Journal of English Language and Education
ISSN 2597- 6850 (Online), 2502-4132 (Print)
Journal Homepage: https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/index

OPEN ACCESS Article

Improving EFL Writing Revision and Self-Efficacy through Meditated Screen Cast Video Teacher Feedback

https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i3.2200

*Mohamed Elsayed Seddik[a]
[1]Department of Foreign Languages, Arts and Humanities College, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia·
Corresponding Author: mmelsayed@jazanu.edu.sa

A B S T R A C T

This quasi-experimental study investigated the impact of Screencast Video Feedback (SVF) versus Traditional Written Feedback (TWF) on the writing revision and self-efficacy of Egyptian secondary students. Utilizing purposive sampling, 60 participants were divided into control (TWF) and experimental (SVF) groups for a three-week intervention at a public school in Mansoura. Data from pre-/post-tests and semi-structured interviews were analyzed using MANCOVA. Findings reveal that the SVF group achieved statistically significant improvements in revision accuracy, particularly regarding global issues—such as organization and thesis clarity—and complex grammatical errors. Furthermore, SVF significantly enhanced writing self-efficacy. Qualitative insights indicate that SVF's multimodal nature fosters a personalized, engaging, and comprehensible dialogic connection. Grounded in cognitive load theory and sociocultural approaches, the study argues that SVF is a pedagogically viable alternative to TWF, advocating for its integration in resource-aware EFL settings despite traditional instructional barriers.

Keywords: *Screen-Cast Video Feedback, Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), EFL Writing, Self-Efficacy, Digital Mediation, Egyptian Context, Teacher Feedback*

Article History:
Received 15th February 2026
Accepted 03rd May 2026
Published 06th May 2026

INTRODUCTION

Achieving proficiency in academic writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is a critical yet formidable objective for learners globally, and Egypt is no exception. Within the Egyptian secondary education system, writing instruction is predominantly product-oriented and examination-driven, with teacher feedback often serving a summative, evaluative role rather than a formative, developmental one (Abdullah & Alharbi, 2021; Rashad, 2020). The dominant mode, traditional written corrective feedback (TWF), characterized by marginal annotations, cryptic error codes, and brief end comments, has been widely criticized. Research indicates that TWF can be ambiguous, overly focused on surface-level errors at the expense of global concerns like organization and argumentation, and is frequently met with passive reception from learners who lack the strategies to effectively decode and utilize it (Ferris, 2014; Hyland & Hyland, 2019). This disconnect is particularly acute in large-class contexts common in Egyptian public schools.

Concurrently, the digital transformation in language pedagogy has introduced novel feedback modalities. Among these, screen-cast video feedback (SVF)—where the instructor records their computer screen while providing real-time, narrated commentary over a student's digital document—has garnered significant international interest. Proponents argue that its inherently multimodal nature (combining visual highlighting with auditory explanation) can reduce cognitive load, personalize communication, and foster a more dialogic, student-centered feedback process (Anson, 2015; Elola & Oskoz, 2016). It effectively simulates a one-on-one writing conference, a luxury often unavailable in crowded classrooms.

This study, therefore, seeks to bridge this gap by investigating the efficacy of SVF within the authentic constraints of the Egyptian public school system over a concise, practical timeframe. The research is guided by the following questions:

> *To what extent does screen-cast video feedback (SVF), compared to traditional written feedback (TWF), lead to improved revision quality in the argumentative writing of Egyptian secondary school EFL learners, as measured by a holistic and analytic rubric?*
> *How does SVF, compared to TWF, affect these learners' self-reported writing self-efficacy?*
> *How do learners perceive the usefulness, clarity, and engagement of SVF in contrast to TWF?*

Following this introduction, the paper provides a comprehensive review of relevant literature on WCF, digital feedback, and self-efficacy. The methodology details the 3-week quasi-experimental design, participant selection from a Mansoura school, instruments, and data analysis procedures. The results section presents quantitative and qualitative findings, which are then discussed in relation to theory and prior research. The conclusion outlines pedagogical implications, acknowledges limitations, and suggests directions for future research.

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

The role of written corrective feedback (WCF) in second language acquisition (SLA) has been vigorously debated. Truscott's (1996) polemic against grammar correction sparked decades of research, leading to a more nuanced consensus that WCF can be effective under specific conditions (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Ellis et al., 2008). For WCF to facilitate learning, it should be selective, focused, and comprehensible, prompting learners to engage in cognitive comparison and "notice the gap" between their interlanguage and the target form (Schmidt, 1990). However, TWF often fails to meet these conditions in practice. Written comments can be terse and cryptic (e.g., "awkward," "vague"), placing a high cognitive load on the learner to decipher both the problem and its solution (Hyland, 2013). This challenge is magnified in large-class contexts like those in Egypt, where feedback is often rushed and generic, leading to student confusion and disengagement (El-Sakka, 2019).

Digital Feedback in EFL

Computer-mediated communication has fundamentally reshaped feedback paradigms. Initial steps included email, word processor comment features, and automated scoring systems. The advent of Web 2.0 technologies ushered in more dynamic forms, notably asynchronous audio and video feedback. Research on audio feedback, pioneered by scholars like (Ice et al., 2007), found it was often more detailed, nuanced, and perceived as more supportive and personalized than text-based comments. SVF represents a significant evolution of this concept by incorporating the visual dimension of screencasting. This allows instructors to visually guide the learner through the text—pointing, highlighting, circling, and even modeling edits in real-time—while providing a synchronized auditory explanation (Anson, 2015; Harper et al., 2018). This combination creates a synchronous-like, guided tour of the student's text, potentially enhancing clarity, reducing ambiguity, and increasing student engagement.

Screen-Cast Video Feedback (SVF)

Empirical studies on SVF in L2 writing, though still emerging, report generally positive outcomes. Research by (Harper et al., 2018) and (Ducate & Arnold, 2012) found that SVF led to more successful revisions and was consistently rated as more personal, clear, and helpful by university-level L2 learners compared to text feedback. The efficacy of SVF can be theorized through multiple lenses. From the perspective of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) (Sweller, 2011), well-designed SVF leverages dual-channel processing (auditory and visual) to manage intrinsic load (the complexity of writing concepts) and minimize extraneous load (the effort required to decode handwritten symbols or abbreviated comments). By presenting information through both ear and eye in an integrated manner, it can enhance working memory capacity for learning. Furthermore, from a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky,

1978), SVF serves as a powerful tool for mediated, other-regulation. The teacher's voice provides dynamic scaffolding, turning the monologic act of marking into a more dialogic, apprenticeship-like interaction where guidance is situated within the specific text.

Written Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, a cornerstone of (Bandura, 1997) social cognitive theory, refers to an individual's belief in their capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. In the domain of writing, it profoundly influences task choice, effort, persistence, and emotional resilience. Feedback is a primary source of efficacy information. As (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) argue, effective feedback must reduce the discrepancy between current performance and a desired goal, a process intrinsically linked to building competence and, consequently, efficacy. Impersonal, overly critical, or incomprehensible feedback can undermine self-efficacy. In contrast, SVF, by virtue of its conversational tone, supportive affect, and explicit strategic guidance, may more effectively serve as a potent source of verbal persuasion and a clearer roadmap for mastery experiences—two of the four key sources of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). The perceived care and personal attention embedded in SVF can also positively influence emotional arousal.

The Egyptian Context: A Call for Localized, Feasible Innovation

EFL writing instruction in Egypt faces distinct challenges: overcrowded classrooms, high-stakes exam pressure, and predominantly teacher-centered, product-focused methodologies (Rashad, 2020). While technology adoption is increasing, its application often remains at the level of presentation tools (e.g., PowerPoint) rather than transformative, interactive pedagogical practices. Studies on feedback in Egypt (e.g., El-Sakka, 2019) have highlighted student dissatisfaction with traditional, often incomprehensible, marking but have not rigorously tested and validated accessible alternatives like SVF within the practical time and resource constraints of the public-school calendar. This study directly addresses this contextual gap by designing and evaluating an intervention that is both technologically feasible (using widely available smartphones) and temporally concise (three weeks).

Despite the documented benefits of technology-mediated feedback in Western tertiary settings, a critical three-fold research gap remains. First, a contextual gap exists regarding the feasibility of such digital interventions in resource-aware EFL environments like Egyptian public schools, where pedagogical practices remain traditionally product-oriented despite increasing smartphone penetration. Second, there is a pedagogical gap concerning whether multimodal feedback can effectively bridge the divide between "local" grammatical correction and "global" issues like organization—a persistent challenge in large-class Egyptian contexts. Third, a theoretical gap persists regarding the affective impact of feedback modalities; specifically, how digital mediation influences writing self-efficacy, a robust yet under-investigated predictor of learner resilience. Localized empirical studies are therefore required to examine the linguistic and psychological outcomes of innovative feedback practices within these systemic constraints.

METHOD

Research Design

A mixed-methods, quasi-experimental design was employed, featuring a pre-test, intervention, immediate post-test, and delayed perception elicitation. This design allowed for the triangulation of quantitative data on performance and self-report with qualitative insights into learner experience. The independent variable was the feedback modality (SVF vs. TWF). The dependent variables were (a) writing revision quality (measured by analytic rubric scores) and (b) writing self-efficacy.

Context and Participants

The study involved a purposive sample of 60 first-year secondary students (N=60) from a public school in Mansoura, Egypt, selected for its typical representation of the national educational context. The age range of participants was 15 to 16 years. Regarding gender distribution, the sample was drawn from a single-gender (all-male) public school, reflecting

the localized gender-segregated nature of the Egyptian public secondary system. Participants were selected based on an intermediate English proficiency level, verified by their scores in the previous term's standardized English exam, which fell within the 70% to 85% range. Following selection, students were randomly assigned to either the experimental group (n=30), receiving screen-cast video feedback (SVF), or the control group (n=30), receiving traditional written feedback (TWF). A preliminary survey confirmed that all participants possessed the necessary digital literacy and home access to smartphones and the internet required for the intervention.

Instruments and Materials

The study employed a systematically designed set of instruments to assess both cognitive and affective dimensions of EFL students' argumentative writing. Two parallel writing prompts of equivalent complexity were developed and validated by experienced EFL teacher trainers to ensure content comparability. Writing revision quality was evaluated using a 20-point analytic rubric adapted from Sara Cushing Weigle (2002), encompassing five dimensions: task fulfillment and content, organization and cohesion, grammatical range and accuracy, lexical resource, and mechanics. Inter-rater reliability was established through independent scoring by two trained raters, yielding a Cohen's kappa coefficient of .86, which indicates strong agreement. The affective domain was measured using a 20-item Writing Self-Efficacy Scale adapted from Sun and Wang, with responses on a five-point Likert scale; the instrument demonstrated high internal consistency with a Cronbach's alpha of .89. Qualitative data were collected through a semi-structured interview protocol developed in alignment with the research questions, pilot-tested for clarity, and reviewed by applied linguistics experts to ensure face and construct validity. In addition, the study utilized Loom to produce screen-cast video feedback, selected for its ease of use, efficient link sharing, and compatibility with students' mobile devices.

Procedure

The procedure was tightly structured to fit the three-week window:

> ***Week 1 (Pre-test & Baseline):*** *In a 45-minute class session, all participants completed the WSES and then wrote the first argumentative essay (Pre-test, Prompt A) on Google Docs.*
>
> ***Feedback Intervention (Researcher-led):*** *The researcher, acting as the instructor, provided feedback on all 60 pre-test essays within one week.*
>
> ***Control Group (TWF):*** *Received coded feedback (e.g., "GR" for grammar, "ORG" for organization) with selective underlining/correction and a final summative comment (2-3 sentences) using the comment feature in Google Docs.*
>
> ***Experimental Group (SVF):*** *Received individual 3–5-minute SVF files via Loom links. The researcher shared her screen, scrolling through the student's document, providing holistic praise, highlighting specific areas for improvement (both global and local), and offering oral explanations, questions, and reformulations.*
>
> ***Week 2 (Revision & Post-test):*** *Students accessed their feedback (Doc comments or Loom links). They were given 30 minutes in class to review the feedback and revise their original Pre-test essay. Immediately after, in the same session, they wrote a new essay on the parallel topic (Post-test, Prompt B) under controlled conditions without access to any feedback, ensuring the post-test measured learning transfer.*
>
> ***Week 3 (Delayed Measures & Interviews):*** *All participants re-took the WSES. Subsequently, 10 participants from the SVF group participated in individual 15-minute audio-recorded interviews conducted in Arabic to*

ensure comfort and depth of expression. Interviews were transcribed and translated into English for analysis.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS (Version 28). A one-way Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (MANCOVA) was performed to examine the effect of feedback group on the five post-test writing sub-scores, using the five pre-test sub-scores as covariates. Separate one-way Analyses of Covariance (ANCOVA) were used as follow-up tests for each writing component and for the WSES post-test score (using its pre-test as a covariate). Partial eta-squared (η^2) values were calculated as measures of effect size. Qualitative data from interviews were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis(Braun & Clarke, 2006) to identify, analyze, and report patterns (themes) within the data.

Ethical Considerations

Approval was obtained from the school administration and the district educational directorate. Written informed consent was secured from parents/guardians and assent from students. Participants were assured of confidentiality, anonymity (using codes like SVF_01), and their right to withdraw at any time without consequence. Data was stored on a password-protected drive.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings derived from the quantitative and qualitative data analyses, organized according to the three research questions concerning revision quality, writing self-efficacy, and learner perceptions of the feedback modalities. Statistical results are reported first, followed by qualitative themes, with interpretation reserved for the subsequent Discussion section.

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to conducting the main analyses, preliminary checks were performed to ensure the assumptions of parametric tests were satisfied. Tests of normality (Shapiro-Wilk) indicated that the pre-test and post-test scores for all dependent variables were approximately normally distributed (*p* > .05). Levene's tests confirmed homogeneity of variances across groups for all writing components and self-efficacy measures (*p* > .05). Box's M test indicated homogeneity of covariance matrices (*p* = .27), supporting the use of MANCOVA. Descriptive statistics for pre-test and post-test measures are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Writing Components and Self-Efficacy by Group

Measure	**SVF group (n=30)**		**TWF group (n=30)**	
	Pre-test M (SD)	**Post-test M (SD)**	**Pre-test M (SD)**	**Post-test M (SD)**
Task Fulfillment & Content (5)	2.87 (0.64)	3.98 (0.51)	2.93 (0.58)	3.49 (0.63)
Organization & Cohesion (5)	2.65 (0.71)	4.15 (0.47)	2.71 (0.66)	3.18 (0.69)
Grammatical Range & Accuracy (5)	2.73 (0.68)	3.81 (0.55)	2.78 (0.62)	3.22 (0.73)
Lexical Resource (3)	1.58 (0.45)	2.16 (0.42)	1.62 (0.41)	1.94 (0.51)

Measure	SVF group (n=30)		TWF group (n=30)	
Mechanics (2)	1.32 (0.37)	1.66 (0.28)	1.35 (0.34)	1.57 (0.33)
Writing Self-Efficacy (5)	3.15 (0.49)	3.85 (0.40)	3.10 (0.53)	3.30 (0.49)

Note. SVF = Screen-cast Video Feedback; *TWF* = Traditional Written Feedback.

Research Question 1: Effect of Feedback Type on Writing Revision Quality

To examine the impact of feedback modality on writing revision quality, a one-way multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was conducted. The independent variable was feedback group (SVF vs. TWF). The dependent variables were the five post-test writing component scores: Task Fulfillment & Content, Organization & Cohesion, Grammatical Range & Accuracy, Lexical Resource, and Mechanics. The corresponding five pre-test component scores were entered as covariates to control for initial writing ability differences.

The MANCOVA results revealed a statistically significant multivariate effect of feedback group on the combined dependent variables, Wilks' $\Lambda = .55$, $F(5, 53) = 8.74$, *p* < .001, partial $\eta^2 = .45$. This indicates that 45% of the variance in the combined writing post-test scores was attributable to the feedback modality, representing a large effect size according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines.

Following the significant multivariate effect, univariate between-subjects ANCOVAs were conducted for each writing component to identify which specific areas were influenced by feedback type. Table 2 presents the adjusted post-test means, standard errors, and ANCOVA results for each writing component, controlling for pre-test scores.

Table 2. Summary of ANCOVA Results for Post-Test Writing Components by Group

Dependent Variable	SVF Group (n=30)	TWF Group (n=30)	ANCOVA Results			
	Adj. M (SE)	Adj. M (SE)	Mean Diff.	*F*(1, 57)	*p*	Partial η^2
Task Fulfillment & Content	3.95 (0.10)	3.52 (0.10)	0.43	6.94	.011	.11
Organization & Cohesion	4.12 (0.09)	3.21 (0.09)	0.91	26.83	< .001	.32
Grammatical Range & Accuracy	3.78 (0.10)	3.25 (0.10)	0.53	9.65	.003	.15
Lexical Resource	2.15 (0.07)	1.95 (0.07)	0.20	2.15	.148	.04
Mechanics	1.65 (0.05)	1.58 (0.05)	0.07	0.87	.355	.02

Note. Adjusted means control for pre-test scores on each respective component. Mean difference = SVF adjusted mean minus TWF adjusted mean.

As shown in Table 2, statistically significant differences favoring the SVF group were observed for three of the five writing components:

Task Fulfillment & Content: The SVF group demonstrated significantly higher adjusted post-test scores than the TWF group, $F(1, 57) = 6.94$, *p* = .011, partial $\eta^2 = .11$, representing a

medium effect size. The adjusted mean difference was 0.43 points on the 5-point scale. Organization & Cohesion: The largest and most statistically significant effect was found for this component, $F(1, 57) = 26.83$, *p* < .001, partial $\eta^2 = .32$, indicating a large effect size. The SVF group's adjusted mean exceeded the TWF group by 0.91 points. Grammatical Range & Accuracy: A significant medium-to-large effect was observed, $F(1, 57) = 9.65$, *p* = .003, partial $\eta^2 = .15$, with an adjusted mean difference of 0.53 points favoring the SVF group. Lexical Resource: Although the SVF group achieved a higher adjusted mean (2.15) compared to the TWF group (1.95), this difference did not reach statistical significance, $F(1, 57) = 2.15$, *p* = .148, partial $\eta^2 = .04$. Mechanics: No statistically significant difference was detected between the two groups for this component, $F(1, 57) = 0.87$, *p* = .355, partial $\eta^2 = .02$, and the adjusted mean difference was minimal (0.07 points).

Research Question 2: Effect of Feedback Type on Writing Self-Efficacy

To assess the impact of feedback modality on students' writing self-efficacy, a one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted. The independent variable was feedback group (SVF vs. TWF), the dependent variable was the post-test Writing Self-Efficacy Scale (WSES) score, and the pre-test WSES score was entered as a covariate to control for initial self-efficacy levels.

The ANCOVA revealed a statistically significant main effect of feedback group on post-test self-efficacy scores, $F (1, 57) = 15.23$, *p* < .001, partial $\eta^2 = .21$. This represents a large effect size, indicating that 21% of the variance in post-test self-efficacy scores was explained by the feedback modality after controlling pre-test differences. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics, and adjusted post-test means for both groups.

Table 3. Descriptive and ANCOVA Results for Writing Self-Efficacy Scale Scores

Group	Pre-test M (SD)	Post-test M (SD)	Adjusted Post-test M (SE)	95% CI for Adjusted Mean
VF (n=30)	3.15 (0.49)	3.85 (0.40)	3.78 (0.08)	[3.62, 3.94]
TWF (n=30)	3.10 (0.53)	3.30 (0.49)	3.21 (0.08)	[3.05, 3.37]

Note. **WSES** scores range from 1 (Not Confident at All) to 5 (Very Confident). Adjusted means control for pre-test WSES scores. CI = confidence interval.

The SVF group demonstrated a substantially greater increase in self-efficacy from pre-test to post-test (unadjusted mean gain = 0.70 points) compared to the TWF group (unadjusted mean gain = 0.20 points). After adjusting for pre-test scores, the SVF group's mean self-efficacy (3.78) was significantly higher than that of the TWF group (3.21), yielding an adjusted mean difference of 0.57 points (*p* < .001).

Research Question 3: Learner Perceptions of Screen-Cast Video Feedback

To address the third research question concerning students' perceptions of the usefulness, clarity, and engagement of SVF compared to TWF, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 participants from the experimental group. The interview data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), following a six-phase process: familiarization, initial coding, theme generation, theme review, theme definition, and write-up. Analysis yielded three overarching themes, each with constituent sub-themes, which are presented below with representative quotations. Participant codes (e.g., SVF_03) are used to ensure anonymity.

Theme 1: Enhanced Clarity and Reduced Ambiguity

All 10 participants reported that SVF provided greater clarity compared to their prior experiences with written feedback. This theme comprised two interrelated sub-themes: explicit explanation of errors and visual-auditory synchronization. Regarding explicit explanation, participants consistently noted that hearing the teacher articulate the nature of errors and demonstrate corrections made the feedback more comprehensible than cryptic written symbols or abbreviations.

> *"When the teacher just writes 'awk' or '?' on my paper, I never really know what she means. But in the video, she said, 'This sentence is confusing because the subject and verb don't agree,' and then she showed me how to fix it. That made perfect sense." (SVF_07)*
>
> *"With written feedback, I often guess what the teacher wants. With the video, there was no guessing. She explained exactly why my paragraph was disorganized and how to rearrange my ideas." (SVF_15)*

The visual-auditory synchronization inherent in SVF emerged as a particularly valued feature. Participants emphasized that seeing the teacher highlight, circle, and scroll through their document while simultaneously hearing explanations created a coherent learning experience.

> *"It was like having the teacher sit next to me and guide me through my essay. She would say, 'Look here,' and I could see her cursor pointing exactly to the problem. My eyes and ears were working together." (SVF_21)*
>
> *"When she corrected my grammar, she would say the correct sentence while typing it. I could hear the correct structure and see it appear on the screen at the same time. That helped me remember it better." (SVF_04)*

Theme 2: Perceived Personalization and Teacher Investment

A second prominent theme concerned the affective dimension of receiving video feedback. Participants reported feeling that the teacher had invested significant personal attention in their work, which enhanced their motivation and engagement. This theme encompassed two sub-themes: sense of individual attention and emotional impact on motivation.

The sense of individual attention was frequently mentioned, with participants contrasting the personalized nature of SVF against the impersonal feel of written comments.

> *"It felt like she was talking just to me, not like the general comments she writes on everyone's papers. I could hear her voice, her tone. It felt personal, like she really cared about my writing." (SVF_12)*
>
> *"In a class of 40 students, you often feel invisible. But when I received my video, I thought, 'She actually read my essay carefully and thought about how to help me.' That meant a lot." (SVF_28)*

This perceived personalization translated into positive emotional responses and increased motivation to engage with and act upon the feedback.

> *"Because I knew she spent time making that video for me, I felt I owed it to her—and to myself—to watch it carefully and really try to improve my essay. I didn't want to let her down." (SVF_19)*
>
> *"I actually felt happy when I received the video link. It was exciting to hear her praise my good ideas before she talked about what needed fixing. With written feedback, I just feel anxious when I see red marks." (SVF_09)*

Theme 3: Engagement through Revisability and Control

The third theme related to the affordances of the digital format, specifically the ability to control the pace of feedback reception and revisit content multiple times. Two sub-themes were identified: self-paced learning and multiple viewings for reinforcement.

Participants valued the ability to pause, rewind, and replay segments of the feedback, which allowed them to process information at their own pace—an affordance not available with static written comments.

> *"I watched my feedback video three times while revising. The first time, I just listened to get an overall idea. The second time, I paused at each suggestion and made notes. The third time, I checked if I had fixed everything she mentioned. You can't do that with a paper full of marks." (SVF_19)*
> *"Sometimes I didn't understand something the first time, so I just rewound and listened again. It's like having the teacher repeat herself without feeling embarrassed to ask." (SVF_03)*

The revisability of the video format also facilitated deeper processing and reinforcement of learning points.

> *"A week after revising, I watched the video again to remind myself of the grammar points she explained. It was like a mini-lesson I could access anytime. Written feedback gets lost or forgotten." (SVF_11)*
> *"Being able to watch it multiple times meant I could really focus on different things each time—first organization, then vocabulary, then grammar. I couldn't do that with written comments because they're all mixed together on the page." (SVF_24)*

Summary of Key Findings

The quantitative analyses revealed that:

SVF produced significantly higher writing revision quality than TWF across three components: Task Fulfillment & Content (*p* = .011, η^2 = .11), Organization & Cohesion (*p* < .001, η^2 = .32), and Grammatical Range & Accuracy (*p* = .003, η^2 = .15).

No significant differences were found for Lexical Resource (*p* = .148) or Mechanics (*p* = .355).

SVF resulted in significantly higher writing self-efficacy compared to TWF (*p* < .001, η^2 = .21), with an adjusted mean difference of 0.57 points.

The qualitative analysis provided three themes explaining these outcomes: Enhanced Clarity and Reduced Ambiguity, Perceived Personalization and Teacher Investment, and Engagement through Revisability and Control. These themes illuminate the mechanisms through which SVF facilitated improved revision outcomes and heightened self-efficacy among participants.

Discussion

This study demonstrates that SVF, implemented within a concise, three-week framework in a typical Egyptian public school, yielded significant quantitative and qualitative advantages over conventional TWF. The findings offer robust, triangulated evidence for the efficacy of this multimodal feedback approach in a previously under-researched context.

Impact on Revision Quality: Prioritizing Global Meaning

The superior improvement in Organization & Cohesion and Task Fulfillment & Content (RQ1) underscores a pivotal strength of SVF: its unique capacity to effectively address global, meaning-based issues that are notoriously difficult to comment on via marginalia or brief end comments (Hyland, 2013). The oral commentary allows for a coherent, holistic critique of argument flow, thesis development, and paragraph unity, which can be modeled prosodically and visually in a way static text cannot. This aligns with findings from (Anson, 2015), who argued that screencasting allows instructors to "perform" a reading of the text, making abstract concepts like "awkward" or "unclear" concretely audible and visible. The significant gains in Grammatical Range & Accuracy further support the argument that SVF's dual-channel delivery makes complex linguistic explanations (e.g., tense sequences, article usage, complex sentence boundaries) more comprehensible. This finding resonates with the principles of Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) (Sweller, 2011). By presenting verbal explanations synchronized with visual highlighting, SVF effectively manages intrinsic load and minimizes extraneous load, freeing up working memory capacity for deeper cognitive processing and integration of feedback.

Fostering the Affective Scaffold: Building Writing Self-Efficacy

The marked and significant increase in writing self-efficacy reported by the SVF group (RQ2) is arguably one of the most important findings of this study. This can be cogently interpreted through (Bandura, 1997) theory. SVF provides richer, more explicit verbal persuasion ("You have a good idea here; let's try to make it clearer by…") and, by making the path to improvement more transparent, it facilitates a more attainable mastery experience. When students understand *why* something is wrong and *how* to fix it, their sense of competence grows. Furthermore, the perceived care and individual attention (Theme 2) likely created a more positive emotional arousal associated with the feedback event, reducing anxiety and defensive reactions common with critical written comments (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). This affective boost is crucial in contexts like Egypt, where learners often view writing as a high-stakes, error-avoidance task rather than a process of communication and development.

Learner Perceptions: Validation of a Humanized Digital Tool

The qualitative themes (RQ3) provide rich explanatory power for the quantitative results. The themes of Enhanced Clarity and Revisability directly explain the improved revision outcomes: when feedback is understood and can be reviewed repeatedly, it is more likely to be applied successfully. The theme of Perceived Personalization is particularly salient, confirming the humanizing potential of well-deployed technology. In a large-class context where students may feel anonymous, SVF created a powerful sense of individual connection and pedagogical dialogue, transforming feedback from a monologic judgment into a dialogic scaffold. This aligns strongly with a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), where the teacher's voice in the SVF acts as a tool for mediated learning, guiding the learner through their Zone of Proximal Development in a more engaged and supportive manner than static red ink.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that chart a course for future inquiry. First, the three-week duration, while proving feasibility, cannot assess the long-term retention of improvements or the sustainability of self-efficacy gains. Longitudinal studies are needed. Second, the sample was drawn from a single-gender public school in one city; research across different school types (private, co-ed, rural) would enhance generalizability. Third, the feedback was provided by the researcher; future studies should train and involve regular classroom teachers to assess scalability and practical implementation challenges. Finally, exploring the impact of SVF on different genres (e.g., descriptive, narrative) and proficiency levels would yield a more comprehensive understanding of its applications.

Practical and Pedagogical Implications

The success of the SVF intervention carries several critical implications for educational stakeholders in similar EFL contexts:

> *Teacher Training and Digital Literacy: There is a pressing need to integrate multimodal feedback strategies into pre-service and in-service teacher education programs. Training should move beyond basic technical proficiency to focus on the "pedagogical delivery" of video feedback – teaching educators how to balance visual highlighting with verbal explanation to minimize cognitive load for the learner.*
>
> *Sustained Professional Development: Schools should establish collaborative professional development networks where teachers can share SVF best practices and "lessons learnt." This localized knowledge-sharing can help instructors navigate the time-management challenges associated with digital feedback and refine their commentary to be more concise and impactful.*
>
> *Strategic Digital Infrastructure Investment: While the study highlights the feasibility of using existing tools like smartphones, long-term success requires*

institutional support. Policymakers and school administrators should prioritize investment in stable high-speed internet and cloud-based platforms within public schools. Providing teachers with dedicated hardware and quiet zones for recording can ensure that digital mediation becomes a sustainable, rather than occasional, component of the writing curriculum.

CONCLUSION

This study provides compelling, context-specific evidence that screen-cast video feedback is not merely a novel technological add-on but a pedagogically superior medium for delivering WCF in resource-aware EFL contexts like Egypt. It demonstrates that SVF can be successfully integrated within the stringent time constraints of a public-school calendar. By making feedback more comprehensible, personal, and actionable, SVF leads to higher quality revisions, particularly in the crucial areas of organization and content development. More importantly, it significantly enhances learners' writing self-efficacy—a key affective variable that predicts long-term engagement, persistence, and success. For practitioners in similar contexts, the study offers a practical blueprint. Using ubiquitous, often free tools (like Loom), teachers can humanize and intensify their feedback without requiring extensive new infrastructure. For teacher trainers and policymakers in Egypt and the wider MENA region, the findings argue strongly for the inclusion of digital feedback literacy—focusing on multimodal, student-centered practices—within mandatory professional development programs. Ultimately, this research advocates for a paradigm shift in feedback practices: from corrective and monologic to communicative and dialogic, where technology serves to deepen, rather than diminish, the essential human connection at the heart of effective language teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, A. S., & Alharbi, M. A. (2021). EFL writing instruction in an Egyptian university: A process-genre perspective. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(2), 1127–1144.

Anson, C. M. (2015). Crossing thresholds: What's to know about screen-capture response to student writing. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, *8*(1). http://journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=78

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Ducate, L., & Arnold, N. (2012). Computer-mediated feedback: Effectiveness and student perceptions of screen-casting software versus the comment function. In G. Kessler, A. Oskoz, & I. Elola (Eds.), *Technology across writing contexts and tasks* (pp. 31–55). CALICO.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, *36*(3), 353–371. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals*, *49*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12183

El-Sakka, S. M. F. (2019). Written corrective feedback in an Egyptian EFL classroom: Teacher beliefs, learner preferences, and effective practices. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(3), 641–651. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1003.26

Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, *19*, 6–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.004

Harper, F., Green, H., & Fernandez-Toro, M. (2018). Using screencasts in the teaching of modern languages: Investigating the use of Jing® in feedback on written assignments. *The Language Learning Journal*, *46*(3), 277–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2015.1061586

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hyland, K. (2013). Student perceptions of hidden messages in teacher written feedback. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *39*(3), 180–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2013.06.003

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Ice, P., Curtis, R., Phillips, P., & Wells, J. (2007). Using asynchronous audio feedback to enhance teaching presence and students' sense of community. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *11*(2), 3–25.

Rashad, H. M. (2020). Challenges of teaching EFL writing in Egypt: A review of literature. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *9*(3), 44–51. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.9n.3p.44

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, *90*, 102221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221

Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. In J. P. Mestre & B. H. Ross (Eds.), *Psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 55, pp. 37–76). Academic Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, *46*(2), 327–369. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.