Journal of Language Research
ISSN: 2602-4578

Research Article

Screencast versus Text-Based Feedback in L2 Academic Writing: Revision Uptake and Student Perceptions

Gökçe Kurt[1], Marmara University, Faculty of Education, gokce.kurt@marmara.edu.tr
Aslıhan Karabulut[2], Marmara University, School of Foreign Languages, aslihan.karabulut@marmara.edu.tr

Recommended citation: Kurt, G. & Karabulut, A. (2026). Screencast versus Text-based Feedback in L2 Academic Writing: Revision Uptake and Student Perceptions. *Journal of Language Research (JLR), 10*(2), 450-468.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.51726/jlr.1937595

Abstract: The rapid expansion of technology-mediated feedback has prompted growing interest in digital feedback modalities, including screencast feedback, in L2 writing instruction. This study compares the effects of screencast feedback and text-based electronic feedback on revision uptake and explores students' perceptions of screencast feedback in a content-based academic reading and writing course. The participants were 41 pre-service English language teachers enrolled at a state university in Türkiye. Over one semester, the experimental group received indirect instructor feedback on their second drafts through screencast recordings, while the control group received their feedback via marginal comments in Microsoft Word. Quantitative data were drawn from a randomly selected subsample of 20 students, with 10 participants in each group. Across four writing tasks, 40 second-to-final draft comparisons were analysed per group. Revision uptake was measured using correction scores calculated by comparing the second and final drafts, and each participant's scores across the four essays were averaged before group differences were analysed using Mann-Whitney U tests. In addition, ten randomly selected participants from the experimental group took part in a semi-structured focus group interview exploring their perceptions of the screencast feedback process. The results showed that students in the screencast feedback group achieved significantly higher correction scores at the macro, micro, and overall levels. Qualitative findings indicated that students perceived screencast feedback as contributing to improvements in their writing, enhancing their engagement with feedback, and supporting the revision process. They also demonstrated critical awareness of the constraints imposed by recording-time limitations. These findings contribute to the growing evidence base on screencast feedback and highlight its potential as an effective and engaging feedback modality in EFL academic writing contexts, including pre-service teacher education.

Keywords: *screencast feedback, revision uptake, academic writing, perceptions, L2 writing.*

INTRODUCTION

Feedback is widely recognized as a core component of second/foreign language (L2) writing instruction with its potential to help learners notice problems in their texts, understand expectations for effective writing, and make revisions that can support longer-term development (Hyland & Hyland, 2019; Mao & Lee, 2024). Broadly defined, feedback refers to information provided to learners about their written work with the aim of supporting revision, guiding future writing, and fostering the development of their writing competence (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). By highlighting the gap between

[1] *ORCID: 0000-0002-9022-1258 (Corresponding Author)*
[2] *ORCID: 0000-0001-9183-1210*
Submitted: 24.07.2026
Accepted:03.08.2026

intended and actual performance, while also identifying learners' strengths and areas for improvement, feedback provides a "drive for change" (Alharbi, 2017, p. 239). Its influence extends beyond the correction of surface-level errors to encompass higher-order concerns of content, organisation, and rhetorical effectiveness, making it an indispensable component of writing instruction (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Lee, 2017).

The history of feedback pedagogy in L2 writing has been characterised by successive and overlapping paradigm shifts that have progressively reshaped both theory and practice. In its earliest form, feedback in the writing classroom was almost exclusively teacher-centred, comprising summative written commentary delivered after a final draft. This model was criticized for its limited capacity to foster genuine revision and learning, prompting a first major shift towards process-oriented writing instruction and formative assessment, wherein feedback is integrated throughout the drafting cycle to emphasise the development of students' writing processes (Ferris, 2003; Hyland & Hyland, 2019). A second major shift involved supplementing teacher-dominated feedback with a broader range of feedback sources. Peer feedback, writing workshops, conferencing, and self-assessment have gradually expanded feedback practices, distributing evaluative responsibility across multiple participants and contexts (Lee, 2017; Yu, 2021).

Feedback pedagogy is currently in the midst of a third paradigmatic change: the rise of new technologies has diversified the modalities through which feedback reaches learners (Loncar et al., 2023). Technology-mediated feedback (TMF) has emerged as a broad and expanding category encompassing a range of digital feedback modalities, including electronic written commentary delivered via word-processing track-changes functions, automated writing evaluation (AWE) platforms, and synchronous and asynchronous audio-visual feedback (Loncar et al., 2023). This technological turn has been accelerated further by the rise of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools such as ChatGPT, which are reshaping the conceptualisation and delivery of automated written corrective feedback in L2 pedagogy (Barrot, 2023; Guo & Wang, 2024).

Within these evolving pedagogies, an alternative mode of feedback delivery that has attracted growing scholarly interest is recorded audiovisual feedback delivered via screen-capture video technology, commonly referred to as screencast feedback (Cavaleri et al., 2019). Screencast feedback integrates the visual display of a student's text on screen with simultaneous instructor audio commentary, creating a multimodal feedback experience that differs from written feedback. This mode has been characterised in the literature as information-rich, personalised, and pedagogically engaging (Cunningham, 2019; Mahoney et al., 2019), and has been shown to offer advantages over text-based feedback with respect to depth, clarity, and the interpersonal dimensions of the feedback relationship (Penn & Brown, 2022; Wood, 2023).

Given the growing interest in multimodal feedback and the continuing need for context-sensitive evidence, further research is needed to understand how screencast feedback functions in specific L2 writing settings. Against this background, the present study compares the effects of screencast feedback and text-based electronic feedback on revision uptake at the micro and macro levels and in terms of overall revision performance and explores students' perceptions of screencast feedback in a content-based academic reading and writing course taught to pre-service English language teachers at a state university in Türkiye.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Screencast Feedback

A screencast is "the process of recording a digital display with voiceover" (Cunningham, 2019, p. 224) and involves using screen-capture software that allows teachers to record their on-screen activities, such as scrolling through a student's written work and highlighting the text, and to record their oral comments. The resulting video can then be shared with students via email or a link.

Screencast feedback has attracted considerable research interest, and its potential benefits have been identified in numerous studies. Compared to written feedback, screencast feedback is often received positively by students (Cunningham, 2019; Elola & Oskoz, 2016; İnan-Karagül & Şeker, 2021; Thompson & Lee, 2012). Students may perceive screencast feedback as providing higher-quality and more extensive feedback (Borup et al., 2015; Henderson & Phillips, 2015), more



constructive and engaging (Ali, 2016; Henderson & Phillips, 2015), and more personal because it conveys teacher presence through voice and on-screen interaction (Harper et al., 2018; Marshall et al., 2020; Vincelette & Bostic, 2013; West & Turner, 2016). More recent work has also suggested that the value of such feedback depends not only on the technology itself, but also on how effectively teachers design and deliver it as part of broader feedback practices (Jiang et al., 2024; Lee & Mao, 2024).

In addition to these perceived advantages, simultaneously viewing and listening to teacher feedback, rather than processing written comments and the text separately, may reduce students' cognitive load (Edwards et al., 2012). The ability to pause, replay, and review screencasts also allows students to engage with feedback at their own pace (Ruffini, 2012). As Wakeman (2013) notes, screencasts are particularly useful when step-by-step processes are being explained. Screencast feedback can also enable teachers to provide more detailed, comprehensive, and contextualised responses to student writing (Wood, 2023). Teacher comments in screencast feedback tend to focus more on global aspects of performance, such as structure, argument, and evidence (Cheng & Li, 2020; Orlando, 2016), while also allowing for more personalised feedback adjusted to individual students (Vincelette & Bostic, 2013). In L2 writing contexts, screencast feedback may offer an additional benefit in that students are exposed to the target language through listening while engaging with feedback on their writing (Elola & Oskoz, 2016). At the same time, recent research suggests that the effects of different e-feedback modes are not always uniform and may vary depending on the feedback focus, the teacher's evaluative language, and students' uptake of feedback (Saeed et al., 2024).

The affordances of screencast feedback can be understood in relation to both its potential to support dialogic engagement and its multimodal nature. In recent years, feedback has increasingly been understood as a socially embedded and agentic process that requires shared responsibility for its effectiveness rather than as a one-way transmission of information from expert to novice (Nash & Winstone, 2017). Dialogic feedback involves ongoing processes in which interpretations are shared, meanings are negotiated, and expectations are clarified to promote feedback uptake (Carless, 2015). When learners engage in dialogue, they may become more actively involved in the learning process by questioning feedback, seeking clarification, and requesting further support, all of which may enhance feedback engagement (Wood, 2023). Such dialogue may also create opportunities for more individualised instruction that responds to students' diverse cultural, educational, and writing needs (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). From this perspective, feedback can be understood as a socially constructed process involving co-construction and sense-making among participants (Ajjawi & Boud, 2017; Carless & Boud, 2018).

Although recorded screencast feedback does not necessarily involve direct interaction, its conversational style and personalised explanations may create conditions that support subsequent dialogue and learner engagement. Its multimodal format also allows teachers to integrate spoken explanation with cursor movement, highlighting, and on-screen text, potentially making feedback more explicit and easier to interpret. Recent research has therefore emphasised teacher feedback literacy and multimodal feedback literacy, drawing attention to teachers' ability to make pedagogically informed choices about feedback mode, timing, and purpose in digital environments (Jiang et al., 2024; Lee & Mao, 2024).

Despite the potential of dialogue to facilitate feedback engagement and uptake, practical challenges may arise. Finding sufficient time and space for feedback dialogue can be difficult, particularly for teachers working with large numbers of students. Teachers also require interactional skills to conduct productive feedback discussions, and these skills may not always be fully developed. Similarly, L2 students may lack the experience, interactional competence, or aural comprehension skills needed to benefit from such discussions (Hyland, 2003). Some students may also feel uncomfortable engaging with authority figures because of cultural or social inhibitions, resulting in the passive and unreflective incorporation of teacher suggestions into their work (Henderson & Phillips, 2015; Hyland & Hyland, 2019). In addition, criticism delivered in face-to-face settings may threaten students' self-esteem and motivation (Sambell, 2013).

Screencast feedback may address some of these concerns by allowing teachers to convey tone of voice while avoiding the immediacy and pressure of face-to-face interaction (Vincelette & Bostic, 2013). Its asynchronous format enables students to replay the feedback as often as needed and allows teachers greater control over the wording, tone, and delivery of their comments. In this sense,

screencast feedback may provide a more approachable and less intimidating alternative to face-to-face oral feedback for students who feel uncomfortable, shy, or insecure about approaching the teacher directly (Hennessy & Forrester, 2014). Nevertheless, recent studies have identified limitations, including restricted opportunities for immediate interaction, occasional technical difficulties, and the need for both teachers and students to develop the digital and feedback literacies required to use screencast feedback effectively (Din Eak & Annamalai, 2024; Savaşçı & Akçor, 2026).

Research on Screencast Feedback in the L2 Writing Context

Research on screencast feedback in L2 writing has grown considerably over the past decade, yet important gaps remain in the evidence base. Most studies have compared screencast feedback with text-based modes, focusing on either student and teacher perceptions or writing outcomes.

In terms of perceptions, students and teachers across a range of contexts have responded positively to screencast feedback. Vincelette and Bostic (2013) found that students at an American university preferred screencast feedback over paper and digital text-based feedback and were more likely to incorporate it into their revisions, while teachers valued its capacity to reveal their thought processes while grading, fostering richer student-teacher communication about writing. Similarly, Ali's (2016) experimental study with 63 EFL students in Egypt found that the majority of students receiving screencast feedback described it as clear, personal, specific, supportive, and engaging, though they also noted practical challenges such as slow loading times and the inability to download videos. Cunningham's (2019) study of 12 students in an intermediate-level writing course in the US reinforced these positive perceptions, with students preferring screencast feedback for its effectiveness, clarity, ease of use, and its ability to enhance their understanding. More recently, Fatoni et al. (2024) found that EFL university students held positive perceptions of screencast feedback and reported developing self-regulated learning strategies such as goal setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation in response to it, suggesting that screencast feedback may also support learners' autonomous engagement with the writing process beyond the immediate revision cycle. These perceived advantages have also been supported by systematic reviews of the broader video feedback literature, which have consistently shown that students perceive screencast feedback as more detailed, more personalised, and more motivating than text-based alternatives (Din Eak & Annamalai, 2024; Penn & Brown, 2022).

Research has also suggested that screencast feedback may influence the nature of students' revisions. Cavaleri et al. (2019) compared text and screencast feedback on academic assignment revisions at an Australian institution, finding that screencast feedback's multimodal format, conversational tone, and personalised nature facilitated more effective engagement with the feedback, particularly for students with lower levels of English proficiency. Ali (2016) similarly found that screencast feedback was more effective than written feedback in improving global aspects of writing such as content and organisation. Cunningham (2019) reported a slightly higher average percentage of successful global changes in the screencast group, though this difference was not statistically significant. In their systematic review, Penn and Brown (2022) found that perceptions of screencast feedback were overwhelmingly positive, although the small number of studies directly measuring student learning provided inconclusive evidence. Bakla (2020), however, reported a more mixed picture. Although students found screencast feedback more comprehensible and motivating, it did not consistently outperform other modes across writing and revision tasks.

More recent studies have examined screencast feedback in relation to feedback engagement, uptake, agency, and feedback literacy. For example, Vatansever and Toker (2022) explored e-written and screencast feedback from an engagement perspective, while Wood (2023) argued that dialogic screencast feedback can create opportunities for feedback seeking, learner agency, and uptake rather than merely transmitting comments. At the same time, Jiang et al. (2024) have emphasised the importance of multimodal feedback literacy for L2 writing teachers, highlighting that the pedagogical value of screencast feedback depends on how effectively teachers integrate different semiotic modes in response to learners' needs. Relatedly, Saeed et al. (2024) showed that differences across written, audio, and screencast feedback also involve differences in evaluative language, which may shape how learners interpret and act on the feedback they receive.



This review suggests that much of the earlier empirical research compared screencast feedback with other feedback modes primarily in terms of student preferences and broad writing or revision outcomes. Fewer studies, however, have examined successful feedback uptake across both micro- and macro-level revisions in multi-draft L2 writing tasks. This represents an important gap, as recent syntheses of L2 written-feedback research have called for more classroom-based and process-oriented studies that move beyond general effectiveness claims to examine how learners engage with and use feedback in practice (Mao & Lee, 2024).

Students' perceptions also remain important because they can provide insight into how learners interpret, engage with, and respond to this feedback mode. Although screencast feedback has been investigated in several national and institutional contexts, evidence from Turkish L2 writing settings remains limited. The present study therefore compares screencast and text-based electronic feedback in terms of successful revision uptake and investigates Turkish pre-service English language teachers' perceptions of screencast feedback. The following research questions were addressed:

1. Are there differences in revision uptake at the macro, micro, and overall levels between students who receive screencast feedback and those who receive text-based electronic feedback?
2. How do students perceive the effectiveness of screencast feedback in supporting their writing and revision processes?

METHODOLOGY

Design, Participants, and Setting

The present study employed an embedded mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018), in which qualitative data from a student focus group interview were embedded within a primarily quantitative quasi-experimental framework. The quantitative strand compared two digital feedback modes in terms of students' revision uptake, while the qualitative strand explored students' perceptions of screencast feedback to provide further insight into the quantitative findings.

The participants were 41 pre-service English teachers enrolled in a four-year English Language Teaching (ELT) programme at a state university in Türkiye. At the time of the study, the "Advanced Reading and Writing II" course was offered to four intact groups. One of the authors taught two of these groups, comprising 21 and 20 students. The two groups were randomly assigned to the control and experimental conditions, respectively. All participants provided written consent for the use of their essays and interview data for research purposes. Data were handled with strict confidentiality throughout, and all participants were assigned identification codes during analysis.

The students were already familiar with text-based electronic feedback from the first term "Advanced Reading and Writing I" course, thus there was no need to provide training on how to use this feedback mode. However, initial discussions with the students revealed that none of them had previously received screencast feedback on their work, although some of them were familiar with the term "screencasting." Therefore, a brief training session was conducted with the experimental group to familiarise them with the screencast feedback process.

The "Advanced Reading and Writing II" course was a compulsory three-credit course offered in the second semester of the ELT programme. Its primary objective was to prepare students for the academic reading and writing demands of their degree programme. The course adopted a process-writing approach and introduced students to different essay types, with an emphasis on audience, purpose, coherence, unity, and academic integrity. As a content-based course, it required students to engage with assigned readings on topics related to English language teaching and to develop their essays based on these texts. Over the course of the semester, students completed four essay types, comparison-and-contrast, cause-and-effect, definition, and argumentative essays, each developed through multiple drafts.

Procedure

The writing process followed the same sequence in both groups. After submitting their first drafts, students participated in in-class peer feedback sessions in which they gave and received written

feedback from their classmates. They then revised their essays and submitted their second drafts through an online platform. The instructor provided indirect feedback by identifying the types of errors or problems in the essays without supplying explicit corrections. For the control group, this feedback was delivered through marginal comments in Microsoft Word, whereas the experimental group received it through screencast recordings.

Each screencast displayed the student's essay on screen while the instructor provided simultaneous audio commentary. No written comments were included in the screencasts. The instructor used the cursor to highlight the sections of the text being discussed. The screencasts were created using the free version of Loom, which, at the time of the study, allowed recordings of up to five minutes and generated a shareable video link. Before recording each screencast, the instructor reviewed the essay and prepared brief notes to guide the feedback. To enhance consistency across the two conditions, the instructor addressed the same categories of micro- and macro-level concerns in both the screencast recordings and the written comments. Students then used the instructor feedback to prepare their final drafts, which were submitted for evaluation.

Data Collection and Analysis

Quantitative Data

The quantitative data consisted of essays produced by a randomly selected subsample of 20 students, with 10 students selected from each group. The decision to analyse a subsample was made on practical grounds. Each participant produced four essays, and revision uptake was manually coded for every instructor feedback point by comparing the second and final drafts. Analysing the full cohort would have involved manually coding all second and final drafts produced across the four writing tasks, resulting in a considerably larger dataset. Random selection was used to produce a manageable dataset while maintaining equal representation of the two feedback conditions.

For each of the four essays, the second and final drafts were included in the analysis, resulting in 160 drafts in total: 80 second drafts and 80 corresponding final drafts. Revision uptake was assessed by comparing each second draft with its final version to determine whether the student had successfully incorporated the instructor feedback.

Both macro-level concerns, relating to content and organisation, and micro-level concerns, relating primarily to language use, were included in the analysis. Ferris's (2003) taxonomy of feedback issues served as the initial coding framework because of its established use in L2 writing-feedback research. When the essays contained issues not represented in the taxonomy, additional categories were created at the appropriate level. To support the content validity of the resulting framework, an expert EFL teacher educator reviewed the macro- and micro-level categories and their definitions and judged them to be appropriate before coding began.

The two authors independently analysed the feedback provided in the screencast and text-based conditions alongside the corresponding second and final drafts. First, each feedback point was classified as addressing either a macro- or micro-level concern. The authors then independently judged whether the feedback had been successfully incorporated into the final draft. Independent coding resulted in 100% agreement for the classification of feedback points as macro- or micro-level concerns and 93% agreement for judgements of successful uptake. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Each feedback point was coded as 1 when the student revised it successfully and as 0 when the revision was unsuccessful or no revision was made. A revision was considered successful when the issue identified in the feedback was addressed appropriately. Minor errors introduced during revision were disregarded when the student had successfully addressed the original feedback point. For example, the addition of an appropriate thesis statement was coded as successful even if the new sentence contained a minor grammatical error, such as subject-verb disagreement.

For each essay, correction scores were calculated as the percentage of feedback points successfully incorporated. Scores were calculated separately at the macro, micro, overall, subcategory, and individual error-category levels. When a particular category did not occur in an essay, no score was calculated for that category, and the case was treated as missing rather than assigned a score of zero. Each participant's essay-level scores were then averaged across the four writing tasks to produce



one participant-level score for each outcome. The student therefore served as the unit of inferential analysis, with 10 participants included in each group for the primary macro-, micro-, and overall comparisons.

The distributions of the participant-level correction scores in the two independent groups were compared using Mann-Whitney U tests. This rank-based test was selected because the scores did not meet the assumption of normality (Field, 2018). Effect sizes were calculated as $r = z/\sqrt{N}$, where z was the standardised test statistic and N was the total number of participants with valid scores in the relevant comparison. Values of .10, .30, and .50 were interpreted as small, medium, and large effects, respectively (Field, 2018). Exact two-sided *p* values were reported because of the small participant-level sample sizes. The subcategory and individual error-category analyses were treated as exploratory, and their unadjusted *p* values should therefore be interpreted cautiously.

Qualitative Data

Qualitative data were obtained from a semi-structured focus group interview conducted with ten randomly selected students from the experimental group. The aim was to explore students' perceptions of the screencast feedback process and whether they found it effective in supporting the development of their writing skills. The focus group interview was conducted in Turkish, the participants' mother tongue. It lasted approximately 40 minutes and was audio-recorded with the participants' permission for transcription purposes.

The transcribed data were analysed using inductive thematic analysis following the six-phase procedure outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), which involves familiarisation with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the final report. Analysis began with an initial reading of the transcript, during which significant and information-rich segments of participants' responses were highlighted. These segments were then coded and grouped into categories, which were subsequently refined through re-coding and re-categorisation. Finally, the themes were reviewed by both authors to ensure that they accurately reflected the data and addressed the research questions. The quotations included in the findings were translated into English by the authors and checked against the original Turkish transcript to ensure accuracy.

FINDINGS

Quantitative Findings

This section reports the findings in relation to the study's first research question, which examined whether there were differences in revision uptake between students who received screencast feedback and those who received text-based electronic feedback. Revision uptake in the control and experimental groups was examined across two main levels of writing concern: macro-level concerns, which encompassed organisational features of an essay such as hooks, thesis statements, paragraph structure, and discourse features related to unity, coherence, and cohesion, and micro-level concerns, which included grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, capitalisation, and APA formatting.

Correction scores were calculated for each essay by comparing the second and final drafts (40 essay-level observations per group; 10 students × 4 essays). Because the four essays produced by each student were not statistically independent, each student's scores were averaged across the four essays, producing one participant-level score per outcome (n = 10 per group). The descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 indicate that the experimental group obtained higher scores than the control group at the macro, micro, and overall levels. The findings represent differences in students' average revision uptake across the four writing tasks.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Control and Experimental Groups' Correction Scores

Group	*n**	Macro *M* (%)	Macro *Mdn* (IQR)**	Micro *M* (%)	Micro *Mdn* (IQR)	Overall *M* (%)	Overall *Mdn* (IQR)
Control	10	49.56	49.73 (37.88–55.70)	56.12	56.31 (50.30–63.99)	54.11	54.63 (51.39–58.92)
Experimental	10	76.93	74.17 (68.33–90.25)	80.84	83.20 (76.03–85.97)	79.29	79.48 (74.05–81.75)

**n = number of participants; each participant's score is the mean across their four essays.*
***IQR= interquartile range*

Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted to determine whether the observed differences between the two groups were statistically significant. Macro-level correction scores were significantly higher in the experimental group than in the control group (U= 12.0, *p*= .003, *r*= .63). A similar pattern was observed for micro-level correction scores (U= 2.0, *p*< .001, *r*= .80). Likewise, the experimental group achieved significantly higher overall correction scores (U= 2.0, *p*< .001, *r*= .80).

To provide a more detailed picture of the specific aspects of writing in which the two groups differed, the feedback points were further grouped into subcategories. Macro-level concerns were divided into introduction, main body, conclusion, and overall subcategories, while micro-level concerns were subdivided into grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and formatting. Mann-Whitney *U* tests were conducted for each of the eight subcategories. Because not every student received feedback in every subcategory across their four essays, participant numbers varied across these analyses and are reported for each test (control/experimental). At the macro level, the experimental group (mean rank= 11.39, *Mdn*= 100.00) achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 6.31, *Mdn*= 0.00) in the introduction subcategory (U= 14.5, *p*= .046, *r*= .54, *n*= 8/9). The experimental group (mean rank= 12.75, *Mdn*= 100.00) again achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 6.94, *Mdn*= 50.00) in the main body subcategory (U= 17.5, *p*= .028, *r*= .52, *n*= 9/10). The conclusion subcategory revealed no significant difference between the two groups (U= 21.0, *p*= .463, *r*= .21, *n*= 8/7), although the experimental group (mean rank= 9.00, *Mdn*= 100.00) showed descriptively higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 7.12, *Mdn*= 58.33). For the overall macro subcategory, the experimental group (mean rank= 13.75, *Mdn*= 77.08) achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 7.25, *Mdn*= 36.18) (U= 17.5, *p*= .015, *r*= .54, *n*= 10/10).

At the micro level, the experimental group (mean rank= 14.40, *Mdn*= 82.21) achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 6.60, *Mdn*= 57.56) in the grammar subcategory (U= 11.0, *p*= .002, *r*= .65, *n*= 10/10). Similarly, the experimental group (mean rank= 14.50, *Mdn*= 89.51) achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 6.50, *Mdn*= 66.36) in the vocabulary subcategory (U= 10.0, *p*= .002, *r*=.67, *n*= 10/10). In the mechanics subcategory, the experimental group (mean rank= 15.00, *Mdn*= 75.06) achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 6.00, *Mdn*= 46.02; U= 5.0, *p*< .001, *r*= .75, *n*= 10/10). The experimental group (mean rank= 12.94, *Mdn*= 75.00) also achieved significantly higher correction scores than the control group (mean rank= 7.35, *Mdn*= 54.90) in the formatting subcategory (U= 18.5, *p*= .035, *r*= .49, *n*= 10/9).

Table 2 presents the correction percentages and the results of the Mann-Whitney U tests for each individual error category within the subcategories. Among the macro-level categories, an unadjusted statistically significant difference in favour of the experimental group was found for lack of thesis statement (*p*= .021). Among the micro-level categories, statistically significant differences were found for tense error (*p*= .008), punctuation (*p*< .001), wrong word (*p*= .001), acronym (*p*= .043), and APA format (*p*= .035). The wrong paragraph order category showed a correction rate of 0% in both groups, indicating that neither group addressed this type of error in their revisions. Wrong determiner and comparative or superlative error were the only categories in which the control group showed descriptively higher correction percentages, although neither difference was statistically significant.



Table 2.
Correction Percentages and Exploratory Mann–Whitney U Test Results for Individual Error Categories

Level	Category	Feedback issue	Control, *M* (%)	Experimental, *M* (%)	*p*
Macro level	**Introduction**	Title error	94.44	100.00	.776
		Lack of connection between hook and thesis statement	50.00	66.67	1.000
		Lack of thesis statement	21.43	87.50	.021
	Main body	Lack of topic sentence	45.37	80.25	.063
		Lack of supporting details	55.90	65.00	.408
	Conclusion	Lack of final thought	61.90	62.50	1.000
		Lack of a summary of major points	66.67	75.00	1.000
		Lack of thesis restatement	66.67	66.67	1.000
	Overall	Lack of clarification of additional information	55.00	74.07	.156
		Logical fallacy	26.67	86.67	.056
		Lack of unity	46.43	100.00	.117
		Repetition of ideas	33.33	100.00	.400
		Lack of reliable resource	55.55	81.25	.282
		Overuse of quotation	50.00	100.00	.800
		Wrong paragraph order	0.00	0.00	1.000
		Lack of cohesion	47.72	60.65	.400
Micro level	**Grammar**	Tense error	35.76	80.56	.008



	Subject–verb disagreement	70.37	93.65	.408
	Active or passive error	0.00	70.83	.057
	Word order error	44.44	82.29	.108
	Word form error	52.90	86.04	.055
	Singularity or plurality error	74.17	90.62	.491
	Wrong determiner	79.74	74.82	.837
	Fragments	65.62	100.00	.279
	Article error	59.00	78.79	.143
	Missing word	51.82	64.84	.694
	Relative pronoun error	50.00	75.00	.800
	Gerund or infinitive error	20.00	50.00	.857
	Phrase or clause error	40.00	100.00	.381
	Comparative or superlative error	75.40	50.00	1.000
	Incorrect pronoun type or form	47.22	85.42	.114
Vocabulary	Wrong word	61.99	82.53	.001
	Acronym	59.83	92.71	.043
	Redundant word	61.51	100.00	.164
	Repetitive word	59.49	76.98	.252
Mechanics	Capitalisation	65.48	90.83	.101
	Punctuation	29.94	68.58	< .001



	Spelling	51.62	100.00	.145
Formatting	APA formatting	54.11	79.24	.035

To summarise, the participant-level quantitative findings favoured screencast feedback over text-based feedback at both levels of writing concern and in seven of the eight subcategories examined. The experimental group achieved significantly higher mean correction scores at the macro, micro, and overall levels, with large effect sizes. At the subcategory level, unadjusted differences reached statistical significance for introduction, main body, overall macro, grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, and formatting. Conclusion was the only subcategory in which the difference did not reach statistical significance, although the descriptive results continued to favour the experimental group. In the subcategories of introduction, main body, and conclusion, the experimental group's median correction score was 100%, compared with corresponding control-group medians of 0.00%, 50.00%, and 58.33%.

Qualitative Findings

Students' responses to the second research question, which explored their perceptions of screencast feedback, were organised into four themes: (1) perceived contribution to writing development, (2) enhanced engagement with feedback, (3) support for the revision process, and (4) awareness of screencast feedback's limitations.

Theme 1*: *Perceived contribution to writing development

Participants perceived screencast feedback as contributing to the development of their writing. Compared with conventional written comments, screencast feedback was described as more detailed, explanatory, and informative. Some students believed that the teacher's spoken explanations helped them better understand weaknesses in both language use and content development.

For example, S8 reported that detailed comments helped improve sentence structure as well as genre-specific writing skills. Similarly, S10 noted that the teacher's in-depth comments on idea development and the relevance of supporting examples enabled her to recognise weaker parts of her essays and improve overall quality. S4 also contrasted screencast feedback with written comments, describing the latter as shorter and less explanatory.

Participants additionally valued the repeated reinforcement provided through the spoken feedback. S2 explained that her understanding of punctuation improved because the teacher repeatedly pointed out recurring problems throughout the video. S1 made a similar observation, noting that the instructor returned to the same problem each time it appeared in her writing, adding: "if it were written feedback, the teacher would mention it just once and it would not be as effective."

Theme 2*: *Enhanced engagement with feedback

Students reported that screencast feedback enhanced their engagement with feedback, attributing this primarily to its personalised and dialogic character. Hearing the teacher's voice, being addressed by name, and experiencing the feedback in a conversational tone appeared to increase emotional connection and motivation to revise. S1 stated that "hearing the feedback from my teacher's voice made me feel obliged to make corrections," while S2 reported that the teacher's tone helped her accept criticism more positively. S3 described feeling individually supported when the teacher used her name, explaining that "it felt like the teacher took care of me individually."

The affective dimension of this personalisation was vividly illustrated by S7, who contrasted his experience of text-based feedback in the previous term with screencast feedback in the current one:

> In the first term writing course, the teacher added written comments to my paper using capital letters. I thought the teacher was too angry at me, like shouting. This made me feel very nervous. I got really anxious about making mistakes in the revised version. But, this term, when I heard her voice telling of my mistakes, I realised that she was not angry but supportive. I was relieved.

In addition to this sense of personalisation, students described the conversational quality of screencast feedback as fostering a sense of dialogic interaction with the instructor. Several participants described the experience as resembling face-to-face interaction, even though the feedback was asynchronous. As S6 said, "it felt like the teacher was there, opposite of me, talking to me." Similarly, S4 said, "it was like a real interaction with the teacher. I listened to the teacher and made corrections at



the same time." S7 added that when he listened to the feedback, he felt like he was receiving it from the teacher face-to-face. S8 explained that listening to the feedback felt similar to approaching the teacher to discuss his mistakes in person.

Theme 3*: *Support for the revision process

The multimodality and flexibility of screencast feedback were mentioned by students as facilitators of the revision process. Students valued being able to simultaneously hear explanations, view the relevant section of text, and follow cursor movements or highlighting on the screen. For instance, S10 found it easy to follow the teacher's comments as she highlighted the relevant parts of her text using the cursor and provided oral explanations. Similarly, S5 appreciated the teacher's use of highlighting to match comments to the relevant parts of the text. S1 found the revision process easier while watching the essay on the screen, following the teacher's mouse movements and listening to her comments simultaneously.

A preference for audio-visual input over written text also emerged as a recurring motif. S9 stated a clear preference for listening to the instructor's comments over reading them, and some other students expressed a similar preference, noting that they learned more effectively through video than through written text.

Students also valued the ability to replay the screencast feedback. Being able to pause, replay, and take notes allowed students to work at their own pace. For example, S1 described her revision process as follows: "While listening to my teacher's comments, I pause the video and take notes. Then I play it again. Pausing and taking notes are very useful, and I use my notes to correct my mistakes." S5 followed a similar approach. She explained, "I open the video and my essay on my computer screen side by side. I watch, pause, and correct as needed. The revision process is much easier and shorter for me." S6 watched the video without pausing initially, then watched it again with pauses, and replayed comments that were unclear.

Theme 4*: *Awareness of screencast feedback's limitations

While students were broadly positive about screencast feedback, several expressed thoughtful and specific suggestions for improvement, demonstrating critical awareness about the conditions under which screencast feedback is most effective. The most common concern was related to the five-minute time limit imposed by the free version of the software. Students felt longer recordings would have allowed for fuller explanations, more examples, and a better balance between corrective and positive comments. As S1 stated, "the time was enough to point out our mistakes and explain them in detail. However, I felt that if there was more time, the teacher could have given examples to clarify her explanation." S3 felt that the teacher kept the feedback on the conclusion paragraph brief because of the limited recording time available.

S2 thought that time pressure led the teacher to focus mainly on errors and limited opportunities for encouraging comments. In her own words, she said, "as the time was limited, the teacher focused primarily on our mistakes. I wish she could give more positive comments about my essays. That would be more encouraging." S4 stated a similar concern and mentioned that the teacher made positive comments on one of his essays that had fewer mistakes, but in another essay with more errors, he could not receive any positive comments, which he found discouraging.

Some participants also suggested including the teacher's webcam image. They believed that seeing the teacher while listening could increase motivation and further strengthen the sense of presence. S6 stated that seeing the teacher's video could be "more motivating and activating" for students, and S2 added that seeing the teacher on the screen would enhance the feeling of "being there with the teacher."

To summarise, the four themes suggest that students' experiences with screencast feedback were largely positive. Students perceived it as improving the quality of their writing, deepening their engagement with the feedback process, and facilitating revision through its multimodal and flexible format. At the same time, their critical observations, particularly regarding recording time, the balance between corrective and positive comments, and the potential value of including the teacher's webcam image, point to important design considerations for practitioners implementing screencast feedback in L2 writing contexts.



DISCUSSION

This study compared screencast feedback and text-based electronic feedback in an L2 content-based writing course by examining students' successful revision uptake at the macro, micro, and overall levels. It also explored students' perceptions of the effectiveness of screencast feedback. Across the quantitative analyses, students receiving screencast feedback achieved higher correction scores than those receiving text-based electronic feedback. The qualitative findings further showed that students generally perceived screencast feedback as more detailed, engaging, and supportive of the revision process. The findings from both strands of data suggest that screencast feedback may offer pedagogical advantages over conventional text-based electronic feedback by supporting both revision uptake and students' engagement with feedback in L2 writing contexts.

One important contribution of the study is that it builds on earlier screencast feedback research by examining revision uptake in greater detail. While previous studies have often focused on student satisfaction or holistic writing improvement (Ali, 2016; Cavaleri et al., 2019; Cunningham, 2019), the present findings indicate that screencast feedback was associated with stronger uptake across both macro-level and micro-level concerns. This more differentiated analysis suggests that screencast feedback may support revision across both local language issues and broader rhetorical and organisational concerns.

The subcategory findings further indicate that the advantages of screencast feedback may not be uniform across all feedback targets. Among the analysed subcategories, the largest differences were observed in the mechanics, vocabulary, and grammar subcategories. This pattern suggests that screencast feedback may be particularly beneficial for areas that require explanation, modelling, or repeated attention to recurring patterns. As the analysis has also revealed, the advantage of screencast feedback extended to APA formatting as well, suggesting that oral explanation can support the uptake of rule-based conventions in addition to more global writing concerns.

The qualitative data help explain why screencast feedback may have supported stronger uptake. Students attributed this to the greater depth, explicitness, and repeated reinforcement provided by the instructor's comments in the screencasts. This supports earlier work suggesting that spoken explanation can reduce ambiguity often associated with brief marginal comments and allow teachers to provide more contextualised guidance (Henderson & Phillips, 2015; Wood, 2023). Students also appreciated that recurring problems were addressed repeatedly throughout the screencast feedback. This repeated attention may have strengthened learners' awareness of persistent errors and supported more successful revision. The multimodal affordances of screencast feedback, specifically the simultaneous presentation of visual highlighting, cursor movement, and oral commentary, were consistently identified by students as facilitators of the revision process. The ability to see precisely which part of their text was being discussed while simultaneously hearing the instructor's explanation reduced the cognitive effort required to connect feedback comments to the relevant textual location, a challenge often associated with written feedback (Edwards et al., 2012). This finding aligns with Cavaleri et al.'s (2019) observation that screencast feedback's multimodal format was particularly beneficial for students with lower levels of English proficiency, who may rely more heavily on visual cues to support their understanding of oral commentary.

Students' emotional engagement with the feedback may also help explain the stronger revision uptake observed in the screencast group. Participants frequently described hearing the teacher's voice, being addressed by name, and experiencing the feedback in a conversational tone. These features appeared to create a stronger sense of teacher presence and care, which may have increased students' willingness to engage with corrective feedback. These findings contribute meaningfully to a growing body of literature on the socio-affective dimensions of feedback (Bush, 2021; van der Zijden et al., 2021). Particularly noteworthy was one student's contrast between written comments previously interpreted as anger and voice-based feedback perceived as supportive. This finding suggests that both the content of feedback and its mode of delivery shape its emotional meaning. In this sense, screencast feedback may reduce some of the negative emotional responses associated with written corrective comments, supporting the argument advanced by Anson et al. (2016) and Hennessy and Forrester (2014).

The study also contributes to broader theoretical discussions of feedback in L2 writing. First, it provides empirical support for the socio-constructivist account of feedback as a dynamic, interpretive



process in which meaning is co-constructed between the feedback provider and recipient (Ajjawi & Boud, 2017; Carless & Boud, 2018). The qualitative findings indicate that students were not passive receivers of information but active interpreters of the instructor's communicative intent: reading tone of voice, personalisation, and visual cues as evidence of care, support, and engagement. This interpretive activity, enabled by the multimodal richness of screencast feedback, appears to have played an important role in motivating students to act on the feedback they received. Second, the study contributes to the emerging literature on feedback literacy, defined as the capacity to interpret, emotionally manage, and act on feedback (Carless & Boud, 2018; Dawson et al., 2024), suggesting that the design of the feedback mode can itself scaffold feedback literacy practices. Students' accounts of pausing, note-taking, replaying, and independently structuring their revision process suggest that screencast feedback, by making feedback more accessible and emotionally supportive, may help learners develop the feedback engagement behaviours that feedback literacy research has identified as essential for effective uptake (Wood, 2023).

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study has several pedagogical implications. First, screencast feedback may be particularly useful for global writing issues, recurring language problems, or situations where detailed explanation or modelling is needed. Second, effective screencast feedback should balance corrective guidance with positive reinforcement. Third, institutions should recognise that technological affordances influence the quality of screencast feedback. Restrictive software time limits may constrain the depth of feedback and the quality of teacher-student interaction. Fourth, personalisation strategies, such as addressing students by name and using an encouraging tone of voice, may support students' affective engagement with feedback. These practices should not be treated as stylistic choices only, but as important design features that can strengthen the relational quality of feedback and encourage students to engage more seriously with its content. Finally, teacher education programmes may benefit from preparing instructors to use screencasting tools effectively while also developing the pedagogical skills needed to design concise, supportive, and purposeful multimodal feedback.

Some limitations of this study should be acknowledged when interpreting its findings. First, the novelty effect might have contributed to the experimental group's more positive engagement with screencast feedback. Students who had not previously received screencast feedback may have responded with heightened interest and motivation because the feedback mode was new, independently of its pedagogical qualities. Second, the quantitative analyses were based on participant-level mean scores from a relatively small subsample of 20 students. Although aggregating scores across the four essays addressed the non-independence of repeated observations, this approach did not allow variation across individual writing tasks to be examined. Third, although the two intact classes were randomly assigned to the control and experimental conditions, having only one class in each condition limited the extent to which class-specific differences could be distinguished from the effects of feedback mode. Fourth, the study was conducted with a single cohort of pre-service EFL teachers at one institution, which limits the generalisability of the findings.

Several directions for future research emerge from this study. Future studies could compare screencast feedback with other feedback modes, such as audio feedback, synchronous video conferencing, and AI-generated written feedback, to better understand when different modes are most effective. Further research could also examine how learners use pause-and-replay functions while revising their writing, for example through think-aloud protocols or screen recordings. Finally, given the pre-service teacher education context of this study, future research could explore whether experiencing screencast feedback as learners influences pre-service teachers' own feedback beliefs and classroom feedback practices.

Ethical Statement: This research has been conducted in compliance with the institutional regulations of the Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Marmara University (Approval date: 14.02.2024; Decision no: 02-19).

REFERENCES

Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2017). Researching feedback dialogue. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(2), 252–265. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1102863

Alharbi, W. (2017). E-feedback as a scaffolding teaching strategy in the online language classroom. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, *46*(2), 239–251. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239517697966

Ali, A. D. (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., 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. (2020). A mixed-methods study of feedback modes in EFL writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, *24*(1), 107–128. https://doi.org/10125/44712

Barrot, J. S. (2023). Using ChatGPT for second language writing: Pitfalls and potentials. *Assessing Writing*, *57*, 100745. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2023.100745

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Borup, J., West, R. E., & Thomas, R. (2015). The impact of text versus video communication on instructor feedback in blended courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *63*(2), 161–184. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9367-8

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bush, J. C. (2021). Using screencasting to give feedback for academic writing. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *15*(5), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1840571

Carless, D. (2015). *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge.

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Di Biase, B., & Power, C. (2019). How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *16*(4), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.16.4.6

Cheng, D., & Li, M. (2020). Screencast video feedback in online TESOL classes. *Computers and Composition*, *58*, 102612. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage.

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

Dawson, P., Yan, Z., Lipnevich, A., Tai, J., Boud, D., & Mahoney, P. (2024). Measuring what learners do in feedback: The feedback literacy behaviour scale. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *49*(3), 348–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2240983

Din Eak, A., & Annamalai, N. (2024). Enhancing online learning: A systematic literature review exploring the impact of screencast feedback on student learning outcomes.



Asian Association of Open Universities Journal, *19*(3), 247–263. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAOUJ-08-2023-0100

Edwards, K., Dujardin, A.-F., & Williams, N. (2012). Screencast feedback for essays on a distance learning MA in professional communication: An action research project. *Journal of Academic Writing, 2*(1), 95–126. https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v2i1.62

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

Fatoni, M., Setiawan, S., & Munir, A. (2024). The students' perceptions of screencast video feedback and their self-regulated learning in responding to the feedback. *KnE Social Sciences*, *9*(6), 517–527. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i6.15301

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage.

Guo, K., & Wang, D. (2024). To resist it or to embrace it? Examining ChatGPT's potential to support teacher feedback in EFL writing. *Education and Information Technologies, 29*(7), 8435–8463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12146-0

Harper, F., Green, H., & Fernandez-Toro, M. (2018). 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. (2015). Video-based feedback on student assessment: Scarily personal. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *31*(1), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1878

Hennessy, C., & Forrester, G. (2014). Developing a framework for effective audio feedback: A case study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *39*(7), 777–789. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.870530

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.

İnan-Karagül, B., & Şeker, M. (2021). Improving language learners' use of self-regulated writing strategies through screencast feedback. *SAGE Open*, *11*(4), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211064895

Jiang, L., Lee, I., & Yu, S. (2024). Conceptualizing multimodal feedback literacy for L2 writing teachers in the digital age. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 34*(4), 1479–1496. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12578

Lee, I. (2017). *Classroom writing assessment and feedback in L2 school contexts*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-3924-9

Lee, I., & Mao, Z. (2024). Writing teacher feedback literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, values, and abilities. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 63*, 101094. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2024.101094

Loncar, M., Schams, W., & Liang, J. S. (2023). Multiple technologies, multiple sources: Trends and analyses of the literature on technology-mediated feedback for L2 English writing published from 2015–2019. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 36*(4), 722–784. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1943452

Mahoney, P., Macfarlane, S., & Ajjawi, R. (2019). A qualitative synthesis of video feedback in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *24*(2), 157–179. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1471457

Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2024). Student engagement with written feedback: Critical issues and way forward. *RELC Journal*, *55*(3), 810–818. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221150811

Marshall, D. T., Love, S. M., & Scott, L. (2020). "It's not like he was being a robot": Student perceptions of video-based writing feedback in online graduate coursework. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14*(1), 10. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2020.140110

Mellen, C., & Sommers, J. (2003). Audiotaped response and the 2-year-campus writing classroom: The two-sided desk, the "guy with the axe," and the chirping birds. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 31*, 25–39.

Nash, R. A., & Winstone, N. E. (2017). Responsibility-sharing in the giving and receiving of assessment feedback. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1519. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01519

Orlando, J. (2016). A comparison of text, voice, and screencasting feedback to online students. *American Journal of Distance Education, 30*(3), 156–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2016.1187472

Penn, S., & Brown, N. (2022). Is screencast feedback better than text feedback for student learning in higher education? A systematic review. *Ubiquitous Learning: An International Journal, 15*(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-9795/CGP/v15i02/1-18

Ruffini, M. (2012). Creating a PowerPoint screencast using Camtasia Studio. *Proceedings of the World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education, Chesapeake, 1*, 355–364.

Saeed, M. A., AbuSa'aleek, A., & Alharbi, M. A. (2024). Examining teacher's evaluative language in written, audio and screencast feedback on EFL learners' writing from the appraisal framework: A linguistic perspective. *Assessing Writing, 61*, 100871. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100871

Sambell, K. (2013). Engaging students through assessment. In E. Dunne & D. Owen (Eds.), *The student engagement handbook*. Emerald.

Savaşçı, M., & Akçor, G. (2026). Beyond the red pen: Screencast-mediated feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning, 9*(1), 22–44. https://doi.org/10.31681/jetol.1836639

Thompson, R., & Lee, M. J. (2012). Talking with students through screencasting: Experimentations with video feedback to improve student learning. *The Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy, 1*(1), 1–16.

Van der Zijden, J., Scheerans, J., & Wijsman, L. (2021). Experiences and understanding of screencast feedback on written reports in the bachelor pharmacy. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal, 14*(1), 46–67. https://doi.org/10.59236/td2021vol14iss11463

Vatansever, A., & Toker, T. (2022). E-written versus screencast feedback in the L2 writing classroom: An engagement perspective. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology, 10*(3), 189–199. https://doi.org/10.52380/mojet.2022.10.3.371

Vincelette, E. J., & Bostic, J. (2013). Show and tell: Student and instructor perceptions of screencast assessment. *Assessing Writing, 18*(4), 257–277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.08.001

Wakeman, C. (2013). The innovative use of screencasts in higher education. *Innovative Practice in Higher Education, 1*(3), 1–5.

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



Wood, J. (2023). Enabling feedback seeking, agency and uptake through dialogic screencast feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 48*(4), 464–484. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2089973

Yu, S. (2021). Giving genre-based peer feedback in academic writing: Sources of knowledge and skills, difficulties and challenges. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 46*(1), 36–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1742872