PRISM Journal
PRISM Early View (2025) https://doi.org/10.24377/prism.article2226

From Academic Judgement to Academic Coaching: Using Video Feed as an Alternative to Written Feedback

Lindsey Gaston,[1] **Laura Dixon** [2]

[1] Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool Business School, Liverpool, UK (L.E.Gaston@ljmu.ac.uk)
[2] Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool Business School, Liverpool, UK (L.J.Dixon@ljmu.ac.uk)

Received: 29/01/2024
Accepted for publication: 07/11/2024
Published in Early View: 28/01/2025

Abstract

The National Student Satisfaction Survey (NSS) consistency highlights student feedback as a concern across the Higher Education sector. As such there needs to be a re-think in how feedback is provided, not only to justify academic judgement but to allow students to improve future work. This article explores the use of video feedback and the potential impact it can have on how students engage with and value of feedback. This article is supported by data collected from a cohort of second year university students after receiving video feedback for the first time on their academic programme. From the data, several key benefits were discovered that benefits the educational experience. Students demonstrated a greater level of understanding of the feedback, as it was more detailed and personalised, making it feel less intimidating. They also spent more time engaging with the feedback, which suggests that this format helps enhance future work and learning outcomes. Overall, the video feedback approach proved to be an effective method for improving students' comprehension and interaction with feedback. This can lead to more accurate and effective feedback, ultimately resulting in better performance outcomes. This feedback can be both positive and constructive, and it can help individuals to better understand their strengths and weaknesses, and to make improvements in their future performance.

Keywords: Video Feedback; Student Engagement; Feed Forward; Assessment

Introduction

The UK tertiary education sector is facing numerous challenges with respect to evolving student demands and needs, especially in the aftermath of Covid 19, which placed UK universities under increasing pressure (Hénard and Roseveare, 2012). Since tuition fees were increased in 2012, there has been an emphasis in public discourse on 'value for money' for degree programmes; with students being pitched primarily as 'customers' of universities (Wilkinson and Wilkinson, 2023). As a result, this has led to a particular focus on the benefits that students gain post-degree, with undergraduate courses being increasingly evaluated in relation to their perceived levels of employability (Tomlinson, 2008). In order to demonstrate that degree programmes provide value for money, increasing importance has been – and is

  ISSN: 2514-5347

being – placed on efforts to assess and measure student satisfaction; both externally and through large-scale surveys like the National Student Survey (NSS), and internally, through institutional feedback mechanisms at the modular, program, department, and faculty levels. These multifaceted 'quality' mechanisms reinforce the notion that 'students are customers' (Giannakis and Bullivant, 2016; Khan and Hemsley-Brown, 2024).

At the same time, over the years, there has been a significant increase in the number of students enrolling in Higher Education, with the number almost doubling from 984,000 in 1992 to 1.87 million in 2016, when around one in three individuals aged 18-24 were in full-time learning, leading to what is known as the "massification" of Higher Education (Giannakis and Bullivant, 2016). This growth in student numbers has been attributed to successful Widening Participation programs across the sector and the availability of new and non-traditional routes to Further Education (FE). Consequently, the ability of teaching staff to adapt to these changes has become critical; as the number of students attending university has increased, so has the diversity of those students (Burton and Nesbit 2008; Wlodkowski and Kasworm 2003). However, this diversity is not evenly distributed across the sector with Post-92 institutions attracting significantly higher numbers of 'non-traditional' learners (Schuetze and Slowey 2002).

These issues are compounded further, because of shifts in recent government educational policy and exacerbated by the increasing pressures that schools and colleges themselves are facing, so that students are increasingly arriving at university following educational experiences in which rote or surface style learning is prioritised as they are 'taught to the test' in order to meet school and/or college attainment targets (ibid). In addition, current learners arriving to university have experienced an increase of rote or surface style learning promoted by the 'taught to the test' approach to meet school and/or college attainment target. "*Taught to the test*" refers to teaching methods and practices focused on preparing students specifically for standardized tests and exams, rather than providing a broader, deeper education.

As a result, many students embarking upon undergraduate degrees at universities – particularly in the first year – may lack the kind of key skills, such as critical thinking and independent learning, needed to succeed at this level (Jones et al.2015). To overcome the challenges faced, the adaptation and adoption of innovative and flexible forms of teaching practice are now of paramount importance (Davies, 2006). One increasing focus of such adaptation has been in the arena of assessment feedback.

The changing role of feedback

The term "feedback" is commonly used in higher education to refer to the comments on student work and, traditionally at least, is seen to serve a corrective function (Boud and Molloy, 2013). However, as HE has evolved, it has become increasingly accepted that the primary purpose of feedback is not simply to provide comments to correct student work, but can also be used in innovative ways to achieve different outcomes (Henderson, Ryan, and Kennedy, 2024). Formative feedback, for example, is feedback that is provided throughout the course of the module, allowing students to identify areas for improvement and increase their understanding before more formal assessments are undertaken (Irons and Elkington, 2021). This can be used in conjunction with 'diagnostic' feedback, which can be used at the start of a module as a way to gauge students' prior knowledge, helping to direct the course that the learning journey might then take (Leenknecht and Carless, 2023).

More traditional or 'summative' feedback can then be provided, which tends to occur at the end of the learning process, when work produced is measured against how well it has met objective learning outcome criteria (Gomis, Saini, Arif, and Pathirage, 2024). Effective feedback can, in other words, be used to engage students in the feedback process itself with a view to helping them to understand the original assessment goals, self-evaluate their work in relation to those goals, and to develop strategies to achieve more challenging learning outcomes as they progress through their degree programmes (Hattie and Timperley 2007). Feedback should not just be to provide objective evaluation, but rather should be seen as a forward-looking, action-oriented process.

Yet, both students and those undertaking the marking often underutilise its educative potential; research consistently shows that students are dissatisfied with assessment feedback, finding it inconsistent, unhelpful, infrequent, and poorly timed (Akponah, Hassen, and Higgins, 2024; Hounsell 2007; Nicol 2010). Lecturers also report that feedback comments may be ignored and/or not accessed, especially when provided at the end of a unit or module of study, where there is no immediate opportunity to use it (Zimbardi et al. 2017). In response, researchers have sought to bridge the gap between the potential and actual impacts of feedback by proposing alternative perspectives on information transmission. Sociocultural perspectives have emerged, for example, where context, interaction, and relationships within a learning trajectory are understood to influence students' capacity for meaning-making (Ajjawi and Boud 2017; Esterhazy and Damşa 2017; Telio, Regehr, and Ajjawi 2016).

Within this research, feedback is viewed as a social process and communicative act; relationally, it is shaped by power, emotion, and discourse, this can affect how messages are constructed, interpreted, and acted upon (Ajjawi and Boud 2018). By creating opportunities for feedback-dialogue, assignment feedback – beyond objective correction – can be achieved; furthermore, this can be utilised to facilitate self-regulation, help students understand the criteria, and guide them to pre-assess their own work (Ajjawi and Boud 2018; Boud and Molloy 2013; Esterhazy and Damşa 2017). Such purposes align with a sustainable assessment agenda that enables students to address their current task and meet their future learning needs (Boud and Soler 2016). The key question then becomes how to achieve this practically and consistently, within a Higher Education setting.

Considering this sociocultural conception of feedback, it has been suggested that media-rich verbal and nonverbal cues are best suited for generating this kind of complex communication (Borup, Graham, and Velasquez, 2011). These principles suggest that video feedback has the potential to generate more constructive social interactions, in ways that written, or audio feedback cannot. Whilst there is a substantial body of research on written feedback (see: Dowden et al. 2013; Jolly and Boud 2013; Vardi 2013) and audio feedback (see: Gould and Day 2013; Lunt and Curran 2010; Voelkel and Mello 2014), video feedback has received comparatively little attention. In this paper, we focus on the impacts of video-based feedback content, on a level 5 Events Management module, on an undergraduate programme at a university in the North West of England, UK.

Background for the initiative

In 2022, the Events Management (EM) programme at the university underwent a full revalidation, which led to the decision to trial a new and experimental approach to feedback. This was based on course evaluation and focus group discussions with students who had graduated the previous year; during which two key issues emerged. Firstly, the diverse entry routes for students resulted in a wide variation in academic study-skills, creating barriers to learning and engagement. In particular, students coming into university from FE colleges (which accounted for almost 35% on this programme), struggled with the lack of a tightly structured learning environment, and an increased emphasis on independent learning (Raven, 2024).

Secondly, students reported inconsistencies in approaches to feedback, in terms of both quality (i.e., some lecturers provided commentary on grammar, spelling and structure, whilst others focused more on content); the quantity of feedback was also highlighted (i.e., some lecturers provided an abundance of written feedback, and others less so). These inconsistencies resulted in difficulties being experienced by students, in using written feedback effectively to improve their work as they progressed through the degree. As a result, it was agreed that the teaching team would trial video feedback, to resolve and overcome these limitations and difficulties, and ensure that the information provided – in relation to assignments – was as useful for engaging in academic progress as it could possibly be.

What is video feedback?

The definition of video feedback is not well-established in the current literature, leading to confusion and the application of the term to various

feedback formats, including those with a moving image or video cues in computer-assisted learning applications (Henderson and Phillips 2014). The term has also been used to describe 'screencast feedback', which involves a recording of the assessment marker's computer screen or designated window, along with an audio narration, but may not include a physical image of the marker as they speak (Henderson and Phillips 2014; Thompson and Lee 2012). This differs from purely audio feedback but lacks the range of nonverbal cues that Borup et al. (2014) argue are critical to the richness of video feedback, such as facial expressions and body language.

On the other hand, 'talking head' video feedback refers to a situation where the assessment marker creates a video in which they address the student's assessment while being recorded, and then make the video accessible to the student (Lamey 2015, 692). A hybrid approach between these two types of video feedback is presented by Klappa (2015) and Phillips (in Ross 2015), who suggest that a "talking head" or "combination" screencast can be used. This format allows a small video recording of the marker to be incorporated into a traditional screencast, thus providing a visual representation of the marker in addition to the screen capture and audio narration. These are the three most common and distinct video feedback formats available to markers: screencast, combination screencast, and talking head, but in this paper, we focus specifically on a "talking head approach" where assessment feedback was provided to the cohort via a video created by the marker and made available to each student via the university's Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). This was chosen because of the increased sense of personalisation it offers, and the fact that the technology to enable this was already embedded into the VLE.

Video feedback – student perspectives

Numerous studies have examined the impact of video feedback on students, with most researchers concluding that video feedback differs from written feedback in several ways (Wood, 2023; Borup, West, and Thomas 2015; Crook et al. 2012). The most consistent finding is that video feedback, provides students with both a greater quantity of feedback, and feedback with a higher level of detail (Pryke, Rees, and Witton, 2023; Elola and Oskoz 2016; Henderson and Phillips 2015). Compared to written feedback, episodes of video feedback contain almost double or more the number of words, and markers using video feedback are more likely to provide more detailed comments on the positive aspects of students' work (Pryke, Rees, and Witton, 2023; Elola and Oskoz 2016; Henderson and Phillips 2015). Some researchers suggest that video feedback shifts the focus of feedback from surface-level mechanics, i.e., from grammar, spelling, formatting etc., to more substantive and holistic aspects of students' performance, such as depth of argument, quality of analysis, and synthesis of key concepts (Pryke, Rees, and Witton, 2023; Lamey 2015; Orlando 2016).

Video feedback is also more conversational in nature, with students receiving it, perceiving a closer relationship with their marker and describing it as conversational and therefore much more reminiscent of a face-to-face meeting (Payne, Ajjawi and Holloway, 2023; Grigoryan 2017). Although video feedback can be used anonymously and still provide the opportunity to create a sense of conversation, this element can be enhanced where marking is not anonymous through the repeated use of student names and comments that can encourage relationship-building in a way that is much more natural than in written feedback, encouraging students to view their tutors as "coaches" rather than "judges" (Anson et al, 2016). This conversational nature of video feedback subsequently encourages markers to provide more constructive comments and suggestions for future assignments, rather than simply a list of corrections. However, it is important to note that while the format provides this opportunity, in order to be fully utilised nonetheless still necessitates specific feedback protocols and design at a study or institutional level, rather than the video medium itself (Edwards, Dujardin, and Williams 2012).

Most research indicates that students react positively to video feedback, and that they tend to prefer it over written feedback, finding it more detailed and informative than written feedback (West and Turner, 2016). The visual and aural cues in video feedback improve clarity and reduce the ambiguity of

feedback information, and it can also be more engaging, with students spending more time reviewing it than they would spend on written feedback (West and Turner, 2016). Students have reported that they often view it multiple times, and using it to revise their assignments, or take notes while watching (Crook et al, 2012). The flexibility to pause, repeat, and revisit video feedback is considered a significant advantage of this format (Anson et al, 2016). Video feedback is by definition, less likely to be generalised that written feedback, so that it leads to a more personalised and individualised feedback experience, making students feel recognised and valued (Borup et al, 2014). However, to ensure that students can benefit from video feedback also depends on the engagement of lecturers.

Video feedback – lecturer perspectives

In general, lecturers who have tried video feedback see it as a positive way to engage students (Payne, Ajjawi and Holloway, 2023; Henderson and Phillips, 2015). Although initially sceptical, lecturers have seen one significant benefit of video feedback as being its potential to reduce marking times, with research suggesting that the time required to produce it is either less than (or at least the same as) that required for written feedback (Crook et al, 2012). Perhaps as a result, in contrast to a sense of reluctance or frustration that many lecturers may experience while providing written feedback, several studies have found that providing video feedback is more enjoyable and can renew a sense of enthusiasm for marking (Henderson and Phillips, 2015; Lamey, 2015). A key benefit of feedback provided in a video format is that it allows complex issues to be discussed that are often difficult to address in written feedback (Crook et al, 2012). This is not least because the personalised nature of video feedback enables lecturers to address students as individuals, which can make the feedback more meaningful to them (Crook et al, 2012; Pryke, Rees, and Witton, 2023).

However, there are still some notes of caution that remain. In particular technical difficulties can make the process more frustrating and ultimately, more time consuming, particularly if staff are not fully skilled in using the relevant recording software (Borup, et al, 2014). Difficulties in editing video feedback in order to correct mistakes have also been noted, although over time, some lecturers have moved away from doing so, feeling that small mistakes or moments of interruption may actually provide an added sense of authenticity to the feedback provided (Borup, et al, 2014). Still, it is clear that issues of privacy / data protection may also arise during the sharing of video feedback, meaning that staff must all be provided with training to ensure they have facility with the process before rolling it out more fully across all cohorts and programmes (Klappa, 2015).

It may also be difficult for lecturers to provide feedback in a sensitive tone, particularly when providing feedback that refers to issues with the work being assessed, and markers need to be much more aware of facial expressions and body language when doing so (Henderson and Phillips 2015; Lamey 2015). Nonetheless, the research available to-date suggests that those who have trialled video-based feedback have a positive view of it, seeing it as a beneficial tool in enabling students to engage more fully with advice provided and therefore, to benefit from it too. It was with this in mind, that the trial was undertaken with a group of level 5 Events Management undergraduate students.

Methodology

This research embraced an Interpretivist Research Paradigm (William, 2024), which highlights the subjectiveness of the human experiences within a specific social context (Creswell, 2013). As the aim of this research was to develop an understanding of how students experienced the use of video feedback, the Interpretivist Research Paradigm allows for the subjective interpretation based on personal perspective expressed by the student participants (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). Additionally, the use of anonymous questionnaires works well with the chosen paradigm as the anonymous questionnaires allowed the students to share their experiences freely thus providing an honest and authentic expression of experience (Bryman, 2016). As the aim of the authors was to provide a description of how students experienced the use of Video Feedback, the

interpretivist research paradigm provided such a framework (Schwandt, 2000).

Online Student Survey

Participants consisted of fifty-seven (57) students enrolled in a Business Ethics module during the 2023/ 24 academic year and received their assessment feedback in video form using the 'Media Comment' option on Canvas's Speed Grader, the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) used by the university. Canvas's Media Comment allows for audio (microphone) and visual (cameras) to sync with the VLE directly, allowing videos to be recorded and deposited on the student's assessment in the same location as they would find written feedback. Using the integrated tool eliminated any additional procedures needed to be performed by the students to access their feedback. They simply accessed the video feedback as they would have accessed their written feedback - press play to watch and listen to their feedback.

The assessment consisted of three (3) separate and distinct tasks. The tutor provided a video for each assessment task and then a video providing a holistic overview of the assessment for a total of four (4) videos per student. Each video lasted an average of two (2) to three (3) minutes each for a total run time of eight (8) to twelve (12) minutes of feedback per student. In total, the tutor created 228 videos resulting in a range of 456 minutes (7.6 hours) to 684 minutes (11.4 hours) of content. Students were asked to complete an anonymous online questionnaire after receiving their assessment mark and feedback, which received a response rate of 45.61%. Using the survey adapted from West and Turner (2016, p403), the students were asked to rate the following questions using a Likert scale:

- Whether they spent more or less time reviewing their video feedback than they normally would for alternative forms of feedback.
- Whether they felt, video feedback was more or less likely to enhance their future work.
- How well they felt they understood their tutor's feedback.

Additionally, students were given the opportunity to provide qualitative comments about their experience of receiving feedback in the form of a video, exploring ideas around whether video feedback was more or less valuable than written feedback. The combination of these two forms of data underpins the discussion section that follows. When using anonymous questionnaires, it is essential to prioritise several ethical considerations. First, participants gave consent, after being informed about the purpose of the questionnaire, as well as how their data would be used, and their right to withdraw at any time without facing any penalty (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). Participants were informed that their voluntary participation would remain anonymous and confidential (Denscombe, 2021) via the use of an online questionnaire format (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). The project complied with all relevant established ethical standards and guidelines.

Findings & discussion

This start with, it is important to state that 100% of the participants reported they understood the feedback provided by the tutor. Therefore, this paper provides a discussion on the use of video as a vehicle to deliver feedback that is unclouded by any possible issues regarding clarity of the feedback. The additional Likert scale-based questions provided equally positive results. When asked whether they spent more or less time reviewing their video feedback than they normally would for alternative forms of feedback, the response was 92.3% in the affirmative, with 34.6% stating more and 57.7% stating much more. When posed the questions of whether they felt that video feedback was more or less likely to enhance their future work, the response was 26.9% more, with an overwhelming 69.2% stating much more, an overall of 96.1% in the affirmative. This clearly fits with the findings of Anson et al (2016), who argued that video feedback created a sense for students of being 'coached' rather than 'judged'(Anson et al, 2016).

Was video feedback more or less valuable than written feedback?

The qualitative data was coded thematically and produced three major themes, suggesting that video feedback promoted: 1) better understanding of the feedback that students received; 2) better understanding of how to improve in future assessments; and 3) feedback was more personal, all

of which are in agreement with much of the previously published material regarding video feedback (See: Elola and Oskoz 2016; Henderson and Phillips 2015). The most consistent finding was that video feedback provides students with both a greater quantity of relevant information, as well as feedback with a higher level of detail (Elola and Oskoz 2016; Henderson and Phillips 2015). The qualitative comments provide a clear level of agreement:

'*I feel the video feedback is more detailed than written feedback and I was able to understand it a lot more*'

'*More in-depth feedback and easier to understand*'

'*Feedback points can be explained more*'

For the majority of students, 73.3% stated that being able to see the body language of the tutor, as well as hearing the tone of their voice, added to the quality and understanding of their feedback. These points are key features of West and Turner (2016) who highlighted the importance of both the visual and aural cues how they improve the clarity and reduce the ambiguity of feedback. Due to better understanding of the feedback, students consistently expressed the second most dominant theme – the feeling that they can better apply the video feedback to future work. This is directly supported by Boud and Molloy (2013), who have suggested that within Higher Education, feedback should not simply provide comments to correct student work, but to positively impact what students can do in assessments moving forward. This result could be because video feedback is less likely to be generalised or generic this leads to a more personalised and individualised feedback experience providing the student with a clear understanding of how they can better their future work (Borup et al, 2014). It helped to overcome the first barrier of marking; in other words, it worked to encourage students to access their feedback in the first place:

'*Easy to understand and hearing the feedback out loud makes it more interesting to hear and learn what I can do to improve'*

'Makes feedback easier to understand and implement in your next assignment'

'It was easier to understand what lecturers want you to improve on as the videos were more detailed'.

'*The feedback was so much more digestible and easier to understand what I need to work on / what I can carry on through my work.'*

'I found the video feedback more valuable as I felt the points could be explained better for me to understand and take on-board for later work.'

The above is a positive indication that the intended goals of lecturers who chose to employ video feedback were successful. When examining the lecturer perspective, the desire expressed by the lecturers was to use video as a vehicle to deliver feedback that is engaging and useful to the student. The results provided in this study suggest that video feedback allows that to occur, because in specific terms, it means that the feedback is more consumable and useful to the student (Crook, et al 2012). The student quotes suggest that because the feedback is more personal, the students feel recognised and valued, which is the third and final theme that emerged from the qualitative data - feedback, students felt, was more personal (Borup et al, 2014). In particular, students appreciated the conversational tone of the feedback, finding that the video feedback felt more relaxed and familiar:

'Less intimidating than written feedback, more relaxed and easier to process / take in and understand what is actually being said'.

'It makes you engage more as it feels like a real live conversation.

'I could sense the tone of voice and I actually took the information in as it was less formal'.

Once again, the response provided by the student participants also provides support to Crook's et al (2012) contention that lecturers felt providing video feedback allows them to address the student more as individuals as well as in a more personal and supportive tone . While Henderson and Phillips (2015) and Lamey (2015) expressed concern regarding the facial and body language when providing feedback, the students regularly commented that seeing the body movements and facial expression of the marker helped in the understanding to their feedback, which

meant that they interpreted the comments as being more constructive (West and Turner, 2016).

The statements expressed by the participants support the claims of Grigoryan (2017) that video feedback is more conversational in tone and as such more reminiscent of a face-to-face meeting. However, this is not to say that the vehicle is without its issues. While the majority of participants responded positively, there was a small minority, 7.7% stating they spent less time reviewing the feedback and 3.8% who felt video feedback would not enhance their future work. The supporting qualitative comments comprise of two consistent themes with the most predominant being an issue with the lack of a written transcript:

'It is nice to have the written feedback to refer too, something you kind of lose with the video. Video is not as easy to pull up for different things'.

'If wanting to find a specific part of it, I'll have to go through each video and try to find it rather than seeing it straight away in writing'.

So, if a student wanted to review or wanted to find a particular point made in the feedback, they would need to re-watch the video up until the desired point, which created more difficulty. These comments stand in direct contrast to the advantages stated by Anson et al (2016), who suggest that the ability to pause, repeat, and revisit video feedback is considered to be a significant advantage. The comments also challenge Crook et al (2012) who suggest that students often view video feedback multiple times, and use it to revise their assignments, or take notes while watching. From the data collected, it can be suggested that students find the video feedback more engaging and informative, they need more direction as to how to maximise the benefit of the video feedback in the form of note taking, for example. However, the above may also be a contributor to the other dominant critique of the new feedback delivery vehicle; that reviewing video feedback was deemed to be too time-consuming by some students:

'They are more time consuming to watch and review'

'A bit more time consuming'

'More time consuming to watch'

While this may be seen as a critique, the fact that the students must watch and listen to the feedback in detail, rather than skim-read written feedback, that is the perceived time-consuming nature, can in a key sense be read as actually being beneficial. This is because it is unlikely that the benefits described above would actually occur without the increased engagement that video feedback necessitates. Overall, therefore, it is clear that positive comments outweigh the negative comments showing that those students who participated in the questionnaire find receiving feedback as a video format more valuable than in the traditional written format.

Conclusion

As previously stated, "feedback" is commonly used in higher education to refer to the comments on student work and, traditionally at least, it was seen to serve a corrective function (Boud and Molloy, 2013). However, as HE evolves, there is a growing argument that feedback should not simply be to provide comments to correct student work, but to positively impact what students can do in assessments moving forward (Boud and Molloy, 2013). Effective feedback should engage students in the process itself with a view to helping them to understand the original assessment goals, self-evaluate their work in relation to those goals, and to develop strategies to achieve more challenging learning outcomes as they progress through their degree programmes (Hattie and Timperley 2007). Feedback should not just be to provide justification for academic judgement, but rather it should be tool that coaches the student for future success.

From the student perspective here, the use of video feedback is doing just that. As this article has shown, students found video feedback as a positive and potentially more useful alternative to the traditional written feedback. The participants provide compelling evidence that video feedback provides a more engaging tool to receive feedback. Because of the more compelling feedback delivery system, students are watching and listening in greater detail and find the material more useful in both explaining what they did well and what could have been better, but also how they can apply the feedback to future

work allowing for the academic coaching to occur (Anson et al, 2016).

Overall, there was a clear indication that students found value in video feedback, there remains of need for some level of written comments. The most consistent concern expressed was the lack of written comments for the purpose of revision. This worry could be addressed by using transcript software that would create a text version of the feedback that would sit alongside the video feedback, however this could run a risk of the student not watching the video thus reducing the established benefits of video feedback.

An alternative option is provided by Cook et al (2012) who argue that by instructing students to take notes whilst watching their feedback, video feedback could offer a means by which to encourage the student to be an active agent in the feedback process (Crook et al, 2012). As pressure to respond to changing needs of students evolves, it seems clear from this study that video feedback offers a potentially innovative and flexible form of feedback, providing a valuable opportunity to help students to improve their work and develop the skills they need to become more independent learners, as they progress through the course of their degree programmes.

Disclosure statement

The author(s) declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

Ajjawi, R., and D. Boud. 2017. "Researching Feedback Dialogue: An Interactional Analysis Approach." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 42 (2): 252–265.

Akponah, Precious; Hassen, Hela and Higgins, Matthew (2024). An Exploration of Dialogue to Promote Assessment Feedback Literacy. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 12 pp. 1–19

Anson, C. M., D. P. Dannels, J. I. Laboy, and L. Carneiro. 2016. "Students' Perceptions of Oral Screencast Responses to Their Writing: Exploring Digitally Mediated Identities." Journal of Business and Technical Communication 30 (3): 378–411.

Borup, J., C. R. Graham, and A. Velasquez. 2011. "The Use of Asynchronous Video Communication to Improve Instructor Immediacy and Social Presence in a Blended Learning Environment." In Blended Learning Across Disciplines: Models for Implementation, edited by A. Kitchenham, 38–57. Hershey: IGI Global.

Borup, J., R. E. West, R. A. Thomas, and C. R. Graham. 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.

Boud, D., and E. Molloy. 2013. "Rethinking Models of Feedback for Learning: The Challenge of Design." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 38 (6): 698–712.

Boud, D., and R. Soler. 2016. "Sustainable Assessment Revisited." Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 41 (3): 400–413.

Burton, S., & Nesbit, P. L. (2008). Block or traditional? An analysis of student choice of teaching format. Journal of Management & Organization, 14(1), 4-19.

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). SAGE Publications

Crook, A., C. Mauchline, S. Maw, C. Lawson, R. Drinkwater, K. Lundqvist, P. Orsmond, S. Gomez, and J. Park. 2012. "The Use of Video Technology for Providing Feedback to Students: Can It Enhance the Feedback Experience for Staff and Students?" Computers and Education 58: 386– 396.

Davies, W. M. 2006. "Intensive Teaching Formats: A Review." Issues in Educational Research 16: 1–20.

Denscombe, M. (2021). *The Good Research Guide: Research Methods for Small-Scale Social Research Projects*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (5th ed.). SAGE Publications

Dowden, T., S. Pittaway, H. Yost, and R. McCarthy. 2013. "Students' Perceptions of Written Feedback in Teacher Education: Ideally Feedback is a Continuing Two-Way Communication That Encourages Progress." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 38 (3): 349–362.

Elliott, K. M., & Healy, M. A. (2001). Key factors influencing student satisfaction related to recruitment and retention. Journal of marketing for higher education, 10(4), 1-11.

Elola, I., and A. Oskoz. 2016. "Supporting Second Language Writing Using Multimodal Feedback." Foreign Language Annals 49 (1): 58–74.

Esterhazy, R., and C. Damşa. 2017. "Unpacking the Feedback Process: An Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Interactional Meaning-Making of Feedback Comments." Studies in Higher Education1–15.

Giannakis, M., & Bullivant, N. (2016). The massification of higher education in the UK: Aspects of service quality. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 40(5), 630-648.

Gomis, K., Saini, M., Arif, M., & Pathirage, C. (2024). Enhancing the assessment and the feedback in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, *32*(2), 165-179.

Grigoryan, A. (2017). Feedback 2.0 in online writing instruction: Combining audio-visual and text-based commentary to enhance student revision and writing competency. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 29, 451-476.

Gould, J., and P. Day. 2013. "Hearing You Loud and Clear: Student Perspectives of Audio Feedback in Higher Education." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 38 (5): 554–566.

Hattie, J., and H. Timperley. 2007. "The Power of Feedback." Review of Educational Research 77 (1): 81–112.

Hénard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. An

IMHE guide for higher education institutions, 1(1), 7-11.

Henderson, M., and M. Phillips. 2014. "Technology Enhanced Feedback on Assessment." Paper presented at the Australian computers in education conference, Adelaide, Australia.

Hounsell, D. 2007. "Towards More Sustainable Feedback to Students." In Rethinking Assessment in Higher Education: Learning for the Longer Term, edited by D. Boud, and N. Falchikov, 101–113. Abingdon: Routledge.

Irons, A., & Elkington, S. (2021). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. London: Routledge.

Jolly, B., and D. Boud. 2013. "Written Feedback: What is It Good For and How Can We Do It Well?" In Feedback in Higher and Professional Education: Understanding It and Doing It Well, edited by D. Boud, and E. Molloy, 104–124. Abingdon: Routledge.

Jones, H., B. Black, J. Green, P. Langton, S. Rutherford, J. Scott, and S. Brown. 2015. "Indications of Knowledge Retention in the Transition to Higher Education. Journal Of." Biological Education 49 (3): 261–273.

Khan, J., & Hemsley-Brown, J. (2024). Student satisfaction: The role of expectations in mitigating the pain of paying fees. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, *34*(1), 178-200.

Klappa, P. 2015. Innovative Pedagogies Series: Videos for Learning and Teaching. York: Higher Education Academy. Higher Education Academy website, https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/sites/default/files/peter_klappa_final2.pdf.

Lamey, A. 2015. "Video Feedback in Philosophy." Metaphilosophy 46 (4-5): 691–702.

Leenknecht, M. J., & Carless, D. (2023). Students' feedback seeking behaviour in undegraduate education: A scoping review. *Educational Research Review*, 100549.

Lunt, T., and J. Curran. 2010. "'Are You Listening Please?' The Advantages of Electronic Audio Feedback Compared to Written Feedback." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 35 (7): 759–769.

Nicol, D. 2010. "From Monologue to Dialogue: Improving Written Feedback Processes in Mass Higher Education." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 35 (5): 501–517.

Orlando, J. 2016. "A Comparison of Text, Voice, and Screencasting Feedback to Online Students." American Journal of Distance Education 30 (3): 156–166.

Payne, L., A, Ajjawi, R& Jessica Holloway, J (2023) Humanising feedback encounters: a qualitative study of relational literacies for teachers engaging in technology-enhanced feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 48:7, pages 903-914.

Pryke, S, Rees, M and Witton,G. (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* 0:0, pages 1-11.

Raven, N. (2024). The intermediate steps to widening university access: recognising and responding to the post-16 challenges encountered by those from under-represented backgrounds. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *28*(3), 114-120.

Ross, J. 2015. "Monash's Video Critiques Work for Tutors and Students." The Australian (Higher Education supplement). January 14. Retrieved from http://www.theaustralian.com.au/highereducation/monashs-video-critiques-work-for-tutors-and-students/news-story/8337d215b3a62c30dd876a66def1df62.

Ryan, T., Henderson, M., Ryan, K., & Kennedy, G. (2024). Feedback in higher education: Aligning academic intent and student sensemaking. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(4), 860-875.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 189-213). Sage Publishing.

Schuetze, H. G., & Slowey, M. (2002). Participation and exclusion: A comparative analysis of non-traditional students and lifelong learners in higher education. Higher education, 44, 309-327.

Telio, S., G. Regehr, and R. Ajjawi. 2016. "Feedback and the Educational Alliance: Examining Credibility Judgements and Their Consequences." Medical Education 50 (9): 933–942.

Tomlinson, M. 2008. "'The Degree Is Not Enough': Students' Perceptions of the Role of Higher Education Credentials for Graduate Work and Employability." British Journal of Sociology of Education 29 (1): 49–61.

Thompson, R., and M. J. Lee. 2012. "Talking with Students Through Screencasting: Experimentations with Video Feedback to Improve Student Learning." Journal of Interactive Technology 1.

Vardi, I. 2013. "Effectively Feeding Forward from One Written Assessment Task to the Next." Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 38 (5): 599–610

Voelkel, S., and L. V. Mello. 2014. "Audio Feedback – Better Feedback?" Bioscience Education 22 (1): 16–30.

West, J., and W. Turner. 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.

Wilkinson, L. C., & Wilkinson, M. D. (2023). Value for money and the commodification of higher education: Front-line narratives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *28*(2), 406-422.

William, F. K. A. (2024). Interpretivism or Constructivism: Navigating Research Paradigms in Social Science Research. *Interpretivism or Constructivism: Navigating Research Paradigms in Social Science Research*, *143*(1), 5-5.

Wlodkowski, R. J., & Kasworm, C. E. (2003). Accelerated learning: Future roles and influences. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 97, 93-97.

Wood, J. (2023) Enabling feedback seeking, agency and uptake through dialogic screencast feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 48:4, pages 464-484.

Zimbardi, K., K. Colthorpe, A. Dekker, C. Engstrom, A. Bugarcic, P. Worthy, R. Victor, P. Chunduri, L. Lluka, and P. Long. 2017. "Are They Using My Feedback? The Extent of Students" Feedback Use Has a Large Impact on Subsequent Academic Performance." Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 42 (4): 625–644.