

Submissions Abstract Book - All Papers (Included Submissions)

0294

Enhancing the Peer Feedback Uptake Process Using Dialogic Screencasts: Enhanced Quality, Criticality and Emotional Support During Forced Online Teaching

James M. Wood¹

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

Research Domain: Learning, teaching and assessment (LTA)

Abstract:

Screencast feedback is generally considered to hold advantages over written feedback, yet peer screencast feedback remains underexplored. This study took an in-depth qualitative case study approach to help address this gap, investigating the use of dialogic peer screencast feedback over 16 weeks. Fourteen South Korean undergraduates were encouraged to produce peer screencast feedback on an essay and literature review. Comprehensive data from 7 students were examined and an in-depth interactive survey was administered and inductively analysed.

Screencast peer feedback was considered to offer enhanced quality and depth and enabled students to expand on written comments, focusing on 'global' aspects of the essay. The provision of peer screencast feedback, particularly the use of the camera for the feedback giver and the use of caring language, helped learners understand feedback and process the emotional impacts of feedback encouraging uptake of peer feedback. Implications for those working in forced online, online, and blended conditions are discussed.

Paper:

Engaging in peer feedback is thought to help learners develop their ability to make explicit comparisons (Nicol & McCallum, 2021) and evaluative judgments about what constitutes quality (Carless, 2020). However, technology-mediated dialogic peer feedback practices can also help learners better understand and co-create more actionable peer feedback overcoming logistical limitations and facilitating feedback uptake and literacy (Wood, 2021b). Similarly, screencast feedback may better facilitate feedback engagement and use because it is clearer and more explicit (Mahoney, et al. 2019), more workload sustainable and efficient (Dawson et al. 2018), and better enables uptake (Caveleri et al. 2019). Nevertheless, because many studies deploy screencast feedback as the one-way 'transmission' of feedback comments (Mahoney et al. 2018), this does little more than 'replicate' the provision of written feedback comments (Pitt & Winstone, 2019) within an obsolete feedback paradigm (see Carless, 2015). However, screencast feedback can be produced 'dialogically' using a cloud text editor for an extended discussion of what the feedback means and how it can be used. Such dialogic screencast feedback can help educators produce feedback that better enables understanding of standards and the gap between current and target performance while supporting learner agency through feedback uptake-orientated technology-mediated discussions (Wood, 2021a).

In recent years, there is a growing understanding that receiving peer feedback is often less effective than giving it (Carless, 2020). Learners may also be reluctant to utilise even high-quality feedback from peers (Winstone and Carless, 2019). However, few studies have been successful in developing the quality of peer feedback or the uptake process. Although teacher screencast feedback is generally considered to have considerable advantages over written feedback for uptake, in comparison, little has been written on the subject of peer screencast feedback. Preliminary studies show that it can be more effective in improving performance, making feedback easier to use, and fostering a sense of belonging (Ge, 2019). Thus, it is perceived more positively from an affective perspective (Walker, 2017). However, peer screencast feedback suffers from the same 'transmission' and 'replication' issues as teacher screencast feedback and positions peer feedback receivers as 'passive' in the feedback uptake process.

This study took an in-depth qualitative case study approach to help address and explore this gap, investigating the use of dialogic peer screencast feedback over a 16-week forced online semester. Fourteen undergraduates at Seoul National University were encouraged to produce peer screencast feedback on a discursive research essay and literature review. Seven students offered consent for their essay drafts (before peer feedback and after), reflective writing (mid-course), and screencast data to be used as data for analysis and triangulation, and an in-depth interactive survey (after grading had taken place) was administered.

Three themes were developed through inductive thematic analysis. Screencast peer feedback was generally considered higher quality, more in-depth, and enabled students to expand on Google Doc comments in greater detail. Participants also confirmed that in comparison to written feedback, peer screencast feedback supported feedback givers in focusing on 'global' aspects of the essay, such as argument and criticality. Conversely, written feedback (Google Drive comments) better facilitated feedback at the sentence level. This was also confirmed through analysis of the peer feedback videos and student drafts. Google Doc comments also enabled further recursive collaborative development of the feedback comments, including in many cases, up to the point at which successful changes were made. The provision of peer screencast feedback, particularly the use of the camera for the feedback giver encouragement and sensitivity to the feelings of feedback receivers, helped learners process and mitigate the emotional impact of peer screencast feedback. This also helped the group perceive themselves as collaborators and friends within a warm and caring learning community rather than competitors on an enforced grading curve. Continuing dialogic feedback reportedly fostered feelings of being cared for and aided the successful understanding and application of feedback.

These findings have important implications for instructors working in forced online, online and blended conditions and for instructors who want to provide a social, caring, and connected learning experience for students during the COVID-19 crisis. They also demonstrate how peer screencast feedback can be positioned for uptake within a potentially scalable feedback practice that emphasises the agency of the feedback receiver in eliciting additional information needed to understand and use peer feedback through technology-mediated dialogues. The findings also contribute to both theory and practice in the pursuit of enhanced peer feedback quality and uptake (i.e. Wood, 2021a) and the crucial but underexplored discussion of digital teacher feedback literacy.

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

Carless, D. (2020). From teacher transmission of information to student feedback literacy: Activating the learner role in feedback processes. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 1469787420945845.

Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Di Biase, B., & Power, C. (2019). How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 16(4), 6.

Dawson, P., Henderson, M., Ryan, T., Mahoney, P., Boud, D., Phillips, M., & Molloy, E. (2018). Technology and feedback design. *Learning, design, and technology*.

Ge, Z. (2019) Exploring the effect of video feedback from unknown peers on e-learners' English-Chinese translation performance, *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, DOI: [10.1080/09588221.2019.1677721](https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1677721)

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>

Nicol, D., & McCallum, S. (2021). Making internal feedback explicit: exploiting the multiple comparisons that occur during peer review. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-19.

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.

Shi, M. 2019. "The Effects of Class Size and Instructional Technology on Student Learning Performance." *The International Journal of Management Education* 17 (1): 130–138. doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2019.01.004.

Walker, A. S. (2017). I Hear What You're Saying: The Power of Screencasts in Peer-to-Peer Review. *Journal of Writing Analytics*, 1.

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

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)