



Asynchronous Video Feedback as a Game-Changer for Online Speaking Classes

***¹Arinas Sabila, ¹Bambang Yudi Cahyono, ¹Mirjam Anugerahwati**

Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

***Correspondence:**

arinassabilaedu@gmail.com

Submission History:

Submitted: May 18, 2024

Revised: June 12, 2024

Accepted: July 19, 2024



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Abstract

Asynchronous Video Feedback (AVF) allows students to replay or slow down video feedback for better comprehension, enabling them to thoroughly process and address issues, thereby enhancing their observational and reasoning skills. This study investigates the effectiveness and student perceptions of AVF in improving speaking skills in online English courses. Conducted in an online English course in Pare, Kediri, Indonesia, the research employed a mixed-methods design, including pretests, post-tests, surveys, and semi-structured interviews with eight participants from an online speaking class. The results revealed substantial improvements in learning outcomes, with the pretest mean score of 64.88 increasing to a posttest mean score of 84.88, indicating a significant enhancement in students' speaking capabilities. The study showed that AVF significantly improved pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. Additionally, AVF promotes self-directed learning and discipline, though a student's educational background may influence their comprehension, particularly concerning grammar. Compared to in-class feedback, AVF reduces feelings of embarrassment and fear, offering valuable insights for future online English classes. Therefore, AVF is proposed as an effective tool for developing students' speaking abilities in online courses.

Keywords: Asynchronous video feedback, English language learning, speaking skills, online learning.

INTRODUCTION

Assessing students' speaking skills presents significant challenges, particularly in terms of delivering effective and practical feedback. Traditional methods are often cumbersome, requiring extensive time for evaluation and lacking the ability to provide immediate, detailed, and personalized feedback. Additionally, traditional feedback methods often fail to address individual learning needs adequately, resulting in generalized comments that do not pinpoint specific areas for improvement (Hojeij & Baroudi, 2018). However, with the development of technology, video Feedback has emerged as an effective solution. Video Feedback allows educators to deliver feedback to students via video asynchronously, enabling students to replay or slow down the video to improve comprehension and gain a

thorough understanding of the feedback (Henderson & Phillips, 2015; Walter et al., 2015). This method significantly enhances students' speaking skills, including pronunciation, vocabulary, and fluency. By clearly defining and identifying areas for improvement, asynchronous video feedback took less time to create than text feedback however provides students with more time to explore solutions, leading to better observational and reasoning skills (Cunningham, 2019).

As a form of formative feedback, Asynchronous Video Feedback (AVF) helps students adjust their thinking or behavior to enhance learning. Formative feedback involves gathering information during a lesson to improve students' performance on targeted learning outcomes, narrowing the gap between current and desired performance and offering valuable insights for both students and teachers (Alonzo, 2018). AVF ensures a deeper understanding and better retention of the corrective guidance provided, making the learning process more dynamic and effective for both students and educators. Video feedback is a personal, specific, and engaging approach that allows students to view themselves from a distance, providing authentic and understandable input on their abilities (Crook et al., 2012; Henderson & Phillips, 2015; Lamey, 2015). Through frequent video observation, it also enables in-depth behaviour analysis. With peer interactions that happen in real time and the ability to record feedback for subsequent viewing, video feedback is more engaging than traditional feedback tactics.

Li and Walsh (2023) noted that additional empirical research is necessary to properly comprehend the potential of technology-enhanced video feedback in online education, as it is still in its early phases. Technology has significantly impacted teaching and learning as it has been incorporated into education. Asynchronous video feedback is being used by more online instructors to improve communication in speaking classrooms (Belt & Lowenthal, 2021). Asynchronous video is now more widely available because to technological developments, providing nonverbal, emotional, and visual cues that might enhance online conversation. With content continually available, asynchronous learning environments help students overcome shyness and teacher anxiety (Coman et al., 2020). Mahoney et al. (2019) have identified three ways for video feedback in higher education: talking head video feedback, screencast video feedback, and screencast video feedback using a webcam. English teachers can more efficiently provide video feedback in online learning environments by being aware of these tactics.

Promising results have been found when researchers investigate the usage of blogs and video technologies to provide students with video feedback. At the English Education Department of IAIN Batusangkar, Indonesia, fourth-semester students participated in a study by Zulhermindra and Hadiarni (2020) on the use of filmed feedback to improve public speaking abilities. With noticeable improvements in the introduction, body, conclusion, and timing of their presentations, this classroom action research showed that students' abilities increased from needing improvement to satisfactory. The results imply that filmed feedback is a useful tool for applying to other facets of public speaking and related topics. However, Tseng and Yeh (2019) looked into how third-year EFL college students in the Department of Applied Foreign Language at a national university in Taiwan fared when it came to their English speaking abilities whether they received written versus video feedback. According to the study, receiving written and video feedback was beneficial for improving one's English

speaking abilities. Students' intonation improved the most with video feedback, but their grammar and vocabulary improved more with written input (Cavaleri et al., 2019). The students thought that receiving feedback was essential to improving their speaking skills, and depending on the particular skill area, they preferred receiving both kinds of feedback.

Effective feedback techniques were investigated by Cheng and Li (2020) in online TESOL classrooms at a public institution in the South of the United States, in distance learning settings. They used screencast video feedback in writing classes and evaluated its efficacy against Microsoft Word feedback that was simply text-based. According to the survey, students favoured screencast video feedback since it was intimate and conversational and could offer detailed insights. This approach is a promising strategy for educators working in online learning environments because it provided thorough writing feedback and assisted in building a social presence.

Previous studies have significantly contributed to the literature on feedback in learning, but several gaps remain unaddressed. Notably, these studies have often overlooked informal education settings, the duration of delivering feedback, and geographical factors that may influence students' speaking skills. Additionally, the practice and students' perceptions of using asynchronous video feedback (AVF) in speaking classes have not been thoroughly investigated, particularly in informal education contexts. This study aims to fill these gaps by exploring the use of AVF in online English courses, specifically within informal settings. The study centres on two main enquiries: Do students' speaking abilities before and after getting asynchronous, video-recorded spoken corrective feedback differ significantly? What are the perceptions, benefits, flexibility, and preferences of students in an online speaking course regarding asynchronous video-recorded spoken corrective feedback? In the formative process, feedback is critical since it can either accelerate or stall learning. In order to improve speaking skills, this project aims to apply video feedback as a formative evaluation tool, offering fresh perspectives and theories on its application.

METHOD

Over the course of 11 days, the study evaluated students' speaking abilities in an informal online English course in Pare, Kediri, Indonesia, with an emphasis on topics of everyday conversation. The study examined students' performance in an online speaking class following the receipt of asynchronous video feedback by combining quantitative and qualitative approaches in a mixed-methods design. A two-phase design, with quantitative data collected initially and qualitative data subsequently, was made possible via the sequential explanatory mixed approach (Creswell, 2014). Pre- and post-tests, surveys, and other quantitative methods were used to collect data; semi-structured interviews were used to collect qualitative data.

Eight students from the Speaking 1 class, who had already passed the basic speaking class, were selected using purposive sampling. The online speaking course comprised three levels: Basic, Speaking 1, and Speaking 2. The Speaking 1 level targets students who are familiar with essential phrases and expressions in daily life and can communicate in English. The goal of this level is for students to construct and articulate ideas on topics such as plans, hometown, education, and other relevant subjects provided by the tutor. This comprehensive approach ensured a thorough investigation of the effectiveness of asynchronous video feedback in enhancing speaking skills.

Data collection for this study involved several stages. Initially, a pretest was conducted on day 1 to assess the students' baseline speaking skills. This was followed by a treatment phase using Asynchronous Video Feedback (AVF) from day 2 to day 10, encompassing nine cycles in total. During the treatment, the researcher evaluated students' performance using a scoring rubric that included fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. After summarizing the feedback based on this scoring rubric, the researcher provided detailed explanations of the students' performance in the form of video feedback. This feedback addressed pronunciation errors, vocabulary issues, and grammar mistakes. For pronunciation errors, the researcher used phonetic symbols to demonstrate correct pronunciation. Grammar mistakes were corrected by explaining the proper use of verbs and tenses. Each video feedback was then uploaded to Google Drive and shared with the students via a WhatsApp group.

At the end of the treatment phase, a survey was distributed to gather feedback on the effectiveness of the AVF. On day 11, a posttest was conducted, which included a Question and Answer activity. Additionally, four students were selected for interviews based on their collective speaking scores to gain deeper insights. The collected data were analyzed using statistical techniques such as means, standard deviations, and ranges, and processed using SPSS 26. The results were presented by comparing average scores to determine the impact of asynchronous video feedback on students' language skills.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The study aimed to evaluate the impact of asynchronous video-recorded spoken corrective feedback on students' speaking skills. The results showed a significant increase in the mean values of the pretest and posttest scores, indicating substantial improvement in students' performance. The mean pretest score was 64.88, while the mean posttest score increased to 84.88. This significant increase in the mean scores indicates that students' speaking skills improved markedly after receiving asynchronous video-recorded spoken corrective feedback.

Table 1. Paired Sample Statistic

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test	64.88	10.548	3.729
	Post-test	84.88	7.415	2.622

The significant increase in the mean scores from pretest to posttest demonstrates the effectiveness of asynchronous video-recorded spoken corrective feedback in enhancing students' speaking skills. The reduction in standard deviation and standard error mean further supports that the feedback method not only improved overall performance but also led to more consistent outcomes among the students. These findings highlight the potential of asynchronous video feedback as a valuable tool for improving speaking skills in an educational setting.

Table 2. Paired Sample Correlation

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Pre-test & Post-test	8	.924	.001

The study further examined the correlation between students' pre-test and post-test scores to understand the relationship between their performance before and after receiving asynchronous video-recorded spoken corrective feedback. The paired sample correlation analysis, as shown in Table 2, revealed a very strong positive correlation of 0.924 between the pre-test and post-test scores for the eight students involved in the study. This high correlation coefficient indicates that students who performed well on the pre-test also tended to perform well on the post-test, and those with lower pre-test scores generally showed significant improvement in their post-test scores.

The significance value (Sig.) of 0.001 confirms that this correlation is statistically significant, suggesting that the observed relationship is unlikely to have occurred by chance. This strong, significant correlation underscores the effectiveness of the asynchronous video feedback intervention, as it demonstrates a consistent improvement in students' speaking skills from the pre-test to the post-test. The findings indicate that asynchronous video-recorded feedback can reliably enhance students' speaking abilities, making it a valuable tool in educational settings for improving language proficiency.

A pre-experimental study revealed that asynchronous video feedback significantly improved students' English speaking skills in an online speaking class, as assessed through a pretest and posttest, demonstrating the effectiveness of this formative feedback. This result aligns with the findings of [Zulhermindra and Hadiarni \(2020\)](#), who found that videotaped feedback could enhance students' public speaking skills. However, [Tseng and Yeh \(2019\)](#) noted that while video feedback could improve students' fluency in speaking English, it was less effective for grammar and vocabulary, which were better improved through written feedback. Their study compared students who received video feedback and those who received written feedback, with the latter showing more significant improvements in grammar and vocabulary.

Moreover, peers offered both written and video evaluation in [Tseng and Yeh's \(2019\)](#) investigation, which was finished in a single feedback cycle. Due to the short practice period, some speaking skills components did not develop to their full potential. Additionally, [Nikolic et al. \(2018\)](#) found that obtaining peer criticism did not significantly increase performance in comparison to self-critiquing or receiving no feedback at all. According to [Simpson et al. \(2019\)](#), several students also experienced anxiety and vulnerability when making remarks about their peers.

On the other hand, the current study employed an asynchronous video feedback system wherein one of the researchers served as the instructor for nine cycles of feedback. With this method, which used the feedback as a formative assessment, students had more time in class to practise and analyse their errors. According to [Alonzo \(2018\)](#) and [Wafubwa \(2020\)](#), formative assessment necessitates precise language and an emphasis on comprehension as opposed to evaluation. This method may help students become more proficient speakers in a number of areas, such as fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. The results show that students' speaking abilities significantly differed

before and after receiving asynchronous video-recorded spoken corrective feedback, proving that the intervention improved their performance.

Students' Perceive of an Asynchronous Video-Recorded Spoken Corrective Feedback

The researcher utilized both quantitative and qualitative data to gather comprehensive information on students' speaking abilities. The qualitative data were obtained from open-ended interviews, offering in-depth perspectives. The data were analyzed and categorized into four main areas: understanding of asynchronous video feedback (AVF), benefits of AVF, flexibility of AVF, and preferred forms of feedback.

Understanding of Asynchronous Video Feedback

Students' understanding of asynchronous video feedback (AVF) was assessed through various statements, with average scores indicating that most students agreed they understood and utilized the feedback from their tutor. Specifically, students agreed that they were familiar with the term AVF (average score of 2.50) and actively corrected their errors based on the feedback (average score of 3.38). They strongly agreed that they understood the feedback provided (average score of 3.63). Additionally, students agreed that they watched the entire video feedback (average score of 2.75) and focused on the specific feedback given (average score of 2.63). The overall average score of 2.98 suggests a general agreement among students regarding their understanding of AVF. Despite not fully grasping the concept, a significant number of students used the feedback to correct their speaking practice errors. These results are consistent with those of [Bobo and Andrews \(2010\)](#) and [Simpson et al. \(2019\)](#), who observed that students may appraise their own performance in relation to given assessment criteria by using video feedback. Nonetheless, it is crucial to remember that students' educational backgrounds can have an impact on how well they understand video feedback when learning English.

Participant 1 mentioned, *"I haven't checked everything, perhaps one or two of yesterday's videos, which I believe are pretty simple to grasp. But I'm not sure because we have different ways of implementing it, and our educational backgrounds in acquiring English are also varied. But, for me, it's quite easy."* Prior to enrolling in Speaking 1, Participant 1 had already studied grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation extensively. P1 consequently found it simple to understand the tutor's explanations in the feedback videos. Notwithstanding, P1 conceded that learners' educational experiences with English language acquisition may impact their comprehension, resulting in disparate degrees of comprehension about video feedback. Participant 2 further emphasised this diversity.

Moreover, Participant 2 stated, *"I think I understand what is conveyed in the feedback video, but sometimes it can be difficult for me to apply it directly during class because I forget easily. So, even though I already understand what the feedback is in the video, remembering it in class is difficult. So, you really need to take notes and practice a lot, which is what I try to do."* Participant 2 clarified that although he comprehends the explanations in the video feedback, his forgetfulness makes it difficult for him to put them into practice in class. Given that the researcher uses different terminology to remedy speaking faults, this could point to a shallower understanding of the language. In order to overcome this shortcoming, P2 has

devised a plan that involves making notes on the criticism and practicing more to improve his English speaking abilities.

Daily assessments revealed that many students struggle with grammar, which is essential for fluency. Proficiency in grammar enables speakers to apply and comprehend English language structures quickly and accurately, promoting fluency (Abbaspour, 2016; Kusumawardani & Mardiyani, 2018). Recognizing that grammar was a significant obstacle for many students, the researcher dedicated more time to discussing grammatical feedback.

The Benefit of Asynchronous Video Feedback

Researchers examined the impact of asynchronous video feedback (AVF) on students' speaking skills, in addition to their comprehension of AVF. The analysis of students' perceptions revealed that AVF is beneficial for improving their speaking abilities, with an overall average score of 3.45. Students agreed that AVF provided new ideas for practicing English speaking skills (3.50), helped them understand their mistakes (3.50), corrected pronunciation errors (3.38), and emphasized word stress in sentences (3.63). They also found AVF useful for identifying grammar errors (3.63) and correcting vocabulary usage (3.50). Furthermore, students felt that AVF allowed more practice time during class (3.13), were satisfied with the feedback (3.38), and found it effective for recognizing their teacher (3.38). Overall, AVF was considered very effective in improving speaking abilities for future use (3.38). These findings align with Henderson & Phillips (2015), who noted that video feedback encourages critical thinking and reflection. Additionally, students reported that combining AVF with resources like vlogs, and English podcasts enhanced their continuous practice and learning (Lestari, 2019).

Furthermore, Participant 2 mentioned, *"In my opinion, it should be written in note form, because speaking is a sport or skill requiring a lot of practice. We will not develop our speaking skills until we practice. That's the basic thing that you tried to convey to us, and the most important thing is that we must always try to speak English."* This highlights the importance of consistent practice for developing speaking skills. Students also agreed that AVF helped provide more time in class for practice. Students in the speaking class indicated that one of their main requirements was more time to practice speaking in public through debates, conversations, and discussions. AVF is a useful substitute for synchronous feedback delivery since it cuts down on the amount of time that is usually spent on it—roughly one-third of the class period. Additionally, Participant 2 often applies the feedback from the previous day when students are encouraged to participate in discussions. This includes using proper grammar and word connectors, which are crucial for clearly conveying ideas during talks.

Participant 3 asserted, *"So far it has helped improve my speaking because I have never received any feedback from the tutor in the class I took before."* P3 thought that AVF was especially beneficial because she had never gotten feedback in her prior classes. The teacher's comments was very important to her learning process because of her weak English proficiency. Feedback is intended to assist students in narrowing the gap between their present knowledge and their learning objectives, claim Hattie & Timperley (2007).

The Flexibility of Asynchronous Video Feedback

Asynchronous video feedback (AVF) has been found to be highly flexible in improving students' speaking competence (Yoon, 2021). The analysis of students' perceptions regarding the flexibility of AVF revealed that most students appreciated its adaptability. While students disagreed with spending a long time reviewing AVF (average score of 1.88), they agreed that they would keep the feedback for future review even after the class ended (3.13). They strongly agreed that they could review AVF anywhere (3.63) and at any time (3.38). Additionally, students agreed that they were not obliged to watch the AVF immediately (2.75).

Overall, the average score of 2.95 indicates that students find AVF flexible and beneficial for improving their speaking competence. They value the ability to review and pause the feedback at their convenience. Previous studies by Henderson & Phillips (2015) and Lamey (2015) support these findings, highlighting the flexibility of AVF as a major benefit, enabling students to replay, pause, and review the feedback. Cassano & Di Blas (2023) also emphasize the importance of this flexibility in promoting self-directed learning and discipline. AVF is particularly advantageous for students with diverse backgrounds and busy schedules, allowing them to review feedback even during stressful times, such as pandemics. However, Trip & Rich (2012), Henderson & Phillips (2015), and Borup et al. (2015) noted that delivering video feedback can be time-consuming for teachers and may not always be appreciated by students. The flexibility of AVF largely depends on the class design and students' needs throughout the class period.

Students' Preferred Form of Assessment Feedback

Researchers investigated students' preferred form of feedback in speaking classes, examining options such as direct spoken feedback, peer feedback, and individual feedback. The analysis revealed that students generally preferred various feedback forms. They felt more connected with their tutors through asynchronous video feedback (AVF), with an average score of 3.25, and believed that AVF is necessary for online and online speaking classes (average scores of 3.50). While they disagreed with feeling lazy to listen to AVF (2.13), they acknowledged that relying solely on AVF can feel inadequate (3.13). Students felt comfortable receiving both AVF (3.50) and direct feedback during class (3.50). They also preferred individual feedback (3.38) and comprehensive feedback that includes all errors in fluency, vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar (3.25). However, peer feedback was less preferred (2.75).

The majority of students consented to receive various forms of feedback during the class hour, as evidenced by their total average score of 3.23. Although students valued AVF's flexibility, they also understood that it was essential for online learning, especially for speaking sessions. The results of the study support the findings of Thomas et al. (2017), who found that while AVF is less important in face-to-face interactions, it can be useful in fostering student-teacher relationships in fully online courses. The study also showed that AVF helps students feel more connected to and understand their instructors. Some students felt inadequate using AVF alone because they could not ask specific questions about the feedback. As stated by Participant 1, *"Personally, I usually prefer to get feedback in class directly."* Conversely, other participants favored AVF. Participant 2 asserted, *"It's good and pleasant, the video is short but I think it's quite good."* Moreover, Participant 3 mentioned, *"I*

prefer to receive asynchronous video feedback, in my opinion." Lastly, Participant 4 stated, *"In my opinion, I prefer asynchronous video feedback rather than delivering it directly in class. If it's asynchronous video feedback, we don't feel so embarrassed because it's aimed at everyone."*

Students with limited time for studying grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary preferred AVF due to its flexible nature. Thompson & Lee (2012) also highlighted positive student views on screencasting video feedback in online courses. Interview results showed that students preferred asynchronous feedback for practicing speaking, as it reduced their feelings of embarrassment and anxiety compared to receiving feedback in class.

CONCLUSION

Corrective feedback in speech classes can be given via video feedback, which provides individualised, targeted, and thorough explanations. This method improves learning outcomes in the twenty-first century by closing performance gaps between desired and actual performance. Education has been greatly impacted by technological improvements, which have improved the effectiveness of feedback delivery in both offline and online environments. English teachers can efficiently provide feedback in online speaking classrooms by utilising talking head films, screencasts, and webcam-based feedback as strategies for adopting video feedback in higher education. According to the study, speaking proficiency among students increased using asynchronous video feedback (AVF), as seen by an increase in pretest and posttest scores from 64.88 to 84.88. At a p-value of 0.001, the improvement was statistically significant. The AVF method, applied over nine feedback cycles, provided students with ample time to practice and evaluate their mistakes, leading to enhancements in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency. With its flexibility, AVF encourages self-directed learning and self-discipline by enabling students to evaluate comments at any time and from any location. In addition, as contrasted to in-class comments, it fosters a stronger sense of community between students and teachers while lowering anxiety and feelings of embarrassment. However, the effectiveness of AVF can be influenced by students' educational backgrounds, particularly in understanding grammatical feedback. The small sample size and brief instructional period of this study were its limitations. Further research should explore instructors' perspectives and compare the effectiveness of AVF with other feedback methods in both control and experimental classes. This study highlights AVF's role in enhancing speaking skills in online English classes, offering a practical tool for modern educational practices.

REFERENCES

- Abbaspour, F. (2016). Speaking Competence and its components: A review of literature. *Journal of Research in Linguistics, Language Teaching and Testing*, 1(4), 144–152.
- Alonzo, A. C. (2018). An argument for formative assessment with science learning progressions. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 31(2), 104–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08957347.2017.1408630>
- Belt, E. S., & Lowenthal, P. R. (2021). *Video Use in Online and Blended Courses: A Qualitative Synthesis*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2021.1954882>

- Bobo, L., & Andrews, A. (2010). Using video feedback to measure self-efficacy. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 3. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1096947>
- Borup, J., West, R. E., & Thomas, R. (2015). The impact of text versus video communication on instructor feedback in blended courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 63(2), 161–184. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9367-8>
- Cassano, G., & Di Blas, N. (2024). A tool to support Students-to-Teacher feedback in asynchronous online contexts. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 17, 585–593. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tlt.2023.3273109>
- Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Di Biase, B., & Power, C. (2019). How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 16(4), 6. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.16.4.6>
- Cheng, D., & Li, M. (2020). Screencast video feedback in online TESOL classes. *Computers and Composition*, 58, 102612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612>
- Coman, C., Țîru, L. G., Meseșan-Schmitz, L., Stanciu, C., & Bularca, M. C. J. S. (2020). Online teaching and learning in higher education during the coronavirus pandemic: Students' perspective. 12(24), 10367. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122410367>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed). SAGE Publications.
- 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>
- 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>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2015). Video-based feedback on student assessment: scarily personal. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(1). <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1878>
- Hojeij, Z., & Baroudi, S. J. I. i. E. R. (2018). Student perceptions on peer feedback training using a blended method: A UAE case. 28(3), 655-678. [doi/abs/10.3316/ielapa.864059533726310](https://doi.org/10.3316/ielapa.864059533726310)
- Kusumawardani, S. A., & Mardiyani, E. (2018). The correlation between English grammar competence and speaking fluency. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(6), 724. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i6.p724-733>
- Lamey, A. (2015). Video feedback in philosophy. *Metaphilosophy*, 46(4–5), 691–702. <https://doi.org/10.1111/meta.12155>
- Li, Y., & Walsh, S. (2023). Technology-enhanced reflection and teacher development: A student teacher's journey. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 356-375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231161153>
- Lestari, N. (2019). Improving the speaking skill by vlog (video blog) as learning media: The EFL students perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(1), Pages 915-925. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v9-i1/5490>

- 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>
- Nikolic, S., Stirling, D., & Ros, M. (2018). Formative assessment to develop oral communication competency using YouTube: Self- and peer assessment in engineering. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 43(4), 538–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2017.1298569>
- Simpson, T., Holden, K., Merrick, D., Dawson, S., & Bedford, L. (2019). Does video feedback & peer observation offer a valid method of reinforcing oral presentation training for undergraduate biochemists? *Higher Education Pedagogies*, 4(1), 262–283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23752696.2019.1587717>
- Thomas, R. A., West, R. E., & Borup, J. (2017). An analysis of instructor social presence in online text and asynchronous video feedback comments. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 33, 61–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.01.003>
- Thompson, R., & Lee, M. J. (2012). Talking with students through screencasting: experimentations with video feedback to improve student learning. *SIAS Faculty Publications*, 1(1). https://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/ias_pub/229/
- Tripp, T., & Rich, P. (2012). Using video to analyze one's own teaching. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43(4), 678–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01234.x>
- Tseng, S.-S., & Yeh, H.-C. (2019). *The Impact of Video and Written Feedback on Student Preferences of English Speaking Practice*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/44687>
- Wafubwa, R. (2020). Role of formative assessment in improving students' motivation: a systematic review of literature. *The international journal of assessment and evaluation*, 28(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7920/CGP/v28i01/17-31>
- Walter, N., Ortbach, K., & Niehaves, B. (2015). Designing electronic feedback – Analyzing the effects of social presence on perceived feedback usefulness. *International Journal of Human-computer Studies*, 76, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2014.12.001>
- Yoon, J. (2021). Students' perception of blended asynchronous and synchronous learning in an advanced spanish conversation class. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(6). <http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i6.4065>
- Zulhermindra, Z., & Hadiarni, H. (2020). Improving students' public speaking skills through the use of videotaped feedback. *Ta'dib*, 23(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.31958/jt.v23i1.2008>