

## ỨNG DỤNG PHẢN HỒI BẰNG VIDEO ĐỐI VỚI CÁC BÀI VIẾT HỌC THUẬT: MỘT NGHIÊN CỨU TRƯỜNG HỢP

Nguyễn Ngọc Diệp\*

*Các nghiên cứu về phản hồi bằng video hiện nay hầu hết đều về sự tiến bộ của người học thông qua các bài chữa bằng video. Tuy nhiên, số lượng nghiên cứu tìm hiểu về quan điểm của người học ngoại ngữ với phương thức phản hồi bằng video đối với các bài tập luyện viết học thuật còn hạn chế, nhất là ở những quốc gia đang phát triển. Nghiên cứu này được tiến hành với sự tham gia của 02 sinh viên người Việt Nam, chuyên ngành ngoại ngữ. Hai sinh viên này đã học kỹ năng viết học thuật trong 01 năm và hoàn toàn nhận bài chữa qua phương thức phản hồi dưới dạng viết và bằng lời nói. Tại thời điểm nghiên cứu, cả 02 sinh viên đều đang ở trình độ B1 (theo Khung tham chiếu chung châu Âu về ngôn ngữ - CEFR). Trong 03 tháng nghiên cứu, giảng viên, đồng thời là tác giả bài viết này, đã chuyển sang cách thức phản hồi bài viết qua video để học viên trải nghiệm và cảm nhận sự thay đổi. Sau đó, tác giả tiến hành phỏng vấn nhằm thu thập ý kiến của 02 sinh viên này về phương thức phản hồi nêu trên. Kết quả cho thấy, nhìn chung, 02 sinh viên tham gia nghiên cứu đều tỏ ra hứng thú với cách thức phản hồi dựa vào công nghệ này và đánh giá cao tính tiện lợi, sự rõ ràng, khả năng tạo hứng thú và động lực học tập. Tuy nhiên, cả 02 sinh viên đều bày tỏ quan ngại ngại về một số vấn đề liên quan đến công nghệ và tương tác.*

**Từ khóa:** phản hồi, quay video màn hình, video, đa phương tiện, kỹ năng viết.

*Most research on screencast feedback has focused on student's writing progress without scrutinizing the attitude of students towards this type of feedback, especially in the context of developing countries. This research was carried out to explore the perspectives of Vietnamese foreign language students on screencast feedback in their writing practices. Participants were two B1 level (Common European Framework of Reference for languages - CEFR) students who had studied academic writing for a year during which they had only received oral and written feedback. In this study, a three-month experiment was performed to provide video-based feedback to ensure the participants had enough time to experience this new type of feedback. Afterwards, two in-depth interviews were conducted. The results revealed that both students expressed their favorable attitude to screencast feedback, especially in the aspects of convenience, clarity, learning engagement and motivation stimuli. However, they also showed concern about some issues relating to technology and interaction.*

**Keywords:** feedback, screen-casting, video, multimedia, writing skills.

---

\* ThS., Khoa tiếng Anh, Trường Đại học Hà Nội

Email: diepnned@hanu.edu.vn

# AN APPLICATION OF VIDEO SCREEN-CASTING FEEDBACK ON WRITING ASSIGNMENTS: A CASE STUDY

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background to the study

The effects of feedback in language learning are no longer discussed as it has been widely recognized as a crucial and useful mechanism in the writing progress of a student (Aridah et al., 2017). According to Chowke (2015), feedback plays as a radar to control and navigate the writing ship. Important as it is, writing feedback involves time and effort of teachers for a process of mistake identification, explanation, and correction. There are two traditional methods of commenting, including spoken and written feedback. Despite some undeniable advantages, they are eclipsed by the drawbacks. The problems, which are induced from students' trouble in comprehending written feedback and their failure in recalling comments in oral feedback, could slow down or hinder the progression of students (Chokwe, 2015; Lancaster & Shelton, 2017; Zahro et. al, 2023). As a result, it is urgent to seek another type of feedback which can utilize the benefits of both methods efficiently.

Recent technological advances in education have offered teachers and students various novel teaching and learning experiences. The rapid development of educational applications is consistent with the current digitized

learning trend. Online courses are widely robust with the aid of powerful technological tools, and it has been confirmed by systematic research that computer-mediated approaches positively affect teaching and learning results (Hannay & Newvine, 2006). Therefore, applying technology in teaching is indispensable in this digital era.

Having mentioned that, the practice of adopting cutting-edge technology into conventional teaching can be a challenge for many teachers. There are numerous public and private technology-based platforms which allow students to submit their writing assignments online; however, most of them only support teachers in giving typed feedback. As a result, to produce 2-modality feedback, teachers need to employ another application which can record both their oral and written comments, and screen casting is an optimal choice for the alternative. Screen casting is a method which records both oral and typed actions on drafts of students by using computer-based audio-visual media. These recordings then will be converted to a form of video to send to students via online networking sites). To generate screen casting feedback, teachers can download a reliable add-in software, to record their spoken comments along with typed feedback and then send it to students. This approach is believed to be beneficial for

not only students' writing performance but also teachers' scoring practice (Bahula & Kay, 2020; Zubaidi, 2021). Although there are empirical studies about the effects of using video-based feedback on students' writing performance (Ali, 2016; Bahula & Kay, 2020; Zubaidi, 2021; Fitriyah, 2023), limited research has been undertaken to evaluate how students perceive the use of screen casting feedback in traditional classrooms, especially in the context of developing countries. The perception of students who had experienced screencast feedback would be explored in this paper.

### **1.2. Research questions**

What aspects of screencast feedback do students feel interested in?

What aspects of screencast feedback do students feel uncomfortable?

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Methods of conventional feedback**

There are various ways of giving feedback on learners' writing practices. However, whatever method is applied, it should take students as the center, and aim to improve their performance. The quality of feedback is considered as a decisive element to make sure that students can recognize their learning problems and the level of achieving learning objectives. Commonly, oral commentary and text-based feedback are two popular feedback methods which are widely utilized in writing classes. The role of feedback on writing assignments received consensus

from teachers and educators about its considerable significance in various studies (Aridah et al., 2017). Meanwhile, most of students, who were surveyed, affirmed that there was little that they could do or improve without feedback and comments from teachers on their essays; and feedback, most of the time, could remind them to avoid mistake repetition in future writing tasks (Chokwe, 2015). Therefore, quality feedback is always the yearn of both teachers and students.

#### *2.1.1. Spoken feedback*

Aptly named, this type of feedback is produced via in-person conversations between teachers and students.

There are a multitude of merits in spoken feedback, rooted from interactive stimulus. As this feedback involves deep conversations between correctors and practicing writers, it makes room for the detailed explanations and Question and Answer (Q&A) sessions. This advantage has been studied in related research. Bharuthram and McKenna (2006) confirmed it is evident that in-person feedback stimulates active learning and interactions as students can take part in correcting processes and raise questions if needed. Q&A sessions are believed to be pivotal for students as they encourage students to voice and think critically. Also, it is a critical time for teacher to measure their students' understanding and ability to correct mistakes according to their guidance (Bharuthram & McKenna, 2006).

However, there still exist some problems when teachers give oral feedback. First, time constraint is the biggest drawback of this feedback (Bhruthram & Mckenna, 2016; Lancaster & Shelton, 2017). Because it is compulsory to carry feedback sessions including explanations and Q&A in school time, there is little time for teachers to address all students' writing problems, especially in large classes. Researchers consented that despite the effectiveness of oral comments on writing practices, time limit is an inevitable obstacle which prevents this type of feedback from being utilized regularly (Bhruthram & Mckenna, 2016; Lancaster & Shelton, 2017). Second, even though spoken feedback can ensure the comprehension of students at the time it is being given, students are reluctant to recall all correcting details if they cannot revise their practice immediately. A survey on the perspectives of students towards spoken feedback revealed a fact that 75% of the participants sometimes could not remember teachers' comments in one-on-one tutorial even with written notes (Zahro et. al, 2023).

### *2.1.2. Written feedback*

To address the existing drawbacks of spoken feedback, it is preferable for teachers to use written feedback which can be more effective for large-scale classes. Written feedback does not require such a strict time schedule as spoken feedback because it is performed in written form and

can be done outside the class. It is divided into three main types, including direct feedback, indirect feedback, and metalinguistic feedback (Ellis, 2008). Among those three, the most favorite written feedback from students' views is direct feedback (Aridah et al., 2017). During the direct correcting process, teachers would identify students' errors by marking or highlighting them, then leave suggestions on margins to ensure students recognize their mistakes and fix them in correct ways. The second type is indirect feedback. With this method, teachers only indicate the place of errors without giving any further explanations or corrections. The last one, metalinguistic feedback, which is highly valued by scholars and teachers, uses a range of abbreviations to name the mistake. This method helps students know what types of mistakes they are encountering and find the solutions correctly (Saito, 1994, as cited in Chokwe, 2015).

However, surveys about perspectives of students towards written feedback have highlighted some limitations of the written or typed-based commentary. First, most of student participants in Chokwe's (2015) research did not appreciate the clarity of written feedback as they are too general and vague. One interviewee expressed his/her disappointment that after having received feedback from their teacher, he/she did not know where he/she was wrong and how to improve it. Second, there is another problem about feedback



reading comprehension. An expert abbreviation system (W.C. is “word choice”, Gr is “grammar”, Sp is “spelling”) in metalinguistic feedback and illegible handwriting are two primary factors that hinder students from understanding teachers’ feedback (Chokwe, 2015). Third, with the nature of written feedback, interactional corrections between teachers and students are hindered. As the process of giving feedback is normally taken after school, it is a challenge for teachers to find time to have in-person discussions with their students to ensure that their feedback could address students’ problems properly. Bailey (2009, as cited in Chokwe, 2015) also affirmed that the opportunities to have tutorial interaction are fewer when it comes to written feedback.

### ***2.2. Screen-casting feedback***

Recently, an increasing number of instructors have used video-based feedback with an expectation to provide higher quality feedback for students (Zubaidi, 2021). The computer-based media includes the use of a webcam and a screen recording application. After receiving online submissions, teachers start the feedback process by enabling the chosen screen-casting application, allowing it to turn on microphone and camera. Next, comments should be given in the form of both written and oral explanations simultaneously during the recording time. After finishing, teachers store the video and send it to students individually. When students receive the

video, they can not only read the comments, but also listen to teachers’ elaboration. The combination of two or more mobilities in learning has been studied to be beneficial in related research. In their research, Garner and Alley (2011) found that if more than two senses were involved in a learning process, the level of attention and comprehension of students was improved due to the high level of sense engagement.

## **3. Methodology**

### ***3.1. Design of the study***

#### ***3.1.1. Approach***

The method utilized in this research is qualitative-oriented approach, which goes along with the objective of the study. To investigate the attitude and experience of participants towards a specific practice, qualitative method is highly appreciated as it can examine the depth of the information and enable researchers to exploit the information source (Gray, 2014). In their research, Denscombe (2007) contended that the qualitative method is superior in research which aims to discover the feelings, perceptions, and experiences of research subjects. However, one of the limitations of qualitative approach is that its results cannot be applied on a large scale. Bryman (1992, as cited in Gray, 2014) posed an anticipated challenge, when using qualitative method, about the incapability of generalizing the results beyond a specific case. Nevertheless, generalization is not the aim of this

research. The objective of this study is to seek in-depth information about personal experience of the targeted participants. Therefore, it is firmly believed that the qualitative-oriented approach is profoundly appropriate for the research to study the perceptions of two students towards the practice of receiving video-based feedback for their writing practices.

### *3.1.2. Research Design*

This research employs case study as the strategy to examine the experience of two students when they receive feedback in the form of a video. This strategy facilitates the practice of collecting advanced data in realistic cases and obtaining valuable in-depth information which can be missed in wide ranging surveys (Flyvbjerg, 2011). As a design of qualitative approach, case study is concerned about the inability of generalization (Denscombe, 2007). Having said that, this study is not to explore the experience of all students but a case of two B1 students who had experienced video-based feedback for a period of time. Denscombe (2007) deliberated that despite the uniqueness of each case, it can be an example of a class of things.

## **3.2. Research method**

### *3.2.1. Research Setting*

The setting of the research was at the English Department (ED), Hanoi University (HANU). The Department offers courses in English Language skills,

English Literature, English Cultural Studies, Linguistics, Translation and Interpretation, and Pedagogy. The ED and HANU always attach importance to the practice of teaching and learning language by creating the best conditions. Each classroom is equipped with a projector, desktop computer, whiteboard, and air-conditioners.

### *3.2.2. Participants*

There were two voluntary second-year students participating in this study. Both had spent one year studying academic writing and are at Intermediate English level (B1). They had received spoken and written feedback for their writing practices before their teacher decided to turn to video-based feedback in the last three months of the course. In the three-month period, they were sent links to videos where they could watch their feedback for every writing practice. Therefore, they had been through a certain period to experience both types of traditional feedback and multimedia feedback.

The two participants are a fair sample size for a case study qualitative research. Empirical evidence indicates that it is acceptable for a single-case study to explore a phenomenon from a specific entity; meanwhile, multi-case study can not only trigger in-depth data analysis but also compare and contrast cases' data within the same framework (Heale & Twycross, 2017).

### 3.2.3. Interview

Semi-structured interview was chosen as the instrument of this research. With the purpose of determining the attitude, feelings, and experience of the research subjects, interview is considered a powerful tool to gain deep and complex information (Schmidt, 2004). Gray (2014) also supported the use of interview in investigating human feelings by asserting that it allows interviewees to convey their experience vividly and authentically.

Semi-structured interview was employed as it allows flexibility to evoke any topics of interest. Apart from a list of pre-prepared questions, interviewers can either skip or make probing questions, and ask interviewees to elaborate on their responses. Therefore, semi-structured interviews are widely used to explore the attitude of participants towards a particular entity (Schmidt, 2004).

In this research, an interview protocol is developed to elicit participants' perceptions of the practice of receiving screen-casting feedback to find out their advantages and difficulties while having multimedia feedback.

### 3.2.4. Screen-casting Software: LOOM

To record the video and audio, the teacher in this research used LOOM as an assistant to record screen and audio input while giving feedback on a technological device. LOOM is a screen recording program which allows teachers to

videotape the process of correcting and giving oral comments. Once the process has been done, users merely need to click the STOP button, the video would be uploaded on the cloud automatically, which means that it is totally space-free in users' devices. Then, the LOOM system would generate a link so that teachers can send it to their students.

When the students click on the link, it would let them access a LOOM page in which the video is shown, attached with a comment part. The students can interact with the video by leaving typed comments whenever they want while watching it. The comments would be saved at the exact moment when the students leave their comments. Teachers then can easily locate the comments and give their responses.

LOOM application is currently free for educational accounts, which is highly suitable for teachers in educational institutions. However, the capacity for video storage of free accounts is not unlimited, only 25 videos maximum. Therefore, the teacher in this research reminded her students to watch the video feedback and complete revisions within a week. After that, the videos were deleted.

### 3.2.5. Technological devices

To give the feedback visually, the teacher used a tablet and a digital pen. While LOOM was recording the screen, the teacher used the pen to correct and give suggestions on soft-version essays which were shown on the tablet. These devices

helped the teacher to demonstrate vividly and make the process more effective.

### **3.3. Data collection procedure**

After the end of the term, there was a pilot study on one student, who studied in the same class with two participants, to make sure the questions were understandable. The interviews of the two participants were conducted online and offline, at the convenience of the students. Both appointments were arranged based on the availability of the students. During the interview, only sound was recorded. There was no image recording to avoid any uncomfortable feelings. The duration of the interviews was 30-35 minutes each.

### **3.4. Data analysis**

After the interviews, the researcher transcribed and analyzed data. Derived from interview questions and answers, a coding framework was developed. The transcripts of the videos were coded into five main themes which were convenience, clarity, technology, emotional experience, and interactive experience.

### **3.5. Ethical considerations**

The research was conducted under the following process:

- Consent form was sent to students in the class, and only those who replied with their willingness participated in this study.
- From the beginning, students were informed that they could withdraw at any

time regardless of any reasons and without consequences.

- None of the students was taught by the researcher under the time this research was conducted.

- Data was kept to study in this research only.

## **4. Findings and Discussion**

The aim of the research was to explore the students' perceptions of screen-casting feedback. Findings mostly involved benefits and challenges of screencast feedback which the participants had experienced.

Both participants' responses to the questions about their experience with screen-casting feedback on writing practices were very positive. More specifically, the participants were (1) strongly impressed with the convenience of the multimedia feedback and perceived video-based feedback as (2) clear, easy to understand and helpful in further practices, which (3) promotes learning engagement. They admitted that this type of feedback also (4) evoked many positive emotions, including motivation. However, there were also some critical views towards screen-casting feedback in terms of (5) delayed interaction time and (6) technical problems.

In this section, major aspects of students' perceptions of video-based feedback are presented and analyzed.

#### 4.1. Convenience

Convenience was the first benefit appraised by both participants. The students highly appreciated the mobility of video feedback as they could receive and check on it regardless of time and place. When asked what they liked about screen-casting feedback, student A said:

I like video casting feedback because it is comfortable. I can see it everywhere, not only in my class... I can watch the video again and again so I can be aware of my mistakes and try not to make them again.

Similarly, the other student confirmed that “First of all, it is very convenient as I can receive it any time, everywhere. My teacher could send me whenever she had finished correcting the process.” (Student B)

Convenience is an advantage which differentiates technology-based feedback from conventional forms. Although spoken feedback receives satisfaction from both teachers and students, its accessibility is considered one of its weaknesses. The practice of giving and receiving oral feedback requires the availability of teachers and students in school time (Lancaster & Shelton, 2017). While written feedback is more flexible in correction time, the practice of giving and receiving is still implemented in classroom context (Ling, 2020). In contrast, with the application of technology, feedback videos are normally stored in the cloud. Teachers can send their digital feedback to students any time, simultaneously, students can also

get access to their soft version corrected essays outside the context of a classroom. There is no doubt that convenience is a distinct advantage of screen-casting feedback.

#### 4.2. Clarity

Clarity held contradictory opinions among participants. On the one hand, it was continuously confirmed that video-based feedback was clear and easy to follow.

My teacher used a digital pen to mark my essay. She often ticked on correct sentences, underlined, and circled around my mistakes... So most of the time, I could follow her closely. (Student A)

My teacher often marked while giving spoken comments, so it was clear for me. (Student B)

The use of a pointing device is a contributing element for the clarity of video feedback. It enhances the comprehension of students towards the content and is particularly useful in matching written information with spoken comments. The system of markings on a piece of writing practice which provides students with both visual illustration and audio input makes the process more effective (Bahula & Kay, 2020).

A participant raised another aspect of clarity in terms of format. He explicated:

When I receive written feedback with many red marks, I feel very uncomfortable to see it. I always want to see things in

order, neat and beautiful. Many red marks on my written paper make me angry. I must use another paper to rewrite and cannot use the written one to revise. However, with video feedback, I can correct my soft-copy essay, which makes me relaxed. (Student A)

Psychologically, there are cases in which students were discouraged with a writing paper returned with full red marks and notes (Aridah et al., 2017). In this study, student A had the same feeling as them. From his positive attitude, video-based feedback might be a solution to the psychological problem for some students.

On the other hand, the students in the study sometimes encountered confusion in understanding a few details in the video.

I sometimes cannot understand when my teacher used difficult words or when she highlighted information that is very hard for me to understand... For example, when I had a grammatical mistake, she just highlighted and said it was incorrect grammatically. But I don't understand what mistake I made. She didn't give any explanation... But it just takes 30% of a time (Student A)

In this case, Student A was having a problem with types of feedback rather than the way feedback was delivered. As his example stated, he probably preferred feedback with suggestions or corrections to an indirect one. It was widely consented by participants in related research that they were more comfortable with direct feedback

than other types (Aridah et al., 2017). Although it was found that the frequency of direct feedback is higher in conversational feedback, including video-based feedback (Zubaidi, 2021), the teacher of Student A occasionally used metalinguistic feedback which indicates types of mistakes, but no suggestion was given. This feedback could improve students' self-correction ability and learner autonomy (Chowke, 2015); however, it unintentionally became an obstacle for Student A.

Student B had another problem relating to the practice of matching audio comment to a specific text.

Most of the time I think it is understandable, but there were sometimes that I didn't understand. For example, when my teacher was correcting a mistake in line 10, she said that that was a repetitive mistake which had already been made in the previous part. Well, I didn't know which is "the previous part" so I was really confused.

Apparently, despite the advantages of employing advent technological devices and conversational nature to improve viewers' comprehension, screen-casting feedback is pulled back with mismatching problems. Students in Zahro et al.'s (2023) research also left a comment that they found it difficult to keep up with the oral comment of the grader and where in the essay they were talking about.



### 4.3. Engagement

In this study, engagement was manifested in two ways which are learning engagement and revision completion.

#### 4.3.1. Learning engagement

Firstly, the students showed their high engagement to video-based feedback. At the time they received a feedback link from teachers, the students reported a feeling of excitement with no negative emotion.

Uhm... I was very excited at that moment, I clicked on that link immediately to find if I had a good or bad mark and to see my mistakes. (Student A)

I think it's like a must that I need to watch. Actually, I felt comfortable without any negative feelings... I think I must watch it because I can find out what I did good and what I need to improve. (Student B)

The participants were obviously aware of the nature and learning roles of feedback for their writing practice. They understood the fact that the feedback could give them contributing comments and corrections so that there was no offending attitude when receiving feedback here. This finding contradicts to prior research, in which it was reported that video feedback could be scary in some extents as it triggered pessimistic feelings such as hesitation, awkwardness, anxiety, and discomfort (Bahula & Kay, 2020).

In terms of time-spending, both students disagreed that watching video-

based feedback was a waste of time. They considered it as an essential part of learning and voluntarily watched the video several times.

I don't think it wastes my time. When I watch it, I can understand my mistakes. I watch it again and again and note my mistakes on my essay then I can rewrite my work. (Student A)

I think it is worth and necessary, so I don't think it is a waste of time. (Student B)

This finding is in line with Ali's (2016) research that 72.8% of participants dissented from the idea that watching screen-casting feedback was time-consuming. In contrast, the result from a survey of another study indicated that most of their participants (74.1%) perceived the time spent for watching video feedback was rather inefficient (Zahro et al., 2023). However, when it came to long video, Student A in this research assented with interviewees in Zahro et al. (2023) that they felt distracted, but they would try to watch the whole video.

I think I was excited at first... But if my essay was too long and my teacher read it out, I couldn't pay attention at that time. I had to pause it to understand it. (Student A)

Meanwhile, student B held a differing opinion. According to her response, student B came to realization that watching was learning; comments and elaborations in video-based feedback were important for her writing progress. Therefore,

regardless of whether the video was long or short, it was not her issue.

Normally, I would save them until I sat down at my desk, when I could focus 100%. The feedback videos were pretty useful for me... I wanted to watch them because I knew that there would be something I could learn from them every time I watch them. They are good for me, I can see. So, I felt it was enjoyable.

The engagement can also be revealed by multiple times of viewing a feedback video. Both interviewees highlighted that they watched each video again and again, several times, until they understood and remembered the feedback. Both admitted that they would watch a video from two to three times and determinedly note useful comments down in a separate paper. Student A stated that:

I can learn more with the video feedback of my teacher because I can watch it again and again. I can remember my mistakes.

Obviously, the nature of recorded videos allows the students to re-view the content until they understand it thoroughly. Viewers can watch the video as frequently as they wish, pause where needed and replay if they need clarification (Fitriyah, 2023). This feature is more advanced than spoken feedback as students can listen to the teacher's elaboration time after time. Zahro et al. (2023) discovered that about three quarters of participants could not remember teachers' comments after person-to-person feedback sessions

even though they had taken notes. Therefore, video-based feedback can be an effective digital assistant to stimulate students' revision. The engagement of students in this study is in line with students in related research. Hall et al. (2016) reported that their students used to replay the feedback video and remember the teachers' instructions for following assessments.

#### 4.3.2. Revision completion

Both interviewed students were required to correct their errors and make improvements based on their teacher's comments in feedback video. However, the practice of writing a revision was no longer a challenge to them with assistance from screen casting feedback. It was reported that it did not take them much time to write a revision. The two participants shared the same experience:

Normally it takes me 30 minutes to watch a video and about 15 minutes to write the revision... I feel rewriting my essay is quite easy. (Student A)

I often follow two steps. First, I watch the video, which takes about 30 minutes, then I write the revision. But it didn't take much time. (Student B)

Moreover, the students perceived the benefits of video-based feedback on revisions quite positively though differently. In terms of ideas, student A agreed that it could help him to reform his ideas in an essay "My teacher often

analyzed the logic of my ideas. For example, she told me that my example was not suitable to the idea and provided me with another one... and I would change it in my revision... Yes, she did explain why it was not suitable.” Meanwhile, Student B admitted that “I just summarized what the teacher had said. Normally if there was any error, my teacher would talk a lot about it, but I just corrected what I understood”. It means that although this student was aware of the plus point of idea explanation, there was still a barrier that deterred her from being gainful thoroughly. Regarding essay organization, both considered organization as their minor problem; however, they still found it useful when the teacher indicated their problems such as “too short introduction or conclusion, unequal length among body paragraphs” (Student A). With respect to grammar, Student B viewed it as her major weakness; therefore, she enjoyed the grammar correction part the most “This is my biggest problem. I will carefully watch this part... Yes, my teacher used to slow down and explain carefully... I would note on a separate paper for my revision”. Meanwhile, student B also found grammar corrections useful, but he insisted on more details and explanations. With reference to lexical problems, both students were satisfied with vocabulary corrections as they were often provided with better alternatives so that they could make amendments with ease. These findings are analogous to Ali’s (2016) research that majority of

participants saw applicability of video feedback in reshaping their ideas, organizing their essay, and varying their sentence structures. Furthermore, teachers also highly valued the role of video-based feedback as it helped students to comprehend feedback more easily, resulting in more efficient revisions (Zubaidi, 2021).

#### **4.4. Motivation**

Both students proclaimed that they could feel the sense of motivation through video-based feedback. This feeling was evoked when students could listen to teachers’ voices whether it was praise or criticism. The two students also responded that they could feel their teacher’s feelings through the audio channel; however, there was no offensive feeling at all.

Yes, when I have a nice sentence, she encourages me.... She gave me motivation to write. When I have a mistake, she corrects it for me.... I think feedback on my mistakes makes me improve.... I can feel the feelings when she corrects my essay. (Student A)

It cannot be as real as face-to-face conversation but sometimes I could feel the light anger of my teacher on my mistakes... When she said that I had a nice sentence, I felt very happy, especially when I could overcome my repetitive mistakes. When she corrected my mistakes, I felt it was a normal thing. I think that it is understandable for me to make mistakes. And when the teacher corrected it with a

positive attitude, I would listen carefully to improve. (Student B)

It seems that the emergence of audio and visual channels not only promoted engagement but also triggered the enthusiasm of students in writing. Findings by Hall et al. (2016) and Zahro et al. (2023), which also gave consent about this advantage, showed that many participants commented that they were motivated by video-based feedback to make progress and they would apply the feedback in following writing practices.

#### **4.5. Technological issues**

Multimedia feedback requires students to have at least a smartphone or a computer. In these two cases, students had both a phone and a computer to watch feedback videos. Therefore, the requirement of technological devices was not their problem. While student B confirmed that she had not encountered any obstacles relating to technological problems since she received the first video-based feedback, student A experienced some difficulties while watching the videos on mobile phone and indicated that size of screen and lack of function support could be disadvantageous for students who only owned mobile phone:

Sometimes I have trouble on my device like image or sound and I think video feedback is only effective on computer, not smartphone... Because smartphones do not have enough facilities to use all functions of video feedback and the screen on a

smartphone is too small for me to watch the feedback.

Student A elaborated on his technological problems:

Sometimes I cannot hear my teacher's voice, or my screen has a table in the middle of the screen so I cannot watch the video... It is a black box in the middle, I think it is the mistake of the app... About sound problems, I tried to turn on other videos, but I could hear them well, I don't know why I could not hear my teacher's voice in the feedback video.

As it was stated, there were some unexpected problems relating to technology which arose while students were watching videos. However, these issues were out of the scope for both teachers and students; therefore, it urged them to seek a solution. "I talked to my teacher, and she gave me another video, or I went to my class and my teacher gave me written feedback instead."

The failure can negatively affect the effectiveness of a feedback video as students are delayed receiving their writing feedback. Fitriyah (2023) asserted that once a technology problem, for example, poor audio quality, occurs, the value of the screencast feedback will be considerably less than it should be.

#### **4.6. Interaction**

The combination of visual and audio elements is a major factor contributing to the students' engagement. As discussed

above, recorded oral comments of teachers were confirmed to make the feedback clearer, more understandable, and facilitate positive attitudes in the students. Teachers in the research by Hall et al. (2016) admitted that the nature of communicating in video-based feedback helped them to “speak” to their students to explain more clearly and thoroughly. However, in terms of interaction, both participants gave opposing opinions. When being asked if they could feel the sense of interaction while watching feedback video, student B said:

Not really, sometimes I can feel the emotion of my teacher while she was talking... but I cannot ask her right at the time I have question... I have a habit of keeping in touch with my teacher via social network sites, so I will send her a message or go to class to ask her directly.

This student confirmed during the interview that she had not had any uncomfortable feelings during her experience of watching screencast feedback. However, it seemed to her that she could not find any sense of interaction in this method. Likewise, Hall et al.’s (2016) findings showed that not only did some students not perceive any interaction, but they also felt uncomfortable with the one-sided feedback videos.

In another aspect, student A made use of the comment part attached with the feedback videos to interact with the teacher; however, he raised another issue:

I have to say that when I commented on the video, I had to wait a lot of time for my teacher’s reply. For example, I watched the video and left the comment at 5:00 but my teacher replied to me like a day after that, I felt quite lost interest.

Instead of getting an instant explanation from the teacher, the student had to wait until his teacher was available. His response to the question revealed that delayed response of online feedback can be a barrier that demotivates students. It was also deduced by Lemley et al. (2007) that students who could get immediate feedback might get a better score in comparison with their counterparts because they were motivated to correct the mistakes and would prepare more carefully for the following tests. However, earlier studies proved the benefits of delayed response. It is experimented that students in the delayed group could complete their course work earlier than their counterparts (Lemley et al., 2007).

Student B was also asked about the use of the comment part; however, she refused to use it. The reason was:

Because it’s new to me, I feel like I cannot control it. I’m afraid that if I left the message via comment, I might forget to check it or didn’t know how to check it later, so that I can miss my teacher’s response.

It seems that this student is reluctant to apply the new technology. The hesitation and reluctance hindered her from utilizing

the full function of LOOM. This anxiety, which was one of challenges of digital transformation, was studied in prior research that many people refused to use and adapt to technology and had a tendency to follow their familiar path (Tran, 2023).

## **5. Conclusion**

### ***5.1. Summary of findings***

The perspectives of students towards video-based feedback were explored as follows. First, both students were satisfied with the convenience of the technological application in giving written feedback as they could get access to the feedback wherever they were and whenever they wanted. Second, the engagement was highly appreciated in both cases. None of them had any feelings of discomfort when receiving the screencast feedback and voluntarily re-watched the videos multiple times to understand the teacher's comments thoroughly. The oral and visual elaboration, which minimized misunderstanding, encouraged the students to reproduce better revisions. Third, the employment of two modalities successfully stimulated the students' motivation. Being able to listen to their teacher's voice when receiving feedback, including praise and words of encouragement, had a positive impact on writing interest and helped them to remember and avoid their repetitive mistakes better. In terms of technology, although multimedia feedback required

students with smart devices, it was not the problem of the two students. Nevertheless, some unexpected problems arose when a student got issues with audio quality and visual block so that he had to seek help from his teacher. Finally, interaction was not highly evaluated by the two students. Neither could sense the teacher-student interaction while watching feedback videos. One of them complained about a delayed response in the comment part while the other refused to use the comment part to communicate with their teacher because of its unconventionality.

### ***5.2. Suggestions for further research***

From this research, there are several questions which need further investigation. First, future research can study the same research questions but on a larger scale of samples by employing a mixed method approach to enhance reliability of the findings. Second, teachers' perspectives on multimedia feedback should also be explored to obtain multidimensional views about this unconventional method. Third, to what extent a writing revision is affected by video-based feedback remains an open question in this research. Long-term effects of video-based feedback on writing progress should be examined in follow-up studies.

### ***5.3. Limitations***

The two case studies revealed the advantages and disadvantages of screencast feedback in the views of a small number of participants (two students).



Therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to other same-level students. However, due to the time constraint, three months for both applying video-based feedback in the class and carrying out this research, a case study approach is an optimal choice for the researcher.

#### 5.4. Final comments

Applying technology in teaching and learning is a forward movement. Apart from online courses, multimedia feedback can also be implemented in conventional classrooms due to its significant benefits. Overall, perceptions of students towards screencast feedback are positive. Although it cannot be as satisfying as spoken feedback, students perceived that video-based feedback is the optimal alternative. As one student who was interviewed said “It (video-based feedback) is very useful because I can’t see teachers in person all the time. Therefore, a method that helps me to listen to oral explanations is really advantageous”. Teachers might consider employing this novel method of feedback in their teaching.

#### Acknowledgement

I would like to save my first words to express my gratitude to two students who participated in this research. Had it not been for their willingness, this study could not be completed.

Second, I am much obliged to two of my colleagues, Ms. Nguyen Huong Tram Anh and Ms. Vu Van Hanh for their prompt support and valuable advice.

Last but not least, I would like to extend my appreciation to my family, who consistently understood, supported and encouraged me through my ups and downs in the completion of this research.

#### REFERENCES

1. 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>.
2. Aridah, A., Atmowardoyo, H., & Salija, K. (2017). Teacher practices and students’ preferences for written corrective feedback and their implications on writing instruction. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(1), 112-125. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n1p112>
3. Bahula, T., & Kay, R. (2020). *Exploring student perceptions of video feedback: A review of the literature*. 13th annual International Conference of Education, 2020. ICERI Proceedings. 9-10 November, 2020, Online conference. <https://doi.org/10.21125/iceri.2020.1398>
4. Bharuthram, S., & McKenna, S. (2006). A writer–respondent intervention as a means of developing academic literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 495–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600874300>.
5. Chokwe, J. M. (2015). Students’ and tutors’ perceptions of feedback on academic essays in an open and distance learning context. *Open Praxis*, 7(1), 39-56. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.7.1.154>.
6. Denscombe, M. (2007). *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Open University Press.
7. Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>.
8. Fitriyah, I. (2023). Technology-enhanced teacher feedback in the EFL writing classroom: Taking advantage of screencast

feedback. In S. Kweldju (Ed.). *Innovations in Applied Linguistics: During and After the Pandemic* (pp. 72-90). Penerbit UM.

9. Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 4, (pp. 301-316). SAGE

10. Garner, J. K., & Alley, M. (2011). Powerpoint in the psychology classroom: Lessons from multimedia learning research. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 10(2), 95-106. <https://doi.org/10.2304/plat.2011.10.2.95>.

11. Gray, D. E. (2014). *Doing research in the real world* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

12. Hannay, M., & Newvine, T. (2006). Perceptions of distance learning: A comparison of online and traditional learning. *Journal of online learning and teaching*, 2(1), 1-11. <https://drive.google.com/drive/u/0/folders/1WMWDt1U2uPfKkukBsgh235gU4EsTaMoq>.

13. Heale, R., & Twycross, A. (2017). What is a case study? *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 21(1), 7-8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2017-102845>.

14. Lancaster, A., & Sheldon, L. (2017, January). *Screencasts as writing feedback: Leveraging mediasite analytics to identify trends in how students view writing feedback [Paper presentation]*. International Conference on Writing Analytics: Writing Analytics, Data Mining, and Student Success, St. Petersburg, FL, United States. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20916.04482>

15. Lemley, D., Sudweeks, R. R., Howell, S. L., Laws, R. D., & Sawyer, O. (2007). The effects of immediate and delayed feedback on secondary distance learners. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 8(3), 251-260. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ875064>.

16. Ling, W. W. (2020). *An analysis of spoken feedback on speech presentations*. (Master's thesis, University of Malaya Kuala Lumpur). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368843593>.

17. Schmidt, C. (2004). The analysis of semi-structured interviews. In U. Flick, E. V. Kardoff, I. Steinke (Eds.). *A Companion to qualitative research* (pp. 253-258). SAGE Publications.

18. Tran, U. M., (2023). Digital transformation in higher education in Vietnam today. *GeSec*, 14(8), 14582-14599. <https://doi.org/10.7769/gesec.v14i8.2699>.

19. Zahro, S. K., Khulel, B., & Vionisa, E. (2023). *Students' perception and practices of screencast feedback in academic writing class during blended learning*. The 20th AsiaTEFL-68th TEFLIN-5th iNELLTAL Conference, 2022. Proceedings of the 20th AsiaTEFL-68th TEFLIN-5th iNELLTAL Conference (pp. 708-718). 18 May 2023, Indonesia. [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-054-1\\_61](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-054-1_61).

20. Zubaidi, N. (2021). EFL lecturers' perception and practice of screencast feedback. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 8(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v8i1.2339>.

(Ngày nhận bài: 31/10/2023; ngày duyệt đăng: 28/12/2023)