

Submissions Abstract Book - All Papers (Included Submissions)

0291

Positioning Screencast Feedback for Uptake: The Benefits of Dialogic Screencasting for Understanding, Agency, and Motivation to Use Feedback

James M. Wood¹

¹*Seoul National University, Seoul, The Republic Of Korea*

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Abstract: Screencasting may facilitate feedback engagement because it is clearer, conveys more details, and better enables uptake. However, most studies deploy screencast feedback as ‘transmission’ of comments, neglecting the importance of student agency within the feedback uptake process. This study attempts to position screencast feedback for uptake conceptually by offering students a technology-mediated option to discuss feedback. The study took an in-depth qualitative case approach using reflections and surveys to focus interviews with 13 undergraduate students on an academic writing course in South Korea. Responding to Google Docs/screencast feedback on essays supported learner positioning as the primary agents within the feedback uptake process. Participants reported asking questions and challenging feedback to better understand and apply it. The perceived informality and context of the technology-mediated dialogues increased willingness to interact with the teacher. Screencasts were also perceived as an act of teacher care, which encouraged feedback engagement and uptake.

Paper:

Feedback must be used to close the gap between current and target performance (Sadler, 1989). However, evidence suggests that feedback is often not engaged with (Price et al. 2011), or in some cases, even accessed (Mensink & King, 2020). In addition, more scholarship has focused on what constitutes ‘good feedback’ from a ‘transmission perspective’ than on what influences how it is perceived, engaged with, and used by students (Winstone et al. 2017).

Screencast feedback, by which an educator can record their screen, voice, and sometimes camera, while offering feedback on a student essay, may better facilitate engagement because it is more explicit, conveys more details, and better enables goal setting and use. However, most studies deploy screencast feedback as the one-way ‘transmission’ of feedback comments (Mahoney et al. 2019). Thus, in many cases, screencast feedback does little more than ‘replace’ written feedback (Pitt & Winstone, 2020) and does not consider the importance of learner agency within the feedback uptake process. However, this presentation will argue that screencast feedback can be conceptually positioned for uptake using a cloud document editor such as Google Docs. This allows educators to

provide brief textual comments as they record and talk through feedback. At the same time, receivers can elicit additional information needed to understand and act on feedback, in cases where the 'transmission' of feedback information is not entirely successful. Further dialogue provides co-regulation (Wood, 2021a/b) as learners navigate feedback uptake processes, positions learners as the primary agents in the feedback uptake process, and can help realise a workload sustainable form of 'dialogic feedback' (Nicol, 2010).

This present study took an in-depth qualitative case study approach using reflections and surveys (N=28) to progressively focus interviews with 13 undergraduate students on an advanced academic writing course at a prestigious South Korean institution to illustrate, exemplify, and refine understanding of the conceptual contribution. All participants received a combination of screencast and Google Doc feedback on research essays. First, they were encouraged to initiate a 'feedback request' for teacher feedback using Google Doc comments on their draft. They then had the opportunity to ask additional questions through technology-mediated dialogues via Google Docs over a week.

Throughout the data, participants indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the screencast feedback. They reported that feedback was richer, clearer, and provided more context, better enabling goal setting, and use. The combination of Google Docs and screencasts enabled participants to elicit additional information, question and challenge feedback, supporting their positioning as the primary agents in the feedback uptake process. Google Docs provided a channel for dialogic feedback perceived as placing a low imposition on the feedback provider and convenient for feedback receivers. These factors reportedly increased participants' willingness to engage in feedback uptake-oriented dialogues with the feedback provider.

The findings show that although screencast feedback can improve understanding of current and target achievement and help learners to notice the gaps and use feedback, this one-way 'transmission' process can also fail. Where it fails, technology-mediated dialogues can enable learners to pursue understandings needed to act on feedback dialogically, supporting agentic orientation towards the feedback uptake process. Increased willingness to interact through technology streamlines the dialogic feedback communication process and provides a scalable and potentially workload sustainable method of supporting feedback uptake and learning through dialogic feedback. There is also evidence that screencast feedback increased trust in the educator by providing evidence that work was read thoroughly and 'respected'. It was also perceived as an act of educator 'care', and prompted learners to view feedback as part of an 'educational alliance' (Telio, Ajjawi, & Regehr, 2015) between themselves and the educator. This perception motivated participants to reciprocate by effortfully engaging with and attempting to use the feedback to improve their work. These findings illustrate how the one-way 'transmission' and 'replication' of screencast feedback noted in the literature can be solved.

As feedback satisfaction and uptake are ongoing global issues in higher education, the findings may have important implications for feedback practice during and after COVID-19. The findings also contribute to understanding digital teacher feedback literacy, an aspect of educator competence noted as critical in the assessment and feedback literature (Boud & Dawson, 2021), but remains underexplored. They also provide an exemplar and guidance for educators and help to evidence and refine the technology-mediated model of feedback uptake and literacy (Wood, 2021a), contributing

to both theory and practice in these areas.

References: Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2021). What feedback literate teachers do: an empirically-derived competency framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910928>

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

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

Mensink, P. J., & King, K. (2020). Student access of online feedback is modified by the availability of assessment marks, gender and academic performance. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 51(1), 10–22.

Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501-517.

Pitt E., Winstone N. (2020) Towards Technology Enhanced Dialogic Feedback. In: Bearman M., Dawson P., Ajjawi R., Tai J., Boud D. (eds) *Re-imagining University Assessment in a Digital World. The Enabling Power of Assessment*, vol 7. Springer, Cham.

Price, M., Handley, K., & Millar, J. (2011). Feedback: Focusing attention on engagement. *Studies in higher education*, 36(8), 879-896.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119–144.

Telio S, Ajjawi R, Regehr G. The "educational alliance" as a framework for reconceptualizing feedback in medical education. *Acad Med*. 2015 May;90(5):609-14. doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000000560. PMID: 25406607.

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

Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Parker, M., & Rowntree, J. (2017). Supporting Learners' Agentic Engagement With Feedback: A Systematic Review and a Taxonomy of Recipience Processes. *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 52, pp. 17–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2016.1207538>

Wood J. (2021a) A dialogic technology-mediated model of feedback uptake and literacy, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, DOI: [10.1080/02602938.2020.1852174](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1852174)

Wood, J. (2021b). Making peer feedback work: the contribution of technology-mediated dialogic peer feedback to feedback uptake and literacy, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, DOI: [10.1080/02602938.2021.1914544](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1914544)