JOURNAL OF CULTURAL ANALYSIS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change,
2025, 10(4), 4790-4803
ISSN: 2589-1316

Students' Engagement in Responding to Screencast Feedback during Thesis Writing

Mohammad Fatoni[1], Slamet Setiawan[2*], Ahmad Munir[3], Suhartono Suhartono[4]

[1,2,3,4]*Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia*

***Corresponding Author:** slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id

Citation: Fatoni, M., Setiawan, S., Munir, A. & Suhartono, S. (2026). Students' Engagement in Responding to Screencast Feedback during Thesis Writing, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 10(4), 4790-4803. https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.3927

Published: January 03, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study addresses the challenge of limited clarity, emotional support, and revision guidance often experienced by students during thesis writing, a process that requires sustained engagement with complex academic expectations. It examines how university students interact with screencast feedback while developing their theses, focusing on affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of engagement. Using a case study design, the research involved ten undergraduate students in an English education program who received screencast feedback from their supervisors. Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews exploring their emotional, cognitive, and behavioral responses. Thematic analysis was then employed to identify patterns across the data. Findings indicate that screencast feedback fostered positive affective engagement by enhancing enjoyment, reducing anxiety, and increasing motivation through its clear explanations and supportive tone. Cognitively, students demonstrated improved comprehension of revision points, stronger recognition of writing patterns, clearer visualization of corrections, and greater metacognitive monitoring supported by the ability to pause and replay feedback. Behaviorally, students engaged actively by rewatching segments, revising step by step, taking detailed notes, applying feedback beyond targeted sections, and verifying revisions through self-evaluation. The study highlights that screencast feedback promotes holistic engagement that strengthens emotional readiness, deepens cognitive processing, and encourages sustained revision practices in thesis writing, implying that its multimodal features can substantially enhance students' ability to manage complex academic writing tasks. The findings suggest that incorporating screencast feedback more systematically into supervisory practices may provide a valuable means of supporting students' development as autonomous academic writers.

Keywords: Screencast feedback, students' engagement, thesis writing, well-being

INTRODUCTION

Thesis writing places students in a demanding academic environment where they must navigate complex expectations related to structure, clarity, and disciplinary reasoning. As they draft and revise extended academic texts, students need to manage ideas, maintain coherence, and meet formal writing conventions, all while responding to academic requirements that evolve across stages of supervision. Such demands frequently lead students to depend on instructors' feedback to refine arguments and strengthen the overall quality of their writing. With the increasing integration of digital tools in academic supervision, alternative modes of providing comments have become more prominent. Among these emerging modes, screencast feedback stands out because it blends spoken explanation with visual cues, allowing supervisors to illustrate revision needs more directly. This combination supports students' meaning-making processes more fully and creates opportunities for clearer, more

connected interaction during writing development, especially when students engage with challenging academic tasks.

The rising expectations for strong academic writing in higher education have intensified the need for feedback that not only clarifies revision tasks but also helps students maintain motivation and emotional stability throughout the demanding process of thesis development. Many students struggle to interpret comments, especially when dealing with complex arguments, structural issues, or linguistic refinements that require repeated revisions. In such situations, a mode of feedback capable of sustaining interest, reducing uncertainty, and guiding attention toward specific writing concerns becomes essential for productive progress. Screencast feedback is increasingly recognized as such a mode because its combined verbal and visual features offer clearer explanations, more tangible demonstrations, and a sense of supportive presence. When students are able to listen to detailed commentary, observe highlighted sections, and revisit the feedback at their own pace, they may feel better oriented, more confident, and more consistently engaged in navigating the multifaceted demands of thesis writing.

Existing research highlights the growing effectiveness of screencast feedback in promoting engagement on cognitive, affective, and behavioral levels, helping learners understand revision expectations more clearly and complete revisions more efficiently (Cunningham, 2019; Tauchid et al., 2025). Its multimodal and personalized nature has also been shown to foster emotional involvement, boosting motivation, support, and satisfaction (Ali, 2016), while dialogically oriented screencast practices encourage more active interaction with feedback and strengthen students' sense of agency in managing revisions (Wood, 2023). However, little attention has been directed toward how students respond to this form of feedback specifically within the context of thesis writing, an extended academic endeavor that may shape learners' approaches in distinctive ways. Their processes of interpreting supervisors' screencast comments and translating them into concrete revisions remain underexplored. Therefore, this study seeks to explore the students' engagement in responding to screencast feedback in thesis writing.

Understanding how students respond to this form of digitally delivered guidance provides an opportunity to observe how they interpret supervisory explanations, regulate their revision strategies, and maintain emotional readiness across multiple stages of thesis development. Such understanding can enrich perspectives on academic writing by shedding light on how students negotiate meaning during extended writing tasks that require sustained focus and decision-making. These insights can also inform supervisory practices by illustrating how particular feedback features support deliberate revision, stronger ownership of writing decisions, and greater confidence in constructing well-reasoned arguments. At the same time, the findings may shape instructional approaches by encouraging educators to refine feedback strategies that are sensitive to students' developing needs, offering support that aligns with the complexity and evolving nature of the thesis-writing process.

This study contributes to discussions on technology-mediated feedback by presenting context-specific evidence from students' experiences in responding to supervisors' screencast comments during thesis development. It also intends to contribute to ongoing conversations about students' writing practices by highlighting how they draw upon feedback when navigating extended academic tasks that demand sustained engagement and consistent revision management. Furthermore, the findings are expected to contribute to instructional design by illustrating how screencast-based practices can be incorporated into supervisory routines to help students engage more reflectively and confidently with their writing. Through insights generated from this investigation, the study seeks to contribute to the refinement of academic support practices that more effectively assist students as they progress through the challenging stages of thesis writing. Hence, the research questions are formulated as follows:

1. How do university students engage affectively with screencast feedback during thesis writing?
2. How do university students engage cognitively with screencast feedback during thesis writing?
3. How do university students engage behaviorally with screencast feedback during thesis writing?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Screencast Feedback in Academic Writing

Screencast feedback has gained significant traction as an effective method for improving academic writing because it pairs visual demonstrations with verbal explanations, creating a richer and more interactive feedback experience. This multimodal format extends beyond the limitations of text-only feedback by capturing tone, emphasis, and direct authorial intent, making the guidance clearer and more meaningful for learners. As more institutions adopt digital learning environments, screencast feedback offers an adaptable tool that strengthens the clarity of instructional communication. The combination of narrated explanations and on-screen highlighting has positioned screencast feedback as a promising approach for helping students understand complex writing issues

that may otherwise be difficult to interpret in static comments. Such benefits align with findings by Wood (2023), who notes the growing acceptance of multimodal feedback in higher education, and Cheng (2020), who argue that visual-verbal synergy enhances comprehension. These features collectively contribute to a learning environment that supports deeper engagement with revision processes in academic writing contexts.

A growing body of literature underscores the pedagogical value of screencast feedback in cultivating self-regulated writing practices. Karagül and Şeker (2021) emphasize that screencasts foster students' autonomy by enabling them to revisit feedback as needed, promoting metacognitive awareness and encouraging independent decision-making in writing development. Their study reveals that students benefit from being able to pause, replay, and analyze feedback at their own pace, which aids in identifying specific areas requiring improvement. Similar results were documented by Wood (2024), who observed that digital replay functions enhance students' metacognitive monitoring. This capacity for targeted attention supports learners in establishing more focused trajectories for their revisions. Especially in online learning environments—where the absence of immediate face-to-face interaction may leave learners feeling isolated—screencast feedback offers a sense of presence and support that written comments alone often fail to deliver. This is echoed in Saeed (2024), who highlight the relational value of instructor voice.

The motivational benefits of screencast feedback also emerge prominently in the literature. Eak and Annamalai (2024) highlight that screencast feedback not only clarifies aspects of writing that require refinement but also contributes to sustaining students' engagement and emotional readiness. Their findings show that the conversational tone of narrated comments reduces anxiety, strengthens rapport between instructors and students, and encourages learners to persist with difficult tasks. These motivational gains correspond with the work of Payne (2022), who connect multimodal feedback with heightened learner persistence. In virtual learning contexts where disengagement and demotivation frequently arise, the personalized nature of screencasts acts as an important counterbalance. By bridging emotional and cognitive dimensions of learning, screencast feedback enhances students' readiness to engage in the demanding processes of academic writing.

Comparative studies have positioned screencast feedback as more effective than traditional text-based comments in promoting deeper student involvement. Penn (2022) report that students prefer the interactive nature of screencasts, noting that written comments often feel impersonal and may lack sufficient elaboration. Through blended visual and auditory cues, screencast feedback caters to diverse learning preferences and promotes stronger comprehension of revision expectations. Additional evidence from Bjerknes (2024) indicates that multimodal explanations improve students' retention of feedback points. This dynamic form of communication enables learners to better interpret complex instructions, reflect on identified weaknesses, and develop greater confidence in their writing. Such engagement demonstrates how technology-mediated feedback can bridge gaps in understanding and enhance writing quality, a point further reinforced by Imsa-ard (2022), who highlights increased depth of revision among students receiving screencast comments.

The advantages of screencast feedback also extend to skill development beyond academic writing, as demonstrated in discipline-specific studies. Jones and Wisniewski (2021) examined the use of screencast assignments among pharmacy students and found notable improvements in their literature searching abilities and professional readiness. Their findings signal the importance of integrating feedback tools that mirror real-world professional environments. Parallel findings from Pachuashvili (2024) show that students in engineering programs benefited similarly when screencast explanations were applied to technical problem-solving tasks. The alignment of screencast feedback with authentic tasks reflects broader shifts in education toward technology-enhanced assessment practices. This broader applicability positions screencast feedback as a versatile method capable of supporting diverse academic and professional competencies.

Despite its strengths, the use of screencast feedback presents challenges that educators must navigate, particularly in relation to technological proficiency and cognitive processing. Bonafini and Lee (2021) emphasize that many instructors struggle with the rapid shift to technology-intensive teaching. Inadequate training and unfamiliarity with digital tools create barriers to effective screencast implementation. Kueker and Moore (2023) further note that the cognitive load imposed by different technological environments influences how students absorb screencast information. Complementing these findings, Nicolás-Conesa (2024) argue that students' prior digital literacy significantly affects their ability to benefit from screencast-based guidance. Yahya et al. (2021) also highlight the need to consider psychological and technological diversity when designing feedback strategies. Addressing these barriers through targeted professional development and equitable access to resources is essential for maximizing the benefits of screencast feedback.

Overall, the literature positions screencast feedback as a transformative tool in academic writing instruction, capable of enhancing clarity, engagement, autonomy, and motivation among students. Its potential is evident across multiple dimensions, from improving revision literacy to strengthening emotional support and fostering disciplinary skill development. However, successful implementation requires acknowledging the technological and pedagogical challenges that accompany integration. As noted by Rayeji (2023), sustainable feedback practices must

balance innovation with accessibility, while Aguilera-Fuentes (2025) stresses the importance of institution-level support structures. Continued research is therefore critical to refining implementation strategies, ensuring that both instructors and students can fully benefit from the capabilities of screencast technologies as educational landscapes continue to evolve.

Student Engagement in Responding to Feedback

Student engagement in responding to feedback is a pivotal area of educational research, encompassing how learners interact with feedback throughout their writing processes. Recent literature indicates that diverse feedback practices significantly influence students' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement. Notably, the effectiveness of written corrective feedback—whether provided by teachers or automated systems—plays a critical role in shaping students' motivation and sustained participation in writing tasks. Afifi et al. (2023) emphasize that for feedback to be impactful, learners must actively engage with it. This assertion aligns with studies demonstrating that both the nature of feedback and learners' perceptions of it directly affect their writing performance and degree of engagement. Increasingly, research suggests that the reception of feedback is not passive; rather, it requires students to critically reflect on their work and adjust their efforts accordingly.

This engagement can be better understood through the lens of self-regulated learning (SRL). Zhou and Hiver (2022) and Fatoni et al. (2024) argue that self-regulated writing strategies serve as essential indicators of student engagement, as they encourage active participation in the learning process. In the absence of SRL strategies, students may exhibit disengagement behaviors that hinder writing development. The integration of SRL approaches fosters a deeper connection between feedback and engagement, highlighting the importance of helping learners cultivate self-management skills. Effective student engagement is therefore closely tied to instructional practices that emphasize strategic reflection and active involvement in the writing process.

The impact of technology on student engagement in writing feedback has also garnered increasing attention. Collaborative writing supported by social learning analytic tools offers innovative ways to boost engagement by enabling real-time interaction among peers. Chen et al. (2021) describe how these tools create opportunities for students to reflect on their collaborative processes, thereby enhancing engagement with both the task and their peers. The shift toward technology-enhanced learning environments—particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic—has introduced new challenges and opportunities in writing instruction. Aldaghri and Oraif (2022) note that although students recognize the advantages of online learning, many believe it cannot fully replicate the dynamics of face-to-face interaction. This insight underscores the importance of considering the context in which feedback is delivered, as it significantly shapes students' willingness to engage with it.

Pedagogical approaches further influence how students respond to feedback, with research indicating a shift from product-oriented to process- and genre-oriented methods in second-language (L2) writing instruction. Yu et al. (2020) demonstrate that such pedagogical orientations can enhance student motivation and engagement, suggesting that the instructional context around feedback meaningfully impacts learners' experiences. Similarly, Linuwih et al. (2024) report that student engagement with teacher-written feedback in online EFL settings involves cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions. This multifaceted understanding of engagement highlights the complexity of feedback reception and the need for educators to employ varied feedback strategies that address diverse learning preferences.

Reflective practices also play an important role in deepening student engagement with feedback. Zafeer et al. (2023) found that reflective journal writing during the pandemic provided students with a meaningful way to process their experiences, fostering independence and critical thinking. Students who engage in structured reflection on feedback are more likely to internalize what they have learned and apply it effectively in subsequent writing tasks. This underscores the importance of creating instructional environments that empower students to critically assess both their work and the feedback they receive, ultimately contributing to improved writing outcomes.

Understanding student engagement in responding to feedback requires a multifaceted perspective that integrates SRL strategies, technological innovations, pedagogical developments, and reflective practices. As research continues to expand, it becomes increasingly clear that fostering deep engagement with feedback is essential for improving students' literacy and writing skills across diverse educational contexts. Collectively, these studies underscore the value of a comprehensive understanding of engagement, enabling educators to refine their feedback practices and strengthen student learning outcomes.

METHOD

Research Design

This study adopted a case study design to provide an in-depth examination of students' engagement in responding to screencast feedback during the process of thesis writing. A case study approach was deemed appropriate because it allows for a detailed investigation of a particular phenomenon within its real-life context,

enabling the researcher to explore participants' experiences holistically. In this study, the phenomenon of interest—students' engagement with screencast feedback—occurs within an authentic academic environment where digital feedback practices have been integrated into supervisory routines. The design facilitated the exploration of multiple dimensions of engagement, including emotional reactions, cognitive processes, and observable revision behaviors. By capturing a rich and contextualized understanding of how students interpret, process, and apply feedback, the case study design supported the goal of uncovering nuanced insights that might not be visible through other research approaches. This design also enabled the researcher to integrate diverse data sources that, when triangulated, provided a comprehensive portrayal of the participants' learning experiences.

Participants and Setting

The study involved ten undergraduate students from a private university in East Java, Indonesia. All participants were enrolled in the English education department and were actively engaged in thesis writing at the time of the study. This stage of their academic journey was intentionally selected because it demands sustained interaction with feedback, substantial engagement in revision practices, and the application of advanced writing skills. The university setting was deemed particularly suitable because it has adopted screencast feedback as part of its supervision mechanism, providing a natural environment for examining how students respond to this digital feedback format. Participants were recruited voluntarily and represented different levels of academic writing proficiency, allowing the study to capture a range of experiences and responses to screencast feedback. The institutional context—characterized by active digital learning practices, online supervisory interactions, and technology-mediated communication—provided a realistic and meaningful backdrop for investigating students' engagement in thesis writing.

Research Instruments

Multiple instruments were employed to gather comprehensive data. Semi-structured interviews served as the primary tool for eliciting participants' perceptions, attitudes, and experiences with screencast feedback. The interview protocol (Table 1) was carefully constructed to explore affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of engagement, ensuring that students' responses captured not only what they did but also how and why they interpreted and acted on the feedback. In addition to interviews, text-based artifacts of students' thesis drafts before and after receiving screencast feedback were collected. These documents allowed the researcher to trace concrete evidence of revision practices, identify recurring patterns of improvement, and examine how feedback was translated into written changes. The combination of verbal data from interviews and written data from thesis drafts strengthened the study by providing complementary sources that enhanced interpretive depth.

Data Collection

Data collection involved a two-step process consisting of semi-structured interviews and text analysis. First, individual interviews were conducted with each participant, allowing the researcher to explore their experiences in depth. Interviews were carried out in a quiet academic setting and lasted approximately 30–45 minutes, ensuring that participants had sufficient time to elaborate on their perceptions, challenges, and revision strategies. Interview questions were designed to encourage reflective responses and to probe into the nuances of how students interpreted screencast feedback, managed their emotional, cognitive, and behavioral reactions, and navigated the revision process. Second, students' thesis drafts were collected both before and after the feedback episodes. The researcher examined these drafts to identify specific revisions made in response to the screencast comments, including corrections related to grammar, structure, coherence, and argumentation. This dual method of data collection allowed for triangulation and enhanced the credibility of the study's findings by linking participants' reported experiences with their actual writing practices.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consisted of two major stages: transcription and thematic coding. All interview sessions were transcribed verbatim to preserve the authenticity of participants' responses and ensure that their voices were represented accurately in the analysis. Transcripts were then reviewed repeatedly to become deeply familiar with the data. Thematic coding was applied to identify meaningful patterns across participants' experiences, with initial codes generated inductively from the data. These preliminary codes included recurring themes related to emotional responses, comprehension of feedback, and revision behaviors. Codes were then organized into broader categories aligned with the dimensions of engagement: affective, cognitive, and behavioral. Text-based analysis of participants' thesis drafts further enriched the coding process by providing tangible evidence of engagement, allowing the researcher to compare reported experiences with observable writing changes. This systematic and iterative process ensured that the final themes were grounded in the data and represented an accurate interpretation of participants' engagement with screencast feedback.

Table 1. Interview protocol

Dimensions of Engagement	Questions
Affective	1. What is your impression of the screencast feedback? 2. How do you think screencast feedback helped you compose the text with fewer errors? 3. Were you satisfied with the feedback? Why or why not?
Cognitive	4. How the learner detect screencast feedback, recognizes the teacher's corrective intention, and attends to linguistic accuracy? 5. How the learner successfully diagnoses the error, and is able to provide accurate metalinguistic explanations? 6. How are your strategies and skills to regulate your mental processes, practices, and emotional reactions?
Behavioral	7. How do you correct the errors on your writing? 8. What strategies do you take to enhance the accuracy of the draft, and/or to improve your writing pieces?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#RQ 1: How do university students engage affectively with screencast feedback during thesis writing?

The analysis showed that students engaged affectively with screencast feedback in ways that were more nuanced and emotionally positive than what they typically experienced with written comments. Many students described the feedback as enjoyable because the audio–visual format created a sense of presence, clarity, and interaction. The combination of spoken explanations and on-screen highlighting allowed students to feel as though the lecturer was accompanying them through the text, transforming feedback from a solitary task into a guided learning experience.

"I enjoyed listening because it felt like the lecturer was right there guiding me through each mistake." (S8)

"The moving cursor kept my attention. It felt like the lecturer was taking me on a tour of my own writing." (S4)

"I didn't get bored like I usually do with written comments. It felt interactive." (S1)

In addition to enjoyment, students highlighted that the screencast format helped reduce anxiety. Written feedback sometimes caused tension because it lacked emotional tone and could be read more harshly than intended. The audio component of screencasts conveyed the lecturer's tone—calm, supportive, and reassuring—which helped students feel less intimidated and more open to receiving criticism. Students also appreciated that the explanations in screencasts minimized the risk of misinterpreting comments, which is a common source of stress when dealing with complex revisions.

"I wasn't scared to open the feedback this time because I knew the lecturer's voice would help me understand the tone." (S2)

"Hearing the explanation made me feel calmer. Written comments sometimes make me panic." (S9)

"I used to worry I'd misunderstand what the lecturer meant, but the screencast removed that fear." (S10)

Relaxation was another strong affective response that emerged from the data. Students repeatedly mentioned how the ability to pause, rewind, and replay the screencast created a more relaxed environment for engaging with feedback. Unlike written comments, which sometimes felt dense or overwhelming, screencast feedback allowed students to break down explanations into manageable segments. They could revisit complicated parts without feeling embarrassed or pressured, which fostered a calm and reflective mental state while processing feedback.

"I felt more relaxed because I could take my time. I paused a lot and that helped me absorb everything." (S3)

"Replaying the difficult parts gave me space to breathe. I didn't feel rushed at all." (S6)

"It was comforting that I could watch the feedback whenever I felt ready mentally." (S1)

These affective benefits also strengthened students' motivation to revise their drafts. Students frequently noted that the detailed, clear explanations in the screencast helped them understand the underlying problems in their writing. This clarity made the revision process feel purposeful rather than confusing or overwhelming. The

lecturer's encouraging tone also played a role in boosting students' willingness to revise, transforming revision from a burdensome requirement into a constructive learning opportunity.

"Hearing the lecturer explain why my argument was unclear really motivated me to fix it." (S7)

"I felt a push to revise immediately after watching the video because everything made sense." (S3)

"The supportive tone made the revisions feel doable, not overwhelming. That alone motivated me." (S8)

Satisfaction was also expressed strongly in students' reflections. They appreciated the sense of effort, care, and thoroughness that the screencast conveyed. The format allowed the lecturer to walk them through complex ideas step by step, making them feel supported and valued. Students emphasized that being able to revisit the feedback multiple times enhanced their understanding and gave them confidence in their revisions.

"I was satisfied because the lecturer really took the time to explain every detail patiently." (S5)

"The screencast felt personal. It made me feel supported and valued as a student." (S9)

"Knowing I could replay the video whenever I needed made me feel secure and satisfied." (S6)

Finally, students described developing a sense of enthusiasm toward revision after watching the screencast. This enthusiasm emerged because the feedback made the revision process feel more achievable and less overwhelming. With clearer guidance, students approached revision with renewed energy and a stronger sense of direction. For some, this was the first time they actually looked forward to improving their academic writing.

"The feedback made me excited to revise because it showed me exactly where to start." (S4)

"I felt enthusiastic because the explanations made everything feel within reach." (S10)

"For the first time, I actually looked forward to revising my draft." (S8)

Overall, students' affective engagement—marked by enjoyment, reduced anxiety, relaxation, motivation, satisfaction, and enthusiasm—played a foundational role in shaping how they responded to screencast feedback. These emotional responses created a supportive psychological environment that encouraged deeper engagement, greater confidence, and more meaningful revision behaviors. See Table 2 below for the summary.

Table 2. Summary of Affective Engagement

Affective Theme	Description	Excerpts
Enjoyment	Students felt the feedback was lively, personal, and engaging.	"I enjoyed listening because it felt like the lecturer was right there guiding me through each mistake." (S8) "The moving cursor kept my attention. It felt like the lecturer was taking me on a tour of my own writing." (S4) "I didn't get bored like I usually do with written comments. It felt interactive." (S1)
Reduced Anxiety	Audio tone and clarity reduced emotional tension.	"I wasn't scared to open the feedback this time because I knew the lecturer's voice would help me understand the tone." (S2) "Hearing the explanation made me feel calmer. Written comments sometimes make me panic." (S9) "I used to worry I'd misunderstand what the lecturer meant, but the screencast removed that fear." (S10)
Relaxation	Students felt calm due to pacing control and replay features.	"I felt more relaxed because I could take my time. I paused a lot and that helped me absorb everything." (S3) "Replaying the difficult parts gave me space to breathe. I didn't feel rushed at all." (S6) "It was comforting that I could watch the feedback whenever I felt ready mentally." (S1)
Motivation	Students felt encouraged and energized to revise.	"Hearing the lecturer explain why my argument was unclear really motivated me to fix it." (S7) "I felt a push to revise immediately after watching the video because everything made sense." (S3) "The supportive tone made the revisions feel doable, not overwhelming. That alone motivated me." (S8)
Satisfaction	Students valued clarity, detail, and personal attention.	"I was satisfied because the lecturer really took the time to explain every detail patiently." (S5) "The screencast felt personal. It made me feel supported and valued as a student." (S9) "Knowing I could replay the video whenever I needed made me feel secure and satisfied." (S6)
Enthusiasm	Students felt eager and excited to revise.	"The feedback made me excited to revise because it showed me exactly where to start." (S4) "I felt enthusiastic because the explanations made everything feel within reach." (S10)

		"For the first time, I actually looked forward to revising my draft." (S8)

#RQ 2: How do university students engage cognitively with screencast feedback during thesis writing?

The analysis revealed that screencast feedback fostered a deep and multifaceted cognitive engagement among students as they worked through their thesis drafts. One of the strongest patterns that emerged was students' improved comprehension of complex comments. The ability to see the lecturer highlight specific textual features while simultaneously explaining them verbally provided a dual-channel processing experience that made it easier for students to follow the logic behind corrections. Many students reported that they understood their mistakes more clearly because the screencast allowed them to visually track the lecturer's reasoning step by step, rather than trying to interpret brief, sometimes ambiguous written comments.

"Seeing the lecturer highlight each part while explaining helped me finally understand what was wrong with my paragraph structure." (S1)

"The combination of the voice and the screen made the explanation clearer than any written comment I've ever received." (S9)

"I understood the feedback better because I could watch how the lecturer moved through the text logically." (S3)

Another major aspect of cognitive engagement concerned students' enhanced ability to identify patterns in their own writing. Instead of addressing individual mistakes in isolation, students were able to recognize recurring issues such as unclear topic sentences, inconsistent argumentation, or citation formatting errors. The visual walkthrough provided by the screencast helped students see how these problems manifested across the text, enabling them to develop a more holistic understanding of their writing weaknesses. This cognitive shift—from focusing on scattered errors to understanding broader patterns—was repeatedly emphasized by students.

"By watching the video, I realized I kept making the same mistake in different paragraphs." (S8)

"The screencast made me see patterns in my writing that I never noticed before." (S4)

"I finally understood why my arguments felt repetitive, because the lecturer showed the pattern across sections." (S7)

The screencast also supported deeper cognitive processing by enabling students to visualize revisions. Instead of imagining how changes should look, students could see the lecturer point to exact locations, demonstrate alternatives, and model improved sentence structures or paragraph flow. This modelling function of the screencast served as a cognitive scaffold, helping students internalize more effective academic writing strategies. Students repeatedly emphasized that this form of demonstration made revision tasks easier to conceptualize.

"When the lecturer showed a better way to phrase the sentence, I could visualize how to fix the rest of my writing." (S10)

"Seeing the example directly on my screen helped me understand how to rewrite my ideas more clearly." (S5)

"It was easier to modify my draft because I could picture the improvements while watching the feedback." (S2)

Students also demonstrated strong cognitive engagement through repeated review and self-monitoring. The ability to pause and replay specific feedback segments allowed them to process cognitively demanding information at their own pace. Many students described watching certain parts two or three times until they fully understood the lecturer's reasoning. This self-regulated behavior helped deepen their comprehension and encouraged metacognitive reflection about their writing choices.

"I rewatched one part several times because I wanted to make sure I understood the logic behind the comment." (S3)

"Being able to replay the feedback made me think more critically about why my sentence didn't work." (S8)

"I paused often to reflect on what the lecturer said and compare it with my original writing." (S10)

Finally, the screencast format strengthened students' ability to transfer learning across different sections of their thesis. Because the explanations were more explicit and process-oriented, students could apply the same principles to other paragraphs without needing additional feedback. This cognitive transfer represented a deeper form of engagement, where students not only understood corrections but learned how to replicate correct writing practices independently.

"After watching the screencast, I applied the same corrections to other sections even though they weren't mentioned." (S4)

"The explanation helped me understand the principle, so I used it to improve other parts of my chapter." (S2)

"I realized how to fix similar mistakes elsewhere, and I didn't need the lecturer to point them out again." (S7)

These findings illustrate that screencast feedback not only improves accuracy in revision but also supports a richer cognitive engagement. Students processed feedback more deeply, monitored their understanding more actively, recognized broader patterns in their writing, and demonstrated meaningful transfer of learning across their drafts. Through its clarity, multimodality, and opportunities for self-regulation, screencast feedback served as a powerful cognitive scaffold during the thesis-writing process. See Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Cognitive Engagement

Cognitive Theme	Description	Excerpts
Improved Comprehension	Students understood feedback more clearly through combined audio–visual explanations.	"Seeing the lecturer highlight each part while explaining helped me finally understand what was wrong with my paragraph structure." (S1) "The combination of the voice and the screen made the explanation clearer than any written comment I've ever received." (S9) "I understood the feedback better because I could watch how the lecturer moved through the text logically." (S3)
Pattern Recognition	Students identified recurring issues across their writing rather than isolated mistakes.	"By watching the video, I realized I kept making the same mistake in different paragraphs." (S8) "The screencast made me see patterns in my writing that I never noticed before." (S4) "I finally understood why my arguments felt repetitive, because the lecturer showed the pattern across sections." (S7)
Visualization of Revisions	Students understood how revisions should look through direct modeling.	"When the lecturer showed a better way to phrase the sentence, I could visualize how to fix the rest of my writing." (S10) "Seeing the example directly on my screen helped me understand how to rewrite my ideas more clearly." (S5) "It was easier to modify my draft because I could picture the improvements while watching the feedback." (S2)
Self-Monitoring & Review	Students replayed segments, reflected, and monitored their own understanding.	"I rewatched one part several times because I wanted to make sure I understood the logic behind the comment." (S3) "Being able to replay the feedback made me think more critically about why my sentence didn't work." (S8) "I paused often to reflect on what the lecturer said and compare it with my original writing." (S10)
Transfer of Learning	Students applied feedback principles to other sections independently.	"After watching the screencast, I applied the same corrections to other sections even though they weren't mentioned." (S4) "The explanation helped me understand the principle, so I used it to improve other parts of my chapter." (S2) "I realized how to fix similar mistakes elsewhere, and I didn't need the lecturer to point them out again." (S7)

#RQ 3: How do university students engage behaviorally with screencast feedback during thesis writing?

The analysis demonstrated that students' behavioral engagement with screencast feedback was both active and sustained, reflecting the substantial influence of the multimodal format on their revision practices. One of the clearest behavioral patterns was students' tendency to rewatch the screencast multiple times to ensure they understood the feedback fully. Unlike written comments, which they typically read only once or twice, students deliberately revisited specific segments of the screencast to clarify details and confirm their understanding before making revisions. This repeated viewing behaviour showed a high level of effortful, self-regulated engagement.

"I watched the video several times, especially the part about my introduction, because I wanted to understand the explanation completely." (S9)

"Some sections I replayed three or four times until I was sure I understood exactly what to revise." (S3)

"I kept going back to the same timestamp to double-check the lecturer's explanation before changing anything." (S6)

A second key behavioural indicator was students' careful, step-by-step implementation of the feedback. Many students described working through the screencast slowly, pausing after each explanation to revise the relevant section in their draft. This methodical approach was different from their usual response to written feedback, where they often skimmed notes and attempted revisions more haphazardly. The screencast encouraged a systematic workflow in which students alternated between watching, reflecting, and editing.

"I paused after each explanation and fixed that part of my draft before continuing the video." (S2)
"The feedback made me revise step by step. I didn't rush like I sometimes do with written comments." (S7)
"I followed the video and edited my draft at the same time, so I wouldn't miss anything." (S1)

Students also demonstrated behavioural engagement by taking detailed notes while watching the screencast. Note-taking served as a bridge between understanding and implementation, helping them track important points, patterns, and examples provided by the lecturer. Some students described writing summary lists of what to revise, while others copied down specific phrases or structures modeled in the video.

"I took notes on every important point so I could check them off during revision." (S4)
"I wrote down the example phrases the lecturer gave, because I wanted to use them correctly later." (S5)
"Note-taking helped me not forget anything when I returned to my draft." (S10)

Another strong indicator of behavioural engagement was students' tendency to revise beyond the areas explicitly mentioned in the screencast. After understanding the rationale behind the lecturer's suggestions, students often applied the same principles to other paragraphs or sections that were not directly discussed. This proactive behaviour showed that students were not merely following instructions but taking initiative to improve their overall writing quality.

"I corrected the same problem in other paragraphs, even the ones the lecturer didn't mention." (S8)
"After watching the screencast, I checked the rest of my chapter for similar mistakes." (S2)
"I ended up revising more than what was in the video because I realized other parts had the same issue." (S7)

Finally, the screencast format prompted students to engage in verification and self-evaluation after revising. Many described rewatching certain segments after making changes to ensure their revisions matched the lecturer's expectations. This behaviour indicated a strong sense of responsibility and self-monitoring, as students actively sought confirmation that they had accurately implemented the feedback.

"After revising, I replayed the video to make sure my changes matched what the lecturer explained." (S6)
"I checked my revision against the video to see if I improved the paragraph the right way." (S9)
"I rewatched the explanation to evaluate whether my revision was correct." (S10)

Collectively, these behavioural patterns—rewatching, step-by-step editing, note-taking, proactive revision beyond the feedback, and verification—demonstrate that screencast feedback promoted a sustained, careful, and self-regulated engagement with the thesis-writing process. Students were not passive recipients of feedback; rather, they acted purposefully, repeatedly, and strategically to ensure meaningful improvement in their writing. See Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of Behavioral Engagement

Behavioral Theme	Description	Excerpts
Repeated Viewing	Students watched and rewatched screencast segments to fully grasp the feedback.	"I watched the video several times, especially the part about my introduction, because I wanted to understand the explanation completely." (S9) "Some sections I replayed three or four times until I was sure I understood exactly what to revise." (S3) "I kept going back to the same timestamp to double-check the lecturer's explanation before changing anything." (S6)
Step-by-Step Revision	Students revised gradually, pausing after each explanation to apply changes.	"I paused after each explanation and fixed that part of my draft before continuing the video." (S2) "The feedback made me revise step by step. I didn't rush like I sometimes do with written comments." (S7) "I followed the video and edited my draft at the same time, so I wouldn't miss anything." (S1)
Note-Taking	Students took detailed notes to support accurate and complete revisions.	"I took notes on every important point so I could check them off during revision." (S4)

		"I wrote down the example phrases the lecturer gave, because I wanted to use them correctly later." (S5) "Note-taking helped me not forget anything when I returned to my draft." (S10)
Proactive Revision	Students revised beyond the sections mentioned in the screencast.	"I corrected the same problem in other paragraphs, even the ones the lecturer didn't mention." (S8) "After watching the screencast, I checked the rest of my chapter for similar mistakes." (S2) "I ended up revising more than what was in the video because I realized other parts had the same issue." (S7)
Verification & Self-Evaluation	Students rewatched segments after revising to ensure accuracy.	"After revising, I replayed the video to make sure my changes matched what the lecturer explained." (S6) "I checked my revision against the video to see if I improved the paragraph the right way." (S9) "I rewatched the explanation to evaluate whether my revision was correct." (S10)

The findings show that students demonstrated strong affective, cognitive, and behavioral engagement when responding to screencast feedback during thesis writing. Affective engagement was reflected in feelings of enjoyment, reduced anxiety, relaxation, increased motivation, satisfaction, and enthusiasm, largely due to the clarity, supportive tone, and interactive nature of the audio–visual feedback. Cognitively, students showed deeper comprehension of revision points, better recognition of writing patterns, improved ability to visualize revisions, increased self-monitoring through repeated viewing, and greater transfer of learning to other parts of their thesis. Behaviorally, students actively engaged with the feedback by rewatching specific segments, revising their drafts step-by-step, taking detailed notes, applying feedback beyond the highlighted sections, and verifying revisions through self-evaluation. Collectively, these findings indicate that screencast feedback fosters a comprehensive and sustained engagement that enhances students' emotional readiness, cognitive processing, and revision practices throughout the thesis-writing process.

DISCUSSION

The findings reveal that students demonstrated strong affective, cognitive, and behavioral engagement when interacting with screencast feedback during thesis writing. Emotionally, students experienced enjoyment, reduced anxiety, relaxation, heightened motivation, satisfaction, and enthusiasm, largely due to the clarity and supportive tone of audio–visual explanations. Cognitively, they showed deeper comprehension of revision issues, improved recognition of writing patterns, better visualization of corrections, stronger self-monitoring through repeated viewing, and enhanced transfer of learning to other thesis sections. Behaviorally, students actively rewatched targeted segments, revised iteratively, took notes, applied feedback to unmarked areas, and verified revisions through self-evaluation. These patterns indicate that screencast feedback fosters comprehensive and sustained engagement that strengthens emotional readiness, cognitive processing, and revision performance across the thesis-writing process.

The affective engagement demonstrated by students aligns strongly with existing literature highlighting the emotional and motivational benefits of screencast feedback. Studies such as Eak and Annamalai (2024) report that the conversational tone of narrated comments reduces anxiety and increases students' willingness to persist—mirroring the emotional comfort and motivation found in the present study. Saeed (2024) similarly emphasizes the relational value of instructor voice, which helps students feel supported, a feature that clearly resonates with the enjoyment and relaxation experienced by participants. Payne (2022) notes that multimodal feedback increases persistence, reinforcing the current findings that screencasts promote enthusiasm and motivation. The emotional clarity provided by tone, pacing, and emphasis in audiovisual feedback also aligns with Wood (2023) and Cheng (2020), who highlight the superiority of multimodal feedback in conveying intent and reducing misunderstandings. However, some literature raises concerns that emotional benefits may vary depending on students' digital readiness; Bonafini and Lee (2021) argue that insufficient instructor training may hinder the creation of "warm" or effective audio–visual messages, and Nicolás-Conesa (2024) suggests that insufficient digital literacy may limit students' ability to engage emotionally. Nonetheless, the current study shows predominantly positive emotional outcomes, suggesting that in this context, the multimodal clarity and supportive tone outweighed any potential technological obstacles.

The findings on cognitive engagement are strongly supported by literature emphasizing the metacognitive benefits of screencast feedback. Karagül and Şeker (2021) find that the ability to pause, replay, and analyze feedback fosters deeper comprehension and metacognitive monitoring, which directly corresponds to students' repeated

viewing, improved visualization of revisions, and increased self-monitoring in the present study. Wood (2024) likewise documents how replay functions enhance metacognition, echoing students' use of screencasts to understand writing patterns and transfer learning across thesis sections. Cognitive alignment also appears in studies comparing screencasts with written comments: Penn (2022) and Bjerknes (2024) show that audiovisual explanations improve clarity and retention, consistent with students' improved comprehension of revision points. From the broader engagement literature, Zhou and Hiver (2022) argue that cognitive engagement is closely tied to self-regulated learning processes, and the present findings support this claim by demonstrating students' deliberate monitoring, evaluation, and targeted revision behaviors. Although technological cognitive load was raised as a concern by Kueker and Moore (2023), the participants in this study appeared to benefit more from the cognitive scaffolding provided by the screencast format than to be burdened by its complexity. Thus, existing literature largely supports the finding that screencasts enhance comprehension, pattern recognition, and metacognitive engagement.

Students' behavioral engagement—such as rewatching segments, conducting step-by-step revisions, taking notes, and applying feedback beyond marked areas—is similarly well supported by prior studies. Karagül and Şeker (2021) emphasize that screencasts promote autonomous, self-paced engagement, reflected here in students' repeated viewing and systematic revision actions. Imsa-ard (2022) reports deeper revision among students receiving screencast comments, aligning with participants' willingness to revise beyond the highlighted sections. Penn (2022) shows that students prefer the interactive nature of screencasts, which encourages active involvement rather than passive reception of feedback; this preference corresponds with the active behaviors observed in the current study. From the broader literature on engagement, Afifi et al. (2023) stress that meaningful feedback only leads to improvement when learners actively respond to it, and Linuwih et al. (2024) document behavioral engagement as a key component of feedback uptake in online settings, echoing the active revision practices demonstrated here. Although Aldaghri and Oraif (2022) caution that online environments may reduce authenticity and limit hands-on interaction, the present findings suggest that the multimodality of screencast feedback compensated for the absence of face-to-face discussion. Thus, the behavioral evidence strongly confirms that screencast feedback can promote sustained, independent engagement with revision.

Beyond writing-specific contexts, comparative studies further support the claim that screencast feedback strengthens engagement across disciplines. Jones and Wisniewski (2021) find that screencast assignments improve performance and readiness in pharmacy education, while Pachuashvili (2024) reports similar benefits in engineering problem-solving tasks. These findings demonstrate that the active, iterative behaviors observed in thesis-writing students reflect broader trends in how learners respond to multimodal explanations. At the same time, the challenges discussed in the literature highlight potential limitations that did not present strongly in this study. For instance, Bonafini and Lee (2021) and Yahya et al. (2021) warn that uneven technological skills may impede students' behavioral engagement, and Rayeji (2023) stresses the importance of balancing innovation with accessibility. The present findings suggest that with adequate institutional support—as emphasized by Aguilera-Fuentes (2025)—students can engage behaviorally at a deep level despite potential technological constraints. Overall, the consistency between the present findings and existing literature indicates that the multimodality, personalization, and replayability of screencast feedback naturally foster a high degree of behavioral involvement.

The alignment between the current findings and the existing literature across emotional, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions reinforces the value of screencast feedback within thesis writing. However, this study offers a specific contribution by demonstrating how these three dimensions operate simultaneously and continuously throughout a complex writing task such as a thesis, rather than in short assignments commonly examined in prior research. While previous studies have explored discrete forms of engagement or focused on short-term tasks, the present findings reveal the sustained, cyclical nature of engagement across drafting, revising, and refining multiple thesis sections. This broader, integrated perspective highlights the novelty of the study: it shows that screencast feedback not only supports momentary engagement but also fosters an ongoing, multi-dimensional revision culture that strengthens emotional readiness, deepens cognitive processing, and promotes autonomous behavioral engagement throughout an extended academic writing process.

CONCLUSION

The findings reveal that university students engaged affectively, cognitively, and behaviorally with screencast feedback in ways that substantially supported their thesis-writing process. Affectively, students responded with enjoyment, reduced anxiety, greater motivation, and a sense of satisfaction, implying that the clarity and supportive tone of audio–visual feedback can strengthen emotional readiness for complex writing tasks. Cognitively, students demonstrated deeper understanding of revision points, clearer recognition of writing patterns, and stronger metacognitive monitoring, suggesting that screencast feedback enhances comprehension and facilitates meaningful

learning transfer across different thesis sections. Behaviorally, students showed active engagement through repeated viewing, detailed note-taking, iterative revision, and self-evaluation, which imply that screencasts encourage sustained, autonomous, and deliberate interaction with feedback. These results suggest that screencast feedback supports holistic engagement that benefits students' emotional, cognitive, and practical revision capacities during thesis writing.

This study, however, is limited by its context-specific sample, reliance on self-reported experiences, and focus on a single feedback modality within a single academic task. These limitations indicate that the findings may not fully capture variations across disciplines, student populations, or different technological environments. Future research should therefore explore engagement with screencast feedback across broader institutional settings, examine how individual differences such as digital literacy or writing proficiency shape engagement, and compare screencast feedback with other multimodal or interactive feedback tools. Longitudinal studies would also be valuable for understanding how engagement evolves over multiple writing cycles and whether the benefits observed here persist across diverse academic tasks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Indonesia Endowment Funds for Education (LPDP/Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan) for their financial support.

REFERENCES

Afifi, S., Rahimi, M., & Wilson, J. (2023). Student engagement with teacher and automated written corrective feedback on l2 writing: A multiple case study. *The JALT Call Journal, 19*(2), 216-242. https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v19n2.1041

Aguilera-Fuentes, Y. (2025). Enhancing English speaking skills through screencast feedback: A technique explored with Spanish-speaking undergraduates. *Cogent Education*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2545330

Aldaghri, A., & Oraif, I. (2022). The impact of online teaching on students' engagement in writing during the pandemic of covid-19. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 23*(3), 216-229. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1137290

Ali, A. D. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching, 9*(8), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p106

Bjerknes, A.L. (2024). 'I finally understand my mistakes'–the benefits of screencast feedback. *Technology Pedagogy and Education*, *33*(1), 43-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2023.2258134

Bonafini, F., & Lee, Y. (2021). Investigating prospective teachers' TPACK and their use of mathematical action technologies as they create screencast video lessons on Ipads. *Techtrends, 65*(3), 303-319. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-020-00578-1

Chen, S., Ouyang, F., & Jiao, P. (2021). Promoting student engagement in online collaborative writing through a student-facing social learning analytics tool. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 38*(1), 192-208. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12604

Cheng, D. (2020). Screencast video feedback in online TESOL classes. *Computers and Composition*, *58*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612

Cunningham, K. J. (2019). Student perceptions and use of technology-mediated text and screencast feedback in ESL writing. *Computers and Composition, 52*, 222–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.003

Eak, A., & Annamalai, N. (2024). Enhancing online learning: A systematic literature review exploring the impact of screencast feedback on student learning outcomes. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal, 19*(3), 247-263. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaouj-08-2023-0100

Fatoni, M., Setiawan, S., Munir, A., & Suhartono, S. (2024). The students' perceptions of screencast video feedback and their self-regulated learning in responding to the feedback. *Kne Social Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v9i6.15301

Imsa-ard, P. (2022). Enhancing lesson plan writing skills through screencast-assisted written feedback: A study of Thai pre-service EFL teachers. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Curriculum*, *29*(1), 67-82. https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7963/CGP/v29i01/67-82

Jones, E., & Wisniewski, C. (2021). Video killed the multiple-choice quiz: Capturing pharmacy students' literature searching skills using a screencast video assignment. *Journal of the Medical Library Association, 109*(4). https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2021.1270

Karagül, B., & Şeker, M. (2021). Improving language learners' use of self-regulated writing strategies through screencast feedback. *Sage Open, 11*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211064895

Kueker, D., & Moore, J. (2023). Learning from screencast software tutorials: A comparison of cognitive load in dual and single-monitor learning environments. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 40*(1), 118-135. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12875

Linuwih, E., Setiawan, S., & Munir, A. (2024). Student engagement with teacher written feedback in online EFL writing context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 14*(7), 2186-2192. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1407.26

Liu, R. (2025). The impact of generative pre-trained transformers on creative writing instruction: Enhancing student engagement and expressive competence. *Journal of Computational Methods in Sciences and Engineering, 25*(5), 4437-4450. https://doi.org/10.1177/14727978251337961

Nicolás-Conesa, F. (2024). Affordances of screencast technology for analyzing engagement with computer-mediated feedback on L2 writing. *Routledge Handbook of Technological Advances in Researching Language Learning*, 479-493, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003459088-43

Pachuashvili, N. (2024). Using Screencast Video Feedback in the 21st Century EFL Writing Class. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *12*(1), 225-242. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.12.1.09

Payne, A.L. (2022). Mobilising screencast technology and ipsative design to transform feedback practices. *Academic Voices A Conversation on New Approaches to Teaching and Learning in the Post Covid World*, 43-55, https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91185-6.00028-8

Penn, S. (2022). Is screencast feedback better than text feedback for student learning in higher education? A Systematic Review. *Ubiquitous Learning*, *15*(2), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-9795/CGP/v15i02/1-18

Penn, S., & 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(2), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.18848/1835-9795/cgp/v15i02/1-18

Rayeji, S. (2023). Comparative effect of screencast and face-to-face corrective feedback on EFL learners' speaking proficiency. *Call EJ*, *24*(3), 69-88. https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85182688637&origin=inward

Saeed, M.A. (2024). Examining teacher's evaluative language in written, audio and screencast feedback on EFL learners' writing from the appraisal framework: A linguistic perspective. *Assessing Writing*, *61*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100871

Tauchid, A., Muhid, A., Khudlori, A., Ayunda, N. A., Lee, A., & Jisoo, C. (2025). Investigating communicative language teaching through meaning-based tasks and processing strategies to strengthen learners' oral performance. *Journal of Research in English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *1*(2), 153–169. https://doi.org/10.65431/jrell.v1i2.30

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

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

Wood, J.M. (2024). Supporting the uptake process with dialogic peer screencast feedback: A sociomaterial perspective. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(4), 913-935. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.2042243

Yahya, F., Kassymova, G., Murtafiah, W., & Suparman, S. (2021). Experts and designated users evaluations on visual tools screencast SketchUp make (vitos-sum). *Perspectives of Science and Education, 54*(6), 460-472. https://doi.org/10.32744/pse.2021.6.31

Yu, S., Jiang, L., & Zhou, N. (2020). The impact of L2 writing instructional approaches on student writing motivation and engagement. *Language Teaching Research, 27*(4), 958-973. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820957024

Zafeer, H., Li, Y., & Maqbool, S. (2023). An approach to progress learning outcomes: international graduate students' engagement in reflective practice and reflective journal writing during pandemic. *Sustainability, 15*(3), 1898. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15031898

Zheng, Y., Yu, S., & Tong, Z. (2022). Understanding the dynamic of student engagement in project-based collaborative writing: Insights from a longitudinal case study. *Language Teaching Research, 29*(6), 2435-2459. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688221115808

Zhou, S., & Hiver, P. (2022). The effect of self-regulated writing strategies on students' L2 writing engagement and disengagement behaviors. *System, 106*, 102768. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102768

