bachelorsportal: <https://www.bachelorsportal.com/universities/12105/mef-university.html>.
- Sultan, A. J. 2014. "Addiction to Mobile Text Messaging Applications is Nothing to "lol" About." *The Social Science Journal*, 51: 57-69.
- Tekinarslan, E. 2013. "Effects of Screencasting on the Turkish Undergraduate Students' Achievement and Knowledge Acquisitions in Spreadsheet Applications." *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research* 12: 271-282.
- Truscott, J. 1996. "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes." *Language Learning* 46 (2): 327-369.
- Welkenhuysen-Gybels, J., J. Billiet, and B. Cambre. 2003. "Adjustment for the Acquiescence in the Assessment of the Construct Equivalence of Likert-Type Score Items." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 34 (6): 702-722.
- West, J., and W. Turner. 2016. "Enhancing the Assessment Experience: Improving Student Perceptions, Engagement, and Understanding Using Online Video Feedback." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 53 (4): 400-410.

Appendix – Survey

Research survey for extra credit

Purpose: the study is to investigate student reactions to the video feedback I gave this semester.

Important Notes:

1. Participation is entirely voluntary, there is no penalty for not doing the survey
2. Honesty is important – positive comments or marks get you no benefit
3. Everyone who fills out the survey completely will get 10 points of extra credit on the final exam
4. Anonymity is guaranteed. Your name will not be used in the study.

Önemli notlar:

1. Katılım tamamen isteğe bağlıdır, anketi yapmaktan ceza alınmaz
2. Dürüstlük önemlidir - olumlu yorumlar veya işaretler size fayda sağlamaz
3. Anketi tamamen dolduran herkes final sınavında 10 puan ekstra kredi alacaktır.
4. Anonimlik garanti edilir. İsmi çalışmada kullanılmayacak.

Full Name: _____

1. Age: _____ Gender: M / F
2. Where did you study just before ELT113? (circle the most appropriate)
 - a. MEF hazirlik
 - b. other university hazirlik
 - c. private high school
 - b. Public high school
 - e. other _____
3. How many times have you received video feedback during ELT113? _____
4. Is this the first time you have received feedback in this manner? YES NO

5. Please write a little about your opinions of the **disadvantages** of video feedback

Please write a little about your opinions of the **advantages** of video feedback

6. Please try to give a suggestion for improving the feedback or the process of giving it?

7. What did you do when you got the feedback?

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements by circling a number from 1 to 6.

1= strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree

1	It was easy to get the video and watch it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	It was easy to understand my instructor and the feedback in the video.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	I used the feedback right away and made some corrections and improvements on my paper.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I found it easier to remember the feedback when it was given in written and spoken forms.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	The video helped me to think about writing in a general way.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	I was excited and happy when I received my video feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I had some technical problems while I was trying to watch the video.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	Getting video feedback motivated me to study more and learn more about writing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	I felt connected to my instructor as a result of the video feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	I could understand the feedback my instructor wrote on my paper and didn't need the video feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	I felt the feedback was very negative and didn't like hearing about it in the video.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	I came back to the video several times as I was rewriting my paper.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	I felt like I could talk about my essay more because of the video feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I was sent a Word file with text feedback and a link that was easy to understand and follow.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	I accessed and watched the entire video	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	My instructor used some highlighting in the video, and this was very helpful.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I think the written feedback provides a good connection with the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	The video helped me with more than just this paper, it helped me improve as a writer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	The feedback I received on my paper helped me with my later papers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	I hope my instructor continues to use this form of feedback in the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	I remember what is written on my paper more than what is said in the video	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	I watched the video several times to make sure I understood the feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	The video feedback made me feel uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I couldn't always understand what my instructor was talking about in the video.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	When I heard my teacher's voice, I felt he really cared about me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I think the instructor spend too much time on the video feedback and it would have been better if he graded our other papers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I thought it was really useful to have the video feedback along with the written feedback.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I did not find the video more effective than just written feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6

Thank you for completing this survey! You have just earned 10 points of extra credit!