



# Students' Perception and Practices of Screencast Feedback in Academic Writing Class During Blended Learning

Syifa Khuriyatuz Zahro<sup>(✉)</sup>, Buyun Khulel, and Evatul Vionisa

English Education, Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan, Lamongan, Indonesia  
syifazahro@unisda.ac.id

**Abstract.** The study aimed at revealing the students' perception and practices on the utilization of screencast feedback in writing class as digital video feedback where lecturers recorded their oral comments and screen-records the point they commented on the screen toward students' writing draft in the form of audiovisual or video. This research was a survey designed for the students in an academic writing class who had a two-month experience using "Screencast-O-Matic". By the end of the semester, they were asked to fill out 10 questionnaire items through Google forms. The participants were university students who were divided into three categories; competent writers, moderate writers, and incompetent writers at Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan, Indonesia. These categories were drawn from the scores of final drafts of their article writing. The findings revealed several underlying reasons beyond students' preference for screencast feedback to written feedback. They perceived screencast feedback positively as it was clearer to understand than only written one, easier to access anywhere at any time, and more helpful to assist them in revising their draft. Another finding indicated that self-motivation and discipline had an impact on the result of the draft revision, especially for competent writers. The conclusion drawn from the study was that students perceived screencast feedback more positively than written feedback. Therefore, the study had an implication for the lecturers of writing courses, especially in blended or online learning environments to make use of more sophisticated technology like screencast feedback to produce more understandable feedback.

**Keywords:** Academic Writing · Blended Learning · Screencast Feedback

## 1 Introduction

Recent digital advances and developments in learning have provided new practices and experiences for both teachers and students. The rapid development of technology-based learning affects the way the teachers teach and the students learn positively [1]. The urgency of using technology in teaching and learning is very obvious for the reason that technology is one of the media to help achieve educational goals for both teachers and students [2]. As a result, technology in teaching and learning has become a medium that must exist and be applied in this digital era.

© The Author(s) 2023

U. Widiati et al. (Eds.): ASIATEFL 2022, ASSEHR 749, pp. 708–718, 2023.

[https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-054-1\\_61](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-054-1_61)

Blended learning as one of the current technology-mediated learning approaches is extensively practiced throughout the world, including in higher education. A blended learning approach that offers innovations of technology in the classroom, challenges higher education to apply flexible and appropriate learning processes [3]. Moreover, higher education students nowadays are nomophobia ones who weighed their learning on teachers' course plans [4]. Consequently, higher education teachers must be concerned with effective process-based learning to apply during blended learning.

In practice, blended learning adaptation in higher education leads students to compare one another. Involving both face-to-face and online learning in a course forms students' preferences. The preliminary study revealed that 53% of the students preferred face-to-face, while the rest favored online more during blended learning. The result is consistent with an argument that students enjoy face-to-face learning mode more [5]. However, the little difference between both mode preferences implies that both modes; face-to-face and online learning have been perceived as to some extent similar.

Nevertheless, boundless problems in blended learning appear in both modes as faced by students enrolled in academic writing courses in Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan Indonesia both face-to-face and online. A preliminary study resulted that the teachers required the students to submit a soft file of their writing draft to be commented on through the use of the computer typed-comment feature of Microsoft office word© in online learning, while the students received typed feedback on their draft. The majority of them admitted that they have limited understanding to comprehend the typed feedback on their draft comments so they face difficulty with what to write and how to revise (85%). Thus, the main problem in online learning of academic writing courses is the students' inadequate ability to comprehend the typed comments as feedback.

On the other hand, the preliminary study in the face-to-face learning of the academic writing course generated that the face-to-face consultation session where student and teacher meet face-to-face to listen to teachers' oral and written feedback on their printed draft in some way is helpful yet forms another problem. About 75% of the students acknowledged that they were occasionally unable to remember the teachers' comments on the face-to-face consultation session although they have taken some notes on it. The student's failure to recall particular points of the teacher's written comments on their printed draft is therefore the problem found in face-to-face learning of academic writing courses.

Academic writing course requires higher education students to be able to write an academic paper characterized as formal, comprehensive, and well-organized paragraph writing [6]. Those three characteristics urgently require a teacher's complete assistance to provide meaningful and comprehensible feedback. The problem of teachers' limited feedback along with students' difficulty in feedback comprehension in online learning and their inability to recall the comments in offline learning makes an even more complicated process of learning to write an academic paper accurately. The idea of utilizing another type of feedback must be sought to further practice.

Screencast is an alternative feedback type used recently by numerous educational practices as teachers and researchers for various purposes. It is a method of combining oral and typed action through audio-visual media recorded with additional computer

screen sharing possibility outputted in digital video form [7]. To give screencast feedback, teachers may use software like Screencast-O-Matic to record their oral and typed feedback simultaneously on the students' draft shown on the screen where students can know the point to revise and what to revise. Hence, alternative feedback besides typed, written and oral feedback can be employed through screencast that comes with the development of technology replacing the traditional ones.

Related studies on screencasts previously showed that screencasts can be applied for numerous purposes. Screencast proved to be effectively applied as video feedback in writing class because of providing more comments, handing easiness for the students to track the points to revise, and addressing students' learning style through audio-lingual output [8]. The usefulness of Screencast was also apparent to allow the teachers to underline, highlight color, bold, insert words, and highlight [9]. Furthermore, Screencast as audio-visual feedback was revealed to be an effective way to reduce students' postponement to do revisions [10]. Hence, the above studies presented the effective practice of screencast feedback to provide more understandable feedback.

Other research highlighted that using screencasts perceived by students to be helpful, able to promote them to improve their grades as well as provide deep understanding and mastering of the material explained on it so that their performance was enhanced [11], and not only attract their interest but also motivate them to focus on the detail points of provided feedback [12]. On the other hand, despite the helpful screencast perceived by most students, it was not needed according to some of the students' confessions. Accordingly, perceived screencast was believed both helpful and unneeded.

It is obvious from the above explanation that the practice and perception from students about screencast feedback in writing class during blended learning have been confirmed positive and somehow unwanted. Thus, the use of screencasts as video feedback was selected to prove both diverse perceptions as well as to answer the abovementioned problems that students are unable to properly understand the previous type of feedback as well as unable to recall teachers' direct oral feedback. Since the participants in the study have no experience in practicing screencast, the concern of students' practice using screencast feedback as assistance in writing revision during blended learning is the main theme to discuss in addition to the elucidation of perception.

Purposing to elucidate the students' perceptions and practices of screencast feedback in an academic writing class as digital video feedback, the questions constructed under the investigation are 1) how was screencast feedback perceived by students in academic writing class during blended learning, and 2) how was screencast feedback practiced by students in academic writing class during blended learning. For that reason, the current study attempts to answer the two inquiries.

## 2 Method

Aiming at elucidating screencast feedback perceived and practiced by students in Academic Writing class during blended learning, a qualitative survey design was designated to utilize in this study. The participants are students at Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan Indonesia enrolled in an academic writing class and had two-month experience using Screencast-O-Matic, a software to screen record computer screens with

additional narrated audio recording simultaneously that had been extensively used by 190 countries and has taken 60,000,000 screen recordings [13]. However, the result of the preliminary study yielded that no one exposes to the use of screencasts in providing feedback before.

Two types of data were collected; students' perception and their practice data. The questionnaire responses and students' interview transcripts are the main data for the students' perceptions collected from distributing questionnaires and having focus group interviews. A total of 10 sets of statements were given through the questionnaires that were adapted from Ali [8] and Green et al. [11]. Meanwhile, the interview guide consists of 10 questions that were adapted from Ali [8] and West and Turner [14]. The students' drafts, revisions, and screencast feedback videos are the primary data for the students' practices collected through documents with additional interview sessions about their practice of screencast feedback to support the primary data. Hence, the two research questions mentioned earlier were answered by the above two types of data.

All the participants, 26 students were required to submit a draft about the introduction of their future article resulting in 26 drafts involved. They were initially trained on how to write an effective paragraph and accurate organization of the article's introduction. Upon the completion of submission, the teacher provided screencast feedback video through Screencast-O-Matic software on each draft. Unfortunately, among the 26 drafts, only 24 draft feedback videos were taken as the data due to the incompleteness of 2 drafts. After receiving feedback, they were obliged to resubmit their revision result. Thus, the revision data were 26. On each revision, they were also given video feedback through screencast. In total, 50 screencast feedback videos were obtained from both draft and revision ranging from 5 to 20 min. The entire practice data was formerly compared to each other to find the changes made in their revisions.

The students' final revisions of introduction writing respectively were assessed by the teacher using the analytical scoring rubric for writing to obtain their middle-test score for the academic writing course. The scores were used to categorize three types of writers; competent writers, moderate writers, and incompetent writers among 26 participants. Those categories were used to select the interview participants represented from each category to know how to attain the best result of screencast feedback assistance by assigning different types of writers leading to the different results of screencast practices and revisions.

After completing the mid-test, all students registered in the academic writing course were required to fill out a questionnaire distributed online through Google form to explore their perception of the use of screencasts feedback in assisting their writing revision. In addition to filling out the questionnaire, six selected participants representing the three categories above were interviewed to further examine in detail their perception of screencast feedback that was conducted face-to-face.

The data from the questionnaire were analyzed by using Likert on a three-point scale as well as finding out each statement's percentage where the description of each percentage was discussed narratively along with the result of the interview supporting a triangulation process. Furthermore, to analyze the data obtained from documents, a content analysis was employed by comparing the draft, revision, and final revision through compare documents feature in Microsoft Office Word© to gain more noticeable changes

to the analysis which was then evaluated along with the screencast feedback based on feedback coding descriptors consisted of global, local, direct, explanatory, changed, and successful change [15]. A triangulation was later employed through interview results about their screencast practice.

### **3 Findings and Discussion**

The elucidation of the screencast feedback in the academic writing course viewed from students' perceptions and practices during blended learning is separated into two sections based on the two research questions prior stated. Both research questions principally inquire how screencast feedback was perceived and practiced by students in academic writing class during blended learning. Thus, the following sections are the findings along with a discussion of students' perceptions and practices of screencast feedback in academic writing class.

#### **3.1 Students' Perceptions of Screencast Feedback**

In general, most students in academic writing classes (88.5%) perceived screencast feedback they received positively. The helpfulness, clarity, and easiness of screencast feedback are the reasons beyond their positive attitude toward screencast feedback as elaborated in the next sections. On the other hand, consuming more time was the only contributing factor influencing how others (11.5%) confessed their neutral stance toward screencast feedback. For those four reasons; helpfulness, clarity, easiness, and time inefficiency are factors to contribute to students' perception of screencast feedback explicated subsequently.

##### **3.1.1 The Helpfulness**

Two statements of the questionnaire found that the reason for students' positive perception of screencast feedback is that it was helpful. Nearly 92.3% of students agreed with helpfulness statements in the questionnaire which accords with several earlier studies [15, 16]. They found that screencast feedback can reform their ideas, restructure their draft organization, and show them the points to write on their revision. Thus, they perceived screencast feedback as helpful to guide them in rewriting their paragraph.

The helpfulness was elaborated by most interviewees as they can finally understand how to organize their writing systematically, where to focus the revision, and what to write on the revised manuscript. The interview with competent writers further revealed that compared to the typed feedback through the comment feature, they got more explanations about why particular points were incorrectly written such as the incorrect writing of paragraph content or its grammatical use. They successively rewrote it based on where the points must be written as explained so they know what, how, and where to revise through oral explanation and screen display provided by screencast feedback. Accordingly, the majority of them witnessed its helpfulness.

### 3.1.2 The Clarity

Another reason found to subsidize students' positive perception of screencast feedback is clarity. The responses to clarity statements in the questionnaire showed that students generally considered screencast feedback as clear. The questionnaire responses indicated that 80.8% of them detected the screencast as clear which is consistent with a preceding study [8]. The clarity was rooted in the suggestions and examples provided affected their understanding of what to write accurately on the revision. Hence, screencast feedback was perceived as clear to guide what to rewrite based on the delivered suggestions, and examples.

The clarity of screencast feedback was an ensuing reason to support students' positive attitudes toward screencast feedback. In line with this finding, interviewees believed that screencast feedback was sufficiently clear to guide them in writing revisions. The clarity was explained since several mistakes in their writing were shown along with the recommendations and illustrations to rewrite it. Moreover, they admitted that once they understand the mistake from the oral explanation, they were suggested to rewrite it accurately or they simply corrected it based on the suggestions provided. The provided writing mistakes and suggestions on screencast feedback are, thus, reflected as clear to understand by the interviewees and guide them to revise their draft or revision.

### 3.1.3 The Easiness

The positive perception of screencast feedback had also been measured as it was easy. The responses to the three easiness statements were 84.6% positive. Three reasons for screencast feedback easiness were easiness of understanding leading to a direct step to rewrite the revision (69.2%), easiness to follow the tracks by going back and forth (96.2%), and easiness of accessing screencast feedback without worrying about the place and time (84.6%). Hence, the easiness of screencast feedback was perceived as easy to understand, follow, and access.

In the interview session, the screencast feedback easiness was described by the interviewee as easy to trace when they failed to recall what to revise. They simply opened screencast feedback, went to the exact part in which a certain point was explained, found what to write, and directly rewrote it on the revision. They found it easy to access as they were able to go directly to certain points as they wish. As a result, they felt screencast feedback was easy to trace the point so that it is easy to understand which is in accordance with a previous study [15] as their guide to rewrite and revise the manuscript.

### 3.1.4 The Time Inefficiency

Except for the positive attitude toward screencast feedback, the neutral stance on time inefficiency was perceived mostly by 51.9% of the participants as a novel issue. It indicated that more than half of them felt neutral regarding the inefficiency of time using screencast feedback. In contrast, only 25.9% of them did not agree that screencast was time-consuming. Those who agreed are only 22.2%. In other words, the majority of them considered using screencast feedback fairly time-consuming. This is not in line with a study that found that 72.8% of the students disagreed that screencast feedback was time-consuming [8].

The time-consuming is the only negative statement on the questionnaire. All of the interviewees perceived time-consuming questions as neutral. Despite the advantages of screencast feedback they obtained, some of them got a 20-min-long video duration as the longest one. They acknowledged that listening to a long video explanation for the first time was somehow tiresome. However, during the revision writing process, they only traced the points they want to listen to so it turned out to be challenging to find certain points to revise. In brief, although they admitted a long video duration was boring, they still listened to the feedback to guide their revision.

As a follow-up for future practice, students were asked to respond to their future preference statements for using screencast feedback. The finding indicated that most of them are willing to receive more screencast feedback in writing classes (80.8%). In agreement with the above questionnaire result, all of the interviewees favored that they did not mind receiving more feedback in form of screencast videos. They considered the countless benefits they can gain during the screencast feedback use in academic writing class for their writing improvement, particularly to write academically. More specifically, they wish that through screencast feedback in academic writing class, they know how to write an academic paper correctly so that they can write their forthcoming thesis accurately. This indicated that although more than half of them were neutral responding to the time consideration of screencast feedback, its benefits are still a major factor in their desire for future use of screencast feedback in writing classes.

### **3.2 Students' Practice of Screencast Feedback**

The positive perception measured by students in the academic writing class as above-described is generated from the successful practice of screencast feedback. To determine the successful practice of screencast feedback, the data of students' practices in the form of students' drafts, first revisions, and final revisions are compared to one another along with the screencast feedback videos given for each. The comparison analyzed the feedback content first for its global, local, direct, or explanatory feedback. Finally, after obtaining those four feedback descriptor categories, the obtained coded data were determined as changed or successful change. For that reason, the findings and discussions are related to those six kinds of feedback descriptors.

Most of the students' drafts were given global feedback concerned with the organization and structure of paragraph writing. The global feedback found consisted of missing concluding sentences in a paragraph, missing citations, missing certain topics and discussion of paragraphs, and addressing inappropriate topics. Most of the global feedback was only about missing concluding sentences, missing citations, and missing particular topics to discuss. All of the global feedback on the draft was observed as explanatory which supported the preceding research result [15]. However, little local feedback was also found in students' drafts addressing incorrect grammar, spelling missing verbs, missing objects of transitive verbs, incorrect use of verbs, missing articles, incorrect diction, incorrect capitalization, and incorrect punctuation. The local feedback provided was all direct rather than explanatory. This finding does not accept prior study claim that local feedback was tend to be explanatory [15]. Accordingly, the students' first drafts were dominated by global explanatory feedback despite the minor presence of local feedback.

The students' revision analysis results as responses to global explanatory feedback of their drafts brought about changes in the majority of papers. The changes were generally adding the missing components such as the concluding sentence for each paragraph, citation, certain topics, and discussion of paragraphs. The additional paragraphs in some cases produced another mistake to focus on local components. Moreover, only a few global explanatory feedback were written in a successful change. In contrast, local direct feedback mostly resulted in successful changes due to the presence of direct corrective feedback enabling students to simply rewrite the paragraph without trouble. Thus, global explanatory feedback was likely to be changed, while the local direct feedback tended to be written successfully.

Interview results generated that in the first phase, students simply wrote the draft based on what was on their minds without considering the content and organization of each paragraph as explained in the lecture. This lecture material ignorance tended to be the cause of student's inability to write an effective paragraph or correct organization of the introduction which was considered a source of students' mistakes coded as global feedback. In response to successful change in global explanatory feedback, the competent and moderate writers carefully rewrote the revision based on the suggestions for instance writing the sequence of the topic of the whole paragraph based on the keywords taken from the title. Such global explanatory feedback in the form of suggestions was admitted to be able to assist them to rewrite the organization of the topic in their revised drafts. It is therefore observed that global explanatory feedback was able to assist students to rewrite their paragraphs' organization and structure based on the suggestions.

However, all revised drafts that were written by incompetent writers in response to global feedback were changed but were still unsuccessful to address the accurate changes of local feedback. Although the revised paragraphs were written based on the suggestion, they ignored the cohesive devices responding to local issues. Most of the paragraphs were written independently resulting in no cohesive concern. Consequently, incompetent writers only wrote and changed their revisions without considering other aspects of writing.

In contrast to the students' drafts that were mostly receiving global explanatory feedback, the students' revision documents were given a large portion of local feedback. The local feedback found was emerging from miss-spelling, missing subject and/ or verb of the sentence, inappropriate use of verbs, missing conjunctions to join two sentences, and missing punctuation after conjunction. A huge number of local feedback on the revision was still direct, but some of them were also explanatory. The finding that local feedback was somehow explanatory agrees with previous research discoveries that local feedback leaned towards explanatory [15]. In other words, the revisions were given not only local direct feedback largely, but also a few local explanatory feedback.

Another type of feedback found in revision was global feedback. The global feedback was mostly in response to the new paragraphs written for missing certain topics on draft feedback. The global feedback on the revised manuscripts in large comprised of missing appropriate concluding sentences in specific paragraphs. For the revision feedback, most global feedback was both explanatory and direct in a balanced portion. The interviewees admitted that either the local or global explanatory feedback was clear to understand that they know not only the mistakes but also the correct way to rewrite

them based on the suggestions provided on the screencast feedback explanation. This supported the clarity aspect of the student's perception affected by provided suggestions on screencast feedback through oral explanation. As a result, both global explanatory and direct feedback were found on students' revisions feedback.

Furthermore, changes and successful changes were discovered in students' final revisions. Changes were frequently made in response to global and local explanatory feedback. On the contrary, the global direct and local direct were found to be successful changes. These findings corroborated previous findings that explanatory feedback, both global and local, seemed to be changed according to merely the suggestions and recommendations. Most incompetent and few moderate writers admitted that they simply rewrite the explanatory feedback based on the suggestion without any other concerns. Only a few successful changes were discovered for explanatory feedback made by competent writers. The majority of successful changes were made by competent writers who confessed that they carefully rewrote sentences based on the suggestions along with reflecting on how to write effective paragraphs. This is in line with Glynn and Muth who highlighted that competent writers are able to regain their long-term memory of several needed knowledge ranging from metacognition, idea construction, idea relation, text production, and revision [17]. This indicated that all students needed to be reminded about the ways to write an effective paragraph. In short, to respond to their revision feedback, most students simply changed global and local explanatory feedback and successfully changed global direct and local direct feedback, while explanatory feedback was effectively changed by competent writers.

To get more vigorous findings, factors to donate to successful changes in final revision for competent writers were elaborated on in the interview session. The result was that they were motivated to write each paragraph effectively after watching screencast videos so they directly rewrote and made changes in their draft and revision papers. This showed that external motivation from screencast feedback was evidenced to lead highly motivated students to revise their manuscripts directly. Another factor to contributes to successful changes is students' self-discipline. The competent writers admitted that they revised the paper directly after they got the screencast feedback. It is therefore noticed that two factors influencing competent writers to revise their papers successfully are motivation and self-discipline.

## 4 Conclusion and Suggestions

The conclusion that can be drawn from the above description is that most students perceived screencast feedback positively for the benefits of its helpfulness, clarity, and easiness. Another factor that contributed to their neutral perception toward screencast feedback is that they matter the long duration of the video was somehow time-consuming to watch. Nonetheless, they are still eager to receive more screencast feedback for future writing classes because of obtaining more benefits from watching screencast feedback for their writing improvement.

Additionally, concerning students' practice of screencast feedback, it was found that students' drafts were given global explanatory feedback that tended to be changed and local direct feedback that was revised and changed successfully. On the other

hand, another finding on students' revision was that local direct feedback and global direct feedback were successfully revised by students, whereas local explanatory feedback and global explanatory feedback were merely revised. The successful revision to explanatory feedback was only made by competent writers who had high motivation and self-discipline to accomplish the writing task completely.

The results of the study imply that screencast feedback is recommended to apply by writing course instructors to any other writing classes to produce more understandable feedback. This study executed a single writing task for two months where students received three screencast feedback for their drafts and revision. The upcoming study is required to consider longer time implementation, more than one writing task in diverse types and investigate it thoroughly in a classroom action research involving the teacher's perspective as well as teacher's practices in giving screencast feedback so that fruitful results can be obtained and examined intensively for many cycles.

**Acknowledgments.** We would like to acknowledge with gratitude to Diktiristek which provides research grants for this research project as well as second-year students in the academic writing class of Universitas Islam Darul 'Ulum Lamongan for their cooperativeness during the research.

## References

1. K. Ratheeswari, Information communication technology in education. *Journal of Applied and Advanced Research*, 3(1) (2018) 45-47.
2. M. Akintolu, & C. Uleanya, Ensuring Sustainable Development Goal in Rural Africa through Adult Literacy Programme: A Case Study of Technology Usage in Developing Nations. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 9(4) (2021) 713-719.
3. R. Castro, Blended learning in higher education: Trends and capabilities. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(4) (2019) 2523-2546.
4. A.A. Okaz, Integrating blended learning in higher education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 186 (2015) 600-603.
5. L. Fatmawati, D. Sofeny, S.K. Zahro, Students' Attitudes Toward The Transformation of Online to Offline Learning in EFL Classroom. *IJECA: International Journal of Education and Curriculum Application*, 4(3) (2021) 264-272.
6. F. Imaniar, L.A. Lestari, A. Munir, The teaching and learning of academic writing involving critical thinking in Higher Education. *Journal of English Language and Literature*, 10(1) (2018) 975-981.
7. K.J. Cunningham, S. Link, Video and text feedback on ESL writing: Understanding attitude and negotiating relationships. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52(100797) (2021) 1-17.
8. A.D. Ali, Effectiveness of Using Screencast Feedback on EFL Students' Writing and Perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8) (2016) 106-121.
9. A. Bakla, An overview of screencast feedback in EFL writing: Fad or the future. *Yabancı Dil Olarak Türkçe Öğretimi ve Yabancı Dil Öğretimi Araştırmaları*, (2018) 319-331
10. S. Nourinezhad, E. Hadipourfard, M. Bavali, The Impact of audiovisual feedback on academic writing task procrastination. *Teaching English Language*, 15(2) (2021) 173-200.
11. K.R.Green, T.Pinder-Grover, J.M. Millunchick, Impact of screencast technology: Connecting the perception of usefulness and the reality of performance. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 101(4) (2012) 717-737.

12. D. Cranny, Screencasting, a tool to facilitate engagement with formative feedback?. *AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 8(3) (2016) 2911–2927.
13. N. Pachuashvili, Screencast video feedback and its implication on English as Foreign Language (EFL) Writing. *European Scientific Journal*, 17(33) (2021) 66-80.
14. J. West, W. Turner, Enhancing the assessment experience: Improving student perceptions, engagement and understanding using online video feedback. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 53(4) (2016) 400-410,
15. K.J. Cunningham, Student Perceptions and Use of Technology-Mediated Text and Screen Feedback in ESL Writing. *Computers and Composition* 52. (2019) 222–241.
16. C.M. Anson, D.P. Dannels, J. I. Laboy, L. Carneiro, Students’ perceptions of oral screencast responses to their writing: Exploring digitally mediated identities. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(3) (2016) 378–411,
17. S.M Glynn, K.D. Muth, Reading and writing to learn science: Achieving scientific literacy. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 31(9) (1994) 1057–1073.

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

