

Enabling feedback seeking, agency and uptake through dialogic screencast feedback

Wood, James

Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2089973>

Published: 01/06/2023

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

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

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Enabling feedback seeking, agency and uptake through dialogic screencast feedback.

James M Wood

Faculty of Liberal Education, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea.

James M Wood

email: james.wood@alumni.ucl.ac.uk

ORCID iD

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4349-6002>

https://twitter.com/Dr_JamesWood

Notes on contributor

James is an Associate Teaching Professor in the Faculty of Liberal Education at Seoul National University. His research explores how learner engagement, agency and learning from feedback can be supported through socio-constructivist and socio-cultural perspectives augmented by socio-material understandings of how technology can be deployed in workload sustainable ways.

Abstract

Screencast feedback is higher in quantity, explicit and engaging and may better enable uptake compared to written feedback. However, most studies deploy screencast feedback as ‘transmission’ of feedback comments, positioning learners as passive and neglecting the importance of agency and action within the uptake process. This study attempts to overcome this limitation by conceptually positioning and deploying screencast feedback in a way that supports agency by providing technology-mediated opportunities for learners to request feedback and initiate uptake-oriented dialogues with providers. Taking a qualitative case approach, using written data, reflections (N=14) and surveys (N=14) to progressively focus interviews with 13 undergraduate advanced writing students in South Korea, three themes were developed. First, screencasts appeared to enhance understanding of feedback, helping learners understand standards and to set and achieve goals. Second, through initial feedback requests and opportunities to seek and clarify feedback, responding to feedback dialogically enabled learners to better understand and enact it, supporting their agency. Finally, the perception that the feedback was supportive and caring encouraged trust and motivation to engage with and use feedback. The findings have several theoretical and practical implications and are especially relevant to higher education practitioners wishing to support agency and uptake with a relational approach.

Keywords: Agency, Dialogic Feedback, Feedback Uptake, Relational Pedagogy, Socio Constructivism, English for Academic Purposes.

Enabling feedback seeking, agency and uptake through dialogic screencast feedback.

Introduction

In recent years, technology has been increasingly recommended to provide a medium for practices to support feedback engagement and uptake (Carless and Boud, 2018; Carless and Winstone, 2020; Wood, 2021). In particular, the practice of screencast feedback, in which educators can record screens while reviewing and providing feedback information on student work, has been suggested as a method that can improve perceptions of feedback quality and quantity while building rapport and communicating effort and care (Dawson et al., 2018; Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019). However, the existing body of work on screencast feedback has also been critiqued for deploying it feedback as cognitivist, information ‘transmission’ (Boud and Molloy, 2013) in which feedback is delivered one-way and so merely replicates ‘old paradigm’ (Carless, 2015) feedback practices in a digital setting (Pitt and Winstone, 2020, 82). Consequently, such feedback fails to promote the agency needed to seek (Molloy, Boud and Henderson, 2020) build on or clarify feedback, or the sense of shared responsibility learners need to proactively engaging with and use feedback (Winstone et al., 2017a). Instead, it tacitly positions them as ‘passive recipients’ (Ajjawi and Boud, 2017) which may also undermine their agency to make comparisons (Nicol, 2021), generate evaluative judgements about their own work (Tai *et al.*, 2018), or seek help enacting feedback. Thus, ‘feedback as transmission’ also denies learners opportunities to learn through an agentic socio-constructivist process of dialogic co-construction and sense-making with the feedback provider (Carless and Boud, 2018). This is important because if students make changes to work after transmissive feedback, learning may or may not have occurred. However, if feedback uptake is

understood as an open-ended process of dialogic co-construction and reflection, students are left to make agentic decisions about how to improve their work (Torres, 2022). They can also decide whether further dialogic exchanges with the feedback provider are necessary to support their learning and uptake process.

This paper attempts to position screencast feedback for uptake conceptually by considering how the feedback uptake process (Carless and Boud, 2018) can be supported by providing technology-mediated opportunities for learners to request feedback and initiate uptake-oriented feedback dialogues with providers to enable a socio-constructivist dialogic learning process (Wood, 2021). It then illustrates how this can be efficiently realised in practice, while offering learners support in engaging with, using and learning from feedback, through a small-scale inductively analysed case study.

In this article, I first explore findings relevant to the proposed conceptual argument and then outline how the ‘information transmission’ (Mahoney, Macfarlane and Ajjawi, 2019) issue with screencast feedback can be overcome through dialogues with the feedback provider, which can be mediated expediently through technology. I then demonstrate how, in an undergraduate advanced English academic writing context, technological mediation enabled feedback requests and the ability to ask further questions about using feedback. This enhanced learners’ ability to understand performance, set goals, and, where the initial information transmission process failed, served their agency to elicit additional information and challenge or question feedback in uptake-oriented dialogues. The study further illustrates how the affordances of a particular technology can encourage willingness to initiate uptake-oriented dialogues and how motivation to enact screencast feedback can be enhanced if feedback is perceived as sincere and effortful support of

learners' goals. It concludes by exploring why educators may consider taking up dialogic screencast feedback to support high-quality feedback uptake processes as a relational pedagogy (Gravett and Winstone, 2020) which also supports the development and exercise of learners' agency within the feedback uptake process.

The Benefits of Screencast Feedback

In recent years, much has been gleaned about the potential beneficial effects of screencast feedback as a method that can improve perceptions of feedback quality and student-teacher relationships, despite its old paradigm positioning. From a practice perspective, screencasts are often considered more workload sustainable and efficient than providing text comments (Dawson et al., 2018; Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019), or at least, comparable to written feedback (Crook *et al.*, 2012). This suggests that producing screencasts can be considered a practical use of the feedback providers' time. The consensus in the feedback literature is that screencast feedback results in greater quantity and detail than text-only methods (Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019). Learners have also reported that the medium affords a clearer understanding of feedback comments, with features such as voice tone improving clarity and detail while helping to avoid ambiguity and the risk of misinterpretation (Anson et al. 2016; Henderson and Phillips, 2015). Screencasts can also reveal instructor thought processes as they review the work in real-time, facilitating an additional layer of meaning transfer (Fernández-Toro and Furnborough, 2014; Vincelette and Bostic, 2013). In several studies, screencasts may have also encouraged more constructive enactment-oriented feedback production (Lamey, 2015; Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019), perhaps because of the additional time afforded for feedback through the medium (Henderson and Phillips, 2015). There is also evidence that, in screencasts, comments tend to shift towards more substantive 'global' aspects of performance such as structure, argument,

evidence, and answering the question (Henderson and Phillips 2015; Lamey 2015; Orlando, 2016; Cheng and Li, 2020; Wood, 2022b). These combined factors may help to account for the conclusions of studies that learners make more successful changes in response to screencast feedback than written comments (Cavaleri et al. 2019; Yiğit and Seferoğlu 2021) and also more substantive, global level (as opposed to surface level), changes after receiving screencast feedback (Thompson and Lee, 2012). However, the nature of the impact of screencast feedback on feedback engagement, uptake and outcomes is an underexplored area of screencast scholarship requiring more attention (Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019; Penn and Brown, 2022).

Screencast feedback may be especially beneficial in online courses, as online learning is inherently more socially isolated than learning in person (Lowenthal and Dennen, 2017; Lowenthal, 2021). However, according to self-reports, learners are more likely to view screencast feedback as ‘conversational’ (Anson et al. 2016), view it several times (Grigoryan, 2017), and feel it is more human than text-only (Marshall, Love, and Scott, 2020). Learners also find it more personalised (Henderson and Phillips, 2015; Gould and Day, 2013) than written feedback. Screencasts may also support learning because they strengthen socio-affective aspects of the teacher-student relationship (Dawson et al., 2018), convey indicators of instructor social presence (Thomas, West, and Borup, 2017; Lowenthal *et al.*, 2020), and generate more rapport (West and Turner, 2016). Because screencasts facilitate more feedback content in less time, they may also bolster positive socio-affect by offering comparatively more time and space to provide comments that highlight strengths or build relationships (Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019; Ryan, 2021), as well as providing detailed comments on areas to improve (Harper, Green and

Fernandez-Toro, 2018). Thus, screencast feedback may be especially suited to feedback provision on online or blended classes or as part of a relational pedagogic strategy.

However, it should be noted that screencast feedback can also carry socio-affective risks. Students may feel more sensitive when receiving screencast feedback, perhaps due to the potential for screencast feedback to convey emotion (see Lamey, 2015). Thus, it is important to consider how such risks can be mitigated in setting up and deploying screencast feedback practices. Deploying screencast feedback dialogically may offer a potential solution by offering opportunities for initial feedback seeking, co-regulation and co-construction of learning after feedback.

Positioning Screencast Feedback for Uptake Conceptually

Despite encouraging findings regarding the potential benefits, screencasts cannot be considered a panacea to the problem of learners engaging with and enacting feedback due to the one-way transmission approach utilised in existing studies (Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019). However, screencast feedback can be conceptually positioned for uptake and deployed as an agency supportive, ‘new paradigm’ dialogic approach, as illustrated in the following two-stage conceptual argument.

First, screencast feedback can potentially better support feedback uptake compared to written feedback because it can facilitate the efficient communication of high-quality, clear, and well-contextualised dual-channel feedback information (Dawson et al. 2018; Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019). These enhancements may, in turn, help develop learners’ ability to make better-informed comparisons (Nicol, 2021) and evaluative judgements (Tai et al. 2018) to help them to understand the gap between the academic standards and the current quality of the work (Sadler, 1989). They can also, in

theory, help learners better understand how to set and achieve goals (Wood, 2021). Similarly, as screencast feedback may enhance relatability, social presence, and the perception of care, learners may be motivated to enact feedback.

Nevertheless, in discussing the benefits of screencast feedback, it is essential to note that even if richer, more comprehensive and contextualised feedback is provided, there may still be a gap between the suggestions made within the feedback and learners' ability to understand and implement it. Consequently, feedback receivers may still require additional support in negotiating its meaning and building upon their understanding to improve their work, skills or understanding. Not understanding feedback or knowing how to use it is considered a significant 'barrier' to feedback uptake (Winstone et al., 2017b), and screencast feedback is no exception. In one study, sixty per cent of students reported not fully understanding screencast feedback (West and Turner, 2016). Feedback receivers may also feel the need to respond to feedback received somehow (i.e. Lamey, 2015) to help process, or decide what to do with it.

To address the issue of one-sidedness and transmission failure, the main conceptual contribution of this article is the argument that if screencasts are produced together with a cloud text editor, such as Google Docs or Microsoft 365, learners can make reflective initial feedback requests (see Winstone and Carless, 2019) for screencasts to answer. The combination with a cloud document can provide a contextual 'anchoring point' (Wood, 2022a) for requests for additional information or questions about feedback (see figure 1).


Figure 1: Student makes an initial reflective feedback request

<https://www.loom.com/share/91c6a56f40914e8795a07baa08b66910>

To what extent should schools invest in e-textbooks as opposed to physical textbooks?

As cheaper and more portable devices have become commercialized in recent years (Blikstad-Balas & Davies, 2017), many schools are considering utilizing digital textbooks instead of the more traditional paper textbooks. Digital or electronic textbooks refer to textbooks that can be accessed through a computer or electronic device, with no need to possess a physical copy (Rockinson- Szapkiw et al., 2013). Some electronic textbooks may offer special features such as annotation, search, and a built-in dictionary (Johnson, 2013). This raises the question of to what extent schools should invest in e-textbooks as opposed to physical textbooks. Some crucial aspects to consider are effectiveness on learning, cost and maintenance, and impacts on health. Although tablets indeed offer a range of benefits to schools and their students, this essay will argue against schools' investments in digital textbooks by examining each of the key points mentioned above.

The first aspect to consider is whether digital textbooks and paper textbooks show



Instructors can also mark out ‘local level’ errors on the document while screencasting, which may be perceived as a more comprehensive form of feedback (Wood, 2022b) and preferred by learners (Grigoryan, 2017). Technological mediation may also be more convenient, practical, and be considered more informal than, for example, writing an email or setting up a meeting to ask questions. By efficiently mediating the creation, delivery, and notification of comment threads in direct response to highlighted text, fewer words and less effort are required to convey meaning; this, in turn, may encourage the dialogic engagement of both providers and receivers. Such dialogues can then support a potentially multi-turn, dialogic, socio-constructivist meaning-making and uptake process (Carless and Boud, 2018; Wood, 2022b).

Through such a process, the role of peer and teacher feedback and the dialogue that accompanies it relates to the expansion of the ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978), and can be viewed as ‘co-regulation’ (Pandero, Andrade and Brookhart, 2018; Wood 2021), of the process of expanding individual’s ZPDs enabling them to use feedback or learn from it. Deploying screencast feedback in a two-way dialogue aligns with much of the key literature on feedback literacy (Winstone et al. 2017a; Carless and Boud, 2018; Molloy, Boud and Henderson, 2020), which considers a socio-constructivist process of meaning-making to be central to successful feedback engagement and uptake.

However, much empirical work on screencasts and teacher and peer feedback in general, is deployed as the one-way transmission of feedback comments without opportunities for dialogic negotiation of how feedback can be understood, learned from and used (Wood, 2022b). This can render feedback an inefficient use of time for providers and receivers because feedback that cannot be understood is often ignored (Winstone et al. 2017b). Similarly, feedback applied before it is understood or aligned with students' own evaluative judgement may not contribute to longer-term development.

The proactivity inherent in initiating and seeing uptake-oriented feedback dialogues through to a satisfactory conclusion also helps solve the issue of learner passivity in the screencast feedback and general feedback literature. Encouraging learners to agentically seek initial feedback, as well as further dialogues to help them understand how written or screencast feedback can be interpreted, built upon and enacted, and supporting them with appropriate tools to mediate the process, better aligns the practice of screencast feedback with the 'new feedback paradigm' (see Carless 2015; Winstone and Carless, 2019). Furthermore, providing informal opportunities for learners to engage in dialogues with the feedback provider in digital 'spaces' that may be perceived as less unequal (Gravett and Winstone, 2019) and with tools perceived as more informal, convenient, and valuable (Wood, 2022a), may also support learners' agency, defined here as the ability to act purposefully and autonomously (Emirbayer and Mische, 1998). More specifically, such tools may serve learners' agency to engage in uptake-oriented dialogues from a sociomaterial perspective (Gravett, 2020; Nieminen et al., 2021; Wood, 2022b). They may also help mitigate the power imbalance perceived in screencast feedback provider-recipient relationships, potentially helping to avoid the anxiety and sense of helplessness that may result from one-way approaches.

Research Gaps and Aims

While the number of studies related to screencast feedback has proliferated in the past few years, to date, there appear to have been no empirical attempts to position and deploy teacher screencast feedback focusing on the use of dialogic methods to support the feedback seeking and the uptake of feedback information while departing from a monologic ‘information transmission’ approach. This has been considered a serious and enduring limitation of the medium (Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019; Pitt and Winstone, 2020). Thus, there is a clear imperative to explore dialogic teacher screencast feedback practices empirically. Accordingly, this study seeks to make this original contribution to the literature guided by the following research question:

What were the perceived and actual effects of dialogic screencasting feedback practices on feedback understanding, engagement, goal setting, and uptake processes?

Methodology

Context and Participants

The study context was an elective credit-bearing advanced English research writing course at a prestigious South Korean university. After permission from a UK university ethics board and the necessary local permissions, a convenience sample (14 out of 15) of South Korean undergraduates (eight females and six males) chose pseudonyms and provided verbal and written consent to participate. Participants were between advanced to near-native in linguistic ability (TEPS 815 or above: the equivalent of IELTS 7.5+ or more) and came from mixed-majors (social sciences, humanities, and sciences), around half in their first year, and half from diverse year groups. Ages ranged between 19 and 25

years old. Within the greater study context, students generally have experience receiving summative but not formative feedback on writing and tend to hold negative views about the value and purpose of feedback (see theme three). Such views were also common for the students in the study sample, none of whom reported having experienced formative feedback prior to this class or having positive views about feedback (see results).

Procedure

Working from an assumption that students might require some support in becoming receptive to feedback, the course began with an attempt to scaffold feedback receptivity based on the model described in Wood (2021). Following the model, participants were asked to reflect (through forums and in-class discussions) on previous emotions and reactions to feedback experiences. They were also asked to consider popular concepts like growth mindset and grit and formulate personal accounts of how learning might occur from feedback and co-regulative feedback dialogues by considering how they might influence their zones of proximal development (Vygostky, 1978).

Learners were introduced to the essay marking criteria and practised applying them to exemplars at different grades (a standard classroom practice to internalise standards) and were tasked with writing a 1,200-word research paper on a discursive topic selected by students and co-developed with the teacher. After three weeks, students engaged in technology-mediated peer feedback on their first drafts in line with the model in Wood (2021) and as described in Wood (2022a) (also standard classroom practice). After a week, students produced a second draft of their work and submitted it to the teacher. They then received hybrid (screencast/Google Doc) formative feedback and had the opportunity to ask questions via the Google Doc comment function over another week. Finally, students produced and submitted a third draft and received summative comments,

with grades visually mapped against the marking criteria to assist with self-assessment and goal setting for the final assignment. Once again, students had the opportunity to raise questions if required to enhance learning opportunities from feedback.

Loom.com was chosen as the screencast medium for the study because it enables viewing at different speeds, pausing/resuming recordings, and provides high-speed link generation and sharing with no discernible lag in the workflow. Google Docs was chosen to mediate text comments during screencasts because it is free and can generate forum-type discussions linked to a specific highlighted section of text. Google Docs has also been found to mediate multiple exchanges and enhance engagement with peer-to-peer feedback because students perceive it to be especially useful and convenient (Wood, 2022a). These considerations predict the uptake of new technologies according to the Technology Acceptance Model (Rejón-Guardia, Polo-Peña, and Maraver-Tarifa, 2020) and student self-reports (Winstone et al. 2020). Before using the chosen technologies, students were introduced to the privacy statements of the two companies, the potential implications of their business models (through class discussion), and were given an opportunity to opt out of their use.

Approach and Data Collection

The study aimed to illustrate and evidence the conceptual contribution of this article and answer the research question by deeply exploring participant feedback experiences by engaging with and using dialogic screencast feedback from an interpretive perspective, in a naturalistic setting (Denzin and Lincoln, 2017). Thus, I adopted a qualitative instrumental case study design utilising the chosen context as a 'typical case' of the phenomenon of research interest (Crowe *et al.*, 2011). Data collection occurred at various

points and included one round of participants' reflective writing after summative feedback (see figure 2), qualitative surveys (see figure 3), and semi-structured interviews (audio-recorded and 30 minutes to an hour) over a month (see figure 4). Due to my positionality as both teacher and researcher in this study, I attempted to be particularly rigorous and reflective (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2017) within the ethical approval, data collection and analysis process, following guidelines for high-quality qualitative research processes (Tracy, 2010) which included consultation with senior UCL-IOE academics and an external ethics advisor. In addition, to provide methodological triangulation (Twining *et al.*, 2017), data from reflections, surveys and interviews were compared for consistency, and to improve credibility and trustworthiness, permissions were sought to use data from students essays to establish what types of questions students asked, and what (if any) action resulted from ensuing dialogues with the teacher. Hence, many of the perceptual claims in this article are also backed by documentary evidence.

Figure 2. Reflection questions to stimulate metacognition after feedback

This reflection activity is intended to stimulate your thinking about how you can learn more effectively. Feel free to write as much or as little as you want, and feel free to read and comment on others reflections.

1. Barriers to use of feedback:

- a. View your final feedback screencast and the grade. Is there anything you can't understand or feel the need to question?
- b. What is your emotional reaction to the feedback? Is this reaction helpful? Harmful? How could you process this in a way that is conducive to learning?

2. Feedback tends to focus on corrections, but there are also many things you didn't know coming into this class that you have now learned.

- a. What key takaways have you learned through this essay - (don't only rely on feedback, think about your own learning process as well/peer feedback, planning, approach) etc.

3. Translating the feedback from the essay into goals for future essay writing and the literature review:

- a. Did you achieve the goals you set for yourself after second draft teacher feedback? Why/why not?
- b. If you had to write the essay again, how would you approach it differently?
- c. What goals/skill to master will you set for your next essay/the future, and how will you reach them?

4. Are there any resources or help you need to reach these goals?

Figure 3. Qualitative Survey Questions (through Google Forms)

1. Please write openly about your experience of our course activities in relation to the way you engaged with feedback and used feedback to improve your work: *

Your answer

2. A) In what ways (if at all) did these practices (Using Google Docs/Screencasts/Dialogue with the teacher) influence your beliefs, behaviour, or way of thinking about feedback? *

Your answer

2. B) Why was this? *

Your answer

3. A) Google Drive enabled screencast feedback to be like a two-way conversation (dialog), between students and the teacher. How did this influence your learning/use of feedback or engagement with feedback? (if at all) *

Your answer

3. B) Why was this? *

Your answer

3. C) Were there any emotional aspects to these feedback experiences (positive or negative)? *

Your answer

4. A) Please talk about your experience of screencast feedback in relation to your understanding of and use of feedback *

Your answer

4. B) Did this have any on influence your understanding of what good performance is, and your ability to set and reach goals, and measure achievement in your work? *

Your answer

4. C) Why? *

Your answer

Figure 4. Semi-structured Interview Questions

Interview questions for Dialogic Screencast Study

1. Can you explain the process of how you engaged with and used feedback, and applied it to your learning and drafting process throughout the course?
2. Can you explain how you came to understand what a good essay is, and what good academic standards are?
3. Can you talk about your emotional journey regarding getting feedback and being motivated to use it and engage with it?
4. Can you tell me about how you self-assessed your work, set goals, checked you reached your goals and reflected on feedback and your learning process?
5. We used Google Docs and Screencasts for feedback in combination; did this influence your experience of feedback engagement in any way? Why/why not
6. Is there any process you went through in engaging with and using feedback that we haven't discussed, or is there anything else you would like to talk about?

Data Analysis

In week 12 (of 16), after summative feedback on the first essay, aligning with an interpretive orientation, data from student reflections and surveys (N=14) were printed and analysed by hand in a close reading process. These informed the study and provided contextual understanding to help ‘progressively focus’ (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2017) semi-structured interviews (N=13) held over the subsequent two weeks. Questions were designed to address areas of potential interest from analysis of the written data and to be broad, non-leading and exploratory regarding how learners understood standards, noticed the gap between current and target performance, set goals and whether there were emotional aspects of the experience.

To avoid the influence of preordinate themes in the data analysis process and to thoroughly engage with the data, an inductive thematic method was chosen based on Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-stage approach. In following the approach, I first became familiar with the data, transcribed, and analysed the interview, then the survey and reflection data in separate NVivo 11 files to allow methodological triangulation, deriving numerous codes from each which were consistent throughout the two data sets. Codes were then reviewed and refined into themes through several iterative cycles. Finally, Google Doc data were used to verify and exemplify participant accounts and provide insight into actual uptake behaviours.

Results

Three main themes were derived from the thematic analysis of the reflection survey and interview data, answering the research question by providing evidence that:

1. Screencast feedback enhanced understanding of feedback and helped learners understand standards, current performance, and set feedback enactment goals.
2. Dialogic screencasting using Google Docs allowed students to request feedback and elicit additional information to bolster understanding, build on feedback, challenge or enact it in an agentic process. Technological mediation appeared to increase convenience and willingness to engage in further feedback seeking and uptake-oriented dialogues with the provider.
3. Screencasts inspired trust in a pedagogic alliance and motivated learners to engage with and enact feedback as a relational pedagogy, as did creating a 'safe space' for learning from mistakes.

Theme 1: Screencast feedback quality, quantity and context aided feedback use

In the most prevalent theme derived from the data analysis process, all respondents (in 29 excerpts) reported that screencast feedback increased the clarity and depth of the feedback. Participants reported that the additional context and directive aspects of the feedback helped them to understand and use it. Screencasts also enabled the feedback provider to visually show assessment criteria and exemplar essays in the videos, which aided their self-assessment and comparison processes (Nicol, 2021). All of this reportedly helped learners understand what a good essay is (standards), how their work fell short (current performance) as well as how the work could be improved (setting goals).

To provide context for this theme, participants first pointed out that in previous experiences of feedback, it was a 'red pen, like a little scribble' and that they 'don't get the context' and that this makes it 'hard to draw a connection between them and integrate

them smoothly into the essay' (Grace interview). However, participants also pointed out that screencast feedback better communicated this missing information in comparison with text feedback:

'you can underline a certain line that I wrote in the sentence, and can give context and thoughts in more detail' (Grace interview).

Indeed, the ability of the screencast video to highlight aspects of the text with cursor, as well as the additional words it afforded, seemed to enable participants to 'connect' the feedback with the parts of the essay they referred to:

Loom (screencast feedback) helps me to see where exactly I made errors, what parts of the writing contribute to form that sort of impression (Grace reflection)

Using Loom made it easier to understand the teacher's comments, and the most important thing is that I could connect the suggestions. It made it easier to get what the teacher was thinking. (Survey 1)

Due to this detail, context, and ability to connect the feedback to their work, participants believed that the screencast feedback they received helped them understand not only 'what' but also 'why' they needed to improve and how they could do so:

After watching and taking notes on areas I need to change to improve my coherence/cohesion, I understood my weaknesses and HOW I could change it.

This is super important because many times, students are told “you need to fix this part” but not “how” or any suggestions regarding it. (Judy reflection)

Because Loom feedback gave me a clearer direction on what I was supposed to fix and focus on for my next draft, it was easier to set goals. (Survey 10)

In addition, participants reported that the ability of screencasts to discuss achievement visually against assessment criteria made it easier to understand current achievement:

Because the class had clear marking criteria for the essay, and with the video, I could easily understand how my essay was. (Survey 11)

While the ability to use an exemplar essay to offer a visual comparison and example of how an essay could improve also reportedly helped students to use their feedback:

Loom can show what is wrong, why it’s wrong, and how to improve. It will be better to do like this or suggest the other’s essay with the monitor. (Survey 13)

Participants also pointed out that the screencast feedback ‘imitated face-to-face feedback’ and conveyed additional meaning through voice tone (survey 8). Rewatching the feedback (Kevin Interview) and watching at different speeds (Kylie Interview) may also have positively influenced the ability to use feedback to set enactment goals.

However, one participant also pointed out that the length of the screencast feedback made it harder to re-access and that screencast feedback can be more emotionally

challenging, and less organised than paper feedback (Haeley interview). Thus, the medium may present risks as well as opportunities that should not be ignored.

Discussion of theme 1:

Overall, the data in this theme inform the research question by providing evidence that the screencasts were perceived to be higher in detail, quality, and quantity (see Mahoney, Macfarlane, and Ajjawi, 2019) and included other helpful cues such as mouse movements and vocal inflexion. This is also because the medium affords other enhancements, such as making a visual comparison with an exemplar and assessment criteria, which has also been reported in other studies (Henderson and Phillips, 2015; Mayhew, 2017). It also seemed that the ability to view the feedback multiple times or at different speeds may enhance these processes. Overall, these factors reportedly made it easier to engage with, understand and implement than written feedback alone, as reported by Cavaleri et al. (2019).

The data also substantiate an aspect of the claimed contribution of this article that screencast feedback can enhance the process of understanding feedback and how it connects to their work (current performance), why their work needs to improve (standards and target performance), and how it could be used to set enactment goals (Winstone et al. 2017a; Wood, 2021). This was considered to aid the uptake of the feedback information, aligning with the inconclusive findings of Lamey (2015), Henderson and Phillips (2015), and Edwards, Dujardin, and Williams (2012) that screencast feedback can better support the provision of feedback enactment-oriented feedback.

Theme 2: Technology-mediated Dialogues Contributed to Agentic Uptake

Despite the reported advantages of the screencast medium for providing clear, usable feedback, participants reported that viewing the screencasts did not always result in an understanding of how to improve. However, initiating dialogues and asking further questions reportedly facilitated participants' ability to understand, engage with and enact feedback. Documentary evidence revealed that participants made eight types of feedback requests, including initial feedback requests and questions regarding changes made after teacher feedback. According to the documentary data, all of the questions participants asked within Google Drive resulted in demonstrable feedback uptake (see figures 12 and 13). The technology's perceived informality, low imposition, and convenience also encouraged willingness to ask questions.

First, with teacher encouragement, students demonstrated reflectivity in making initial feedback requests on the Google Doc. Some students requested feedback at the foot of the Google Doc, (see figure 5).

Figure 5: Feedback request at the start of a Google Doc and as a comment (below)

To what extent should the government impose health-related food tax?


Advanced English: Academic Writing

Parts I need teacher feedback(or just feedback) on:

1. Overall logic/flow/is my essay appropriately answering my question?
2. the logic in the first aspect(third paragraph): There were some concerns from peer feedback that it does not refute the counter-argument well. Although I revised it to make it more logical, it still seemed to have problems. I want to know what you think about the logic here!
3. Any other part that needs feedback


<https://www.loom.com/share/31db693d57cc4192bb3962e35ae42aa2>

Public health is an area of increasing concern regarding government policy. **Obesity rates have risen (WHO, 2016)** and there have been increasing demands for public health interventions (WHO, 2018), but existing resources and policies are not enough. Consequently, there has been ongoing controversy as to whether **the government** should impose health-related food taxes. This



Others made requests within the context of specific highlighted sections of texts (see figure 6). This also demonstrates a potential advantage of using Google Docs for feedback requests as opposed to an interactive cover sheet (see Winstone and Carless, 2019) which would not allow the highlighting of a particular section of text to provide context for the process of initiating and answering questions.

Figure 6: Reflective initial feedback request about a specific problem



Furthermore, participants pointed out that they initiated dialogues with the teacher after feedback when noticing something they could not understand or apply:


If I did not understand something in the video, I could go to Drive and leave a comment (tag the teacher) asking for further clarification. (survey 10)

At first, I felt huge confusion because I couldn't understand what was said in the

feedback video fully. This led me to question things I didn't get, and during the process, my confusion went away a great deal. (Kylie reflection)


Dialogues were also initiated when participants were unsure of how to enact feedback or when considering making new changes (see figure 7).

Figure 7: Student' tags the teacher' to clarify how to enact screencast feedback



Participants also initiated dialogues to check new plans (see figure 8 left) and after creating new sections to ensure they were on the right track (see figure 8 right).

Figure 8. Participants elicit feedback on changes to make and changes after feedback.




After receiving feedback, some participants disagreed with the feedback and decided to question or challenge it, to understand why or if it should be enacted (see figures 9 and 10). In doing so, they appeared to position themselves as the primary agent in the

feedback uptake process, taking responsibility for understanding the feedback before attempting to use it, rather than blindly applying feedback they did not agree with or understand:

After I get teacher feedback, I try to compare it to my understanding ...if I find something that I disagree with, I try to think of why. Then I raise a question. If the explanation is reasonable enough for me, I understand why, and I find some points that I can work on. (Kylie interview)

A related strategy to questioning was attempting to justify arguments or original content decisions so they could clarify what they were trying to say (see figure 9):


Figure 9. A student attempts to question feedback by justifying the original argument



In addition to questions, participants also challenged or rejected feedback, which again demonstrates their agentic self-positioning. This was also exhibited in the Google Drive data. In the example below (Figure 10), one student rejects feedback (which I accepted), while another challenges a recommendation (which led to further clarification and learner acceptance).



Figure 10. Students reject and challenge screencast feedback.



In interview, the same student elaborated on her choice to challenge the feedback rather than ignore or apply it without understanding it. She explained that the strategy allowed her 'seek the truth', which suggests a highly agentic self-positioning in the learning from feedback process.

Either because I did not understand it or because I did not agree with the feedback, I tried to argue with the feedback to seek the truth. (Tonya interview)


This except also suggests that without asking the question, the feedback may have been followed but not understood, implying uptake but not learning, or ignored. This may signal a broader problem in higher education contexts in which further opportunities for clarifying the meaning of feedback are seldom offered. Other students also reported 'refuting', 'discussing' or reflecting on and developing the feedback, suggesting that dialogues assisted in the negotiation of meaning and co-construction of actionable feedback.

‘Through dialogue with the teacher, I could reflect on and develop the feedback and eventually improve my writing’ (survey 7).

Another participant also suggested that this ‘room for discussion’ offered by the technological mediation made it possible to ‘extend and apply’ this learning to her ‘actual writing’ (Grace reflection). This evidence suggests that in some cases, an intermediary dialogic process between teacher feedback and enactment was required before feedback could be enacted or contribute to learning.


Other dialogues were initiated to discuss technical questions such as citation rules or choices about content that participants were still uncertain of when handing in their drafts (see figure 11)

Figure 11. Feedback Requests on technical or content issues.



Participants also initiated questions when groups of peers were discussing feedback and could not resolve a problem together (see figure 12):

Figure 12. Participants ‘tag the teacher’ with a peer discussion generated question about academic practice



Overall, throughout the essay, the 14 participants asked 25 questions, a mean of 1.8 per student (a mode of 2); however, five students asked no questions. In formative cases, the dialogues led to improvements in the learners' texts, and I estimate that answering the questions took an additional 1 to 2 hours of teacher time for the group of 14 students. Interestingly, although the class was for non-native speakers, no questions were asked to about language. Instead, teacher questions focused on issues learners seemed to find more challenging to solve individually or with peers.

The data also suggest that the provision of communication methods perceived as informal or low imposition on the feedback provider (i.e., Google Doc comments) may have also increased participants' willingness to engage in feedback uptake-oriented dialogues with the educator:

Instead of writing an email, using @jameswoodsnu@gmail.com on a doc made it feel less formal, so I was more comfortable asking the teacher. (survey 10)

If I use email, if it feels more formal to me, so I feel more reluctant to send an email, but then if you do it on Google docs, it feels more casual, so you're more willing to send a comment or remark. (Holly interview)

Participants explained that this increased willingness to interact with the teacher compared to email because such comments ‘bothered people less’ (Holly, interview). Similarly, another participant felt that emails might be ‘annoying’ and thus, a more ‘informal way of communicating with the teacher was helpful’. According to this account, the effect of this informality was to increase willingness to engage in feedback dialogue:

when you’re in doubt, you usually end up asking, whereas, if there were no such means, when you’re in doubt, you most likely do not ask. (Judy, interview)

In addition, participants indicated that the rich context afforded by Google Doc dialogues encouraged further questions because the technology provided context:

It made the question clearer and more straightforward, so I would be more likely to ask questions. By Google Doc, I can easily immerse myself and feedback-giver into my writing, with no necessity to repeat the writing. (Tonya, interview)

Participants also reported that using the technology-mediated dialogues lowered logistical and affective barriers to communication:

Google Drive allowed us to easily access teacher's help or opinions by tagging the teacher in our comments (no need to look for the teacher face-to-face).
(survey 10).

Also, it may be uncomfortable to get feedback face-to-face, which might make students hesitate about getting feedback. (Survey 3)

Discussion of theme 2:

As described in theme 1, for feedback to be effective, a rich understanding of the standards, how current performance falls short and how this gap can be bridged (Sadler, 1989) is needed. Data in the second theme inform the research question and the key conceptual contribution of the article by illustrating that technology-mediated dialogues can enhance learners' ability to seek feedback, elicit additional information, challenge, or question feedback to better understand and use it to set and achieve enactment goals. Data from the participants illustrate that, at times, the use of feedback was contingent on interpretations and decisions which were 'developed through dialogue, sense-making and...co-construction', aligning with the socio-constructivist underpinnings of the concepts of feedback uptake and literacy (Carless and Boud, 2018, 1316).

Evidence suggests that dialogues between the feedback provider and recipients helped participants overcome the barriers to feedback uptake of not understanding or knowing what to do with feedback (Winstone et al. 2017b). This is significant because although dialogue underpins socio-constructivist conceptualisations of feedback in the 'new paradigm' (Carless, 2015; Carless and Winstone, 2019), there have been relatively few successful empirical examples illustrating how bi-directional dialogues support feedback uptake in the literature. These findings represent the first evidence of the provision of technology-mediated dialogues with the teacher supporting participants' agentic positioning and uptake of screencast feedback within a 'new paradigm' approach. This has important implications for improving the practice of screencast feedback within higher education more generally.

Data analysis also provides a non-exhaustive taxonomy of eight reasons for initiating dialogues or seeking further feedback (Joughin *et al.*, 2021) to self and co-regulate within uptake processes. These include initial feedback requests, clarifying understanding, seeking reassurance, checking improvements, challenging or rejecting feedback, justifying, asking technical or content questions, and adjudicating or assisting peer feedback uptake processes (see Wood, 2021). This also elucidates the processes learners undergo in engaging with, learning from and using feedback. It also illustrates that rather than simply imposing an additional burden on educators, opportunities for further dialogic co-regulation of all types of feedback through technological mediation may help make feedback processes more efficient by improving uptake and learning from feedback, while adding opportunities to repair understanding or fulfil the learning potential of feedback.

In initiating dialogues, learners also demonstrated a highly agentic orientation, clearly positioning themselves as the key agents responsible for regulating their own uptake process while seeking additional help when deemed necessary. This accords with current understandings of the agentic role of students within the evolving concept of feedback literacy (Molloy, Boud and Henderson, 2019; Joughlin *et al.* 2021). It also substantiates the argument that by inviting dialogue into the feedback uptake process through technology, it may be possible to open new spaces for dialogue and, with them, opportunities for collective self-reflection and decision making (Wegerif, 2022), that may not have been possible or practical without technological mediation.

Together these data suggest that complementing a socio-constructivist understanding of how students learn from feedback, the convenience in overcoming spatial and temporal

barriers, as well as the perceived power neutrality of the technological ‘space’ provided for feedback dialogues (Gravett and Winstone 2019), or the informal mechanism for requesting help, may have positively impacted participants’ agency to engage in feedback enactment-oriented dialogues. For this reason, the data suggest a potential explanatory role for social-material theory. From this perspective, feedback practices (and student engagement in general) are framed as being ‘entangled’ with ‘social, material, spatial and temporal actors’ (Gravett, 2020, 9). Data from this study provide empirical evidence that material factors such as technologies should not be considered a ‘neutral’ backdrop to communication, but instead, factors that can potentially serve or limit learner agency to engage (Tai *et al.*, 2021; Wood, 2022b) in feedback uptake-oriented self and co-regulative dialogues.

Theme 3: Screencasts Inspired Trust in a Pedagogic Alliance and Motivated Learners to Engage with and Enact Feedback as a relational pedagogy

To provide context for the final theme, first, participants disclosed that screencast feedback felt relational and was ‘connected’ (Judy Interview), ‘soothing’ and ‘less distant’ (Kylie interview) and ‘like I was one-on-one with you (Judy interview). One participant even felt that this provided a ‘sort of substitute for office hours’:

Without Loom, though, there will be a necessity for visiting or making appointments. I felt like I’m already having office hours. (Grace interview)

Overall, the data suggest that the practice of screencast feedback supported learners’ perceptions of connectedness with the teacher. When asked about any emotional impacts of engagement with feedback, many participants talked about previous negative experiences. For example, in the past, learners had only experienced summative feedback

and reported viewing the purpose of feedback as simply ‘justifying the grade’ (Jenny interview). Another participant disclosed a ‘fear’ of feedback (Kevin interview) which came from feeling helpless to implement it in future work:

so, getting feedback means getting evaluated or criticised...it was just like declaring that you’ve done wrong, or you have to fix this, but there was no chance to fix it. (Kevin interview)

However, participants disclosed how the screencast feedback ‘changed their attitude’ (Jane interview) towards feedback because they viewed it as part of a sincere and caring effort to help them to improve their work and learning. This perspective appeared to help position the practice as a relational and caring pedagogy and also motivated engagement as a form of reciprocation for perceived effort:

You can see the teacher made so much effort you feel like you need to reciprocate it. (Survey 2)

I am amazed and excited that I can have 20+ minutes of a PROFESSOR’s feedback. It seems rare that professors carefully read students’ papers, but going beyond, reading our papers carefully, you make these videos which I am so thankful for. It really motivates me to do better in my final draft knowing that you have chosen to give us a chance to improve our essays using the feedback.... (Survey 3)

In addition to enhancing perceptions of sincerity and trust, participants described feeling like they mattered to people who cared and spent time helping them:

...and it felt like my work really mattered to someone that really cared about it, you spent time on my work, for it to get better, I could feel that. (Judy interview)

Participants also described feeling that their work is seldom read carefully. Screencast feedback proves that the work is 'being respected' (Kevin interview):

I literally know that you've seen every sentence in my work, and you know, that makes me more, trusting. I can know, how much time you've took, and I know that you've seen every sentence... That gave me a, 'do I deserve this?'. Even in university, I haven't felt like getting this much affection. (Kevin interview)

13 out of 14 participants made extensive changes after formative feedback, many made notes on their Google Doc on what the screencast was telling them to change, made the change and then checked the changes were successful against the feedback as described below and illustrated in figure 13 and 14:

When watching it the first time, I made a brief note on specific time and what was talked about. Then I made changes based on it, then rewatched the video while looking at the document simultaneously so that I would not miss any point. (Jane reflection)

Figure 13. A student makes notes on Google Docs based on screencast

Another widespread argument supporters use to substantiate the use of MC items is based on the premise that MC questions can tap into higher-order level thinking, contrary to popular belief. According to Bloom's taxonomy, learning is divided into lower-level and higher-level thinking, with remembering and understanding making up the former and applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating comprising the latter. Proponents claim that although testing beyond the recognition of factual information is challenging, higher-order skills up to 'evaluating' can be assessed in MC items by methodical design (Buckles and Siegfried, 2006; Scully, 2017). However, one can argue that this only works to accentuate the format's limitation of not being able to include the highest-order level skill which is to 'create' (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001). In addition, the field of 'historical thinking' shows that despite careful question design, the level of cognitive demand a MC test requires lags behind what a performance-based or open-ended (OE) question elicits in a student. Multiple-choice items demand *convergent thinking*, a term coined by Guilford (1959), as "test takers converge on one correct answer from a bounded list of choices" (Smith, 2017). In contrast, performance-based assessment requires meta-cognition and engages students to go beyond reading comprehension to apply content differently from how it was presented in the textbook (Gray, 1993). To further validate this point, a study comparing behaviors of students and historians done by Wineburg (1991) has shown that although students were able to successfully interpret a historical text, they failed to question the trustworthiness of the facts presented as most historians did so. Such critical thinking behavior is what educators ultimately hope students to achieve. Notwithstanding the strengths of MC items, we can presume that the level of cognitive thinking choosing an answer from given alternatives requires still falls short of what a performance-based or OE question entails.

Lastly, it is also believed that multiple-choice exams are beneficial to both educators and learners because it argu objectively graded and quick to receive results (Lee, 2012; Go 2010). However, one must recognize that receiving grades immediately is not a form of helpful feedback. Feedback is essential because it helps learners "determine performance expectations, judge their level of understanding, [...] become aware of misconceptions [...] and provide clues about the best approaches for correcting mistakes" (Attali et al., 2016). Nonetheless, because many teachers re-use questions across semesters, "professors neither review the test in class nor return the tests to students", which prompts the vicious cycle of MC test-takers receiving nothing but their overall scores (Roediger & Marsh, 2005). On the other

perhaps introduce key people who state these arguments

This essay will argue that multiple-choice tests are not suitable

This essay argues that MC tests are not suitable in most educational contexts

Possibly they are not a bad thing when testing recall/check understanding, but whether it can be used to test material at the end of the course

awkward

rather than talking about proponents, focus on research

Some research has shown that...

clarify!
-so it is not strawman: clarify that this first sentence is a fact
-seems like roediger is proponent of MC by reading this first sentence but later on Roediger is citing evidence against!! so fix this

is this a fact that mc tests have this real ability.

Figure 14. The same paragraph (final draft) showing extensive improvements in line with feedback:

Another widespread argument used to substantiate the use of MC items is based on the premise that MC questions can tap into higher-order level thinking, contrary to popular belief. According to Bloom's taxonomy, learning can be divided into lower-level and higher-level thinking. Some researchers maintain that although testing beyond the recognition of factual information is challenging, higher-order skills such as 'evaluating' can be assessed in MC items by methodical design (Buckles and Siegfried, 2006; Scully, 2017; Croft et al., 2015). While it may be true to some extent that well-designed MC questions encourage complex thinking skills, there are limitations that follow when students are asked to select an answer rather than to generate it. In fact, several comparison studies (see Scouler, 1998; Thomas & Bain, 1984; Ramsden, 1988a) based on questionnaires issued to students note that even when tests were carefully constructed to avoid mere factual recall, students saw themselves as employing surface-learning approaches (mainly recall and reproduction) for MC tests "which they perceived as assessing knowledge-based intellectual processing" (Scouler, 1998). In contrast, students employed a deep-learning approach when preparing for OE tests "which they perceived as assessing higher levels of cognitive processing" (ibid.). This conveys the strong association between assessment format and level of critical thinking stimulated. Likewise, the field of 'historical thinking' shows that despite careful question design, the level of cognitive demand a MC test requires is limited because MC items demand 'convergent thinking'. This term, coined by Guilford (1959), describes how "test takers converge on one correct answer from a bounded list of choices" (Smith, 2017). Convergent thinking in MC tests is problematic because of its inadequacy in "measuring the ability to synthesize and evaluate information or apply knowledge to complex problems", and thus may be more suitable to "check on factual knowledge or routine procedures" (The National Center for Fair & Open Testing, 2007). Together these studies suggest that although meticulously designed MC tests can assess critical thinking skills to some degree, an OE exam is unparalleled for testing deeper-level thinking and metacognition in students.

In the final aspect of this theme, there was also evidence of the cumulative effect on the students' feedback receptivity of the teachers' attempt to create a conducive and 'safe atmosphere' for students to make mistakes, as well as the teacher's explicitly stated beliefs and attitudes regarding the efficacy of feedback:

I think the supervisor's attitude quite important, if the supervisor is reluctant about the idea that feedback is not helpful in learning, then the students will also be. (Survey 11)

I think the class environment was well-established to foster a very open (growth) mindset and positive climate of feedback. (Survey 6)

I knew it was safe, safeness was established because everyone was notified how important feedback is, and no one's in danger, I think you made it very clear to us that this is a whole process, and no one's gonna get penalised by making mistakes. (Judy Interview)

In interview, several students elaborated on this in more detail and claimed that the activities designed to scaffold receptivity to feedback (described in the procedure section) motivated them to continue through the feedback uptake process until a satisfactory result was achieved. These activities may have also supported willingness to engage in dialogic interaction with the teacher to better understand and use feedback:

We studied some theoretical backgrounds to why feedback is so important, which gave us reasons to motivate ourselves (Kylie Interview)

I think that (discussion to scaffold feedback receptivity) helped me not to give up and keep fixing my essay after feedbacks (Minseung Interview)

Discussion of theme 3:

The data in theme 3 provide evidence to inform the studies' research question and illustrate the proposed conceptual contribution. They also demonstrate that from an emotional perspective, screencast feedback represented more than the digital

'replacement' of written feedback (Pitt and Winstone, 2020) with additional quality detail and context. Participants also reported that the experience of screencast feedback felt like an in-person meeting and was potentially an acceptable substitute for office hours. While face-to-face meetings described by Hill and West (2020) achieved similarly positive results, face-to-face dialogic feedback is often not workload sustainable, as the authors note. In-person dialogic feedback meetings can also be underattended and may not result in a purposeful two-way dialogue that aids feedback uptake and learning from feedback (see Duncan, 2007; Gravett and Winstone, 2019). This may be due to the many social and material factors that may serve or hinder their success (Gravett, 2020; Tai et al. 2021). Technology-mediated dialogic screencast feedback may offer a workload sustainable alternative that can achieve similar results, increasing feedback efficiency by mediating opportunities for students to ask questions that can enhance uptake and learning. This may positively impact the cost-benefit of teacher-student feedback practices in higher education environments in which feedback is often wasted or underutilised (Price, Handley and Millar, 2011; Winstone et al. 2017a).

Significantly, participants in the present study revealed that screencast feedback was interpreted as an effortful and caring attempt to support learning and personal growth. This understanding reportedly motivated participants to reciprocate by engaging with and using their feedback. These results are similar to a study of online peer screencast feedback (Wood, 2022b), in which participants reported that peer screencast feedback encouraged a deeper appreciation of their peers' efforts in providing feedback, supported the development of reciprocal relationships and led to the formulation of an online learning community. The results of both studies suggest that screencasting can help learners view feedback as more of a partnership and less an act of judgement within a

relationship of unequal power (Gravett, 2020). The practices may also communicate that learners are engaged in an ‘educational alliance’ (Telio, Ajjawi and Regehr, 2015) with feedback providers. Such alliances may improve receptivity to engaging with future teacher feedback (Telio, Ajjawi and Regehr, 2015), as well as willingness to ask questions (Leighton and Bustos Gómez, 2018) and perhaps seek further feedback. The present study confirms this and suggests that learners can experience the provision of dialogic screencast feedback as a relational pedagogy that makes them feel that they matter to feedback providers (Gravett, Taylor and Fairchild, 2021). This is highly significant for students and educators in an era of seemingly increasing depersonalisation and commodification of higher education (Gravett and Winstone, 2020).

Participants also commented on the importance of positive teacher beliefs about the efficacy of feedback and establishing a ‘safe’ class environment that supports a ‘growth mindset’, and that encourages making and learning from mistakes. In several cases, they also reported that understanding how learning occurred from feedback motivated them to continue within the feedback uptake cycle (see Wood, 2021) until successful changes were made. In this sense, it is important to highlight that just as proposed in Wood, (2021), scaffolding for feedback receptivity may be required to foster full engagement with feedback and support engagement in feedback uptake-oriented dialogues with the teacher. Opportunities for engaging with exemplars, criteria and peer feedback, provided before teacher feedback, may also contribute to greater receptivity to teacher feedback and willingness to engage in further feedback seeking dialogues. Thus, the data suggest that participant enthusiasm for dialogic screencasting may be due to a combination of support for feedback receptivity together with dialogic screencast feedback, which may be seen as a more holistic and person-centred response to student learning (see Turnbull 2022).

The results also align with recommendations from work considering the impact of emotions in response to feedback (e.g. Hill et al., 2021) and with studies asserting the need for formal support for feedback literacy and receptivity early within education programmes (see Molloy, Boud and Henderson, 2020).

Limitations and Future Work

As this study has revealed, feedback uptake processes are mediated and influenced by various social and material entanglements. These also include the role of feedback dialogues and agency to take part in them and the characteristics of the context, provider, message, and receiver (Winstone et al. 2017a). These factors undoubtedly influenced this study and may also impact attempts to replicate findings. However, the goal of this paper has been to explore and illustrate the conceptual contribution in the form of a pilot study and, through it, invite readers to consider the extent to which findings resonate with their own experience and understanding and which may thus be ‘naturalistically generalisable’ or ‘transferable’ (Smith, 2018) to local contexts or larger-scale deployments.

It is important to remember that providing opportunities for in-person (see Duncan, 2007) or technology-mediated dialogues (see Filius *et al.*, 2018), can also fail to enhance feedback uptake processes. The use of technology is not being proffered here as a panacea for feedback uptake and learning issues. However, the evidence from this study suggests that judicious use, with holistic attention to scaffolding, receptivity and sociomaterial factors, can help educators support students within the feedback uptake and learning process in significant ways. Future work should attempt to ascertain the impact of dialogic screencasting practices on attainment, explore workload sustainability issues, how the practices can be scaled up to larger classes with less favourable staff-student ratios, and consider implications for training and technology acceptance in various contexts. Further

work should also examine the potential influence of practices to scaffold feedback receptivity and engagement in teacher-student or student-student feedback dialogues, as well as the impact of socio-material entanglements and their impact on feedback seeking, dialogues and the productive uptake of feedback.

Conclusion and Implications

By considering some of the existing literature on feedback uptake and screencast feedback, this paper has attempted to address some of the issues and gaps, the most pressing being the general positioning of screencast feedback as the ‘old paradigm’ ‘transmission’ of comments with little consideration of learners’ role in engaging with and using the feedback in the design or implementation of existing empirical studies. It has done this by conceptually positioning and deploying screencast feedback in a way that helps overcome barriers to students learning from and engaging with feedback, following formative and socio-constructivist ‘new paradigm’ (Winstone and Carless, 2019) principles.

The study has helped elucidate a non-exhaustive taxonomy of reasons students may wish to engage in dialogues with feedback providers, the types of conversations students and teachers have when reflecting on and co-constructing action on feedback, and the roles these can play in learning from and using feedback. The findings illustrate the importance of additional factors that come into play in serving (or potentially limiting) engagement in student-teacher dialogues and uptake processes that may be further elucidated utilising an additional sociomaterial lens (see Wood, 2022b) or by considering the role of methods to support greater receptivity to feedback. It has also shown how dialogic screencast feedback can be perceived as a relational strategy that promotes motivation and agency to engage with teacher feedback.

The findings also demonstrate that it is possible to deploy dialogic screencasting using straightforward and convenient technologies. In comparison to face to face meetings (see Hill and West, 2021), it can also do so in a potentially scalable and workload-sustainable manner. Thus, the practice may offer a potentially worthwhile trade-off between the additional resources needed to handle additional student questions, efficiency gains in learning from feedback, and greater satisfaction with the quality, communicative and relational aspects of the feedback experience. This is especially significant considering students' comparative dissatisfaction with assessment and feedback in global higher education environments (Winstone and Boud, 2020; Wood, 2021), and the ongoing need to improve in these areas of practice.

Acknowledgements:

I acknowledge that this paper is adapted from my doctoral thesis with institutional ethical approval number (UCL-IOE: Z6364106/2017/12/62), local permissions and the informed consent of the participants.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author

8,423 words

References

- Ajjawi, R. and Boud, D. (2017) 'Researching feedback dialogue: an interactional analysis approach', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, 42(2), pp. 252–265. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1102863.
- Anson, C. M. *et al.* (2016) 'Students' Perceptions of Oral Screencast Responses to Their Writing: Exploring Digitally Mediated Identities', *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*. SAGE Publications Inc, 30(3), pp. 378–411. doi: 10.1177/1050651916636424.
- Boud, D. and Molloy, E. (2013) 'Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), pp. 698–712. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2012.691462.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology', *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp. 77–101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.
- Carless, D. (2015) *Excellence in university assessment: Learning from award-winning practice*. Routledge.
- Carless, D. and Boud, D. (2018) 'The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, 43(8), pp. 1315–1325. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354.
- Carless, D. and Winstone, N. (2020) 'Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy', *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372.
- Cavaleri, M. *et al.* (2019) 'How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support', *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 16(4).
- Cheng, D. and Li, M. (2020) 'Screencast Video Feedback in Online TESOL Classes', *Computers and Composition*. Elsevier Ltd, 58, p. 102612. doi:

10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>

Crook, A. *et al.* (2012) ‘The use of video technology for providing feedback to students: Can it enhance the feedback experience for staff and students?’, *Computers & Education*. Elsevier, 58(1), pp. 386–396.

Crowe, S. *et al.* (2011) ‘The case study approach’, *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 11(1), p. 100. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-11-100.

Dawson, P. *et al.* (2018) ‘Technology and feedback design’, *Learning, design, and technology*. Springer International Publishing.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2017) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage publications.

Duncan, N. (2007) ‘“Feed-forward”: improving students’ use of tutors’ comments’, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Taylor & Francis, 32(3), pp. 271–283.

Edwards, K., Dujardin, A.-F. and Williams, N. (2012) ‘Screencast feedback for essays on a distance learning MA in professional communication’, *Journal of Academic Writing*, 2(1), pp. 95–126.

Emirbayer, M. and Mische, A. (1998) ‘What is agency?’, *American journal of sociology*. The University of Chicago Press, 103(4), pp. 962–1023.

Fernández-Toro, M. and Furnborough, C. (2014) *Feedback on feedback: Eliciting learners’ responses to written feedback through student-generated screencasts*, *Educational Media International*. doi: 10.1080/09523987.2014.889401.

Filius, R. M. *et al.* (2018) ‘Strengthening dialogic peer feedback aiming for deep learning in SPOCs’, *Computers & Education*. Pergamon, 125, pp. 86–100. doi: 10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2018.06.004.

Gould, J. and Day, P. (2013) 'Hearing you loud and clear: student perspectives of audio feedback in higher education', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.

Routledge, 38(5), pp. 554–566. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2012.660131.

Gravett, K. (2020) 'Feedback literacies as sociomaterial practice', *Critical Studies in Education*. Routledge. doi: 10.1080/17508487.2020.1747099.

Gravett, K., Taylor, C. A. and Fairchild, N. (2021) 'Pedagogies of mattering: re-conceptualising relational pedagogies in higher education', *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge, pp. 1–16. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2021.1989580.

Gravett, K. and Winstone, N. E. (2020) 'Making connections: authenticity and alienation within students' relationships in higher education', *Higher Education Research & Development*. Routledge, pp. 1–15. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2020.1842335.

Grigoryan, A. (2017) 'Feedback 2.0 in online writing instruction: Combining audio-visual and text-based commentary to enhance student revision and writing competency', *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*. Springer, 29(3), pp. 451–476.

Harper, F., Green, H. and 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*. Routledge, 46(3), pp. 277–292. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2015.1061586.

Henderson, M. and Phillips, M. (2015) 'Video-based feedback on student assessment: Scarily personal', *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(1).

Hill, J. *et al.* (2021) 'Pedagogic partnership in higher education: encountering emotion in learning and enhancing student wellbeing', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. Routledge, 45(2), pp. 167–185. doi: 10.1080/03098265.2019.1661366.

Hill, J. and West, H. (2021) 'Improving the student learning experience through dialogic feed-forward assessment', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.

- Routledge, 45(1), pp. 82–97. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2019.1608908.
- Joughin, G. *et al.* (2021) ‘What can higher education learn from feedback seeking behaviour in organisations? Implications for feedback literacy’, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, 46(1), pp. 80–91. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1733491.
- Lamey, A. (2015) ‘Video feedback in philosophy’, *Metaphilosophy*. Wiley Online Library, 46(4–5), pp. 691–702.
- Leighton, J. P. and Bustos Gómez, M. C. (2018) ‘A pedagogical alliance for trust, wellbeing and the identification of errors for learning and formative assessment’, *Educational Psychology*. Taylor & Francis, 38(3), pp. 381–406.
- Lowenthal, P. R. *et al.* (2020) ‘Thinking Beyond Zoom: Using Asynchronous Video to Maintain Connection and Engagement During the COVID-19 Pandemic’, *Jl. of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), pp. 383–391. Available at: <https://www.marcopolo.me> (Accessed: 22 October 2020).
- Lowenthal, P. R. (2021) ‘Video feedback: is it worth the effort? A response to Borup *et al.*’, *Educational Technology Research and Development*. Springer, 69(1), pp. 127–131. doi: 10.1007/s11423-020-09872-4.
- Lowenthal, P. R. and Dennen, V. P. (2017) ‘Social presence, identity, and online learning: research development and needs’, *Distance Education*. Routledge, 38(2), pp. 137–140. doi: 10.1080/01587919.2017.1335172.
- Mahoney, P., Macfarlane, S. and Ajjawi, R. (2019) ‘A qualitative synthesis of video feedback in higher education’, *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge, 24(2), pp. 157–179. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2018.1471457.
- Marshall, D. T., Love, S. M. and 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), p. 10.
- Mayhew, E. (2017) 'playback feedback: the impact of screen-captured video feedback on student satisfaction, learning and attainment', *European Political Science*, 16(2), pp. 179–192. doi: 10.1057/eps.2015.102.
- Molloy, E., Boud, D. and Henderson, M. (2020) 'Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, 45(4), pp. 527–540. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955.
- Nicol, D. (2021) 'The power of internal feedback: exploiting natural comparison processes', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(5), pp. 756–778. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1823314.
- Nieminen, J. H. *et al.* (2021) 'Student agency in feedback: beyond the individual', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, pp. 1–14. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2021.1887080.
- Orlando, J. (2016) 'A Comparison of Text, Voice, and Screencasting Feedback to Online Students', *American Journal of Distance Education*. Routledge, 30(3), pp. 156–166. doi: 10.1080/08923647.2016.1187472.
- Penn, S. and 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. doi: 10.18848/1835-9795/CGP/v15i02/1-18.
- Pitt, E. and Winstone, N. (2020) 'Towards Technology Enhanced Dialogic Feedback BT - Re-imagining University Assessment in a Digital World', in Bearman, M. *et al.* (eds). Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 79–94. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-41956-1_7.
- Price, M., Handley, K. and Millar, J. (2011) 'Feedback: Focusing attention on

engagement’, *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(8), pp. 879–896. doi:

10.1080/03075079.2010.483513.

Rejón-Guardia, F., Polo-Peña, A. I. and Maraver-Tarifa, G. (2020) ‘The acceptance of a personal learning environment based on Google apps: the role of subjective norms and social image’, *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*. Springer, 32(2), pp. 203–233. doi: 10.1007/s12528-019-09206-1.

Ryan, T. (2021) ‘Designing video feedback to support the socioemotional aspects of online learning’, *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(1), pp. 137–140. doi: 10.1007/s11423-020-09918-7.

Sadler, D. R. (1989) ‘Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems’, *Instructional Science*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 18(2), pp. 119–144. doi: 10.1007/BF00117714.

Smith, B. (2018) ‘Generalizability in qualitative research: misunderstandings, opportunities and recommendations for the sport and exercise sciences’, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*. Routledge, 10(1), pp. 137–149. doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2017.1393221.

Tai, J. *et al.* (2018) ‘Developing evaluative judgement: enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work’, *Higher Education*. Springer Netherlands, 76(3), pp. 467–481. doi: 10.1007/s10734-017-0220-3.

Tai, J. *et al.* (2021) ‘Exploring the notion of teacher feedback literacies through the theory of practice architectures’, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2021.1948967.

Telio, S., Ajjawi, R. and Regehr, G. (2015) ‘The “educational Alliance” as a Framework for Reconceptualizing Feedback in Medical Education’, *Academic Medicine*. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, 90(5), pp. 609–614. doi:

10.1097/ACM.0000000000000560.

Thomas, R. A., West, R. E. and Borup, J. (2017) ‘An analysis of instructor social presence in online text and asynchronous video feedback comments’, *The Internet and Higher Education*. Elsevier, 33, pp. 61–73.

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.

Torres, J. T. (2022) ‘Feedback as Open-Ended Conversation: Inviting Students to Co-Regulate and Metacognitively Reflect During Assessment’, *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 22(1 SE-Articles). doi: 10.14434/josotl.v22i1.31232.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 16(10), 837-851.

Twining, P. *et al.* (2017) ‘Some guidance on conducting and reporting qualitative studies’, *Computers & Education*, 106, pp. A1–A9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.12.002>.

Vincelette, E. J. and Bostic, T. (2013) ‘Show and tell: Student and instructor perceptions of screencast assessment’, *Assessing Writing*. JAI, 18(4), pp. 257–277. doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2013.08.001.

Vygotsky, Lev. 1978. “Interaction between Learning and Development.” *Readings on the Development of Children* 23 (3): 34–41

Wegerif, R. (2022) ‘9. Beyond Democracy: Education as Design for Dialogue’, in Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill | mentis, pp. 157–179. doi: https://doi.org/10.30965/9783969752548_010.

West, J. and Turner, W. (2016) ‘Enhancing the assessment experience: improving student perceptions, engagement and understanding using online video feedback’, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. Routledge, 53(4), pp. 400–410.

doi: 10.1080/14703297.2014.1003954.

Winstone, N. *et al.* (2020) “‘Check the grade, log out’”: students’ engagement with feedback in learning management systems’, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge, pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1787331.

Winstone, N. and Carless, D. (2019) *Designing effective feedback processes in higher education: A learning-focused approach*. Routledge.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., *et al.* (2017b) “‘It’d be useful, but I wouldn’t use it’”: barriers to university students’ feedback seeking and recipience’, *Studies in Higher Education*. Routledge, 42(11), pp. 2026–2041. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032.

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., *et al.* (2017a) ‘Supporting Learners’ Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes’, *Educational Psychologist*. Routledge, pp. 17–37. doi: 10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538.

Winstone, N. E. and Boud, D. (2022) ‘The need to disentangle assessment and feedback in higher education’, *Studies in Higher Education*. Routledge, 47(3), pp. 656–667. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2020.1779687.

Wood, J. (2021) ‘A dialogic technology-mediated model of feedback uptake and literacy’, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, pp. 1–18. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1852174.

Wood, J. (2022a) ‘Making peer feedback work: the contribution of technology-mediated dialogic peer feedback to feedback uptake and literacy’, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Routledge. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2021.1914544.

Wood, James M (2022b) ‘Supporting the uptake process with dialogic peer screencast feedback: a sociomaterial perspective’, *Teaching in Higher Education*. Routledge, pp.

1–23. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2022.2042243.

Yiğit, M. F. and Seferoğlu, S. S. (2021) 'Effect of video feedback on students' feedback use in the online learning environment', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*. Routledge, pp. 1–11. doi: 10.1080/14703297.2021.1966489.