

Using Screencast Video Feedback in the 21st Century EFL Writing Class

Nato Pachuashvili
International Black Sea University, Georgia

Abstract

Giving feedback has always been the backbone of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing class. Written corrective feedback focuses on responding to students' written work by extensively correcting their errors or offering constructive suggestions for improvements. The process of digitalization of education offered an alternative to teachers' written feedback and opened up new opportunities to give video feedback to students. The latter has the potential of improving feedback provision through video capture tools, such as screencasts. The purpose of the research project was to investigate the effectiveness of using screencast video feedback on EFL writing and explore students' perceptions of receiving video feedback for their written assignments. The mixed-method research was carried out with a group of 40 English language students in their academic writing class at a private university in Georgia. To investigate students' perceptions, an online questionnaire was applied that focused on the benefits perceived by the students and technical issues faced during the process of video feedback. The qualitative data was obtained from semi-structured interviews in which the participants talked about the impact of the technology and their overall experience of using it. The findings of the study revealed that video feedback appeared to have been very interactive and supportive in the learning-to-write in a foreign language process. The participants also regarded video feedback as supportive, engaging, multimodal and easily comprehensible.

Keywords: screencast video feedback, written corrective feedback, EFL writing, 21st-century feedback

Providing feedback on students' work has always been an inseparable component of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing class. Quality feedback enhances EFL students' active participation and academic performance in their writing processes. It promotes a constructive learning environment and enables the development of teacher-student rapport (Solhi & Eğinli, 2020). Without feedback, students' written assignments lose purpose and become vain. Critique and subsequent advice not only improve EFL students' learning process, but together they also enrich teachers' performance, emphasizing the key areas of further improvement in the teaching and learning process. Effective feedback provision serves as a motivator and is an essential component for writing skill development (Armağan et al., 2016).

The traditional method of feedback provision centers on giving students written commentary that mainly accentuates the identification of linguistic errors in a given assignment (Yu et al., 2020). This approach is known as written corrective feedback (WCF) and refers to providing explicit corrections for students' work. Two categories of WCF have been identified, direct and indirect. Direct written corrective feedback entails giving suggestions, praises or criticism through a written annotation. EFL teachers use given margins to provide error corrections, whereas indirect feedback serves to give students written comments on their errors, but does not provide error correction (Gasmi, 2017). Although, there is a clear distinction between direct and indirect ways of giving feedback, both types of feedback focus on the identification of students' linguistic errors and providing or suggesting corrections (Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017).

There are several studies that explore the benefits of WCF arguing that this type of assessment provides a valuable contribution to writing skill development and the augmentation of students' lexical range (Arrad et al, 2014). Scholars believe that WCF enables learners to realize and correct their errors, thus, continuing to be a crucial pedagogical practice that is oriented towards the improvement of EFL students' writing skills (Bitchener, 2012; Hylan & Hyland, 2006). Since WCF is still widely used in EFL writing classes, teachers still rely on its potential for improvement in writing accuracy. Furthermore, WCF is thought to increase students' vocabulary as well as grammatical accuracy (Kang & Han, 2016).

Notwithstanding the numerous benefits of WCF, this type of instructive provision has attracted much criticism. One of the reasons for the debate is that WCF does not correspond to the current changes in the field of feedback delivery. This type of corrective reaction is believed to lack the purpose of providing precise feedback to students and appears to be time-consuming (Armağan et al., 2016). Moreover, WCF is said to often fail to lead EFL students to successful error correction and the improvement of their writing skills (Simard et al., 2015). Some researchers even advocate for the abolishment of WCF on the grounds that error correction does not lead to the enhancement of writing skills and accuracy (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019; Shintani & Ellis, 2013). Additionally, it is argued that WCF can be harmful, requiring considerable energy and time.

The emergence of technology transformed the educational system and brought the urgency to reconsider feedback practices. Screencast technology enabled EFL teachers to experiment with

giving oral feedback that focused on recording screens while commenting on students' assignments (Xie et al., 2022). Corrective commentary given through technology served to provide a multimodal alternative to WCF and created an interactive atmosphere for English language learning. Technology-enhanced feedback, which can be listened to, watched or replayed multiple times, appears to create an opportunity to go beyond the boundaries of space and time (Özkul & Ortaçtepe, 2017).

Due to an elevated interest in modern technology, video feedback has gained substantial attention in the field of EFL writing. One of the ways of using video feedback is through screencasting that is “the process of recording a digital display with voiceover” (Cunningham, 2019, p. 224). In other words, screencast technology allows educators to capture their computer screens while providing oral feedback to students (Elola & Oskoz, 2016). This study aimed to experiment with implementing technology in feedback provision practice. In particular, it sought to investigate EFL students' perception of using screencast video feedback as an alternative to WCF and explore challenges faced by students in the process. The paper draws on students' surveys and their interview results as well as reviews of scholarly articles on the area of the imposition of screencast video feedback. To investigate students' perception of using screencast video feedback, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1: What are EFL students' perceptions of using screencast video feedback?

RQ2: What are the benefits of screencast video feedback?

RQ3: What challenges do EFL students face with regard to receiving screencast video feedback?

Literature Review

The advancement in digital tools enabled EFL teachers to better address the deficiencies that were created by written corrective feedback. They vastly contributed to the modification of feedback practices that emphasized their multimodal nature and ease of responding to students' electronic assignment submissions (Cunningham, 2019). Such multimodal feedback is referred to as screencast video feedback since it is recorded using screencast technology and accompanied by the instructor's narration (Cranny, 2016; Séror, 2013). The purpose of screencast video feedback is to provide verbal commentary on students' work and assist them towards self-correction. Unlike WCF, the instructor does not provide direct or indirect error correction on students' assignments, rather locates their errors, specifies the areas of improvement and invites students to address their mistakes (Whitehurst, 2021). In other words, EFL students are exposed to listening to their instructor giving feedback by commenting on areas of improvement.

Screencast video feedback is relatively new and is conducted by recording a computer's on-screen activities (Séror, 2013). The video is accompanied by the narration in which the instructor highlights students' errors and provides suggestions. In other words, the teacher records his/her spoken comments while highlighting students' errors. Screencast technology is different from webcams through which teacher talk is recorded without displaying students'

written work. With screencast technology, on the other hand, students can view their written assignments and listen to the instructors' oral comments (Bush, 2021). Besides, such video feedback resembles a conversation between the instructor and the student; it can be personalized and "contributes to students' multimedia learning experiences by emotionally connecting to students and increasing their interests" (Cheng & Li, 2020, p. 2). For this reason, video feedback has been welcomed as a new alternative and a preferred way of feedback provision for many EFL practitioners (Bush, 2021; Cheng & Li, 2020; Cunningham & Link, 2021).

Benefits of Using Screencast Video Feedback

There are multiple studies that outline the benefits of using screencast video feedback in EFL writing classes. Scholars claim that screencast video feedback positively boosts EFL students' engagement by listening to educator commentary and revising their written words (Ali, 2016; Cranny 2016). High levels of student interaction can also be attributed to a new and innovative mode of feedback through the use of video technology. The study conducted by Bush (2020) showed that screencast video feedback was beneficial for boosting students' involvement since the participants appeared to be very focused on video in their feedback-receiving process. An increased level of participation was also reported in Ali's (2016) and Cranny's (2016) studies. Scholars argue that students' active interaction in this process can be attributed to the innovative and novel nature of the instructional approach. Besides, the participants' comments indicated the importance of feedback being multimodal which also contributed to their involvement. Screencast video feedback enables the instructor to easily highlight or underline students' written errors and provide clear strategies for improvement. Such practices are conducive to increased participation and promote a sort of dialogue between the teacher and feedback receivers. This subsequently promotes enhancing comprehension and boosting the connection concerning teaching and learning (Cranny, 2016).

Screencast video feedback is believed to be personal and conversational which contributes to the establishment of teacher-student rapport. The instructor's conversational manner and friendly tone are perceived to be encouraging and supportive in the EFL writing process (Ali, 2016; Anson et al., 2016). Elola and Oskoz (2016) also emphasize that the conversational nature of video evaluation is highly conducive to building interpersonal relationships that can raise awareness of using a different type of assessment. Scholars argue that this type of feedback is unlike written corrective critique in a number of ways and can lead to successful attainment of the language. Another study carried out by Cunningham (2017) explored the differences between written corrective feedback and screencast video feedback. The latter was perceived as helpful in creating an autonomous environment, whereas the participants perceived written corrective feedback as authoritative. An autonomous environment, in return, contributes to the teacher-student interpersonal relationship that is thought to be crucial for the enhancement of foreign language learning.

Furthermore, screencast video feedback promotes more flexibility than written corrective feedback. Students can access their video feedback at any time and view the recording as many

times as they wish (Cranny, 2016; Lee, 2017). Flexibility in the feedback provision process has been reported as being extremely important since EFL students may not comprehend feedback easily. By viewing a video recording, students can pause and rewind if need be, they can also make some notes and process feedback at their own pace. Video feedback is thought to be more practical and effective in improving the quality of communication as well as being accessible from most devices.

Drawbacks of Using Screencast Video Feedback

Despite a number of benefits, screencast video feedback has some disadvantages. According to Voelkel and Mello (2014), one of the challenges can be attributed to students' lack of emotional readiness to accept the instructor's comments on their written work. They may feel demotivated and frustrated while listening to their instructor directly addressing them. Moreover, students may experience nervousness and anxiety about being unfamiliar with a new technology. It is also believed that if feedback is not provided constructively by the instructor, it may cause annoyance among students. However, some scholars argue that the feeling of uneasiness is normal until students are more familiar with the format of video feedback (Bush, 2020). As soon as students become accustomed to the corrective process via video, they will be more receptive to the corrections. A teacher's positive demeanour can also be conducive to processing feedback as constructive and supportive rather than critical.

Another challenge is related to screencast video feedback being a novel approach that many educators find difficult to handle. Allocating appropriate time might pose another challenge for teachers. In a classroom where there are many students, recording screencast feedback might seem time-consuming (Ali, 2016). A technical issue has also emerged since recording feedback requires advanced technical skills that many teachers may not possess. Furthermore, video format is not always compatible with other devices which can pose further problems for students in terms of viewing or downloading a video. The quality of a video may also undermine the value of screencast video feedback and demotivate students to listen to it (Lee, 2017). Scholars also argue that considering various types of learning styles, screencast video feedback cannot be accessible for all learners. Moreover, students who experience visual or learning impairment may find video feedback difficult to access (Chalmers, MacCallum, Mowat & Fulton, 2014; Johnson & Cooke, 2015).

The Implication of Using Screencast Video Feedback in EFL Writing Class

There is a prolific number of studies that explored the repercussion of using screencast video feedback on EFL students' writing assignments. Elola and Oskoz (2016) in their research argued that the main focus of video feedback is on the content, structure and organization of learners' written work rather than providing suggestions for grammatical errors. They claimed that this type of feedback is particularly beneficial for improving higher-order thinking skills (Ali, 2016; Ducate & Arnold, 2012). Moreover, due to its nature to be specific and engaging, screencast video feedback encourages revision. While listening to the instructor's oral comments, students are shown ways to revise their assignments and correct their errors, thus

leading to writing skill improvement (Ali, 2016). It is also argued that students are more likely to achieve success in revision through video feedback than through written feedback even though the latter is more precise (Elola & Oskoz, 2016). Correspondingly, video feedback has been proven effective for correcting and addressing linguistic errors in written assignments.

As mentioned above, screencast video feedback is personalized and conversational, which enables learners to feel more comfortable than being in face-to-face situations. Vincelette and Bostic (2013) stated that facing an instructor while giving feedback may create pressure, while video feedback can eliminate such constraints on students and make feedback more accurate. Additionally, the interaction without the physical presence of the teacher makes feedback more responsive and initiates a follow-up discussion with the teacher. The scholars also claimed that screencast video feedback allows teachers to provide an alternative assessment enabling the development of EFL students' writing skills.

Some scholars researched EFL students' perceptions of using screencast video feedback in their writing class (Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Vincelette, 2013; Ice et al, 2010). As reported by the participants in Elola's and Oskoz's study, screencast video feedback was perceived positively due to its multi-sensory nature. The students viewed video feedback as multi-functional and specific. It was claimed that screencast video feedback could provide more explanations and suggestions that are necessary to address the issues in writing assignments (Vincelette, 2013).

Methodology and Methods

The study took a mixed-method approach through which quantitative and qualitative data were gathered for analysis. Creswell and Clark (2017) characterize the mixed-method approach as a methodology that offers a more thorough understanding and enhances the validity of the findings. Quantitative data were collected through surveys that were administered at the end of the research period. The survey was generated by the researcher using Google Forms. The aim of using the survey was to investigate the impact of receiving screencast video feedback on Georgian EFL writing students' assignments and their perception of using it. It consisted of three parts: Part 1 of the survey focused on EFL students' reflections on receiving video feedback whereas the second part dealt with the technical issues experienced while listening. The last part of the survey investigated the participants' overall experience of using screencast video feedback. The survey questions were designed by the researcher. The questionnaires/interview questions were then examined and analysed by two independent experts who provided invaluable feedback on the improvement of the content of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was also launched and piloted with 10 students prior to the implementation of the research. The pilot participants filled in the questionnaire in a 5-minute interval. They responded to all the questions and commented that the items were clear and easy to understand.

Quantitative methodology was applied to gain more insight into the benefits of using video feedback. The researcher opted for this methodology to delve deeper into quantitative results and supplement the data. This approach provided additional insight into the mixed-methods

methodology and yielded a more robust research framework (Ivankova, Creswell & Stick, 2006). The semi-structured interviews were conducted with 15 participants using the Zoom platform. The participants were asked 5 questions that were designed by the researcher. By applying qualitative methodology, the researcher was able to enrich the results of the study. Data gleaned from the survey were statistically analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 24). SPSS is an ideal package for quantitative data analysis since it is user-friendly and powerful software for all sorts of analytical data (Rahman & Muktadir, 2021). On the other hand, NVivo was utilized for interview transcript analysis since it aided qualitative data analysis (Welsh, 2002).

Participants

The research sample consisted of 40 undergraduate students studying English Writing as part of their English Philology programme. The majority of the participants (90%) were females, whereas males constituted 10% of the research sample. Most of the participants (97%) were freshmen students of English Philology.

The study was conducted at one of the private universities in Georgia. All participants were first verbally informed about the nature of the research and asked to volunteer to take part in the study. The participants were given a consent form before the start of the study period to confirm their willingness to participate in the study. The form outlined the framework of the study and their right to withdraw their participation at any stage of the research. As regards confidentiality and anonymity, the participants were informed that the survey completion was anonymous. In semi-structured interviews, the participants were again reminded of their voluntary participation and the right to withdraw at any stage of the research with no further consequences. The information provided was strictly used within the scope of this research only and has not been disclosed to any other third party.

Procedure

The survey was administered using Google Forms at the end of the semester. The duration of the research was three months. In the first part of the survey, the participants were asked to reflect on the video feedback they had received on their written assignments and select the appropriate option for each statement. In particular, they were asked to respond to the questions on the clarity of feedback received, ability to revise their work, suggestions for improvement and personalization of feedback. The second part of the questionnaire evaluated the challenges of using screencast video feedback in the EFL writing process. The last part of the questionnaire investigated the overall experience of using video feedback. The statements were organized on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (totally agree), 2 (agree), 3 (neutral), 4 (disagree), and 5 (totally disagree). The Likert scale enabled the participants to indicate their level of agreement with each statement on a metric scale. On the Likert scale, each statement unveils a distinct dimension of attitude toward the issue, thereby inherently interconnected with one another (Joshi et al., 2015).

The data collected were entered in SPSS 24 for statistical analysis. Semi-structured interviews were administered through the Zoom platform. The participants were invited to share their experiences of using screencast video feedback and identify the benefits and challenges they faced while using the technology. The semi-structured interviews were conducted by the researcher. The informants were asked the following questions: 1. *How did you perceive screencast video feedback?* 2. *What aspect of screencast video feedback have you found the most beneficial?* 3. *What challenges have you encountered while listening to video feedback?* 4. *What is your overall experience of using screencast video feedback?* The interviews were transcribed and coded in NVivo. The researcher adapted an open coding system to generate the themes quickly. The transcript analysis revealed 6 major themes.

Findings

The first phase of the data collection was conducted through a survey. The first part of the survey focused on the affordances of screencast video feedback. In the second part of the survey, the participants responded to the statements that dealt with the challenges of using screencast video feedback. The third part of the questionnaire investigated the participants' overall experience of using screencast video feedback.

Table 1

Benefits of Using Screencast Video Feedback

The video feedback:	1 TA	2 A	3 N	4 D	5 TD	Mean	St. Dev	Sig. 2- tailed
Provided a clear understanding of my assignment's content.	77.5%	12.5%	7.5%		2.5%	1.4	0.84	.000
Enabled me to rethink and reevaluate my assignment.	31.5%	20%	2.5%		5%	1.4	0.77	.000
Proved beneficial as it allowed me to revisit my assignment for revisions.	70%	20%	5%		5%	1.50	0.98	.000
Permitted me to gain a better understanding of my mistakes.	70%	20%	7.5%		5%	1.55	1.01	.000
Was comprehensive, highlighting the main strengths and weaknesses of my assignments.	72.5%	17.5%	7.5%		2.5%	1.43	0.84	.000
The instructor commented on my accomplishments.	72.5%	15%	10%		2.5%	1.43	0.87	.000
Included the instructor's recommendations on areas for improvement.	80%	10%	7.5%		2.5%	1.35	0.83	.000
Provided individualized feedback tailored to my personal needs.	80%	7.5%	10%		2.5%	1.38	0.86	.000

As can be seen in Table 1, a significant majority of the participants (77.5%, n=31) perceived video feedback as providing a clear understanding of their assignment content. A similar percentage, 70% (n= 28) regarded video feedback as beneficial in terms of understanding their mistakes and revising their assignments. However, 5% of the participants (n=2) totally disagreed with this statement. Almost 90% of the participants totally agreed or agreed that feedback in the video was individualized and tailored to students' personal needs (n=35). The same percentage of the participants (90%, n=36) also responded positively to video feedback being helpful in providing recommendations and suggesting areas for improvement. Generally, the participants' responses were consistent and positive which was confirmed by the mean scores ranging between 1.38 and 1.50. As regards standard deviation, they varied between 0.77 and 1.01 indicating that the responses provided were not dramatically different.

Table 2

Challenges of Using Screencast Video Feedback.

Video feedback:	1 TA	2 A	3 N	4 D	5 TD	Mean	St. Dev	Sig. 2- tailed
Was time-consuming.	17.5%	17.5%	25%	22.5%	17.5%	3.02	1.32	.000
The audio quality was unclear.	5%	2.5%	10%	45%	37.5%	4.05	1.01	.000
Accessibility was straightforward.	62.5%	17.5%	12.5%	2.5%	5%	1.70	1.11	.000
Accessibility was challenging for me.	72.5%	10%	12.5%	2.5%	2.5%	1.52	0.98	.000
The instructor's tone was supportive and friendly.	80%	10%	7.5%		2.5%	1.35	0.83	.000

As Table 2 statistics indicate, one of the major challenges that emerged from the survey was concern about video feedback being time-consuming. Thirty-five per cent of the participants (n= 14) strongly agreed and agreed with the statement, whereas 10% (n=10) remained neutral. The participants also commented on the quality of the video and a small minority of them (7% n=3) indicated it was unclear. However, for the majority of the participants (82.5%, n=32), the quality of the video was not an issue with 10% (n=4) remaining neutral. The highest mean score (m=4.04) that was observed could be attributed to the fact the statement result could be understood as reversed, since, a negative response, in this case, might be taken as a positive result for the research. As regards the accessibility of video feedback, the participants were positive with 80% totally agreeing or agreeing with the statement, whereas 7.5% (n=3) disagreed or totally disagreed.

Table 3*Overall Experience of Using Screencast Video Feedback*

Video feedback	1 TA	2 A	3 N	4 D	5 TD	Mea n	St. Dev	Sig. 2 tailed
Enhances my writing process, making it more interesting.	80%	10%	7.5 %		2.5%	1.35	0.8	.000
is very interactive and engaging	72.5%	20%	5%		2.5%	1.40	0.8	.000
Deepens my understanding of the subject.	65%	22.5	10 %		2.5%	1.55	0.9	.000
Motivates me to participate in my writing process actively.	80%	5%	12. 5%		2.5%	1.40	0.9	.000
Is advantageous for improving my English writing skills.	70%	20%	5%	2.5%	2.5%	1.47	0.9	.000

As it can be observed from Table 3, the participants' overall experience of using screencast video was very positive, with 90% of the participants (n=36) totally agreeing or agreeing that video feedback made their writing process interesting and enhanced it. Slightly more than 90% of the participants (n=37) also commented on video feedback being very interactive and engaging. Moreover, 85% (n=34) of the participants identified video feedback as motivating in their writing process, whereas a small minority of the participants (n=2.5) responded to this statement negatively. Furthermore, a significant majority of the participants (90%, n= 36) perceived video feedback as advantageous in their writing process.

The second phase of the research concerned analyzing the interview transcript. As it was mentioned in the description of the data collection methodology, the researcher utilized NVivo, went through the coding process, and created the following 6 codes: clear to understand, conversational, motivational, self-reflection, instructor's friendly tone, writing skill improvement. Table 4 summarises the semi-structured interview findings:

Table 4*Semi-structured Interview Results*

Main theme	Number	Quotes
Self-reflection	8	<p>"I liked that the lecturer pointed out my mistakes so I could understand better where I had made mistakes so I can take those in account in the future."</p> <p>"I like it so much. It is easier to understand my mistakes and visualize my mistakes. Everything was real nice"</p> <p>"I love everything about video feedback because it has a lot of benefits. It makes clear in which part I made a mistake and helps me to understand every detail better".</p> <p>"It was an interesting addition, easy to improve those mistakes that were highlighted in the video."</p>

		<p>“It helps me to understand what I have done wrongly, and I like it.”</p> <p>“The video feedback was very engaging. It was interesting to listen to my teacher talking to me about my mistakes. I tried to listen and improve.”</p> <p>“Always looking forward to the instructor’s feedback, I liked the way she praised me and commented on my errors.”</p> <p>“I try to always correct my mistakes and follow the teacher’s advice.”</p> <p>“I like how my lecturer gives me a smiling face every time despite the minor mistakes.”</p> <p>“I personally loved it when I got video feedback. It motivated me to do my assignments perfectly and get that smiley face again.”</p> <p>“The most pleasant thing is that through the video I hear praise for every paragraph and what I wrote is praised, mentioned and appreciated.”</p>
Motivational	6	<p>“There is a zest in this format of feedback, it is more live and I get much more pleasure receiving it now than in past in written form.”</p> <p>“Hearing the teacher’s encouraging words, praising me and my work made me feel really appreciated and respected.”</p>
Instructor’s friendly tone	6	<p>“I like the lecturer’s attitude; she evaluates us very positively and objectively.”</p> <p>“I liked the supportive tone of the lecturer.”</p> <p>“Hearing teachers’ encouraging words, praising me and my work made me feel really appreciated and respected.”</p> <p>“As always lecturer had a friendly tone and that is the thing which I love so much. Please keep going with video feedback. Thank you for helping and supporting us every time.”</p> <p>“The thing, which I liked the most, was the friendly language and tone.”</p> <p>“The lecturer was very friendly and supportive, which made the learning process enjoyable.”</p>
Conversational	5	<p>“It feels like I have a conversation with my lecturer which is absolutely fantastic.”</p> <p>“I have never had such an experience before.”</p> <p>“I absolutely loved that the lecturer was assessing my assignment and in meantime, she was talking as if I was there.”</p> <p>“I liked the fact that it felt like the lecturer was directly talking to me.”</p> <p>“The video feedback was very engaging. It was interesting to listen to my teacher talking to me about my mistakes. I tried to listen and improve.”</p>
Clear to understand	4	<p>“Feedback was clear to understand.”</p> <p>“I loved how the teacher thoroughly explained and discussed every single aspect of my writing, making comments and recommendations for future work as well.”</p> <p>“I liked the way the lecturer described every detail clearly.”</p>

Writing Skill development	3	“I liked the way the lecturer explained everything. Video feedback was super time-consuming and understandable.”
		“I love how everything is described in the video. Either good or bad things in my writing so I can think about it and know what I should improve.”
		“Video feedback is very beneficial, and I hope the instructor will continue to do it in the future.”
		I find video feedback really helpful and useful to use in assessment.”

Table 4 indicated that the first theme that emerged from the interview was self-reflection. According to the comments that are also included in the table above, the participants viewed video feedback as very helpful to understand and revise their errors. It was also mentioned that screencast video feedback enabled the participants to visualize their errors and correct them. The second major theme was labelled as screencast video feedback being motivational. Thirdly, the participants highlighted the instructor’s friendly tone that made them feel appreciated and valued: *“Hearing teacher’s encouraging words, praising me and my work made me feel really appreciated and respected.”* They also indicated that the instructor’s friendly tone was supportive and enjoyable. The participants also felt that screencast video feedback was conversational since they felt the instructor directly addressing them: *“Video feedback was very engaging. It was interesting to listen to my teacher talking to me about my mistakes. I tried to listen and improve.”*

Discussion

The findings reveal that screencast video feedback had a positive impact on Georgian EFL students’ writing. Screencast video feedback was seen as beneficial and clear in providing guidance and error corrections for their writing assignments. The participants’ responses showed that screencast video feedback enables them to revisit their assignments and revise them.

Screencast video feedback is perceived as personalized and individualized. The participants also highlighted the conversational nature of screencast video feedback that made them feel valued and appreciated. As regards the challenges, screencast video feedback appeared to be time-consuming for 35% of the participants. For the minority of the participants, video feedback was seen as unclear (7.5%).

The findings of this study align with the results of the research conducted by Ali (2016) who investigated the effectiveness of screencast video feedback in EFL students’ writing classes. The mixed-method research conducted with undergraduate students revealed that screencast video feedback was perceived as engaging, supportive, clear and personal. Moreover, the scholar argues that screencast video response helps students reshape their ideas and get more organized in writing essays. Similarly, the study conducted by Cunningham (2019) explored EFL students’ perception of using screencast video feedback as an alternative to written corrective feedback. The research findings revealed that the participants preferred screencast video feedback due to it being individualized as opposed to written corrective criticism which

they perceived as very specific. The scholar claims that to yield the best results, a combination of both modes of feedback can be applied.

More recent research carried out by Xie et al. (2022) investigated the impact of screencast video feedback on students' writing performance. The experiment conducted by the researchers involved one group of students who were exposed to screencast recording feedback, whereas the second group received traditional written corrective feedback. The findings of the research revealed that the experimental group students performed better than the control group. As with the current study, the participants' responses were similarly positive towards receiving screencast video feedback since it was perceived as supportive in strengthening teacher-student interaction.

Recommendations

Since most of the respondents regarded screencast video feedback as individualized and interactive, one of the recommendations of the present paper is to enable EFL instructors to use screencast video feedback in their teaching practices. The participants of the study saw the video commentary as stimulating and encouraging. Additionally, they found it readily accessible and highly beneficial for self-editing and revising. The findings also showed positive attitudes towards screencast video feedback, emphasizing its clarity, and capacity for revision. For this reason, EFL teachers are recommended to experiment using screencast video feedback in writing provision. Moreover, the benefits of screencast video feedback that emerged from the research highlight its significance and potential value in future EFL curricula. Curriculum designers are advised to redesign their existing curriculum by incorporating video feedback in teaching and assessment. As regards the challenges, the screencast video feedback emerged to be time-consuming for the majority of the participants. For further consideration, EFL students should receive enough technical support with the accessibility of video feedback.

Conclusion

This paper explored the effectiveness of providing screencast video feedback in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing classes, highlighting its strong usefulness in students' writing skill development. It investigated the concept of written corrective feedback and its main empathy in providing error corrections. The paper also reviewed screencast video feedback as a new alternative to EFL writing classes. The latter offers several benefits, including increased student engagement, personalized feedback and flexibility in writing assessments. However, there are some challenges associated with this approach, such as students' emotional readiness to accept video feedback and technical issues.

The present study employed a mixed-method approach to investigate 40 EFL students' perceptions of screencast video feedback. Quantitative data were collected through surveys, while qualitative data were gathered through semi-structured interviews. The results gleaned from quantitative data suggested that screencast video feedback has a number of benefits. The majority of the participants perceived screencast video feedback as personalized and

conversational providing support for assignment revision. Screencast video feedback was also viewed as engaging and motivational. Moreover, the participants' responses demonstrated that screencast video feedback was easy to access. It was believed to have hugely contributed to self-correction and revising. The results also indicated positive perceptions of screencast video feedback, with participants highlighting benefits such as clarity, revision ability, and personalized feedback. Challenges included technical issues and emotional readiness to accept feedback.

The analysis of semi-structured interview data revealed six main themes. The participants emphasized the benefits of video feedback for self-reflection, noting its clarity in understanding mistakes and its role in facilitating revision. Additionally, they highlighted the motivational aspect of video feedback, appreciating the instructor's friendly tone and feeling valued and respected. Moreover, participants found video feedback conversational and engaging, contributing to an enjoyable learning experience. Overall, participants expressed satisfaction with the clarity, supportiveness, and effectiveness of video feedback in developing their writing skills.

Research Limitations

The present study has identified a number of limitations. One of the concerns is the sample size. The research sample comprised 40 undergraduate students from a specific English philology program at a private university in Georgia. A small sample size and homogeneity of the participants limit the generalizability of the findings to broader populations of EFL students. Moreover, having conducted the study in one specific institutional context may restrict the applicability of the findings to other educational settings. Another limitation is the duration of the study. The present paper presented a small-scale study that lasted for three months. Longitudinal research tracking EFL students' progress over an extended period of time would offer comprehensive insight into the benefits and challenges of screencast video feedback.

References

- Ali, A. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p106>
- Anson, C. M., Dannels, D. P., 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. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.150801>
- Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on the language learning potential of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 348–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.006>
- Bush, J. C. (2021). Using screencasting to give feedback for academic writing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 15(5), 473–486. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1840571>
- Chalmers, C., MacCallum, J., Mowat, E. and Fulton, N. (2014). Audio feedback: Richer language but no measurable impact on student performance. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 8(1), 64–73.
- Cheng, D., & Li, M. (2020). Screencast video feedback in online TESOL classes. *Computers and Composition*, 58, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612>
- 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.
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed-methods research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- 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. (2019). Student perceptions and use of technology-mediated text and Screencast feedback in ESL writing. *Computers and Composition*, 52, 222–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.003>
- 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>
- Ducate, L. & Arnold, N. (2012). Computer-mediated feedback: Effectiveness and student perceptions of screen-casting software versus the comment function. In G. Kessler, A. Oskoz, & I. Elola (Eds.), *Technology Across Writing Contexts and Tasks* (vol. 10) (pp. 31–56). San Marcos, TX: CALICO.

- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting Second Language Writing Using Multimodal Feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183>
- 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>
- Gasmi, M. (2017). *Moodle-based peer review as a tool to enhance and improve EFL learners' writing performance: The case of English department 3rd Year Students*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Algeria: University of Laghouat.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1–19). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ice, P., Swan, K., Diaz, S., Kupczynski, L., & Swan-Dagen, A. (2010). An analysis of students' perceptions of the value and efficacy of instructors auditory and text-based feedback modalities across multiple conceptual levels. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 43(1), 113–134. <https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.43.1.g>
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- Johnson, G. M., & Cooke, A. (2015). Self-regulation of learning and preference for written versus audio-recorded feedback by distance education students. *Distance Education*, 37(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2015.1081737>
- Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology*, 7(4), 396–403. <https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/14975>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189>
- Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9>
- 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/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004>
- Rahman, A., & Mukhtadir, Md. G. (2021). SPSS: An imperative quantitative data analysis tool for social science research. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 5(10), 300–302. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2021.51012>
- Séror, J. (2013). Show me! Enhanced feedback through Screencasting technology. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(1), 104–116. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i1.1128>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2015.1076432>
- 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>
- Vincelette, E. J. & Bostic, T. (2013). Show and tell: Student and instructor perceptions of screencast assessment. *Assessing Writing*, 18, 257–277. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.08.001>
- Vincelette, E. J. (2013). Video capture for grading: multimedia feedback and the millennial student. In E. Smyth, & J. Volker (Eds.), *Enhancing instruction with visual media: Utilizing video and lecture capture* (pp. 107–127). Hershey, PAIGI-Global.
- Voelkel, S. and Mello, L.V. (2014). Audio feedback–better feedback? *Bioscience Education*, 22(1), 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.11120/beej.2014.00022>
- Welsh, E. (2002). Dealing with data: Using NVivo in the qualitative data analysis process. *FQS Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 3(2), 1–9.
- Whitehurst, J. (2021). *Screencast feedback for clear and effective revisions of high-stakes process assignments*. Available: <https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/owi-open-resource/screencast-feedback>. (26 July 2021).
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100451>

Corresponding Author: Nato Pachuashvili

Email: npachuashvili@ibsu.edu.ge