International Journal of Research in English Education

Online ISSN: 2538-3027

Homepage: https://ijreeonline.com

The Effect of Unfocused Direct and Indirect Screencast Feedback on the Writing Accurateness and Self-Efficacy of EFL Learners

Mohammadreza Negahi [1], **Mahdi Mardani** [2], and **Mehdi Goldoust** [3]

1. Department of English, Be. C., Islamic Azad University, Behbahan, Iran. Email: negahimohammadreza@gmail.com
2. Department of General Education, Faculty of Basic Sciences, Behbahan Khatam Alanbia University of Technology Behbahan, Iran. Email: mardani@bkatu.ac.ir
3. Department of Mathematics, Be, C., Islamic Azad University, Behbahan, Iran. Email: mehdigoldust@gmail.com

Article Info

Article type:
Research Article

Article history:
Received:
February 27, 2026
Revision:
June 26, 2026
Accepted:
June 30, 2026
Available online:
June 30, 2026

Keywords:
direct,
Indirect,
Unfocused,
Screencast,
feedback,
writing,
self-efficacy,
EFL learner

ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental study juxtaposes the efficiency of direct and indirect unfocused screencast feedback on the writing exactitude and self-efficacy of EFL students. Three classes participated: direct feedback, indirect feedback, and no-feedback control class. The study employed a pre-test, post-test, and delayed post-test design. Direct feedback provided corrected forms, while indirect feedback indicated error locations. Unfocused feedback was chosen for its ecological validity in real classroom settings. 97 third-year undergraduate students participated, divided into three groups. The Oxford Quick Placement Test ensured homogeneity among groups. Data was collected using the Second Language Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS) and a Writing Test (WT). The L2WSS measured self-efficacy, and WT assessed writing accuracy. Both instruments showed high reliability. The study used argumentative writing tasks for the WT, with topics varied for the pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests. Data analysis was performed via SPSS 21, with MANOVA used to determine class differences. Rules of normality and homogeneity of variance were tested and met. Outcomes showed significant differences among classes post-treatment, with the feedback groups outperforming the control class. The study concludes that both varieties of unfocused screencast feedback are effective in improving writing accuracy, but no noteworthy difference between direct and indirect feedback was found.

Cite this article: Negahi, M., Mardani, M., & Goldoust, M. (2026). The Effect of Unfocused Direct and Indirect Screencast Feedback on the Writing Accurateness and Self-Efficacy of EFL Learners. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, *11*(2), 59-79.

© The author(s) retain the copyright.

Publisher: Science Academy Publications.

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

1. Introduction

The last two decades have observed the rising interest of researchers in relation to transcribed corrective feedback (WCF). Several studies reviewing this subject have been issued in recent years, (e.g., Kang & Han, 2015), and researchers have often considered the impact of direct, indirect, as well as metalinguistic WCF tactics (e.g., Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Shintani & Ellis, 2013), as well as focused and unfocused WCF scopes (e.g., Frear & Chiu, 2015; Rahimi, 2021). Unfocused WCF is a kind of feedback that corrects all errors (Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012), while fixated WCF only targets certain types of written errors (Ferris, 2011).

According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012), even though there is mounting proof of a relationship between WCF and accuracy development over time, a large amount of research has so far been limited to considering focused feedback targeting a restricted number of written errors as feedback (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch 2008; Ellis et al., 2008; Ferris, 2010). As indicated by Sheen (2007), it is believed that focused WCF reduces the mental load on learners and hence increases the possibility of paying attention to the desired structure. On the other hand, the provision of focused WCF for students may lead them to unconsciously consider the use of one or two linguistic items when they are focusing on them; while neglecting other structures (Xu, 2009).

Furthermore, another criticism of focused WCF is that the purpose of teaching writing and correcting grammatical points is to help improve writing accuracy in general, not one or more grammatical items (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010). Therefore, due to the fact that unfocused WCF shows the process of classroom practice more accurately, its usage can increase the ecological validity of the research. Meanwhile, writing is usually considered a multifaceted activity because it involves the coordinated management of several processes such as linguistic, motivational, and cognitive ones. According to Mitchell et al. (2021), it is believed that due to the complexity of the writing process at university, students should be familiar with the relevant writing needs. Lillis and Scott (2007) point out that writing is considered a highly important activity because, during university studies, the writing process is widely used to evaluate students. In turn, Schoonen et al. (2003) indicate that L2 academic writing has more complications because it is possible that some of the abilities that students have in their first language are not transferred to L2 writing.

The fact that learners should be independent and also have the ability to maintain control is very essential when giving written feedback. The independence and student control can be provided or removed by comments, the way teachers look at the writing text, and also via the technology used to create and give feedback. According to Treglia (2008), written feedback can have a great effect, as several students have stated that very negative feedback has had such an impact on them that they feel incompetent, unmotivated, and disrespected.

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

In turn, Young (2000) indicates that students may feel like a failure or leave the course when they have low self-esteem. Teachers may traditionally respond to L2 written texts through pen and paper or they can utilize technology to provide them with feedback. According to Murray (2004), the greatest way to respond to students' written texts is to have face-to-face meetings between students and teachers in educational environments, and they have been supported and reviewed for many years. Although the conversational nature of such meetings is highly appealing, most teachers do not have the possibility to have such meetings with many students for an adequate period of time.

1.1 Significance of the Study

The way students deal with feedback, as well as the way they consider how that feedback improves their agency, depends on the fact that teachers should create an environment of constructive feedback full of potential for learning. Qualitative feedback should be designed in the curriculum in such a way that this learning potential can be implemented in the ecology of the classroom. Therefore, feedback should have the capacity to provide usable information to students, meet the needs of different types of students, and use various sources and modes. Similarly, different types of interacting factors, including the level of proficiency and motivation, may affect the students' response to the teacher's feedback.

Furthermore, dropping the negative burden of correcting inaccuracies by feedback provided through technology can give students motivation, agency, and sense of deference and courtesy. Likewise, it has been shown that the feedback that teachers provide to students through written text has more criticism compared to the feedback that is provided through the screencast video feedback. Thus, it is expected that this type of feedback reduces the negative and discouraging aspects of offering feedback. It has also been found that screencast feedback assists teachers to establish a correct emotional connection with students and also pays attention to their need for independence which are assumed to heighten the self-efficacy of students as well. Due to the perceived gap in the literature on the subject of the assumed impact of feedback through screencasting on the writing correctness, which is regarded to be essential in the ecosystem of education (Ferris, 2011) and the self-efficacy of EFL students, this research project was conducted to bridge the perceived gaps involved in the literature.

1.2 Research Questions

This study utilized screencast feedback to provide additional pedagogical affordances for students. Similarly, to enhance their writing self-efficacy, it was hypothesized that the use of this kind of feedback can have an impact on it. Accordingly, this study attempted to answer these research questions:

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

1. What is the impact of unfocused direct and indirect screencast feedback on the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL students?

2. Does the direct unfocused screencast feedback have any different influence on the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL students compared to the indirect unfocused screencast feedback?

3. What is the impact of these two kinds of screencast feedback on the writing self-efficacy of EFL students?

4. Does the direct unfocused screencast feedback have any different effect on the writing self-efficacy of Iranian EFL students compared to the indirect unfocused screencast feedback?

2. Literature Review

As suggested by Elola and Oskoz (2016), choosing a mode that includes video or transcript can affect the amount and excellence of feedback provided. For instance, in a study conducted by Anson, Dannels, Laboy, and Carneiro (2016), it was shown the feedback that was given to the written text of the students through screencast video was more conversational and assisted them to feel more respected and engaged. Considering that there are different platforms for giving reaction, more studies are desired to investigate how these options may affect teachers' responses to written texts as well as students' experiences with these various types of feedback.

Former research indicates that students understand the interpersonal effect of feedback in a different way on the basis of the feedback technology mode. For example, it has been shown that screencast feedback causes better communication between the student and the teacher, provides a better conversational tone, and increases the sense of the presence of the teacher (Anson, Dannels, Laboy, & Carneiro, 2016; Grigoryan, 2017). In turn, students find this type of feedback more personal, friendly, and supportive, providing more explanations (Ali, 2016; Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Harper et al., 2015). Considering the discouraging aspects in the provision of feedback, it is necessary to employ technology to reduce negative effects and create optimistic aspects in educational environments.

Abdou Seddik (2026) considered the influence of screen-cast video feedback (SVF) on the writing quality and writing self-efficacy of Egyptian schoolchildren. Results discovered that the SVF group formed statistically noteworthy developments in revision accuracy, particularly in addressing global issues (e.g., organization, thesis clarity) and compound grammatical errors. It is also believed that because writing has a multifaceted and dynamic nature. For writing to be considered successful, it is necessary not only to use writing data but also to have a positive self-efficacy to organize the necessary factors and adjust the learning behaviors. In the past years, writing studies have paid more care to the development of writing accuracy, cognition, and feedback.

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

However, few enquiries have examined the potential efficiency of affective factors on students' writing performance (Kormos, 2012). Self-efficacy, which is considered one of the most vital affective factors, take a substantial role in improving the academic performance of students (Amirian, Edalati Bazzaz, Ghaniabadi, & Zareian, 2025; Esfandiari & Heydari, 2024; Kourosh Khanshan, Yousefi, & Kashef, 2025; Moafian & Ghafournia, 2025). A number of researchers believe that a sense of positive self-confidence can lead to improved writing performance because having positive self-efficacy can cause more effort and persistence, as well as more interest in writing (e.g., Locke & Johnston, 2016). Different theoretical schools have paid attention to the prominence of self-efficacy (Bruning, Dempsey, Kauffman, McKim, & Zumbrunn, 2013). Therefore, it has been suggested that it is better that teachers pay attention to student's understanding of their competence as much as they care about students' actual abilities, as it has been shown that the motivation and academic choices of students are more dependent on perceptions. In turn, according to Zimmerman and Schunk (2011), self-efficacy can assist students to think about, control, and in due time change their performance. In addition, Bandura (2001) points out that self-efficacy is one of the most essential components of agency, which is expected to develop students' learning with the help of deliberate actions and choices.

Different types of technology platforms have the possibility to influence feedback choices and interactions that can affect the relationship between students and teachers. Screencast feedback has a conversational tone that offers students a welcoming feeling about this type of feedback compared to written feedback. In a study directed by Anson et al. (2016), it was shown that the use of screencast technology increases personal relationships, and makes the instructors' assessment process clear. It was also found that employing this type of technology results in autonomy, increases respect, and creates a sense of belonging.

In turn, it has been shown that the feedback provided to students through the screencast platform has more explanations, more encouragement and praise, and a more personal mode (Elola & Oskoz, 2016). Moreover, teachers can convey more feedback through screencasting than through the use of written feedback. Students can also hear the voice of their teacher, who is trying to guide them through the places where they need to improve with the help of screencast feedback. From an ecological viewpoint, students' different capabilities and beliefs, as well as the mediating impacts of environmental features, like teachers' educational activities and academic goals, can cause differences in students' application of different feedbacks in writing courses.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Research Design

The present enquiry was quasi-experimental that had two treatment classes (direct unfocused screencast feedback and indirect unfocused screencast feedback treatment) and one comparison

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

group (no feedback). This study was performed at a state university in Iran. The design had 'time' (i.e., pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest) as its intrasubject factor and 'screencast feedback' (i.e., unfocused direct screencast feedback, unfocused indirect screencast feedback, and no feedback) as its intrasubject factor. Therefore, the first treatment group received direct unfocused screencast feedback and the second treatment group obtained indirect unfocused screencast feedback, which was the focus of the present study, as well as feedback on the content and organization of their texts. The control group students did not receive any feedback on the relevant linguistic items; however, they were offered feedback on the content and organization of their texts in order to consider ethical issues.

The two kinds of feedback contrasted in terms of explicitness. Because the direct kind of screencast feedback provided students with the corrected form, it was regarded as more explicit. In contrast, given the indirect kind of screencast feedback, the pupils were offered the location of the linguistic errors; hence, the second kind of treatment was less explicit. The current study selected the unfocused kind of feedback because the ecological validity of the focused feedback is ambiguous (Storch, 2010). Although the factor of rigor, which is one of the main requirements of laboratory research, can be met by utilizing focused feedback, this type of feedback is not suitable for the overall development of writing and also the needs of teachers and students. The current research was performed in real classrooms, as it has been shown that the unfocused kind of feedback is considered a common activity in such classrooms, which also contributes to the ecological validity of the research (Kang & Han, 2015).

3.2 Participants

The participants of the existing survey were 97 third-year undergraduate students of English language and literature (57 females and 40 males) who were aged 20-23. These students had taken a writing course that was part of their general academic education. It can be said that the convenience sampling method was used to handpick the participants for this research, as they were from three intact classrooms. One class was allocated to the direct unfocused screencast treatment group (n = 32); another class was assigned to the indirect unfocused screencast treatment group (n = 32), and the other class was regarded to be the control group (n = 33). To account for the homogeneity of the participants before the conduction of the study, the Oxford Quick Placement Test was administered to students. The findings showed no substantial differences among the three groups of students.

3.3 Materials and Instruments

The following materials were utilized in the present study to collect data on the relevant variables:

The Second Language Writer Self-Efficacy Scale (L2WSS)

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

This test, adopted from Teng, Paul Sun, and Xu (2018), was a 21-item Likert scale with each item having seven points from one (not at all true of me) to seven (very true of me). These items had been constructed on the basis of the constituent sources of self-efficacy, i.e., linguistic self-efficacy, self-regulatory efficacy, and performance self-efficacy, with seven items on each constituent source.

To account for the face validity and lack of ambiguity, two assistant professors in the fields of TEFL, along with the teacher of the classes and nine students, were asked to evaluate the items of this questionnaire. The two assistant professors also performed content validity through a qualitative validation based on the theoretical relationship of the items. To ensure that this questionnaire was reliable in the context of this research, the researchers piloted the test on twenty third-year students from the same university who were among the main participants of the study. Cronbach's alpha coefficients for every course of self-efficacy were 98, 95, and 96, respectively.

Writing Test (WT)

A writing test was employed to check students' writing accuracy in three testing situations of pre-, post-, and delayed post-tests. In fact, all members were requested to write an confrontational text based on a given topic with about 100-150 words. Argumentative topics were used in the writing test because such topics are effective in evaluating student's academic progress from the viewpoint of language skills, expressing opinions, and critical thinking. In turn, the percentage of words without any errors, i.e., errors enumerated in comparison to the sum of the words used in written text (Polio, 1997), was employed to measure the writing accuracy of students in the existing study. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was employed to measure the intrarater agreement and the interrater agreement. The calculated value for the intrarater agreement was revealed to be .94, and 96 for the interrater agreement showed to be acceptable.

3.4 Procedure for Treatment and Data Collection

In the current study, two testing instruments, namely L2WSS and WT, were employed to size the progress of self-efficacy and writing accuracy of students. This writing educational course in which the students participated had been planned for sixteen sessions. The pre-tests, which included L2WSS and WT, were held three days before the beginning of the first instructional session. Regarding the treatment, one of the investigators acted as the trainer for the two treatment classes and the control class for sixteen weeks.

The first treatment class received the first kind of treatment, i.e., direct unfocused screencast feedback, during the instructional period of the semester. Therefore, feedback was provided on every structural error that emerged in the pupils' written texts, as well as the provision of feedback on the content and organization of their written works. In turn, the second type of treatment, which was indirect unfocused screencast feedback, was provided for the students of the second treatment

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

group. Hence, the students of this group were provided with feedback on each structural error emerging in the students' written texts.

On the other hand, no kind of screencast feedback was given to the students of the control group in terms of the grammatical and structural errors that emerged in their written texts. However, they were provided with screencast feedback on the content and organization of their writings for ethical consideration. It should be underlined that the data collected from only the emerging structural problems of the students were taken into account in the data analysis process.

Video feedback that was presented to the students included the recording of the screencast of the students' written texts on the laptop screen with the teacher's audio comments. The teacher used the mouse to show parts of the writing to which was referring at that moment, and did not provide any kind of written feedback. It should be mentioned that all the screencast feedbacks related to the content and organization for the treatment class and the control class were of direct type. Only the screencast feedback that was related to the structural problems were provided in the two types of direct and indirect for the first treatment class and the second treatment class, respectively. It was already mentioned that the students of the control class were not given any screencast feedback related to the structural problems of writing.

The post-tests were run to the students one day after the last treatment sitting. To measure the stability of the learning gains, the delayed post-tests were managed to students two weeks after the administration of the post-tests. In this study, three argumentative tasks were employed for the WT: the first argumentative topic was for the pretest, the second argumentative topic was used for the post-test, and the third argumentative topic was for the delayed post-test. Students had one hour to write each task, because this was the common method of writing compositions for instructional writing courses at this university.

In order for these three writing tasks to be new, three somewhat different topics were utilized. However, they were similar enough to allow comparison among them. Although it is possible that the current procedure of data collection can lead to the practice effect, the researchers of this study did not find another method to scrutinize the effect of screencast feedback on the writing accuracy of students. Of course, it should be mentioned that having ecological validity due to the use of real participants in real classrooms can compensate for the practice effect. Similarly, another drawback of this section was the lack of counterbalancing the writing tasks. However, the researchers attempted to compensate for this shortcoming by using three tasks with almost different topics, because writing compositions are more influenced by the topic.

3.5 Data Analysis

SPSS21 was employed to perform all descriptive and inferential statistics. Cronbach Alpha was used to measure the dependability of the tests.

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

4. Results

The results of the current study, which explored the differential effectiveness of direct and indirect kinds of unfocused screencast feedback on the writing accuracy and self-efficacy of students, are shown in this section.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics of both Testing Instruments

Descriptive statistics (number, mean, standard deviation) of 97 students, who were selected as participants and divided into three classes, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the WT and the SE

			Pre-test		Post-test		Delayed	
Group	**Variables**	**N**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**	**M**	**SD**
Direct	WT	32	45.76	3.92	65.55	3.74	63.29	5.04
	SE	32	94.07	6.65	-	-	121.65	7.86
Indirect	WT	32	46.85	2.82	٦٤.٧٧	٣.٨٧	62.11	5.12
	SE	32	92.37	8.35	-	-	121.08	7.03
Control	WT	33	46.87	3.07	52.16	3.49	50.00	3.53
	SE	33	92.86	6.16	-	-	104.85	5.40

As can be perceived in the above table, the mean calculations of the three groups are close to each other, which shows that the students in each group are homogeneous in terms of the variables before receiving the desired treatment. In turn, a one-way ANOVA statistical technique was performed to find out whether these pre-test differences were noteworthy or not. Table 2 displays the results of one-way ANOVA.

Table 2. One-Way ANOVA for the three groups

Variables		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**p-value**
PREWT	Between Groups	26.050	2	13.025	1.193	٠.308
	Within Groups	1026.649	94	10.922		
	Total	1052.699	96			
PRESE	Between Groups	48.726	2	24.363	0.482	0.619

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

Within Groups	4748.740	94	50.519
Total	4797.466	96	

As revealed, the results of one-way ANOVA for both treatment and the control groups displayed that there was no noteworthy change among the three classes in terms of their scores in PREWT and PRESE.

4.2 Assumptions of MANOVA

The assumptions that must be considered to perform MANOVA are similar to ANOVA analysis:

1. One of the conditions for using MANOVA is the normality of the dependent variables. In this article, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used.
2. The variance-covariance matrices must be homogeneous.
3. Box's M test for equality of covariance can be used to check this condition.
4. If the data does not have this condition, the Leven homogeneity test should also be performed for the homogeneity of variance, so that the reason for the non-fulfillment of the condition may be found.
5. The observations must be independent of each other, that is, there must be no connection between the observations in each class or between different classes that can be accessed according to standard sampling methods.

According to the above assumptions and with the help of analysis of the variance-covariance matrix, it is possible to perform simultaneous tests for several dependent variables compared to the factor variables. In the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, if this test is significant (that is, the p-value is smaller than 5 percent), it means that the data distribution is not normal and the parametric tests cannot be employed. According to the following table, none of the p-values is lesser than 0.05, which indicates the normality of all variables at all different levels.

Table 3. One sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test

			Pre-test		Post-test		Delayed	
Group	Variables	N	K-S	p-value	K-S	p-value	K-S	p-value
Direct	WT	32	0.13	0.18	0.10	>0.20	0.10	>0.20
	SE	32	0.14	0.10	-	-	0.14	0.10
Indirect	WT	32	0.11	>0.20	0.11	>0.20	0.07	>0.20
	SE	32	0.10	>0.20	-	-	0.08	>0.20

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

Control	WT	33	0.82	>0.20	0.10	>0.20	0.13	0.16
	SE	33	0.14	0.10	-	-	0.14	0.10

On the other hand, Box's M test was applied to analyze the homogeneity of the covariance matrix, and the results are shown in the table below.

Table 4. Box's M test

Box's M		36.118
	df1	30
	df2	27952.431
	Sig.	0.308

The above table confirms the lack of significant difference between covariates matrices. In addition, Leven's homogeneity test for homogeneity of variance was implemented, and the results of the table below approve the absence of substantial differences between the variances of the variables.

Table 5. Test of homogeneity of variances

Group	Method	Levene Statistic	p-value
PREWT	Based on Mean	0.875	0.420
	Based on Median	0.725	0.487
PRESE	Based on Mean	1.153	0.320
	Based on Median	1.112	0.333
POSTWT	Based on Mean	0.136	0.873
	Based on Median	0.163	0.850
DPOSTWT	Based on Mean	1.607	0.206
	Based on Median	1.793	0.172
POSTSE	Based on Mean	2.176	0.119
	Based on Median	1.824	0.167

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

After carefully checking the assumptions, the MANOVA test was performed to check the overall difference among the three groups, the results of which are shown in the table below.

Table 6. One-Way MANOVA

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	p-value
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	۰.999	20928.11	5	90	۰.000
	Wilks' Lambda	۰.001	20928.11	5	90	۰.000
	Hotelling's Trace	1162.673	20928.11	5	90	۰.000
	Roy's Largest Root	1162.673	20928.11	5	90	۰.000
Group	Pillai's Trace	۰.877	14.22	10	182	۰.000
	Wilks' Lambda	۰.145	29.20	10	180	۰.000
	Hotelling's Trace	5.719	50.90	10	178	۰.000
	Roy's Largest Root	5.692	103.59	5	91	۰.000

According to Table 6, it is clear that the null hypothesis, that is, the equality of the mean among the three classes, is rejected. The p-value for all tests is less than 0.05, so at least one of the groups is statistically meaningfully unlike from the others. This test has the ability to detect the overall difference in the average of the three groups, but for further investigation and the detection of the difference between the groups, it is possible to compare them two by two.

Tukey’s b test is one of the suitable methods for performing post-tests; therefore, in addition to controlling the error level of simultaneous tests, it also introduces similar and homogeneous groups. The related table shows that the control group has a substantial difference with groups 1 and 2 in terms of the WT and SE scores, but the difference between the grades of groups 1 and 2 is not significant.

Table 7. Multiple comparisons Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference	Std. Error	pvalue

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

PREWT	1	2	-1.0881	.82620	⋆.389
		3	-1.1153	.81992	0.366
	2	1	1.0881	.82620	0.389
		3	-.0272	.81992	0.999
	3	1	1.1153	.81992	0.366
		2	.0272	.81992	0.999
PRESE	1	2	1.6944	1.77691	0.608
		3	1.2053	1.76340	0.774
	2	1	-1.6944	1.77691	0.608
		3	-.4891	1.76340	0.958
	3	1	-1.2053	1.76340	0.774
		2	.4891	1.76340	0.958
POSTWT	1	2	.7822	.91896	0.672
		3	13.3886	.91197	0 .000
	2	1	-.7822	.91896	0.672
		3	12.6064	.91197	0.000
	3	1	-13.3886	.91197	0.000
		2	-12.606	.91197	0.000
DPOSTWT	1	2	1.1781	1.15403	0.566
		3	13.2901*	1.14525	0.000
	2	1	-1.1781	1.15403	0.566
		3	12.1120*	1.14525	0.000
	3	1	-13.2901*	1.14525	0.000
		2	-12.1120*	1.14525	0.000
POSTSE	1	2	.5716	1.70801	0.940
		3	16.7962*	1.69502	0.000

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

2	1	-.5716	1.70801	0.940
	3	16.2246*	1.69502	0.000
3	1	-16.7962*	1.69502	0.000
	2	-16.2246*	1.69502	0.000

5. Discussion

The first resolution of the study was to probe the bearing of unfocused direct and indirect screencast feedback on the writing correctness of Iranian EFL students and the potential differential effects of these two styles of feedback corrections. The study found that both direct unfocused screencast feedback and indirect unfocused screencast feedback led to the promotion of the writing accuracy of Iranian EFL students. Our findings are in line with Kang and Han (2015) suggesting that there is no momentous change between the direct kind of feedback and the indirect one in terms of the development of writing grammatical accuracy.

Various reasons for obtaining these inconclusive results can be mentioned. One reason for the unclear results is that the success of WCF also relies on several other factors such as the nature of the error along with contextual and learner variables comprising L2 skill and teacher beliefs (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019) and pupils' belief towards accuracy. Direct corrective feedback has regularly been shown to enhance structural accuracy (Bitchener, 2012), with its strength lying in the clear information it delivers about the correction. In contrast, indirect corrective feedback engages learners in evaluating their work (Ferris, 2010).

As learners do not receive the correction, they are encouraged to closely analyze their work to pinpoint the issue for correction. Our findings are also in harmony with that of Ducate and Arnold (2012) concluding the screencast feedback can have an affirmative impact on their learners and be a motivational dynamism in the L2 classroom. Our findings are also confirming the results that both kinds of direct and indirect unfocused screencast feedback can be smoothly provided by instructors and develop learners' writing performance in terms of its various aspects including writing accuracy. Audio-visual annotation can support tackle this problem of tone and lack of nuance integral in written interaction by addition of a personal voice and potentially friendly tone to the communication with the student. Video feedback also improves their overall comprehension of instructor feedback by offering more specifics and catering to auditory and visual learning preferences. Consequently, the cognitive load may be reduced through screen casting, as simultaneous viewing and listening, rather than separate viewing of the feedback and related essay text, may assist the student in assimilating the advice more effectively.

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

The second drive of the research was to find out the effectiveness of direct and indirect unfocused kinds of screencast feedback on the writing self-efficacy of EFL students as well as their probable differential effectiveness of these two types of feedback corrections. Our results are consistent with those of Golparvar and Khafi (2021), and Sun and Wang (2020) who pointed out that L2 writing self-efficacy has been made known to be allied with writing performance (for our case, writing accuracy).

According to Teng et al. (2018), the linguistic constituent of L2 writing self-efficacy, which is regarded to be one of the essential parts, denotes to learners' philosophies concerning their capacity to manipulate grammar, vocabulary, revision and mechanics. The results of this study can be taken as confirming the hypothesis that L2 writing self-efficacy has been shown to improve with teacher feedback as well as through peer feedback. Students who stated low self-efficacy stated that academic writing was unfamiliar to them and that they required additional guidance and feedback.

The category of low self-efficacy included more specific mentions of grammatical and mechanical issues, placing greater emphasis on the linguistic aspect of L2 writing self-efficacy (Teng et al., 2018). Ferris (2013) discovered that self-assurance appeared to affect students' capability to benefit from teacher feedback and instruction overall, which is also anticipated to align with this study's findings. Consequently, this study has enhanced self-efficacy, suggesting that audio-visual screencasting may foster a more supportive relationship between the tutor and student, reduce feelings of social distance and power imbalance, alleviate students' anxiety, and encourage learning while building self-efficacy.

The outcomes of the current inquiry are also harmonious with previous studies (e.g., Bruning et al., 2013; Waddington, 2019) suggesting that successful writing development needs not only the effective application of writing knowledge but also an optimistic belief in one's capacity to use that knowledge and manage learning behavior. The students who reported increased self-efficacy described feelings of comfort with academic writing. Consequently, this indicates that learners' high levels of self-reliance lead to improved writing presentation since positive self-efficacy can foster greater attention in writing, enhanced effort, and increased diligence.

Therefore, educators should focus equally on students' perceptions of their capabilities as they do on actual abilities, as these perceptions may more precisely forecast students' motivation and forthcoming academic decisions. The results of this study contrast with several earlier findings (e. g., Ferris, 2002) which claim that more teacher feedback leads to reduced confidence. It can be argued that teacher feedback was not only needless but also suggested that this type of intervention could be detrimental to students. Specifically, he noted that one of the negative effects of teacher feedback could be its role in diminishing student confidence

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

6. Conclusion

The use of multimodal methods that are the result of new technologies and the creation of more capabilities in this way for the provision of feedback has not been widely researched. The outcomes of the present study can be reflected as a stage towards using screencast feedback to help learners develop their writing composition. In turn, the current research shows the positive relationship between this particular type of technology-oriented feedback and students' writing self-efficacy; teachers and instructors are expected to plan educational tasks in such a way that can strengthen their writing self-efficacy. Similarly, another aspect of this research is its attention to the writing grammatical correctness. This aspect is regarded as essential from the viewpoint that the grammatical accuracy of writing is one of the requirements of different institutions.

Another suggestion is that effective educators are encouraged to create lesson plans for classifying, stimulating, and modifying the attitudes of less confident students in order to foster more self-assured learners. Similarly, various types of writing lessons (e. g., writing programs and workshops) can be offered to enhance learners' accurate assessments of their writing abilities. Self-efficacy is an internalized concept that can be cultivated and enhanced over time through a combination of regular self-assessment, mentorship, and consistent practice. Consequently, fostering positive self-efficacy beliefs is critical to encouraging students' adaptive performance and academic achievement with the goal of promoting learners' own agency in both L1 and L2 writing processes. While structural correctness was the focus of this research, it was not the emphasis of the class.

However, although concentrating solely on accuracy might be unfavorable, the importance of linguistic accurateness cannot be entirely disregarded, as L2 writers face institutional demand to write accurately. The outcomes of this research show a multifaceted bond between CF and the enhancement of L2 linguistic accuracy. Ecological validity was a goal and a strength of the study: (a) it investigates the growth of linguistic precision throughout a term, similar to a standard classroom; (b) it offers instruction on various grammatical features and subsequently assesses the efficacy of CF on those structures.

6.1 Limitations of the Study

Some notable limitations were noted in the present study. Although the absence of a genuine control group may be acceptable from an educational perspective, it constrains contributions to concept and the inferences that can be assumed from the analysis results. Moreover, the survey has a limited scope; it does not analyze teacher and student behaviors or interactions, and it occurred during only one university term with two CF treatments. Extended studies considering more variables are necessary to evaluate language development. Additionally, since the participants in

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

this study were STEM majors, dissimilar populations may respond in a different way to the interventions.

6.2 Implications of the Study

This study also has pedagogical inferences. This study noted that writing self-efficacy was positively related to proficiency in an EFL context in Iran. Moreover, since self-efficacy is a significant predictor of students' writing outcomes, assessment of writing should include both the assessment of students' writing competence and students' self-efficacy. It is also noted that teachers and instructors can develop their repertoire of written corrective feedback by utilizing screencast feedback in order to make their feedback more conversational and assist students in their writing accuracy. Therefore, the different modalities for providing written feedback to students can help teachers develop their experience of providing feedback in a way that will be understandable and useful for students as well, as students compositions can be upgraded.

Compliance with Ethical Statements

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Informed Consent

Verbal informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to the study.

Author Contributions

All authors contributed equally to the conceptualization of the article and writing of the original and subsequent drafts.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all participants of the present study.

Ethical considerations

The authors avoided data fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, and misconduct.

References

Abdou seddik. M. E. (2026). The digital mediation of teacher's feedback: investigating the efficacy of screen-cast video feedback on EFL learners' writing revision and self-efficacy. *Journal of English Language and Education, 11*(3), 103-114. https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i3.2200

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

Ali, A. D. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching, 9*(8), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.5539/eltv9n8p106

Amirian, S. M. R., Edalati Bazzaz, V., Ghaniabadi, S., & Zareian, G. (2025). Probing into the contribution of self-efficacy, l2 grit, and foreign language classroom enjoyment to oral presentation anxiety of university students. *IJREE, 10*(4), 102-123. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-1017-en.html

Anson, C. M., Dannels, D. P., Laboy, J. I., & Carneiro, L. (2016). Students' perceptions of oral screencast responses to their writing: Exploring digitally mediated identities. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 30*(3), 378–411. https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651916636424

Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(4), 348–363. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jslw.2012.09.006

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

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research, 12*, 409-431. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924

Bruning, R., Dempsey, M., Kauffman, D. F., McKim, C., & Zumbrunn, S. (2013). Examining dimensions of self-efficacy for writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 105*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029692

Cunningham, K. J., & Link, S. (2021). Video and text feedback on ESL writing: Understanding attitude and negotiating relationships. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *52,* 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100797.

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* (vol. 10) (pp. 31–56). San Marcos, TX: 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*, 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

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

Esfandiari, S., & Heydari, A. (2024). Investigating the relationship between EFL learners' sense of self-efficacy and their pedagogical success: different proficiency levels in focus. *IJREE, 9*(4), 56-70. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-932-en.html

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201

Ferris, D. (2010). Second language writing research and written correct SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*, 181-201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of errors in second language student writing* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 161–184. https://doi. org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X.

Frear, D., & Chiu, Y. (2015). The effect of focused and unfocused indirect written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing. *System, 53,* 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.006.

Golparvar, S. E., & Khafi, A. (2021). The role of L2 writing self-efficacy in integrated writing strategy use and performance. *Assessing Writing, 47,* 100504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100504

Grigoryan, A. (2017). Audiovisual commentary as a way to reduce transactional distance and increase teaching presence in online writing instruction: Student perceptions and preferences. *Journal of Response to Writing, 3*(1), 83–128. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw/vol3/iss1/5

Harper, F., Green, H., & Fernandez-Toro, M. (2015). 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

Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *Modern Language Journal, 99*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*, 390–403. https://doi.org/doi.org10.1016/j.jslw.2012. 09.003

Kourosh Khanshan, S., Yousefi, M. H., & Kashef, S. H. (2025). Investigating teachers' self-efficacy, instructional practice and self-reflective practice: The case of tertiary level teachers. *IJREE*, *10*(3), 103-121. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-694-en.htmlju

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System, 84*, 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. system.2019.05.006.

Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology, ideology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4,* 5–33. https://doi. org/10.1558/japlv4i1.5

Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 30*, 66–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.011

Locke, T., & Johnston, M. (2016). Developing an individual and collective self-efficacy scale for the teaching of writing in high schools. *Assessing Writing, 28,* 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.01.001

Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 45,* 46–60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004

Mitchell, K. M., McMillan, D. E., Lobchuk, M. M., Nickel, N. C., Rabbani, R., & Li, J. (2021). Development and validation of the situated academic writing self-efficacy scale (SAWSES). *Assessing Writing, 48*(January), 100524. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100524

Moafian, N., & Ghafournia, N. (2025). Iranian EFL learners' academic self-efficacy, metacognitive reading strategies, and reading comprehension achievement: Exploring the relationships and predicting roles. *IJREE, 10*(2), 79-98. http://ijreeonline.com/article-1-984-en.html

Murray, D. M. (2004). *A writer teaches writing* (Rev. 2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle/Thomson.

Polio, C. G. (1997). Measure of linguistic accuracy in second language writing research. *Language Learning, 47*(1), 101-143. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.31997003

Rahimi, M. (2021). A comparative study of the impact of focused vs. comprehensive corrective feedback and revision on ESL learners' writing accuracy and quality. *Language Teaching Research*, *25*(5), 687-710. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819879182

Schoonen, R., Gelderen, A. V., Glopper, K. D., Hulstijn, J., Simis, A., Snellings, P., & Stevenson, M. (2003), First language and second language writing: The role of linguistic knowledge, speed of processing, and metacognitive knowledge. *Language Learning, 53,* 165-202. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00213

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 255-283. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 286–306. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: Case studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*, 303-334. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990532

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, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221

Teng, L. S., Sun, P. P., & Xu, L. (2018). Conceptualizing writing self-efficacy in English as a foreign language context: scale validation through structural equation modeling. *TESOL Quart*., *52*, 911–942. https://doi: 10.1002/tesq.432

Treglia, M. O. (2008). Feedback on feedback: Exploring student responses to teachers' written commentary. *Journal of Basic Writing, 27*(1), 105-137. https://doi:10.37514/JBW-J.2008.27.1.06

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning, 62*(1), 1–41. https://doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x

Waddington, J. (2019). Developing primary school students' foreign language learner self-concept. *System, 82*, 39–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.02.012

Xu, C. (2009). Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Ellis et al. (2008) and Bitchener (2008). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18,* 270-275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2009.05.005

Young, P. (2000). I might as well give up: Self-esteem and mature students' feelings about feedback on assignments. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 24*(3), 409-418. https://doi:10.1080/030987700750022325

Zimmerman, B. J., & Schunk, D. H. (2011). Self-regulated learning and performance: An introduction and an overview. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance* (pp. 1–12). New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203839010

[Downloaded from ijreeonline.com on 2026-11-26]