



“It makes you feel like they’ve actually put effort into it.” Students’ perceptions of screen-capture video feedback on assignments on a social science course

Sam Pryke, Michael Rees & Gemma Witton

To cite this article: Sam Pryke, Michael Rees & Gemma Witton (2023): “It makes you feel like they’ve actually put effort into it.” Students’ perceptions of screen-capture video feedback on assignments on a social science course, *Interactive Learning Environments*, DOI: [10.1080/10494820.2023.2167839](https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2167839)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2023.2167839>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 30 Jan 2023.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 115






[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

“It makes you feel like they’ve actually put effort into it.” Students’ perceptions of screen-capture video feedback on assignments on a social science course

Sam Pryke , Michael Rees  and Gemma Witton 

University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton, UK

ABSTRACT

This article is the first to examine the use of screen-capture video feedback on student assignments on a social science degree at a British university. It is based on qualitative, focus group, research with students who received one or more video recordings on their academic work over the period 2019–2021. The article first places video feedback in the wider context of research on the subject. Our literature review suggests that whilst video does not herald a pedagogic revolution, it is a considerable advance on orthodox written feedback. Our findings are that students prefer video recordings because they provide (1) an interpersonal aspect to feedback; (2) more extensive, detailed, nuanced and directed coverage of their work than with written comments; (3) a more credible appreciation of their grade. Our discussion ends with a summary of our findings and a breakdown of the benefits and constraints of video feedback.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 19 June 2022
Accepted 8 January 2023

KEYWORDS

Feedback; feed forward; video feedback; screen-capture; capture technologies; panopto; assessment feedback; student perceptions; academic experiences

Introduction

Recording and providing video feedback for students on their assignments is a well-known practice in higher education. However, it remains much less common than orthodox written feedback. Even those academics, including the authors of this paper, who now regularly provide video feedback for students on some modules, continue to rely on the written form for several others. Moreover, at least in the UK, there is no evidence that the use of video feedback is significantly increasing. This is despite the well-known drawbacks of the written format and the mounting body of evidence, examined below, that video feedback is a superior means of commenting on student work and providing feedforward recommendations. Beyond convention, there are several reasons discussed below why university teachers will, no doubt, view video feedback with some scepticism and continue to leave written feedback. The following discussion on the use of video feedback at a post 1992 British university is not intended as advocacy for this practice – although, as already indicated, we do think it has definite advantages. Rather, it concerns our qualitative research into the use of video feedback with second – and third-year students. It is the first investigation of video feedback with social science students.¹ We adopted the practice in the academic year 2019–2020 in the context of increased use of Panopto capture technology at the institution. The ability of this software to allow us to record ourselves discussing student work while simultaneously displaying the document offered a definite advantage over previous software that did not have this facility (see below for a discussion of the history of video capture technology). The article first considers the findings of

CONTACT Gemma Witton  gemma.witton@wlv.ac.uk

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

the now sizeable literature on video feedback. Second, it outlines our research findings whereby we sought to investigate two inter-related research questions – What are the benefits and constraints students identify in video feedback in comparison to written feedback? and What is the best form for video feedback to take? For example, in terms of video length, appropriate formats for annotation, the need for supplementary written information such as feedback forms etc. Third, it provides some general practical advice based on our own experiences with making feedback videos over a three-year period.

Literature review

The first point to make is that there is rarely a definition of what feedback, either written or video (Mahoney et al., 2019), constitutes in the substantial teaching and learning literature on the subject.² For the purposes of this article, the definition of Carless et al. (2011, p. 397) given to a particular variant of feedback, so called “sustainable feedback”, is useful: “Dialogic processes and activities which can support and inform the student on the current task, whilst also developing the ability to self-regulate performance on future tasks”.

In the past, it was customary for a teacher’s comments to extend or even focus on the student’s wider engagement, attitude and intellect – e.g. “Clearly, you have little interest in or aptitude for Latin.” This is now less common (at least for student consumption, reviewing for academic journals can be a little more “old school”). Feedback can be conveyed through a variety of media: written, audio, video or oral. It is unlikely that many university teachers will have been formally taught about providing effective feedback to students, even on now compulsory teaching courses that new lecturers must take. Like many aspects of academic practice, new teachers (markers) will, no doubt, base their feedback on what they regard as good, if conventional, academic practice. This will be derived from their experiences of feedback whilst students themselves and, perhaps, the influence of colleagues.

Teaching and learning considerations of feedback on student work go all the way back to the 1950s. In recent years there has been much discussion of how feedback can be improved at a general and practical level. It is impossible to summarise the various trends, but two are noticeable. One is an insistence that markers should direct their remarks not on the individual as a learner, but on their work in the context of their, goal orientated, learning trajectory. In a widely cited article entitled “The Power of Feedback,” Hattie and Timperley (2007, pp. 90–91) distinguish between “feedback about the task (FT), about the processing of the task (FP), about self-regulation (FR), and about the self as a person (FS)”. They argue that “FS is the least effective, FR and FP are powerful in terms of deep processing and proficiency in tasks, and FT is powerful when the task information subsequently is useful for improving strategy processing or enhancing self-regulation (which it too rarely does).” More recently, there has been an emphasis on the dialogic dimension to feedback in the quest to enable students to improve their own work, i.e. feedforward. Van der Kleij et al. (2017, p. 1094) claim (discussing video but with wider applicability) that feedback should be a “dialogic practice” to “enable students to take responsibility for their own learning, to become self-regulated learners”. In a similar vein, but without reference to video, Ajjawi and Boud (2018, p. 1108) advocate a “productive dialogue” given that feedback is a “communicative act and a social process in which power, emotion and discourse impact on how messages are constructed, interpreted and acted upon”. It is worth noting that these authors fail to mention that dialogue has a fundamental limit in this context as the teacher determines the grade.

At a more practical level, there are numerous overviews of effective feedback. Gibbs and Simpson (2004) set out not simply attributes of good practice, but the context in which students are likely to be receptive to it. Therefore, they argue that the engagement with feedback cannot be divorced from the assessment task itself. The latter include ensuring that assessments “orientate students to allocate appropriate amounts of time and effort to the most important aspects of the course,” (p. 14) and that “the assessed task engages students in productive learning activity of an appropriate

kind.” (p. 14) The former that “sufficient feedback is provided, both often enough and in enough detail,” (p. 17) and it “is timely in that it is received by students while it still matters to them and in time for them to pay attention to further learning or receive further assistance.” (p. 18)

Notwithstanding all the conceptual and practical discussion on marking, there are several reasons why both students and academics are cynical about the practice. Summarising the evidence on students’ perceptions of feedback, McCarthy (2015, p. 154) states, “For many students, feedback can often be provided in a manner which they feel is too late to be useful, too vague, unclear and inconsistent”. A long-standing belief amongst academics is that feedback is not just little acted on, but hardly read – if read at all (see below for our findings on this). And this is not just supposition as there are several studies (Bailey & Garner, 2010; Higgins et al., 2001) that have found evidence that students often note their assignment mark and then quickly scan the markers comments. Debusse et al (2007) found that that many prefer to find out their grades from university online data bases that do not include their feedback. Even if they read their feedback, there is no guarantee that they will act on the given advice (Bailey & Garner, 2010; Mutch, 2003).

Taken together, these things result in, on the one hand, the low ratings for assessment and feedback that students leave in the annual UK National Student Survey and, on the other, the resigned resentment that academics have towards these ratings (NSS, 2022). Apart from those for student unions, the satisfaction levels for “Assessment and feedback” are the lowest for the sets of questions in the NSS; some eleven percentage points below “Teaching on my course” in the 2020 survey. Of course, NSS results vary enormously between universities, but this category is often marked down by students compared with other indices across the UK Higher Education sector. Moreover, the scores have not significantly improved during the history of the NSS. The UK is not alone in respect to lowly student ratings for feedback (McCarthy, 2015).

Video feedback should not be hailed as a panacea given all of this. Apart from anything else, video does not guarantee that students will engage with feedback. Over the last two years some 27 percent of our students watched less than ten percent of their videos, most of this number none at all.³ Our research subsequent to the focus groups has revealed that students who lack academic self-confidence were disinclined to subject themselves to a lecturer, as they saw it, picking apart their work to their face (especially during the “just about coping” social psychology of the pandemic). The wider point is that video simply substitutes one media for another, and there is no prior evidence (Clark, 1983) that this in itself will lead to a marked improvement in learning. However, there is a mounting body of evidence (Mahoney et al., 2019), backed by our findings, that video does constitute a significant advance on written feedback: it is a more effective medium to convey a marker’s thoughts than written words and it is more likely to be acted upon by students. Before outlining the attributes of video, it is worth touching on the history of research on the subject.

As indicated above, video feedback is not new. In performance subjects, where in part assessment is through video, teachers have been providing video feedback since at least the 1990s (Cruikshank, 1998).⁴ The first large scale use of video feedback (of a general kind, not on individual assignments) seems to have been at Reading University in the UK in 2009 (Crook et al., 2012). Writing in 2020, Wilkie and Biefer claimed that “the concept of technology-enhanced video feedback remains in its infancy” (p.404) but were able to produce an overview of the findings to date. A year earlier, Mahoney et al. (2019) wrote the first meta-review article on the subject, a perusal of some 37 studies, 33 of them peer reviewed, 11 using mixed methods, the rest either qualitative or quantitative. It is evident from the literature that the recording of video has been improved and been made easier with the evolution of the technology. The length of upload times for a video of c.10 min has shortened since Pru and Keong (2012, p. 589) reported on it taking 20-30 min. Contemporaneous to faster internet speed is the versatility of recent video production, now allowing for screenshare – the type we have used. This enables the display of the assessment submission and a talking head, allowing a teacher to identify and discuss specific points of a student’s work with them whilst they remain in the corner of the screen. This has the advantage that students do not have to independently access their work whilst watching the video. In a 2016 article, Lamey (2015, p. 693) looked

forward to when “video functionality that will allow instructors to create and embed video files directly within virtual learning environments”, making “the process simpler and superior”. In 2022 this is now possible and easily done. Finally, it is worth noting that whilst it has been said that every new generation has been a video one since the 1980s, the medium really is now ubiquitous. As Wilkie and Liefeith (2022, p. 5) comment, video is “a medium that students have an inherent affinity towards”. TikTok is now said (Kalupski, 2021) to have replaced Instagram as the most popular form of social media amongst Gen Zers – post Millennials.

Mahoney et al. (2019) note certain limitations in the discussion of video feedback, noticeably that all the published articles are by enthusiasts who have recorded video feedback for their students and then carried out research with them on what they thought of it. This obviously is not fatal, but there is no counterbalance by writers who are either sceptical of video feedback in itself or have tried it and found it disappointing. However, most of the articles are clear that the practice does have drawbacks. We examine them below having outlined the attributes of video feedback.

The initial thing to mention is the relative popularity for video compared to written feedback found in the survey research on the subject. This varies but is consistently emphatic. West and Turner (2016) found that video is three times as popular as written feedback: 61% as opposed to 21%.⁵ Marriott and Teoh (2012) state that 71.8% of their students said in a questionnaire that they prefer video. Through a range of questionnaires over the period 2013–2015, Atfield-Cutts et al. (2016) report a preference of 90% to 100%.

The given reasons for the inclination for video are contained in both quantitative and qualitative research on the subject. A dominant theme is that students find video feedback to have a much stronger personal aspect and be more comprehensible than orthodox written feedback (Hung, 2016; Jones et al., 2012; Killingback et al., 2020; Lamey, 2015; West & Turner, 2016; Wilkie & Liefeith, 2022). They appreciate the conversational or dialogic approach that academic markers can adopt, allowing for modalities of expression through tone of voice and facial expression, possible in a video recording. Even if critical, this conveys an impression that the marker is interested in them and their work. One writer (Lamey, 2015, p. 696) states that video serves to “foster a greater connection between professor and student”. Mahoney et al. (2019, p. 157) talk of a “relationship richness” to video feedback. Second, there is indication in the literature – less marked than in our own findings – that students come to have a greater understanding of the reasoning of the grade awarded by dint of video feedback (Lamey, 2015; West & Turner, 2016). Third, video allows more extensive and richer discussion (Marriott & Teoh, 2012; Wilkie & Liefeith, 2022). It facilitates a marker moving from a general observation about, say, grammar or referencing in a student’s assignment to specifying and highlighting through screenshare a particular instance in their text. Simultaneously, it expedites greater intellectual coverage of the content of a student’s assignment, rather than just repeating the standard tropes about grammar, referencing etc. Fourth, there is some evidence (Wilkie & Liefeith, 2022) that video is likely to produce greater self-reflection on the part of the student. Hence video’s feed forward aspect is stronger than with written feedback.

While there is now quite extensive research on student attitudes towards video, there is much more limited evidence on academics’ inclination to make them. West and Turner (2016, p. 407) state that their attitude and those of their colleagues is generally a positive one because they feel that they are doing something constructive, rather than just going through the motions. One study did ask academics about their willingness to produce them having first questioned them on what they thought of the videos on their assignments. Matthews (2019) surveyed predominately young academics on a compulsory PGHE type teaching course at the University of Leicester after they had received feedback on their assignments. She found that they were positive about video. Some 92% of the survey respondents agreed that the use of video enhanced their understanding of the marker’s feedback, and 79% thought that this medium felt more inter-personal than the written form. However, only 50 percent said that they might consider using it in their modules. The dominant reason for their reluctance to embrace video was their perception that it would be more time consuming.

This finding takes us to the final issue to consider from the literature: the drawbacks of making videos. Contrary to the previous point, several articles (for an overview see Mahoney et al., 2019) find recording videos to be about the same or less time consuming than leaving written comment. However, this does seem to be a matter that requires further investigation, especially on bigger modules. Recording a video requires a quiet space where the marker will not be disturbed (Borup et al., 2014). Connected to this is that recording a video does require some sort of performance. One writer (Lamey, 2015, p. 694) reports that before making videos he never “had to make a point to get fully dressed or shave before doing my marking”. He is equally frank about why some students found watching their academic teachers on their screens awkward: their association of video with online dating.

Methodology

This educational research project was carried out using focus group methodology to explore and compare student experiences of engaging with screen-capture video feedback. Focus groups, “typically emphasize a specific theme or topic that is explored in depth” with people “known to have had a certain experience” (Bryman, 2015, p. 501). This key attribute of focus group methodology allowed for the generation of ideas and assisted the research team in devising recommendations for future change in feedback approaches and improvements in student learning.

An initial pilot focus group was carried out by the research team (2x Lecturers plus 1x Educational Developer) using a set of questions that were devised in advance. Subsequent focus groups were facilitated by the Educational Developer without the Lecturers present. The Educational Developer was able to present themselves as a neutral third party outside of the teaching team. The purpose of this was to ensure that the students felt comfortable expressing their own perspective and mitigate for any perceived difference in power between students and teaching staff. In total, 18 Sociology (single and joint honours) students took part in the focus groups over the academic year, 2019–2020. The questions were refined following the pilot focus group and used as a basic structure for the remaining groups to ensure all the required aspects were discussed. However, there remained an emphasis on providing the student respondents with the opportunity to discuss among themselves the strengths and weaknesses of the screen-capture video feedback approach.

During the focus groups, it was made clear that the purpose was to ascertain the effectiveness of video feedback as a form of delivering grades and feedback to students, and not a discussion of the assessment, individual grades, or the content of the feedback. To maintain an ethical process, students gave their informed consent to participating in the focus groups. It was explained to them that they could withdraw their consent at any time and that participation in the focus groups would have no impact on their grades or continuation on the course. Students were offered a £10 Amazon voucher for their participation. Ethical approval was gained from the institutions Ethics Committee prior to research being conducted.

Audio recordings of the focus groups were made to capture the detailed qualitative data. The recordings were transcribed by a third-party transcription service to ensure anonymity and facilitate thematic analysis. Using NVivo, each member of the research team completed a coding exercise on the transcripts which were later compared and combined to ensure a robust analysis of the data.

Research findings

This section is aimed at addressing the first research question – ‘What are the benefits and constraints students identify in video feedback in comparison to written feedback?’ Resonating with the findings of others identified in the literature review (e.g. Lamey, 2015; West & Turner, 2016; Wilkie & Liefieith, 2022) the most common code that emerged from our analysis was students’ preference for the inter-personal nature of video feedback. Sixteen of the 18 students who took part in the research said they preferred video to written feedback: almost 90 percent of the total. Comments

such as, “I liked the personal touch of being able to see them. It’s like you’re in and having the person actually discuss it in front of you ... it feels more like an actual conversation” demonstrated the perception common in our analysis that the feedback spoke to the student receiving it as an individual. Comparisons were often made to written feedback which analysis, both from this project and anecdotal, was perceived by students as being a process of teachers going through the motions and repeating the same stock of phrases. As this student elucidated: “I think sometimes, with written feedback, I’ve known it to be quite copy-and-paste-ish ... so, it’s [video feedback] a lot more personal, which I think is a better thing to do. Because you know, then, the criticisms and the positives are *tailored to you and not everyone else*” (our emphasis). In an environment where students are increasingly treated as consumers and their perception that they are, at best, just names and, at worst, merely numbers, video feedback allowed for much more personal feedback designed for students as *individuals*, making them feel like valued members of a learning community. A recurring theme in the analysis was students wanting their work to feel valued after devoting so much of their time to researching and writing their assessments, as reflected by the following students:

After doing your assignment and you’ve written it for such a long time and then to hear that you’re going to get written feedback again is a bit annoying in a sense. But the fact that you’re able to actually ... have some communication back, that you’re able to comprehend rather than actually having to read it.

It makes you feel like they’ve actually put effort into [it].

Particularly important in the personal nature of video feedback was our tone. Spoken language allows a clear appreciation of good work. By contrast, students felt that written comments often seem to convey frustration or disappointment, rather than a constructive, if critical, engagement with their assignments. Aligned to this was the non-verbal cues such as facial expressions and body language that enabled us to get across our points in precise ways that would be less likely to be misinterpreted. In the words of one of the respondents:

When it’s written, it obviously can be read in different ways ... whereas when somebody’s literally saying it to you, you will take that in a specific way, depending on their tone, their body language, the way they’re saying things.

This is not to say that this was universally accepted as will be discussed in the criticisms of video feedback below, but overwhelmingly students felt that video feedback was more inter-personal, spoke to them as individuals and allowed a much greater emotional breadth than written feedback.

The second main benefit of video feedback identified by students in our research was the ability of video to convey more detailed and directed feedback than was possible through written comment. Estimates indicate that one minute of speech equates to approximately 150 words. Given that our videos were 8–10 min long on average, equating to 1200 - 1500 words, this has provided significantly more content than would be practicable with written feedback. This was acknowledged throughout the focus groups with comments like “I think video feedback is good, in a sense, because they give us a lot more feedback than the written” common. Some students, as will be addressed below, thought that we should provide such detail with written feedback, but most were appreciative that the level of detail possible with video feedback would be too time consuming.

A particularly salient point was that the use of video capture meant that students could be directed to exact passages/sections in their work that we were discussing:

I think in the video feedback, they do a better job of picking up on *where* you could have improved on. (our emphasis)

So, for me to be able to have that ... exactly the pinpointing in my work, like I say, it’s a good feature that you can have that work scrolling along.

An important aspect of video feedback is not just highlighting areas that needed improvement on the assessment being graded, but also offering feedforward to improve future work as elucidated by the following student:

Yes, I definitely focused on some of the points that were raised on the video, since I know that my structure needs working on, which was being able to see someone talk through it in that way helped me figure out, actually, yes, I do need to work more on my introductions. I need to work more on this, rather than just a general paragraph saying this is good work, you need more work in whatever area. Actually, seeing it onscreen was helpful.

A final feature of the detailed feedback offered by using videos is that it allows markers to focus more clearly on the assessment criteria:

They'll say that this is the criteria, this is where you've failed it, and then saying they were going to go through the actual piece, and I'll show you.

But going back and getting through the criteria and saying this is why you got this, and this is why you got that.

A final finding to mention in relation to the greater detail that video feedback allows, one more apparent than in the existing research as mentioned above, was how it enables students to understand the grade they had been given for an assessment. Note the following exchange from one of the focus groups where all participants affirmed that they were more understanding of their given grade:

MO Do you think maybe you understood the way that they'd arrived at your grade, maybe, a little bit more?

PA3 Yes.

PA2 Yes.

PA1 Yes.

PA3 Yes, because they go through a process of explaining it. They'll say that this is the criteria, this is where you've failed it, and then saying they were going to go through the actual piece, and I'll show you.

This was a theme that emerged throughout the three focus groups conducted for this research and elaborated on by participant three (PA3) above, and further by the following student:

The thing, as well, hearing the lecturer say it and seeing them go through the work, it's easier for you to say oh, okay, I know why that piece was good. I know that might have let me a down a bit and brought me down. It was easier to see. *It was a lot easier to know why I got that grade* because you could see clearly and hear them say this let you down a bit or this was really, really good. So, it was easier than written feedback is to know why. (our emphasis)

The final theme that emerged from the data was that video feedback was somehow more credible than was the case with written feedback. As the following student said, "I don't know what it is ... but when someone says, that was good, I maybe believe it more than if it was maybe written down." This student was very frank that this may be due to their own (low) self-esteem but in an increasingly challenging academic environment with increasing pressures on students, this is a positive that is likely to be felt by others. A key aspect to this increased credibility was the inter-personal aspect of video feedback identified above and the ability of students to be able to "see the sincerity when somebody's talking."

Although findings from this study, as previous ones, have pointed to a generally upbeat view of video feedback, we shouldn't assume universal positivity. Respondents in our research pointed to several limitations that those adopting this form of feedback should be cognizant of. One student stated that "it [written feedback] felt more gentle, in a sense. Whereas on the video feedback, I didn't think it was gentle at all, I think it was quite harsh," a reflection that not all students viewed the inter-personal nature of video feedback in a positive light. In discussing video feedback more generally (as opposed to their received feedback), the following student elaborated on this by claiming "if it all feels all negative and then maybe a few positives at the end, you're going to get that sense." This indicates that teachers need to be aware of their own performances when delivering video feedback and that where they are frustrated, this is something that may not be as easily

disguised as with written feedback. This was reflected in our own experiences with both markers choosing not to provide video feedback on modules having experienced personal issues.

Unlike written feedback, video feedback also requires more effort of the student to engage with. One student reflected how they were in a pub with friends when the grades and feedback for her assessment were released which meant that she couldn't access the feedback as it was too noisy – something which would not have been a problem with written feedback where she could just load a document on her phone and read it. As another student commented, “To sit for 12 min and just listen to something about your work is quite, like ... You've got to dedicate time.” While actively engaging students could, and should, be considered a positive, it should also be acknowledged that the greater effort involved in accessing, and paying attention to, video feedback means that some students may not bother (see above). Though these students may not engage with feedback in general, there is a concern that video principally benefits more engaged students.

Another issue highlighted is that though video feedback gave a greater depth of understanding for students, it was recognised as a one-way conversation with a student commenting that they “can't respond ... when they're, like, criticising what you've wrote.” As noted above, there are limits to the “dialogic” nature of any form of feedback: it is the teacher who provides it, video or written, and it is they who determine the mark. Finally, one student felt that markers should be able to convey all the information in feedback video in written form, something that is unrealistic given the number of words per minute it is possible to speak versus the time it would take to type a similar level of feedback. In such instances, student expectations need to be managed by academics first explaining the rationale for offering this particular form, and, as with other forms of feedback, inviting students to discuss their assignments in greater depth through one-to-one sessions.

Summary and recommendations

As a result of the findings of this work, we recommend that screen-capture video feedback is an appropriate method of providing meaningful feedback and feedforward on written assignments. This section provides a summary of our findings and some practical recommendations which are aligned to the second research question – ‘What is the best form for video feedback to take?’ These are which are also presented in [Table 1](#).

In summary, screen-capture video feedback was positively received by our students. They particularly liked the interpersonal aspect of video feedback and appreciated the greater depth that it can provide in comparison to written feedback. The more detailed feedback helped them to have a better understanding of their grade and how they could improve in future assignments. However, some students felt overwhelmed by the level of detail and experienced information overload.

The video format encouraged more purposeful engagement with the feedback because students had to make a conscious effort in choosing an appropriate time and space to watch the video. This

Table 1. Summary of benefits, constraints and recommendations.

Benefits	Constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positively received • More personal • Greater detail • Better understanding of grade • Purposeful engagement with feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much information • Less convenient to access and review • Would like additional written comments

Recommendations

- Screen-capture video feedback is an appropriate format for written assignments
- Add brief annotations on the work
- Minimise the length of feedback (1 min of spoken feedback = 125–150 words)

finding outweighs the small number of negative comments from some students who found the video format less convenient than a written equivalent which they could access anytime anyplace.

Students expressed a preference for some additional written comments so that the key points of the feedback could be reviewed easily in the future. To increase student satisfaction and maximise the usefulness of video feedback, it is recommended that brief annotations or colour shading are also made on the document so that students can easily review the key points without rewatching the video. As the availability and accuracy of automatic speech recognition within capture technology systems improves, it may become practicable to offer transcripts alongside the video feedback.

In addition, it is recommended that the marker carefully considers the length of the video feedback. The video should provide the information concisely and the length of the video should be appropriate relative to the number of words in the assignment. As a guide, one minute of spoken word equates to between 125 and 150 written words. The addition of annotations on the work prior to recording can be helpful to aid the process and improve the succinctness of the feedback.

Notes

1. The research was funded by a grant from university research fund. We are grateful for the money made available to us.
2. Hattie and Timperley (2007, p. 84) provide an overview of some 74 meta-analyses of discussions of feedback. These analyses discuss some 7,000 books and articles on the subject.
3. Panopto collects viewing stats. Such information is not, of course, available for written feedback.
4. At the university the present authors work Interpreting and Deaf Studies lecturers have used video feedback for several years.
5. Another piece of research by these authors (West & Turner, 2013) found a 92% preference for video.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by University of Wolverhampton.

Notes on contributors

Dr Sam Pryke is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Wolverhampton. His specialist areas of expertise include the study of nationalism, migration, social theory and historical sociology. He holds a BA (Hons) Sociology from Lancaster University, masters degrees from Warwick and Manchester, a PhD from Manchester University and a PG Cert in Higher Education and Professional Practice from the University of Wolverhampton. He has previously published on the use of Wikipedia in universities and the teacher student Q&A, Socratic.

Dr Michael Rees is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology whose specialist areas of expertise include the body, identity, sexuality, social theory and research methods. He holds BA (Hons) Sociology (First Class) from the University of the West of England, a Masters degree in Social Research Methods (with Merit) from the University of Kent, a PhD in Sociology from the University of Kent, and a PG Cert in Higher Education and Professional Practice from the University of Wolverhampton. He is interested in improving pedagogy through digital engagement with a particular focus on student assessment feedback.

Gemma Witton is an Educational Developer in the College of Learning and Teaching at the University of Wolverhampton. Gemma has an MA in Online and Distance Education from the Open University Institute of Educational Technology and a PG Cert in Academic Practice in Higher Education. She is a Senior Fellow of Advance HE (SFHEA) and a Certified Member of ALT (CMALT). With a background in visual arts she takes a creative and immersive approach to providing staff development opportunities in digital pedagogies. Research interests include multimedia supported learning, particularly the impact of video on student experience, attainment, retention and progression.

ORCID

Sam Pryke  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3742-0407>

Michael Rees  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9749-1998>

Gemma Witton  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2488-0412>

References

- Ajjawi, R., & Boud, D. (2018). Examining the nature and effects of feedback dialogue. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1106–1119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1434128>
- Atfield-Cutts, S., Ollis, G., & Coles Mayes, H. (2016). Blended feedback ii: video feedback for individual students is the norm, on an undergraduate computer programming unit. <http://eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/23813/>.
- Bailey, R., & Garner, M. (2010). Is the feedback in higher education assessment worth the paper it is written on? Teachers' reflections on their practices. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(2), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562511003620019>
- Borup, J. R. E., West, R. A., Thomas, R. A., & Graham, C. R. (2014). Examining the impact of video feedback on instructor social presence in blended courses. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 15(3), 232–256. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i3.1821>. <https://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/1821>.
- Bryman, A. (2015). *Social Research Methods* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003642449>
- Clark, R. E. (1983). Reconsidering research on learning from media. *Review of Educational Research*, 53(4), 445–459. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543053004445>
- Crook, A., Mauchline, A., Maw, S., Lawson, C., Drinkwater, R., Lundqvist, K., Orsmond, P., Gomez, S., & Park, J. (2012). The use of video technology for providing feedback to students: can it enhance the feedback experience for staff and students? *Computers & Education*, 58(1), 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.08.025>
- Cruikshank, I. (1998). Video: a method of delivering student feedback. *Journal of Art & Design Education*, 17(1), 87–95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5949.00109>
- Debus, J., Lawley, M., & Shibli, R. (2007). The implementation of an automated assessment feedback and quality assurance system for ict courses. *Journal of Information Systems Education*, 18(4), 491–502. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/105734/>.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1(1), 3–31. <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/3609>.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Higgins, R., Hartley, P., & Skelton, A. (2001). Getting the message across: the problem of communicating assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(2), 269–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510120045230>
- Hung, S. A. (2016). Enhancing feedback provision through multimodal video technology. *Computers & Education*, 98(c), 90–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.03.009>
- Jones, N., Georghiades, P., & Gunson, J. (2012). Student feedback via screen capture digital video: stimulating student's modified action. *Higher Education*, 64(5), 593–607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-012-9514-7>
- Kalupski, K. (2021, November 23). Tiktok is the reigning champ amongst gen z. *Investisdigital*. <https://www.investisdigital.com/blog/news/tiktok-gen-z#:~:text=All%20roads%20to%20Gen%20Z,from%2061%20percent%20in%202020>.
- Killingback, C., Drury, D., Mahato, P., & Williams, J. (2020). Student feedback delivery modes: a qualitative study of student and lecturer views. *Nurse Education Today*, 84, 104237–104237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2019.104237>
- Lamey, A. (2015). Video feedback in philosophy. *Metaphilosophy*, 46(4-5), 691–702. <https://doi.org/10.1111/meta.12155>
- 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>
- Marriott, P., & Teoh, L. K. (2012). Using screencasts to enhance assessment feedback: students' perceptions and preferences. *Accounting Education*, 21(6), 583–598. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2012.725637>
- Matthews, L. (2019). Should we use video technology for giving feedback? *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 4(1), 476–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2019.1669480>
- McCarthy, J. (2015). Evaluating written, audio and video feedback in higher education summative assessment tasks. *Issues in Educational Research*, 25(2), 153–169. <https://www.iier.org.au/iier25/mccarthy.pdf>.
- Mutch, A. (2003). Exploring the practice of feedback to students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 4(1), 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787403004001003>
- National Student Survey. (2022). NSS Data: provider level. Retrieved April 2021 from <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-information-and-data/national-student-survey-nss/get-the-nss-data/#datafiles>.
- Van der Kleij, F., Adie, L., & Cumming, J. (2017). Using video technology to enable student voice in assessment feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 48(5), 1092–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12536>

- West, J., & Turner, W. (2013). Assessment for “digital first language” speakers: online video assessment and feedback in higher education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 25(3), 288–296. <https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE1626.pdf>.
- West, J., & Turner, W. (2016). Enhancing the assessment experience: improving student perceptions, engagement and understanding using online video feedback. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 53(4), 400–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2014.1003954>
- Wilkie, B., & Liefieith, A. (2022). Student experiences of live synchronised video feedback in formative assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 27(3), 403–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1725879>