



Scaffolding Second/Foreign Language Writing Through Customized Feedback Using Screencasting Technology

Surya Subrahmanyam Vellanki*

Senior Lecturer in English, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Oman

Abstract

This study investigates the impact of technology-mediated screencast multimodal feedback on EFL students' writing skills in a remote teaching context in Oman. Conducted with two groups of Post-Foundation students in a Technical Writing course, the research examined the effectiveness of screencasting multimodal feedback, which combines video recordings of oral commentary, written corrections, and visual highlights. Data collection included questionnaires, analysis of students' written work, and informal virtual group discussions. The findings revealed that students significantly improved in areas such as task response, coherence, cohesion, lexical resource, and grammar. Multimodal feedback facilitated deeper engagement with the revision process and helped students better understand and incorporate corrections into their subsequent drafts. Despite technical challenges, the majority of students preferred multimodal feedback over traditional methods due to its clarity, personalization, and ability to cater to different learning styles. Students reported that the ability to pause and replay the feedback videos was particularly beneficial for understanding complex corrections. Additionally, the personalized nature of the feedback fostered a stronger connection between students and the instructor, enhancing motivation and support. This study highlights the potential of screencasting feedback to significantly enhance student writing proficiency and suggests further research to explore its long-term effects across diverse educational settings and learner demographics.

Keywords: Engagement, EFL/ESL, Multimodal Feedback, Personalized Feedback Screencasting, Writing Skills

INTRODUCTION

Feedback in EFL Writing

Feedback is an essential part of the teaching/learning process and has been widely researched in second language acquisition (SLA), especially in second language (L2) writing. Writing skills play a prominent role in developing students' language and critical thinking skills (Gammill, 2006; Wade, 1995). Therefore, it is imperative for teachers to devise appropriate strategies to support student learning on a regular basis. Effective feedback plays a crucial role in guiding students to meet their learning objectives by providing insights into their strengths and areas for improvement. It is vital in writing

courses to help students become acquainted with academic conventions. Over the last decade or so, significant transformations have occurred in the methodologies educators employ to provide feedback to students, largely due to technological advancements, which have enabled them to utilize diverse digital tools to enhance student support.

Stern and Solomon (2006) emphasize that feedback should facilitate students' comprehension of the actions necessary to achieve their learning objectives. Moreover, it should help learners recognize their present competencies so that they can strive for their desired levels of proficiency, as highlighted by Hattie and Timperley (2007). In this context, Bitchner and Ferris (2012) stated that educators try to pinpoint students' frequent, challenging, and recurrent linguistic errors that need to be addressed through written Corrective Feedback (CF).

Types of Feedback – Written/Oral/Digital (Oral or Written or a Mix of Both)

This section offers a review of literature on various forms of feedback employed by teachers in their classrooms, focusing on how multimodal feedback has emerged as an invaluable tool for providing feedback on student work. Feedback in EFL writing can be given in several forms: written, oral, and digital. Written feedback, comprising annotations and summary comments, remains the predominant method of feedback in higher education (Orlando, 2016; Ryan, Henderson, and Phillips, 2019). Ellis (2009) categorized written corrective feedback into three main types. The first is direct corrective feedback, which involves identifying errors and supplying the correct forms to students. The second, indirect feedback, points out errors without providing the correct forms, using methods such as underlining. The third type, metalinguistic feedback, involves providing learners with error codes that indicate the nature of their errors, using abbreviated labels for different types of errors to help students identify and correct them. All these feedback approaches prioritize error correction and aim to enhance learners' writing proficiency.

Teachers utilize various methods for corrective feedback. While indirect CF is common in traditional classrooms, it may not be favored by less proficient learners (Lee, 2008; Amrhein and Nassaji, 2010; Chen, Nassaji and Liu, 2016). Research indicates that learners often prefer all errors to be corrected (Lee, 2005; Alshahrani and Storch, 2014) and prioritize written feedback on grammatical errors over vocabulary or mechanical errors (Zhang, 2018). Another study by Zhang, Chen, Hu and Ketwan (2021) found that Thai EFL learners' preferences for written corrective feedback vary based on their proficiency levels, with upper intermediate learners favoring underlining and error codes, while low and upper proficiency groups preferred metalinguistic explanations and overt corrections for lexical errors. However, oral feedback, through face-to-face meetings or audio recordings, offers a personalized approach but lacks the visual aspect of written feedback (Olesova et al., 2011). On the other hand, digital feedback, incorporating tools like screencasting, blends text, audio, and video elements. This multimodal approach caters to diverse learning styles, offering richer insights and a more engaging and creative feedback process (Séror, 2013; West & Turner, 2015).

Each feedback type has its advantages and limitations. Written CF is detailed but can be perceived as impersonal and may not fully communicate improvement areas. Oral feedback is more personal but can lack the visual aspect of written feedback. Screencasting, which combines the strengths of both, is engaging, clear, and detailed, though it may involve technical challenges and can be time-consuming for both students and teachers.

Irrespective of the method followed by teachers, effective feedback, as proposed by Hattie & Timperley (2007), should encompass feed-up (purpose of the task and method of assessment), feedback (progress assessment), and feed-forward (guidance for improvement). O'Malley (2011) emphasizes that feedback should be timely, meaningful, constructive, and personal, addressing specific learner needs rather than general errors (Espasa and Meneses, 2010).

However, it usually becomes impractical for teachers to give feedback considering a large group of students in many teaching contexts. The Covid-19 pandemic and the shift to remote teaching have amplified the challenges of providing effective feedback. The absence of physical presence makes it difficult for teachers to gauge student understanding and engagement during feedback sessions. This has led to uncertainties about whether corrective feedback is being interpreted as intended, since few students actively seek clarification or guidance on improving their writing. Thus, providing a personalized learning experience to students is indeed a serious challenge to all educators in the remote teaching context.

In remote teaching and learning environments, providing effective feedback is even more significant. It is challenging for teachers to determine whether students are attentively following synchronous feedback or facing technical difficulties. The inherent uncertainty of online classes, where reactions and engagement levels of students remain largely unknown, makes delivering impactful feedback a significant priority. Many teachers are unsure if their comments are clear to students. Empirical observations indicate that few students inquire about why their writing was marked as incorrect or seek advice on how to improve it.

In addition, as O'Malley (2011) noted, written comments can often be misconstrued by students. They may struggle to decode comments in teacher feedback, leading to repeated errors in their subsequent writing assignments. This suggests that feedback consisting solely of correction codes or written comments may not be effective or motivating. In online classes, particularly, students benefit from additional explanations. Therefore, a more detailed, personalized, and reassuring feedback approach is recommended. Addressing these challenges requires teachers to proactively develop new skills and strategies, utilizing available technologies to adapt their teaching styles and enhance learning.

Screencasting is one such technology that enables the provision of multimodal feedback on students' writing through tools like Camtasia. It has been extensively studied in the

context of providing multimodal feedback on writing skills, especially in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings. For the purpose of this research, Camtasia, a popular screencasting tool, has been used to prepare and deliver multimodal feedback.

Camtasia, a widely used screen-recording software program, has been instrumental in facilitating the creation of screencast feedback materials. Its features, such as screen video capturing, audio integration, and the addition of animated effects, make it a versatile tool for creating engaging and informative feedback materials (Bauk & Radlinger, 2013). Studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of Camtasia in improving student performance and engagement, particularly in subjects like physiology and mathematics (Miller, 2014; Bauk & Radlinger, 2013). Furthermore, the use of Camtasia in educational settings extends beyond feedback provision. It has been utilized in creating interactive learning materials, improving students' pronunciation skills, and enhancing the delivery of course content through flipped classroom approaches (Deiniatur, 2019; Fitzgerald & Li, 2015; Noor, Octaviandra, & Hussein, 2022), as well as creating learning videos and developing interactive learning materials to enhance students' comprehension in various subjects, including mathematics and technology (Bull, 2013). The versatility of Camtasia in creating engaging and informative educational content underscores its significance in modern pedagogical practices.

Screencast feedback, through Camtasia, merges the benefits of textual, auditory, and visual feedback, allowing a teacher to simultaneously record their screen activities and verbal remarks while providing feedback. This approach has garnered significant interest in EFL research due to its multimodal nature, which aligns with Mayer's cognitive theory of multimedia learning (2014). According to Mayer, learning is enhanced when information is presented both verbally (spoken or written) and pictorially (including videos). This combination helps learners form mental representations and promotes generative processing by encouraging them to actively engage with and make sense of the materials, thus enhancing motivation and deeper learning (Mayer, 2014). Consequently, screencasting technology has emerged as a potential solution to the challenges of traditional feedback methods by providing rich and detailed feedback that caters to various learning preferences.

Screencasting Software for Multimodal Feedback

The purpose of this section is to explore the effectiveness and implications of utilizing Screencasting as a feedback tool in the context of language learning and writing improvement. The review aims to investigate how the integration of multimodal feedback, particularly through screencasting, can enhance students' writing skills, engagement, and overall learning experience. By synthesizing various studies on multimodal technology-mediated feedback, the review seeks to provide insights into the benefits and challenges associated with implementing screencasting multimodal feedback in different educational settings.

Screencasting, defined as recording screen activities with voice narration (Peterson, 2007), caters to various learning styles and can be easily shared with students (Trail and Hadley, 2010). Screencast feedback involves recording the computer screen showcasing the student's work while the teacher provides feedback through actions like scrolling, highlighting, and typing, accompanied by oral narration. This format may also include the teacher's video in a small corner window (Henderson and Phillips 2014; Thompson and Lee 2012).

This software has become popular among YouTubers, software developers, and educators for its capacity to create audiovisual records in various ways, providing feedback in online or asynchronous learning environments. Stannard (2007a, 2008) pioneered the use of screen capture technology to provide multimodal feedback, combining verbal comments with visual highlights on the student's text. This method proved to be a remarkable learning experience, offering innovative and effective feedback (Brick & Holmes, 2008). Stannard (2008) provides guidance on using screencasting technology for feedback through his website, demonstrating how different screen capture software can be utilized. He also mentions that screencasting technology allows teachers to employ novel methods to engage students, improve their work, and enhance their learning in both traditional and online classes.

Research indicates that screencast multimodal feedback offers several significant advantages over traditional text-based feedback. It has been shown to enhance student engagement, understanding, and retention of feedback (Harper et al., 2015; Ice et al., 2007; Bush, 2020). Students better remember explanations given through screencasting and find this form of feedback more encouraging and motivating (Harper et al., 2015). Screencast feedback is considered more effective than text-based feedback because it gives students a sense of the instructor's immediate presence while correcting their assignments (Thompson & Lee, 2012; Stannard, 2007a, 2008). Additionally, it allows students to interact with the community and make social connections with the instructor (Ice et al., 2007).

Screencast feedback has been found to significantly improve students' writing skills by encouraging revisions based on the feedback provided, catering to different learning styles, and enhancing feedback quality and clarity (Cunningham, 2015; West & Turner, 2016). This personalized feedback experience, which can be significant and worthwhile for both students and teachers (Wade, 2016), has been found to positively influence student perceptions of the revision process (Silva, 2012). Moreover, screencast video feedback has been found to encourage students to revise their writing assignments and focus on improving their mistakes (Pachuashvili, 2021). Additionally, Elola and Oskoz (2016) found that students who received screencast feedback demonstrated better revisions and a deeper understanding of their writing issues compared to those who received only written feedback. Overall, the use of screencasting in providing feedback significantly enhances student motivation, understanding of feedback, and the quality of their revisions.

The use of audio in screencast feedback allows for conveying emotions and providing constructive feedback (Middleton and Nortcliffe, 2010; O'Malley, 2011). It can also be less intimidating for students who may find in-class discussions about their work daunting. Mathieson (2012) found that screencast audiovisual feedback, when combined with text-only feedback, was more effective than text-only feedback alone. This multimodal approach not only enhanced student interaction with the instructor and improved learning but also fostered a sense of connection and rapport, as students perceived the feedback as more "real" and "personal" (Crim, 2006; Mathieson, 2012; Pachuashvili, 2021; Silva, 2012; Thompson & Lee, 2012; Zahro, 2023). Students appreciated the personalized nature of screencast feedback and felt more connected to their instructors, the conversational nature of addressing students helps establish an encouraging and supportive interpersonal relationship (Thompson & Lee, 2012; Ali, 2016; Anson, Dannels, Laboy & Carneiro, 2016; Zhang, 2018).

While earlier studies noted challenges in creating and sharing video feedback due to file size and technological limitations (Brick & Holmes, 2008; Silva, 2012), advancements in screencasting tools have mitigated these issues. The ability to create high-quality videos with smaller file sizes has facilitated the wider adoption of screencast feedback. Several researchers have successfully utilized screencasting software like Jing to provide multimodal feedback, with students reporting positive experiences related to the constructive nature of feedback and the option of replaying feedback videos (Standard, 2007a, 2008; Brick & Holmes, 2008; Mathisen, 2012; Silva, 2012; Seror, 2012; AbdRahman, Salam, & Yusof, 2014; Henderson and Phillips, 2015; Stannard, 2017).

Research on screencast feedback has shown its positive impact on various aspects of learning. McGarrell and Alvira (2013) found that screencast feedback improved students' understanding of teacher comments compared to handwritten feedback. Orlando (2016) and Alvira (2016) highlighted its role in increasing student autonomy. Additionally, Alvira (2016) reported that screencast feedback not only enhanced student autonomy but also served as a motivating strategy that produced positive results in students' writing. Studies by Ali (2016) and Henderson & Phillips (2015) further revealed that students perceive screencast feedback as detailed, constructive, personal, engaging, motivating, and helpful, leading to a preference for this method over traditional feedback approaches.

Studies across diverse contexts, including EFL learners of Arabic (Ghosn-Chelala & Al-Chibani, 2018), business and accounting students (Marriot and Teoh, 2017), and general EFL learners (Kim, 2018), have consistently shown that screencast feedback is positively received due to its multimodal nature, which enhances students' comprehension and perception of feedback compared to traditional single-modality methods like typed annotations or just audio files (AbuSa'aleek & Shariq, 2021; Ghosn-Chelala & Al-Chibani, 2018; Laelasari et al., 2019). This positive reception of screencasting feedback is attributed to its engaging and supportive nature, clarity, personalization, and comprehensiveness, which fosters better understanding and engagement.

Students have reported that screencast feedback is clearer and more useful than traditional written feedback, indicating its potential to enhance the feedback process (Ghosn-Chelala & Al-Chibani, 2018). Screencasting multimodal feedback, unlike traditional feedback methods, allows for a richer and more interactive feedback experience, which can be especially beneficial for subjects like writing instruction (Ghosn-Chelala & Al-Chibani, 2018; Setiyani, Putri & Prakarsa, 2019). The integration of screencasting technology addresses the limitations of single-modality feedback approaches and provides a more dynamic feedback environment for students (Setiyani et al., 2019).

Research consistently demonstrates that students prefer individualized technology-mediated feedback, such as screencasting, over traditional written corrective feedback because it allows students to monitor their performance, caters to different learning styles, and provides them with more encouraging feedback (Soltanpour & Valizadeh, 2018). Screencasting feedback has been found to be particularly pleasing and engaging, as it allows students to clearly understand their writing lapses and offers a more individualized and detailed approach that can be reviewed at their convenience (Mathieson, 2012; McCarthy, 2015; Orlando 2016; Mayhew, 2017; Silva, 2017; Bush, 2020).

A comprehensive review of numerous studies by Bakla (2017) highlights the promising nature of screencast feedback, emphasizing its advantages and acknowledging potential disadvantages. The study suggests that screencasting is a versatile tool that can be adapted to various teaching contexts. Stannard and Salli (2019) further support this notion by outlining the potential applications of screen capture technology in teacher training contexts, showcasing its versatility and potential for broader educational use.

Cunningham (2019) found that convenience, clarity, and efficacy are key factors influencing students' preference for video feedback. In a separate study, Cunningham (2019) explored how the choice of feedback mode (video or text) affects the language used by teachers. He argues that text feedback positions the instructor as an authority figure, employing "contracting resources," while video feedback utilizes "expanding engagement resources," empowering students to make their own decisions. In video feedback, teachers offer guidance through suggestions and advice, often casting future changes as opportunities for improvement" (P. 96).

While screencast feedback has been shown to have numerous advantages in enhancing students' writing skills and improving teacher-student interactions (Bush, 2020), there are also some disadvantages associated with its use. One potential drawback, according to Green (2022) is the time-consuming nature of creating screencasts, as instructors may need to invest more time compared to providing written feedback. Furthermore, while screencast feedback is praised for its personal and engaging nature, it may inadvertently position learners as passive recipients of feedback, thereby neglecting the importance of student agency and active engagement in the feedback process (Zahro, 2023). Additionally, Irwin (2022) opines that the implementation of screencast feedback may

require specific technical skills and resources, which could pose challenges for educators and institutions.

Despite these challenges, the benefits of screencast feedback, such as enhanced clarity and the ability to provide multimodal, personalized feedback, often outweigh these disadvantages, making it a valuable tool in modern educational practices. Overall, screencasting multimodal feedback has proven to be highly beneficial for students, significantly improving their writing skills, engagement, and overall learning experience. This method enhances the quality and clarity of feedback by combining visual and auditory elements, making it more comprehensive and easier to understand. Students perceive screencast feedback as more personalized and motivating, which fosters a stronger connection with instructors and encourages them to engage more deeply with the revision process. The ability to cater to different learning styles and provide detailed, constructive feedback helps students better grasp their mistakes and make meaningful improvements. Despite initial technological challenges, advancements in screencasting tools have made this feedback method more accessible and widely adopted, leading to positive student experiences and outcomes in various educational settings.

Driven by the objective of providing more detailed and constructive feedback, the present study focuses on the effectiveness of multimodal feedback, which combines text, audio, and video, in improving students' writing skills. This study targets Post-Foundation students at a university in Oman, and, by introducing multimodal feedback, this research aims to provide insights into its effectiveness and encourage other educators to adopt similar methods to enhance their teaching practices.

Despite the growing body of research on feedback methods in second language acquisition (SLA), there is a notable gap in the literature concerning the use of multimodal feedback in the EFL context, particularly in Oman. Previous studies have primarily focused on traditional written and oral feedback methods, with limited exploration of the potential benefits of combining multiple modalities in the present context. Additionally, the effectiveness of multimodal feedback in remote learning environments remains under-researched.

Notwithstanding the research work done by some researchers on how multimodal feedback can be implemented in different scenarios, there is still a need to explore its impact on student learning outcomes, its effect in the present remote teaching context, and the different aspects that could be incorporated when giving feedback to students. As new technologies continue to emerge with advanced features, there remains substantial scope for research in this area.

Hence, the present study aims to investigate the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback to students using screencasting (multimodal feedback – written, audio and video simultaneously with a webcam) on their writing and explore their perceptions of adapting it to improve their writing skills. This study will provide valuable insights into its applicability and effectiveness in enhancing language learning outcomes in Oman.

Research Questions

Propelled by the objective of providing more detailed and constructive feedback, the author implemented multimodal feedback for post-foundation students at a university in Oman. This study addresses the following research questions:

1. How do learners perceive the screencast multimodal feedback, compared to traditional written feedback, in terms of ease of access and technical issues, understanding and clarity, effectiveness and application of feedback, instructor interaction and its emotional impact?
2. Is there any perceptible engagement from learners with screencast video feedback, and do they integrate this feedback into their subsequent writing drafts to support their progress in writing?
3. What are the perceived advantages and disadvantages of multimodal screencast feedback?
4. Is there any improvement in various aspects of students' writing in their first and second drafts, based on the multimodal feedback?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employs a mixed-method "within-subjects design" to analyze how students perceive the effectiveness of multimodal feedback compared to traditional written feedback in a remote teaching writing course. In this design, the same group of participants is exposed to two distinct feedback methods – initially written feedback, and subsequently multimodal feedback incorporating audio, written correction symbols, and explanatory videos – to ascertain their comparative effectiveness. This approach integrates both qualitative and quantitative data, offering a comprehensive understanding of the research problem (Creswell, 2012; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). Using both data types helps "better understand the research problem and questions than either method by itself" (p. 537), enhancing data triangulation and improving validity in educational research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018).

Context and Participants

The study was carried out in a Technical Writing course at an Omani university during the remote teaching period necessitated by the Covid-19 pandemic. There were 38 participants, all of whom had qualified at the advanced level in the General Foundation Program of the university. They were enrolled in a pre-requisite writing course for their diploma or advanced diploma in their respective specializations. The participants included both males and females, aged between 20 and 25.

Sampling

The study utilized convenience sampling, which involves selecting participants based on their availability and willingness to participate, making it a practical choice for educational settings where researchers use pre-existing groups. This method allows for easy access to participants and can provide valuable insights, although it may limit the generalizability of the findings (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). The present study chose students assigned for teaching and this ensured that the selected group of students were readily accessible for data collection, facilitating an efficient and effective research process.

Instruments for Data Collection

The study collected data from various sources to gain a comprehensive understanding of students' engagement with different feedback methods and their perceptions of these methods. Quantitative data was gathered through a questionnaire administered using Google Forms. This questionnaire aimed to capture students' perceptions of using screencasting for video feedback. Adapted from Bush (2020) and Orlando (2016), the questionnaire was modified to suit the present context and validated by two experienced English language lecturers. It included both closed and open-ended questions, providing a mix of quantitative and qualitative data (Creswell, 2014).

Qualitative data was collected through students' written work at different periods during the teaching process to analyze how they engaged with feedback in different areas of their writing – task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resources and grammar - and self-corrected their essays. This qualitative data was essential for understanding the practical impact of the feedback on students' writing skills. Furthermore, informal virtual group discussions were conducted at the end of the semester to gather in-depth insights into students' experiences and perceptions of both feedback methods. These discussions aimed to collect additional responses to the questionnaire and obtain oral feedback from students who might have found it difficult to provide written responses.

By integrating these methods, the study offers a nuanced understanding of how multimodal feedback can enhance language learning. Combining qualitative and quantitative data from questionnaires with rich, descriptive narratives from written samples and informal virtual group discussions helps validate and inform the findings, providing a strong assessment of the impact of the multimodal feedback method (Creswell, 2014; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010).

Procedures

In this study, participants were required to write essays on various topics aligned with their course requirements. Throughout the semester, the teacher delivered lessons on three prescribed topics and conducted two writing tasks per week. Initially, students received written feedback on their first two essays each week. For the subsequent two essays, they received technology-mediated multimodal feedback. Camtasia, a software

application, was utilized to create the video feedback using screencasting technology. Each student received a screencast video that included written comments, symbols, and highlighting, along with the teacher's video in a corner of the screen. The duration of these videos ranged from 3 to 5 minutes. As this was a remote teaching scenario, both kinds of feedback were given asynchronously. After receiving feedback on each draft, students were instructed to revise and submit a final version of their essays based on the feedback received.

Data Analysis

The quantitative data from the questionnaire was analyzed using descriptive statistics with SPSS (Version 25) software. The qualitative data from students' written work was examined to determine whether the given feedback was accurately incorporated into their subsequent essays. Qualitative content analysis was performed manually, following procedures to identify themes and patterns in students' writing improvements and errors corrected (Newby, 2010, as cited in Cohen et al., 2018). Thematic analysis was applied to the qualitative data from the questionnaire and informal virtual group discussions, identifying common themes and perceptions (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Ethical Considerations

All ethical considerations were meticulously adhered to during data collection. Participants were fully informed about the study's purpose, procedures, and potential risks, and their informed consent was obtained prior to participation. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained to protect their privacy. Participation was entirely voluntary, with no coercion involved. The study received ethical approval from the relevant institutional review committee, ensuring that all research activities complied with established ethical standards and guidelines. This adherence to ethical principles ensured that the rights and well-being of all participants were safeguarded throughout the research process.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

In an effort to evaluate the effectiveness of feedback methods used in the instructional approach, a questionnaire was administered among students. The primary objective was to gather insights on the accessibility, understanding and clarity, effectiveness, application of feedback, quality of instructor interaction and perception, and emotional impact of the multimodal technology-mediated video feedback. This section aims to analyze the common themes and key trends that emerged from the responses, which are essential for understanding the overall effectiveness and perception of the feedback provided. The responses from the questionnaire highlighted several recurring themes, which are discussed under the four research questions.

RQ1: How do learners perceive the screencast multimodal feedback, compared to traditional written feedback, in terms of ease of access and technical issues, understanding and clarity, effectiveness and application of feedback, instructor interaction and its emotional impact?

Ease of Access and Technical Issues

Accessibility was a significant factor, with most respondents finding the video feedback easy to access and watch. Based on the analysis of responses to Q1 and Q2 (table 1), it is evident that the majority of respondents found the video easy to access. The mean value for Q1 is approximately 5.16, indicating a strong agreement towards the ease of accessing the video, with most responses leaning towards "Agree" (45%) and "Strongly Agree" (35%), highlighting the general ease of access. Conversely, Q2, which addresses technical issues, has a mean value of approximately 2.05, indicating that respondents generally disagreed that they had technical problems while trying to watch the video. The results suggest that technical problems were not a significant issue for most respondents, indicating that the majority did not encounter substantial technical difficulties.

Table 1. Ease of Access and Technical Issues

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|----|---------|---------|--------|-------------------|
| Q1 - I had some technical problems while I was trying to watch the video | 38 | 3.00 | 6.00 | 5.1579 | .94515 |
| Q2 - I had some technical problems while I was trying to watch the video. | 38 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 2.0526 | .76925 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 38 | | | | |

Informal virtual group discussions conducted at the end of the semester reinforced these findings. A majority of students reiterated that they could easily access and watch the video feedback. Some students mentioned that the ability to revisit the video feedback at their own pace was particularly beneficial, allowing them to review the feedback as many times as needed without any technical difficulties.

Understanding and Clarity

The analysis of Q3, Q11, and Q18 (Table 2) provides insights into the understanding and clarity of feedback. The high mean value of 4.76 for Q3 suggests that video feedback is generally clear and easy to understand for most respondents. However, the mean value of 2.71 for Q11 indicates that a significant number of respondents felt they still needed the video to understand the feedback, suggesting that written feedback alone may not be sufficient for everyone. Finally, the mean value of 2.45 for Q18 indicates that while most respondents did not frequently struggle with understanding video feedback, there were occasional issues that need to be addressed to ensure clarity.

Table 2. Understanding and Clarity

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Q3 - It was easy to understand my instructor and the feedback in the video. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.7632 | 1.05098 |
| Q11 - I could understand the feedback my instructor wrote on my essay and did not need the video feedback. (inverse 22) | 38 | 1.00 | 4.00 | 2.7105 | .89768 |
| Q18 - I could not always understand what my instructor was talking about in the video. | 38 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.4474 | 1.08297 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 38 | | | | |

The virtual group discussions further supported these findings. Many students mentioned that multimodal video feedback helped them understand their mistakes clearly and provided clarity on what was expected in each type of writing. The combination of audio, visual, and text elements in the feedback accommodated different learning preferences and enhanced information retention and comprehension. This is consistent with the findings of Harper et al. (2015), Ice et al. (2007), and Bush (2020), who also noted the clarity and comprehensibility of multimodal feedback.

Effectiveness of Feedback

When it comes to the effectiveness of multimodal feedback, the analysis of responses reveals a generally positive reception among the respondents. With mean values consistently above 4.4 for most questions, it is evident that respondents found the combination of written and video feedback highly effective. For instance, questions Q5, Q8, Q9, Q14, Q17, Q20, and Q21 (Table 3) all scored mean values close to or above 4.8, indicating strong agreement that multimodal feedback aids in memory retention, motivates further study, helps organize writing, and engages students actively in the revision process. Despite the overall positive feedback, some variability in responses was observed. For example, Q22, which deals with the usefulness of having both video and written feedback, had a higher standard deviation, indicating mixed feelings among respondents. Furthermore, Q23's lower mean score of 2.76 suggests that some respondents still found written feedback alone to be more effective than video feedback, highlighting the importance of providing both types to cater to different preferences. These findings align with the results of Mathieson (2012), Thompson and Lee (2012), and Orlando (2016), which demonstrated that combining audiovisual feedback with text improves student interaction and comprehension.

Table 3. Effectiveness of feedback

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Q5 - I found it easier to remember the feedback when it was given in written and video form. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.7632 | 1.12548 |
| Q6 - The video helped me to think about the techniques of writing different essays. | 38 | 1.00 | 6.00 | 4.4474 | 1.28814 |

| | | | | | |
|---|----|------|------|--------|---------|
| Q8 - Getting video feedback motivated me to study more and learn more about writing. | 38 | 1.00 | 6.00 | 4.9211 | 1.14801 |
| Q9 - Receiving feedback through screencast videos helped me organize my writing. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.9211 | 1.09992 |
| Q14 - My instructor used some highlighting in the video, and this was very helpful. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.8947 | 1.00779 |
| Q17 - I remember what is said in the video more than what is commented in writing on my essay. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.8684 | 1.11915 |
| Q20 - I felt that receiving feedback through screencast videos engaged me actively in the revision process. | 38 | 3.00 | 6.00 | 4.9474 | .89887 |
| Q21 - I have a positive attitude towards receiving feedback through screencast videos. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.9474 | 1.01202 |
| Q22 - I thought it was really useful to have the video feedback along with the written feedback. | 38 | 1.00 | 6.00 | 4.4737 | 1.63966 |
| Q23 - : I found that just the written feedback is more effective than the video feedback. | 38 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 2.7632 | 1.23975 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 38 | | | | |

During the virtual discussions, students emphasized that video feedback was more engaging compared to traditional written feedback. The use of visual aids, such as the cursor pointing out errors and providing explanations, was highlighted as particularly helpful. Students appreciated the personalized and specific feedback, which addressed their individual needs and learning styles. These observations are similar to those reported by Ice et al. (2007), Stannard (2007a, 2008), and Thompson & Lee (2012), who noted the increased engagement and personalization of screencast feedback.

Application of Feedback

Analysis of student responses regarding the application of multimodal feedback shows successful implementation and positive perception of the multimodal feedback. The question evaluating the respondents' experience in accessing and watching the entire video received the highest mean score of 5.32, suggesting that students found the video feedback highly accessible and fully engaged with the content. Question 4, which assesses the immediate use of feedback for making corrections and improvements, had a mean score of 4.50, indicating that respondents generally agreed they could quickly apply the feedback to enhance their work. Similarly, Q15, with a mean score of 4.82, shows that students found the video feedback helpful for subsequent writings, suggesting that the benefits of multimodal feedback extend beyond immediate revisions to future work. However, there is some variability in responses, particularly for Q13, which examines the frequency of re-watching the video feedback to ensure understanding. The mean score of 4.08, while still positive, indicates that not all students felt the need to revisit the feedback multiple times, reflecting varying levels of initial comprehension or confidence in applying the feedback. These insights are consistent with findings from Harper et al. (2015), Cunningham (2015), Orlando (2016) and Bush (2020), which indicated that multimodal feedback facilitates better application and understanding of feedback.

Table 4. Application of feedback

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Q4 - I used the feedback right away and made some corrections and improvements on my paper. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.5000 | 1.22474 |
| Q7 - I accessed and watched the entire video. | 38 | 1.00 | 6.00 | 5.3158 | 1.29667 |
| Q13 - I watched the video several times to make sure I understood the feedback. | 38 | 1.00 | 6.00 | 4.0789 | 1.14801 |
| Q15 - The video feedback I received on my essays helped me with my subsequent writings. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.8158 | 1.11149 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 38 | | | | |

Students in the virtual group discussions also mentioned that video feedback allowed them to correct their mistakes effectively and understand the contents better. The ability to pause and replay the video at their own pace was particularly beneficial, as it allowed them to fully grasp the feedback and apply it directly to their work. These findings corroborate studies by West & Turner (2016) and Bull (2013), which highlighted the importance of revisiting feedback to enhance understanding and application.

Quality of Instructor Interaction

Regarding instructor interaction and perception of video feedback, analysis of responses (Table 5) suggests multimodal feedback fostered positive instructor interaction and perception. Question 16, which measures respondents' hopes that their instructor continues to use video feedback in the future, has the highest mean score of 5.39. This suggests strong agreement and a high level of satisfaction with the video feedback method, indicating that students find it beneficial and effective. Question 10, which assesses whether students felt connected to their instructor because of the video feedback, had a mean score of 4.58, indicating that respondents generally felt that the video feedback helped foster a connection with their instructor. Question 19, which evaluates whether respondents felt their instructor spent enough time on the video feedback, had a mean score of 4.97, suggesting that students generally agreed that sufficient time was dedicated to providing detailed and helpful feedback. These observations are in agreement with findings from Anson et al. (2016), Crim (2006), and Harper et al. (2015), which noted that screencast feedback enhances the feeling of personalized and supportive interaction.

Table 5. Quality of instructor interaction

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--|----|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Q10 - I felt connected to my instructor because of the video feedback. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.5789 | 1.08133 |
| Q16 - I hope my instructor continues to use this form of feedback in the future. | 38 | 4.00 | 6.00 | 5.3947 | .71809 |
| Q19 - I think the instructor spent enough time on the video feedback. | 38 | 2.00 | 6.00 | 4.9737 | 1.07771 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 38 | | | | |

The virtual discussions echoed these sentiments, with many students appreciating the personal touch of video feedback. Hearing and seeing their teacher in the feedback videos fostered a strong teacher-student connection, which many students found motivating and engaging. These findings support the conclusions of Stannard (2007a, 2008) and Thompson & Lee (2012), who also found that audiovisual feedback enhances the teacher-student connection.

Emotional Impact

Insights from student responses for Q12 (I felt the feedback on my essays was very negative and made me feel uncomfortable) on the emotional impact of multimodal feedback suggest a generally positive experience with video feedback. This is supported by the average score of 2.63, which indicates students disagreed or slightly disagreed with feeling uncomfortable. This suggests that most students did not find the feedback overly negative or distressing. However, the standard deviation of 1.05 indicates some variability in the responses, meaning that while most students felt comfortable with the feedback, a few may have had different experiences.

RQ2: Is there any perceptible engagement from learners with screencast video feedback, and do they integrate this feedback into their subsequent writing drafts to support their progress in writing?

Engagement and Comfort with Screencast Multimodal Feedback

In contrast to the traditional feedback, multimodal screencast feedback kept students engaged with feedback to a greater extent. On whether they stopped or paused the screencast multimodal feedback video at any time and why, the majority of respondents (79%) said 'Yes', while just over one-fifth of the respondents (21%) said 'No'. Those who paused the video did so to enhance their understanding of the feedback provided, make immediate amendments to their written work, or due to distractions. Comments like "I wanted to hear the comments again for my own understanding" and "I wanted to amend and make changes to my essays based on the feedback provided" were common, indicating active engagement with the feedback.

Regarding their comfort with multimodal feedback, an overwhelming majority of 35 respondents (92%) answered 'Yes,' citing a variety of reasons that highlight the effectiveness and clarity of this feedback method. Many respondents appreciated the method for its usefulness and comprehensibility, with comments such as "Because it is more useful and more understandable" and "Because this way makes me understand easily and quickly." The ability to accurately identify and correct mistakes was another frequently mentioned benefit, as seen in responses like "Because I was able to know my mistakes very accurately and thus helped me to improve my writing" and "Because it helped me find my mistakes." These insights are in agreement with findings from Mathieson (2012), Thompson and Lee (2012), and Orlando (2016), which indicated that multimodal feedback facilitates better application and understanding of feedback.

However, three respondents (8%) expressed discomfort with the method, attributing their feelings to the quantity of negative feedback and personal challenges in handling criticism.

RQ3: What are the perceived advantages and disadvantages of multimodal screencast feedback?

Advantages of Multimodal Video Feedback

Students provided a range of positive comments on the advantages of multimodal video feedback, emphasizing the clarity and speed with which they could understand and correct their mistakes. Many noted that video feedback helped them remember and avoid repeating mistakes, with comments like "It helps to understand errors and correct them in a very clear way" and "It helps me avoid making the same mistakes." The personalized nature of video feedback was also appreciated, with students feeling a closer connection to their instructor. These observations align with findings from Zhang (2018), Ghosn-Chelala & Al-Chibani (2018), and Bull (2013), who highlighted the benefits of multimodal feedback in improving error correction and personalization.

Problems Faced with Video Feedback

When discussing the problems faced with video feedback, students highlighted both technical and comprehension-related issues. Technical difficulties, particularly related to internet connectivity and audio clarity, were common concerns. Despite these issues, a majority of students reported no problems with the video feedback, indicating that for many, the feedback method was seamless and effective.

Suggestions for Improving Feedback

Many students expressed satisfaction with the feedback process, stating that they found it clear and comprehensive. However, some provided constructive suggestions for improvement, including enhancing audio quality, using consistent color coding, and providing more detailed explanations. While a few students requested model essays for every question, it is important to balance providing support with encouraging independent learning. These suggestions resonate with the findings of Alvira (2016), Marriott & Teoh (2012), and Ghosn-Chelala & Al-Chibani (2018), who discussed the need for technical enhancements and detailed explanations in feedback.

Preferred Form of Feedback

When asked which form of feedback they would prefer for their essays, approximately 87% of students expressed a preference for multimodal video feedback, while around 13% indicated a preference for written feedback. The strong preference for multimodal video feedback suggests that students find this method more engaging and effective, appreciating the combination of visual and auditory elements. However, the 13% who

prefer written feedback may value its directness and ease of reference, highlighting the need for flexible feedback options to accommodate diverse preferences and learning styles.

Overall, the feedback collected through the questionnaire provides valuable insights into the strengths and areas for improvement in our feedback methods. Students generally found multimodal video feedback to be clear, useful, and motivating. They appreciated its ability to quickly and effectively convey corrections, foster personal connections, and provide a resource that they can revisit as needed. However, addressing technical issues, ensuring clarity, balancing multimodal feedback, and maintaining a supportive tone are crucial to enhancing the effectiveness and positive impact of feedback on students. Providing flexible feedback options that cater to different preferences and learning styles will further support student engagement and learning outcomes.

RQ4: Is there any improvement in various aspects of students' writing in their first and second drafts, based on the multimodal feedback?

In examining how students incorporated feedback into their essays, it becomes evident that significant improvements were observed in various areas of writing, such as task response, organization, lexical resource, and grammar. This section will analyze these improvements and discuss how the multimodal feedback contributed to these advancements.

Task Response

One of the primary areas where students showed noticeable improvement was in task response. Initially, many students struggled with understanding the complete question and often focused only on familiar words or phrases. The feedback process emphasized the importance of reading the prompt carefully and identifying the specific question being asked. Through repeated training and practice, students learned to approach the task methodically, ensuring they fully understood the requirements before starting to write. This shift in focus helped students craft more appropriate and relevant responses to the essay prompts. Understanding the task better allowed them to address all parts of the question, which is crucial in an EFL context where students might otherwise miss key elements of the task.

Another critical area of improvement was adherence to task requirements, particularly regarding word count. Initially, many students failed to meet the minimum word count specified in the task instructions (typically 250 words). The multimodal feedback pointed out these shortcomings, prompting students to aim for the minimum word count in their subsequent essays. This focus on meeting task requirements ensured that students provided more comprehensive responses, further enhancing the quality of their writing.

Coherence and cohesion

Feedback played a critical role in helping students improve the coherence and cohesion of their essays. Initially, many students' essays lacked a clear structure, often missing cohesive elements like a well-defined introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion. The feedback provided specific strategies for planning and structuring their essays, encouraging students to jot down key points or arguments before starting to write, which helped them organize their thoughts coherently. Additionally, the importance of a clear thesis statement was stressed, leading many students to include strong thesis statements in their later essays.

Students also learned to ensure that all their arguments and examples were directly relevant to the topic and the essay prompt. The use of a checklist to verify that each topic sentence had adequate supporting evidence became a common practice. When examples were not properly connected to the given topic sentences, students corrected these issues in their subsequent drafts. Moreover, many students initially wrote very brief conclusions, often just one or two sentences. The focused feedback highlighted the necessity of a proper conclusion that summarizes the main points and, when appropriate, includes a prediction related to the topic or advice based on the essay's content. As a result, students began writing more comprehensive and cohesive conclusions in their later essays.

Lexical Resource and Grammar

In terms of lexical resource and grammar, students showed considerable improvement through the feedback process. Despite initial challenges with grammar, students made efforts to use a variety of sentence structures and practiced important grammatical forms relevant to different essay topics. They also worked on incorporating proper linking words and phrases to create a logical flow of ideas between sentences and paragraphs. While some of these elements might have been missed in the first draft, students ensured these were addressed in subsequent drafts, reflecting their commitment to improving based on the feedback received.

Vocabulary usage, although still developing, showed progress as students employed strategies suggested in the feedback to enhance their lexical resource. They attempted to use more varied and precise vocabulary to express their ideas more clearly, even if their proficiency level posed challenges. This effort to implement feedback to the best of their abilities demonstrated a significant step forward in their writing development.

Engagement and Revision Process

The multimodal feedback also encouraged students to engage more deeply with the revision process. Students were motivated to pause and revisit the feedback videos as many times as needed, allowing them to fully understand the comments and make necessary improvements. This iterative process of reviewing and revising their essays

based on detailed feedback helped students refine their writing skills and produce higher-quality work.

Exceptions and Unwillingness to Correct

However, not all students showed the same level of engagement or willingness to correct their essays. A notable exception was the group of students who never bothered to revise their work despite the feedback provided. Some students were not interested in writing a second draft and simply submitted their initial attempts without any revisions. This lack of interest could be attributed to several factors, including a lack of motivation to improve their writing or difficulty in understanding and correcting more complex errors.

For example, while some students were able to correct simple issues such as using connectors and writing a clear thesis statement, they often struggled with more complex grammatical errors. Despite repeated feedback on these errors, these students found it challenging to make the necessary corrections. In the remote teaching context, the absence of face-to-face interactions may have further contributed to this issue. Without direct supervision and encouragement, some students might have felt disconnected from the learning process, leading to a lack of motivation to engage deeply with the feedback.

Other examples of students' unwillingness to correct their work included ignoring detailed feedback on the organization and coherence of their essays. Some students continued to write disorganized essays without clear introductions, body paragraphs, or conclusions, despite receiving specific instructions on how to improve these elements. Additionally, a few students did not aim to meet the word count requirements, even after being reminded of its importance in the feedback.

Overall, the incorporation of feedback into students' essays led to noticeable improvements in task response, organization, lexical resource, and grammar for many students. The multimodal feedback provided a comprehensive and engaging method for students to understand their mistakes and learn how to correct them. By addressing key areas such as understanding the task, structuring the essay, using varied sentence structures, and meeting word count requirements, students were able to enhance their writing skills significantly. However, the challenges faced by some students, particularly those who were unwilling or unable to engage deeply with the feedback, highlight the need for continued support and motivation, especially in remote teaching contexts. Providing additional guidance and fostering a more connected learning environment could help address these issues and further improve the effectiveness of feedback methods.

CONCLUSION

This study contributes to the field of language education by demonstrating the efficacy of screencasting multimodal feedback in scaffolding students' writing, particularly in remote teaching within the Omani EFL setting. By integrating audiovisual elements with

traditional text-based feedback, screencasting provides a comprehensive and engaging method that significantly enhances the feedback process. The findings of this study indicate that screencasting feedback not only improves the clarity and comprehensiveness of feedback but also personalizes the learning experience, fostering a stronger connection between students and the instructor.

The effectiveness of screencasting feedback was evident in several key areas. Students reported a better understanding of their mistakes and felt more motivated to engage in the revision process. The multimodal nature of the feedback, which combines visual and auditory elements, helped cater to diverse learning styles, making it easier for students to grasp complex concepts and apply the feedback to their writing. The ability to pause and replay feedback videos allowed students to review the feedback at their own pace, ensuring they fully understood the corrections and suggestions provided.

Moreover, the study revealed that screencasting feedback positively influenced students' writing skills across various dimensions, including task response, coherence and cohesion, lexical resource, and grammar. Students showed noticeable improvements in addressing essay prompts more accurately, structuring their essays coherently, using varied vocabulary, and applying correct grammatical structures. This comprehensive improvement underscores the potential of screencasting feedback to enhance overall writing proficiency in EFL learners.

The personalized nature of screencasting feedback also played a crucial role in fostering a sense of connection and rapport between students and instructors. Hearing and seeing their teacher in the feedback videos made the feedback feel more "real" and "personal," which was highly appreciated by the students. This personal touch not only motivated students but also made them feel more supported and understood, which is particularly important in a remote teaching context where face-to-face interactions are limited.

Despite these advantages, the study also highlighted some challenges associated with the implementation of screencasting feedback. Technical issues, such as internet connectivity problems and audio clarity, were common concerns among students. These issues sometimes hindered the smooth delivery and reception of feedback, pointing to the need for reliable technological infrastructure and clear audio-visual standards in remote teaching settings.

Another challenge was the varying levels of student engagement with the feedback. While many students actively engaged with the feedback, paused, and replayed the videos to fully understand the comments, some students showed reluctance to revise their work despite the detailed feedback provided. This reluctance could be attributed to a lack of motivation, difficulty in understanding complex grammatical errors, or a preference for traditional written feedback. These findings suggest that while screencasting feedback is highly effective, it must be complemented with strategies to boost student motivation and ensure they are adequately supported in the revision process.

In summary, this study underscores the potential of screencasting multimodal feedback as a valuable tool in language education, particularly in remote teaching contexts. The enhanced clarity, comprehensiveness, and personalization of feedback provided by screencasting significantly improve student engagement and writing skills. However, to fully leverage the benefits of this feedback method, educators must address the technical challenges and varying levels of student engagement. Future research should focus on developing strategies to overcome these challenges and further explore the long-term impact of screencasting feedback on student learning outcomes.

Overall, the findings of this study contribute to the growing body of literature on the use of technology-mediated feedback in language education. By demonstrating the effectiveness of screencasting feedback, this study provides valuable insights for educators and policymakers aiming to enhance the quality of language instruction, especially in remote and online learning environments. The implications of this research highlight the need for continuous innovation and adaptation of feedback methods to meet the evolving needs of students and to ensure that educational practices keep pace with technological advancements.

Limitations of The Study

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. Firstly, the duration of the research was relatively short, spanning only 12 weeks, which may not be sufficient to observe long-term effects of screencasting feedback on students' writing skills. Secondly, the sample size was limited to 38 participants, which may not provide a comprehensive representation of the broader EFL learner population. Additionally, technical difficulties such as internet connectivity issues and audio clarity were common concerns among students, potentially affecting the smooth delivery and reception of feedback. Furthermore, some students struggled with more complex grammatical errors and exhibited reluctance to revise their work despite receiving detailed feedback, indicating variability in student engagement. The study was also conducted in a remote teaching context, where the absence of face-to-face interactions could have influenced students' motivation and understanding. These limitations highlight the need for further research with larger sample sizes, extended durations, and varied educational settings to fully understand the impact of screencasting feedback on student learning outcomes.

Educational Implications

The findings of this study have several important implications for language educators and policymakers, particularly in the context of remote teaching environments. Firstly, the positive impact of screencasting feedback on student engagement and writing skills suggests that educators should consider integrating this method into their feedback practices to cater to diverse learning styles and enhance the clarity and comprehensiveness of feedback. However, the technical difficulties experienced by some

students highlight the need for robust technological infrastructure and training for both teachers and students to effectively implement screencasting feedback.

Given the variability in student engagement and the struggles with complex grammatical errors, it is crucial for educators to provide ongoing support and motivation, particularly in remote teaching contexts where face-to-face interactions are limited. This can include offering additional resources, such as grammar workshops or one-on-one tutoring sessions, to help students overcome their challenges.

The study's short duration and limited sample size indicate that further research is needed to explore the long-term effects of screencasting feedback and to validate these findings across a broader population of EFL learners. Future studies should also examine the effectiveness of screencasting feedback in different educational settings and with varied learner demographics to develop a more comprehensive understanding of its impact.

Moreover, the findings suggest that a selective approach to written corrective feedback, particularly for motivated learners, can be effective in engaging students and improving their writing skills. Educators should feel confident in using more explicit types of feedback and tailoring feedback strategies to individual learner needs to maximize the benefits of feedback and support student learning outcomes.

In conclusion, while screencasting multimodal feedback offers significant benefits in enhancing student writing skills and engagement, educators must address the associated challenges to fully realize its potential. By providing continued support and fostering a more connected learning environment, educators can ensure that students effectively incorporate feedback and achieve meaningful improvements in their writing.

REFERENCES

- AbdRahman, S., Salam, A., & Yusof, M. (2014). *Screencast Feedback Practice on Students' Writing*. Paper presented at Asia-Pacific Social Science Conference 2014, Seoul, Korea, APSSC. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289396637_Screencast_Feedback_Practice_on_Students'_Writing
- Ali, A. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 106–121.
- Alshahrani A., Storch N. (2014). Investigating teachers' written corrective feedback practices in a Saudi EFL context. *Aust. Rev. Appl. Linguist.* 37, 101–122. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.37.2.02als>
- Alvira, R. (2016). The impact of oral and written feedback on EFL writers with the use of screencasts. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 18(2), 79. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v18n2.53397>

- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: what do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 95–127.
- Anson, C. M., Dannels, D. P., Laboy, J. I., & Carneiro, L. (2016). Students' Perceptions of Oral Screencast Responses to Their Writing: Exploring Digitally Mediated Identities. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(3), 378-411. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651916636424>
- Bakla, A. (2017). An Overview of Screencast Feedback in EFL Writing: Fad or the Future? In International Foreign Language Teaching and Teaching Turkish as a Foreign Language, (pp. 319–331), Bursa, Turkey.
- Bauk, S., & Radlinger, R. (2013). Inciting the development of engaging screencasts in teaching ECDIS. In *Marine Navigation and Safety of Sea Transportation: Advances in Marine Navigation* (pp. 19-26). CRC Press.
- Bitchener, J & Ferris, D. (2012). Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing. Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing. 1-220. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400>.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>.
- Brick, B., & Holmes, J. (2008). Using Screen Capture Software for Student Feedback. In D. Klinshuk, G. Sampson, J. M. Spector, P. Isaias, & D. Ifenthaler (Eds.), *Cognition and Exploratory Learning in Digital Age: Proceedings of the IADIS CELDA 2008 conference, 'IADIS CELDA 2008'* (pp. 339-342). IADIS. <http://www.iadis.org>
- Bull, P. (2013) Cognitive Constructivist Theory of Multimedia: Designing Teacher-Made Interactive Digital. *Creative Education*, 4, 614-619. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce/2013.49088>.
- Bush, M. (2020). *Feedback and student engagement: The role of screencasting in higher education*.
- Bush, J. C. (2020). 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>
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H. & Liu, Q. EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ.* 1, 5 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). Research Methods in Education (8th ed.). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Crim, S. J. (2006). An examination of social presence in an online learning environment (Doctoral dissertation). <https://doi.org/10.18297/etd/291>
- Cunningham, M. A. (2015). Using audio screencast for feedback on short written essays. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, IL.
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019). "Student Perceptions and Use of Technology-Mediated Text and Screencast Feedback in ESL Writing." *Computers & Composition* 5 (June): 222–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.003>.
- Cunningham, K.J. (2019). How language choices in feedback change with technology: Engagement in text and screencast feedback on ESL writing. *Computers & Education*, 135(1), 91-99. Elsevier Ltd. Retrieved August 16, 2024, from <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/208187/>.
- Deiniatur, M. (2019). The Use Of Camtasia Video Editor To Improve The Students' Pronunciation Skill At English Study Program Iain Metro Lampung. *INOVISH JOURNAL*, 4(1), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.35314/inovish.v4i1.899>
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting Second Language Writing Using Multimodal Feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(1), 58–74.
- Espasa, A., Meneses, J. Analysing feedback processes in an online teaching and learning environment: an exploratory study. *High Educ* 59, 277–292 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-009-9247-4>
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fitzgerald, N. and Li, L., (2015), Using presentation software to flip an undergraduate analytical chemistry course, *J. Chem.Educ.*, <https://doi.org/10.1021/ed500667c>
- Gammill, D. M. (2006). Learning the Write Way. *Reading Teacher*, 59(8), 754-762. Available at: https://aquila.usm.edu/fac_pubs/2385
- Ghosn-Chelala, M., & Al-Chibani, W. (2018). Screencasting: supportive feedback for EFL remedial writing students. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-08-2017-0075>.
- Harper, F., Green, H., & Fernandez-Toro, M. (2015). Using screencasts in the teaching of modern languages: investigating the use of Jing® in feedback on written

- assignments. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(3), 277–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1061586>
- Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. D. (2014). Technology enhanced feedback on assessment. In T. Sweeney, & S. Urban (Eds.), *Annual meeting of the Australian Council for Computers in Education* (pp. 284-294). Australian Council for Computers in Education.
- 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.
- Green, M. (2022). The use of screencast feedback in undergraduate digital design teaching practice. ICERI proceedings, <https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2022.1119>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Ice, P., Curtis, R., Phillips, P., & Wells, J. (2007). Using asynchronous audio feedback to enhance teaching presence and student sense of community. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 11(2), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v11i2.1724>
- Irwin, B. (2022). Using screencasts to create personalized formative feedback in academic writing courses. <https://doi.org/10.29140/9781914291050-4>
- Kim, V. (2018). Technology-Enhanced Feedback on Student Writing in the English-Medium Instruction Classroom. *ENGLISH TEACHING*. 73. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.73.4.201812.29>.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Laelasari, L., Arfiyanti, R., Nuryanti, M., Widodo, S., & Arigiyati, T. (2019). Camtasia studio learning video for mathematical literature levels students.. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.21-9-2018.2281180>
- Lee, I. (2005). Error Correction in the L2 Writing Classroom: What Do Students Think?. *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v22i2.84>
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69–85.
- Marriott, P., & Teoh, L. K. (2012). Using screencasts to enhance assessment feedback: Students' perceptions and preferences. *Accounting Education*, 21(6), 583–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2012.725637>.
- Mathieson, K. (2012). Exploring Student Perceptions of Audiovisual Feedback via Screencasting in Online Courses. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 26(3), 143–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2012.689166>

- Mayhew, e. playback feedback: the impact of screen-captured video feedback on student satisfaction, learning and attainment. *Eur Polit Sci* **16**, 179–192 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2015.102>
- Mayer, R. E. (2014). Cognitive Theory of Multimedia Learning. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning* (pp. 43–71). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J., 2015. Evaluating written, audio and video feedback in higher education summative assessment tasks. *Issues in Educational Research*, 25(2), pp.153-169. <http://www.iier.org.au/iier25/mccarthy.pdf>
- Middleton, A. & Nortcliffe, A. (2010). Audio feedback design: Principles and emerging practice. *International Journal of Continuing Engineering Education and Lifelong Learning*, Special Issue on Electronic Feedback: feasible progress or just unfulfilled promises, 20(2), 208—223.
- Miller, C. J. (2014). The use of novel camtasia videos to improve performance of at-risk students in undergraduate physiology courses. *World Journal of Education*, 4(1), 22–n/a. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v4n1p22>
- Newby, P. (2010). *Research Methods for Education*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Noor, A. F. M., Octaviandra, A. & Hussein, A. H. M. (2022). The Utilization of the Camtasia Application in Making the Human Respiratory System Science Learning Media. *Journal International Inspire Education Technology*, 1(1), 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.55849/jiiet.v1i1.36>
- Olesova, L., Richardson, J., Weasenforth, D., & Meloni, C. (2011). Using asynchronous instructional audio feedback in online environments: A mixed methods study. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 30-42. [olesova 0311.pdf \(merlot.org\)](https://doi.org/10.3115/olj.v7i1.0311)
- Orlando, J. 2016. “A Comparison of Text, Voice, and Screencasting Feedback to Online Students.” *American Journal of Distance Education* 30 (3): 156–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2016.1187472>.
- O'Malley, P. (2011). Combining Screencasting and a Tablet PC to Deliver Personalized Student Feedback. *New Directions in the Teaching of Physical Sciences*, 5, 27–30.
- Pachuashvili N. (2021). *Screencast Video Feedback and its Implication on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writing*. *European Scientific Journal*, ESJ, 17 (33), 66. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2021.v17n33p66>
- Peterson, E. (2007). Incorporating Screencasts In Online Teaching. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v8i3.495>
- Ryan, T, Henderson, M, and Phillips, M. 2019. “Feedback Modes Matter: Comparing Student Perceptions of Digital and Non-Digital Feedback Modes in Higher

- Education." *British Journal of Educational Technology* 50 (3): 1507–23.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12749>.
- Salkind, N. J. (2010). *Encyclopedia of Research Design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Séror, J. (2013). Show me! Enhanced feedback through Screencasting technology. *TESL Canada Journal*, 30(1), 104–116.
- Setiyani, S., Putri, D., & Prakarsa, D. (2019). Designing camtasia software assisted learning media toward students' mathematical comprehension in numeral material. *Infinity Journal*, 8(2), 143. <https://doi.org/10.22460/infinity.v8i2.p143-156>
- Silva, M. L. (2012). Camtasia in the classroom: Student attitudes and preferences for video commentary or Microsoft Word comments during the revision process. *Computers and Composition*, 29, 1–22.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2011.12.001> Simonsson
- Soltanpour, F & Valizadeh, M. (2018). The Effect of Individualized Technology-Mediated Feedback on EFL Learners' Argumentative Essays. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*. 7. 125.
<https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.125>.
- Stannard, R. (2007a). Goodbye to lecture notes. *The Guardian*, Tuesday 18 September 2007. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2007/sep/18/link.link24>
- Stannard, R. (2008). Screen capture software for feedback in language education. In M. Thomas (ed.) *Proceedings of the Second International Wireless Ready Symposium Interactivity, Collaboration and Feedback in Language Learning Technologies*, (pp. 16-20) NUCB Graduate School Michael Thomas.
- Stannard, R. (2017). A Genuine Innovation In The Delivery And Form Of Feedback On Student's Written Work. In M. Carrier, R. M. Damerow, & K. M. Bailey (Eds.), *Digital Language Learning and Teaching: Research, Theory, and Practice*. New York, NY: Routledge & TIRF.
- Stannard, R. & Salli, A. (2019). Using screen capture technology in teacher education. In S. Mann & S. Walsh (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education*. Routledge.
- Stern, L. A., & Solomon, A. (2006). Effective Faculty Feedback: The Road Less Travelled. *Assessing Writing*, 1, 22-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2005.12.001>
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Thompson, R. and Lee, M.J. (2012). Talking with Students through Screencasting: Experimentations with Video Feedback to Improve Student Learning. *The Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–22.

- Trail, M. A., & Hadley, A. (2010). Assessing the integration of information literacy into a hybrid course using screencasting. *Journal of Online Teaching and Learning* 6 (3): 647–654.
- Wade, C. (1995). Using writing to develop and assess critical thinking. *Teaching of Psychology*, 22(1), 24–28. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top2201_8
- Wade, N. N. (2016). The face of feedback: Exploring the use of asynchronous video to deliver instructor feedback in multidisciplinary online courses [Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University]. Wayne State University Digital Commons. https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2490&context=oa_dissertations
- West, J., & Turner, W. (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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.1003954>
- Zahro, S. K. (2023). Alternative feedback through screencast: Action research practices and perception on academic writing classroom. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v11i1.6886>
- Zhang, Y. (2018). Analysis of Using Multimodal feedback in writing instruction from EFL learners' perspective. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 8(4), 21–29. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v8n4p21>
- Zhang T. (2018). The Effect of Focused Versus Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on the Development of University-Level Learners' Explicit and Implicit Knowledge in an EFL Context. (Unpublished doctoral thesis), The University of Sydney, Sydney.
- Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback: Do Error Types, Language Proficiency, and Foreign Language Enjoyment Matter?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 660564. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564>