## Video Feedback and Instructor Social Presence in an Asynchronous Online Course

Savanna Love, Randolph-Macon College, savannalove@rmc.edu
David Marshall, Auburn University

Abstract: Understanding best practices in online learning environments has become an important area of research in recent years, both before and during the pandemic. Video feedback has been studied as a way to enhance instructor social presence and create classroom community, though more research is needed to understand these constructs in various contexts. The current study sought to understand the extent to which video feedback enhanced instructor social presence in an asynchronous online course. Participants included five sections of an advanced educational psychology course for pre-service teachers. A qualitative, descriptive design using both surveys (n = 63) and interviews (n = 10) was employed to explore student perceptions of video feedback. Findings demonstrate that video feedback enhanced instructor social presence and that weekly videos improved students' overall experience in the course. The video-based feedback led students to develop a better relationship with the course instructor and improved their overall experience in the course. Implications for student outcomes and instructor planning in online courses are discussed.

Keywords: video feedback; writing feedback; asynchronous; graduate students; instructor social presence

An increased interest in online learning environments has led to discussions about the effectiveness of various forms of feedback students receive throughout an online course. While traditionally, feedback has come in the form of written comments, scholars have begun to focus on alternative methods that provide more opportunities for personalized, high-quality feedback messages. Specifically, research has investigated the effectiveness of video feedback in establishing positive learning environments and connections between students and instructors (Anson et al., 2016; Borup et al., 2014).

Recent literature has demonstrated the ways in which asynchronous, one-to-one video feedback is advantageous for building student-teacher relationships, with students claiming that watching video feedback felt personal (Darby & Lang, 2019; Marshall et al., 2020) and made them feel like the instructor knew them (Parton et al., 2010), cared about them, (Henderson & Phillips, 2015), and valued them (Harper et al., 2012). Students have also reported that video feedback made asynchronous instructors feel more real, which motivated them to complete assignments (Borup et al., 2014). Instructors reported that it was easier to give encouragement and communicate authentically with their students using video feedback, compared to text-based comments (Harper et al., 2012).

Though studies exploring student perceptions of video feedback have largely yielded positive findings, students have also reported potential drawbacks, including

feeling anxious to watch their video feedback and finding it difficult to contextualize their video feedback comments within their written projects (Henderson & Phillips, 2015). Additionally, some students were found to be more likely to respond to text feedback due to convenience (Borup et al., 2014) while others reported that they preferred video to text feedback but found it time consuming to download (McCarthy, 2015).

Understanding the influence asynchronous video feedback has on student perceptions of student-teacher relationships may help instructors facilitate online and blended learning environments that support a sense of classroom community and encourage student engagement and cognitive presence (Collins et al., 2019). The current study sought to understand student perceptions of video feedback in a graduate online asynchronous educational psychology course offered to pre-service teachers. Our goal was to answer the following research question: To what extent did the video feedback enhance instructor social presence in an asynchronous course?

## Literature Review

### Instructor Social Presence

Social presence has been considered in a variety of contexts, though scholars have recently been interested in how social presence impacts online spaces. According to Gunawardena (1995), social presence can be considered in part a product of behavior and therefore could "be cultivated" by participants (p.162). This idea became widely accepted and has been the foundation for much of the recent research in this area. Garrison et al. (1999) built on Gunawardena's ideas when they created the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework to examine text-based learning interactions in an online learning environment. According to Garrison et al.'s (1999) CoI framework, the online educational experience consists of three presences: social presence, cognitive presence, and teaching presence (Oyarzun et al., 2018). This framework posits that these three presences overlap to create an effective learning experience and specifically discusses the role of social presence, defined as the learner's ability to present himself or herself as a "real person" (Garrison et al., 1999, p. 89). This can be a prerequisite to cognitive presence, or the extent to which students are able to construct knowledge from their interactions with others in the online environment (Borup et al., 2014). Teaching presence is defined as the design, facilitation of discourse, and direct instruction of the cognitive and social processes of learning to achieve higher order thinking (Anderson et al., 2001), and the intersection of teaching and social presence is known as instructor presence or instructor social presence (Lowenthal, 2015). Garrison and colleagues (1999) go on to explain that social presence's dimensions include affective expression, open communication, and group cohesion (Garrison et al., 1999; Rourke et al., 2001).

Although social presence largely focuses on student social presence within the CoI framework, researchers have acknowledged that a teacher's responsibility to facilitate discourse overlaps with the behaviors identified in the CoI's framework for

social presence (Anderson et al., 2001). Specifically, instructor social presence has been defined as instructors establishing their presence in terms of frequency of communication and interaction with students as well as supporting students through the learning process (Lowenthal, 2015). In their study on the nature of social presence in online course discussions, Swan and Shih (2005) found that instructors' social presence had a larger impact on student outcomes than students' social presence. More recently, Pollard et al. (2014) found instructor social presence to be a significant contributor to positive learning communities. The COVID-19 pandemic forced all instruction to temporarily move online (Benito et al., 2021) and demand for online courses, especially at the graduate level, is likely to persist. As such, finding ways to improve instructor social presence is of great importance.

## Video Feedback

An important way in which instructor social presence can be established is through various forms of feedback students receive throughout an online course. Traditionally, feedback has come in the form of written comments on assignments. However, recent literature has established that audio and video feedback have the ability to convey the non-verbal immediacy cues necessary to create closeness and increase social presence (Anson et al., 2016; Borup et al., 2014). Collins et al. (2019) also argue that asynchronous video may improve student engagement by increasing students' perceptions of instructor social presence in online courses. In a recent review of the literature on video feedback, Bahula and Kay (2021) found that a majority of higher education students preferred video feedback over text-based feedback. Specifically, they found that video feedback offered more detail, was easier to understand, supported higher-level thinking, kept students engaged, was perceived as more personal and authentic, increased social connections and their connection to the instructor, and increased student interaction with the course (Bahula & Kay, 2021).

Research has also demonstrated some challenges associated with video feedback. Accessibility problems have proven to be barriers for many students, including students not knowing how to access the video-based feedback (Thompson & Lee, 2012), files incompatible with devices (Deeley, 2018), slow download speeds or Internet connections (McCarthy, 2015), poor audio quality (Ali, 2016), or the absence of speakers or headphones (Hyde, 2013). Additionally, studies have reported that students found the linear nature of video feedback to be problematic as they were unable to scan the feedback (as one would text comments), requiring them to review the videos multiple times and slowing down the revision process (i.e., Borup et al., 2015; Thompson & Lee, 2012). While some studies have found video feedback to soften the impact of receiving challenging feedback (e.g., Marshall et al., 2020), other studies have reported that students experienced negative feelings when receiving video-based feedback, such as anxiety, nervousness, discomfort, awkwardness, or a hesitancy to watch the feedback (Ali, 2016; Edwards et al., 2012, Hyde, 2013; Lamey, 2015). Therefore, it is important to continue to investigate student perceptions of video feedback to fully understand the impacts it may have on student engagement and instructor social presence. Understanding the influence asynchronous video feedback has on student

perceptions of instructor social presence may help online and blended format instructors facilitate student-teacher relationships that support a sense of classroom community and encourage student engagement and cognitive presence (Collins et al., 2019).

## Methods

This study aimed to understand student perceptions of video-based writing feedback in an asynchronous online course offered to pre-service teachers. This study's participants were students enrolled in a master's level educational psychology course. The study took place at a large public university located in a mid-sized city in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States that enrolls over 30,000 students, one-third of which are from underrepresented groups. Advanced Educational Psychology is a required course for students seeking a master's degree in teaching. The course focuses on theories and research about educational psychology principles that influence effective learning and teaching. Five sections of the same course were offered in the Fall 2019 (one section), Spring 2020 (two sections), and Spring 2021 (two sections) semesters; all were taught by the same instructor.

A qualitative descriptive design was employed to explore student perceptions of the video feedback they received in the course. The primary deliverable in the course was the Review of Research and Application Project (RRAP). The RRAP was a multiple-part assignment that offers students the option of choosing a topic they feel best meets their individual learning needs and preferences. The focus of the assignment was a review and critique of current educational psychology research and the application of both research and theories of learning and motivation to instructional practice. The assignment was broken into four parts, all of which received feedback. In Part I, students were asked to identify three potential topics for their research, and the instructor provided written feedback on the quality of these topics. Part II was dedicated to finding empirical research studies related to the students' topics. Students were asked to submit APA citations of five articles for the instructor to review, and three of these were expected to be used in the final product. The instructor provided written feedback on the articles submitted for this assignment. In Part III, students submitted an outline of their RRAP and received video feedback from the instructor. Students were instructed to provide as much detail as possible, since more detailed outlines received more feedback. The final part of the paper, Part IV, received extensive video feedback as students were given the opportunity to revise their final papers based on the feedback they received. Minimal written comments were included in the paper to be used as markers for discussion in the feedback video. A rubric was used to score the final paper, and the video feedback addressed the scores on the rubric.

The process of recording and sharing video feedback changed over the course of the study due to differences in learning management systems. The first two semesters of the course, Fall 2019 and Spring 2020, used Google Classroom, and

the third semester of the course, Spring 2021, used Canvas[1]. Within Google Classroom, the instructor used Zoom to screencast each student's paper and verbally walk through the feedback provided. Videos were downloaded from Zoom and uploaded to YouTube as a private video. Links were then generated for individual students to be able to view their video feedback and were posted in the assignment comments in Google Classroom. This process averaged about 20-25 minutes for each paper. Videos ranged from 5 to 10 minutes in length, with the additional time spent on reading and scoring the paper. In Canvas, the instructor used the video feedback tool embedded in the platform to provide feedback. While this did not allow the instructor to screencast the paper, it reduced the amount of time required to download, upload, and share a link to a video. Videos ranged from three to six minutes in length, and the entire process of reading and scoring the paper and recording the video took approximately 20–25 minutes, with some additional time spent on written comments compared to previous semesters since screencasting was not an option in Canvas.

## Participants

Participants were selected using purposive sampling. The students enrolled in this course were pre-service teachers, all of whom were pursuing a master's degree. Approximately half of these students were a part of a teacher residency program that sought to train teachers for urban and high poverty school contexts in the metropolitan region in which the university resides. All students enrolled in the instructor's graduate educational psychology courses from the Fall 2019, Spring 2020, and Spring 2021 semesters were invited to participate in the study. Overall, 63 students, representing a response rate of 72.4%, agreed to participate in the study. Demographic information was intentionally not collected from individual survey participants, since doing so would have "outed" some students. See Table 1 for descriptive statistics for the students enrolled in the course.

Two types of data were collected. First, all students were invited to complete a survey at the end of the semester about their experiences in the course, including their perceptions of the feedback received on their RRAP project. The survey was a routine part of the course structure, serving as a way for the instructor to collect formative feedback about the students' experiences in the course. Specific items were added to this survey that were relevant to the study's research, and other items were considered as appropriate based on student responses. For example, students were asked to comment on their perception of video versus written feedback and how connected they felt to their instructor and classmates. Additionally, students were asked to describe the most effective aspect of the course, and responses related to video feedback were included in this study. At the conclusion of the survey, students were invited to leave their email address if they were willing to participate in an interview about their experiences in the course. They were informed that we were specifically interested in their experiences with the video feedback they received on their writing assignments in the course.

---

[1]The instructor used Google Classroom until the University adopted Canvas in the 2020–2021 academic year.

Table 1

*Demographics of Students Enrolled in the Course*

| Variable | Fall 2019 | Spring 2020 | Spring 2021 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Race/Ethnicity | N (%) | N (%) | N (%) | N(%) |
| African American or Black | 2 (9.1) | 6 (18.8) | 10 (30.3) | 18 (20.7) |
| Asian American | 0 (0.0) | 1 (3.1) | 2 (6.1) | 3 (3.4) |
| Hispanic or Latina/o | 1 (4.5) | 1 (3.1) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (2.3) |
| White or Caucasian | 19 (86.4) | 22 (68.8) | 20 (60.6) | 61 (70.1) |
| Other | 0 (0.) | 2 (6.3) | 1 (3.0) | 3 (3.4) |
| | | | | |
| Gender | | | | |
| Female | 17 (77.3) | 27 (84.4) | 29 (87.9) | 73 (83.9) |
| Male | 5 (22.7) | 5 (15.6) | 4 (12.1) | 14 (16.1) |
| | | | | |
| Teacher Education Program | | | | |
| Elementary | 17 (77.3) | 15 (46.9) | 11 (33.3) | 43 (49.4) |
| Special Education | 4 (18.2) | 15 (46.9) | 19 (57.6) | 38 (43.7) |
| Secondary | 0 (0.0) | 2 (6.3) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (2.3) |
| Teacher Residency[a] | 0 (0.0) | 13 (40.6) | 8 (24.2) | 21 (24.1) |
| Other | 1 (4.5) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (9.1) | 4 (4.6) |
| | | | | |
| Total | 22 | 32 | 33 | 87 |

Note. N = 87; [a] student was enrolled in the university's teacher residency program

Ten of the 63 students who completed a survey participated in an interview. Interviews followed a semi-structured protocol and lasted between 15 and 30 minutes. Questions probed for participants' previous online learning experiences, how connected they felt with peers and the instructor in this course, and their perceptions of the video feedback they received in the class, including on the RRAP assignment. The interview protocol used for this study can be found in Appendix A. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Several considerations were made to ensure the protection of the participants in the study. This was especially important given the power dynamics that exist between instructors and students. A member of the research team who worked at a different university and had no prior interactions with the students was introduced to the class two weeks prior to the conclusion of each semester. This team member independently contacted students to solicit their participation in the project. This team member consented, interviewed participants, and transcribed the interviews thereafter. No interviews were completed until final grades were posted for the course. Audio recordings were deleted following the verification of transcripts. Race/ethnicity, gender, and other demographic variables were not collected in the survey participation as part of an effort to protect the identity of the participants.

Collecting demographic data would have identified some individuals enrolled in the course. Transcripts did not contain any personally identifiable information and transcript files were named using a unique code. Personally identifiable information that was shared during the course of an interview, such as the university the student attended for their undergraduate education, was redacted. The instructor of the course did not interact with any of the transcripts until they were in deidentified form. Surveys were administered at the conclusion of the semester; responses were anonymous. An information letter was used for both in lieu of an informed consent form since a signed consent form would have been the only documentation linking an individual with participation in this study. This work was approved by both universities' institutional review boards.

## Positionality[2]

Our team of researchers consisted of two individuals: one with expertise in educational psychology, who taught the course in which the study took place. The other member of the team was not connected with the course under study but had also previously used video-based feedback for writing deliverables assigned in their online coursework. Both members of this research team have studied and published on writing feedback previously (Marshall et al., 2020). Similar to the study's participants, both researchers have been involved with teacher preparation programs previously and both were formerly secondary public education teachers. Our collective expertise allowed for different perspectives on the data during analysis. Had only the instructor of the course conducted the study, it would have posed ethical issues related to power dynamics discussed previously, and it may have been difficult for them to separate a desire for positive outcomes in their teaching from the findings in this study.

## Data Analysis

After the interviews were conducted and transcribed, we followed a member checking protocol which afforded participants the opportunity to review the transcripts of their interviews to ensure that we accurately captured their thoughts and perspectives (Maxwell, 2013). A hybrid coding approach was used for this analysis (Saldaña, 2015), and interview transcripts were coded using Atlas.ti version 9. Survey data were also imported into Atlas.ti for analysis. A priori codes were initially created to correspond to aspects of writing feedback, video-based feedback, and instructor social presence. Additional codes were added as needed based on the transcripts. A total of 48 codes were initially created during the first round of coding. Team members met to discuss coding and created a final list of 23 codes that were used to analyze the qualitative data. A second round of coding was conducted thereafter. Emerging themes were identified individually. The team met a final time to discuss discrepancies and reach consensus on findings.

---

[2]Positionality statements are important to include when reporting on qualitative research (Foote & Bartell, 2011). They allow the researchers to identify the experiences they bring into the work that may influence the research process.

## Results

This study sought to understand the extent to which using video-based feedback for student writing deliverables enhanced instructor social presence in an asynchronous online graduate-level course. These findings reflect what we learned from the survey and interview data we collected. Overall, four themes emerged in the data. Three themes correspond with aspects of instructor social presence, and the fourth represents an unexpected factor in our findings: (1) participants perceived the instructor as a "real person"; (2) video feedback added emotional expression; (3) participants reported feeling connected to the instructor; and (4) weekly videos improved student experience.

### Participants Perceived the Instructor as a "Real Person"

The students we surveyed and interviewed shared that the video feedback they received helped them to perceive their instructor as a "real person" that they got to know over the course of the semester. Students in the course described this especially in terms of the writing feedback they received. One student shared that videos made the course more personable, explaining, "The professor made everything super personable. She made herself very human to us and reached out to us as often as she could." Another student shared that seeing the instructor's face made a difference:

> A lot of my professors in the past would take a pen and write on my paper or just put a grade on my paper or attach a rubric to it and circle where I fell on the rubric. But this was different because I could see her face…I think it was as if I was sitting down in front of her in person and she was going through my paper with me, which was incredibly helpful.

A third student similarly shared, "She gave me video feedback for one of them, but she Zoomed with me about the other one, and she was actually going through my paper with me. And she was sitting on her front porch with her dog outside with her and I was like, 'Wow, she's actually just another human being.'" As basic as this first finding may seem, it can be easy for those engaged in asynchronous online teaching and learning to be faceless names on a screen. The addition of videos in the writing process added a dimension of instructor social presence in the course.

### Video Feedback Added Emotional Expression

Participants described the added benefit of having tone, expression, and nonverbal communication cues added to the feedback that they received on their writing, all of which are missing when feedback is only provided in written form. In open-ended survey responses, only three percent of participants indicated that they preferred to receive written feedback only. Alternatively, 86% of students specifically commented on aspects of video feedback that enhanced their experience in the course. One student shared the video feedback allowed them to see the instructor's body language, explaining "…when she was providing feedback over the video, it's like you can read her body language. You can see something and listen versus

[only] reading the words." Another student discussed the importance of hearing the instructor's tone of voice, "…I know [the instructor is] invested in our class. But hearing how she speaks to us and hearing in her voice how she cares about our assignments kind of transforms that a little bit." Overall, participants shared that the emotional expression and nonverbal communication that was present in video-based feedback helped humanize the writing experience.

## Participants Reported Feeling Connected to the Instructor

The video feedback embedded in the course also helped to develop instructor-student relationships. In responses to open-ended survey items asking students about their experiences in the class, 87% of participants shared that they felt more connected with their instructor because of the video feedback. In an interview, one participant shared that the videos made them feel more connected to the course instructor in this asynchronous course than they did to professors who taught some of their face-to-face courses. They shared, "I felt pretty connected to her just because she was providing very regular feedback on all of my content. So, weird on some level, I felt like I was more connected to her than some of my professors…" Another student shared that seeing the instructor's face made it feel like an in-person experience, "This was different because I could see her face. …it was as if I was sitting down in front of her in person." This feeling of connection also extended to the course in general. One student explained, "I felt more connected to the course, because I felt like with the personalized video feedback, in a way, it made me feel like I was held a little bit more accountable, because I was getting such personalized feedback, that I was more motivated to expand more on my work or my thoughts." Overall, participants felt that having the ability to see and hear the course instructor when receiving feedback on their writing enhanced the rapport they had with them.

## Weekly Videos Improved Student Experience

Our study sought to understand the impact that video feedback had on students' writing. A factor that complicated our understanding of this was the instructor's weekly video posts. Each week, she posted a weekly video that was shared with the whole class, which discussed course content, major points in the current week's content, and an overview of upcoming assignments. Some of these assignments involved components of the writing project, which also received personalized video feedback; however, other assignments were discussed as well. Students reported difficulty in untangling the impact of the personalized videos they received on their writing from the impact of the weekly videos posted for the entire class to view. One student shared, "I felt pretty connected to the professor due to the videos she uploaded each week, explaining our assignments and what was going on in the class."

Another student shared, "She made videos regarding our assignments, and it was the most personable of any online class I've ever taken. It was different but so much nicer to be able to see her face and hear her voice when telling us about the upcoming week. It was very helpful." A third student shared, "[In] most online

courses I have taken, I didn't even know what the professor looked like. I enjoyed being able to see the professor through the weekly videos and through [the writing feedback]. This created more of a relationship with the professor and made the experience of this course more comfortable." Students overwhelmingly described the weekly videos the instructor made for the entire class's consumption to be helpful, and they described them as developing instructor social presence. Thus, separating the students' experience with individualized video feedback and whole-group class videos was somewhat difficult as both seemed to have added to instructor social presence.

## Discussion

This study's findings are consistent with much of the previous literature on video feedback. They also provide added insight on the specific context of writing feedback in a graduate-level asynchronous online course. Specifically, the finding that participants perceived the instructor as a "real person" is consistent with Garrison and colleagues' (1999) conceptualization of social presence. This, along with the finding that participants reported feeling connected to the instructor, confirms the findings that video feedback is able to create closeness and increase social presence (Anson et al., 2016; Borup et al., 2014; Lamey, 2015). Our findings offer an important addition to the research in this area given the context of a fully online asynchronous course compared to blended courses (Borup et al., 2014) and in-person courses with video feedback on virtually submitted assignments (Anson et al., 2016; Lamey, 2015). Given the increase we have seen in courses offered online, especially since the COVID-19 pandemic, it is important to understand how students perceive instructional methods in an online environment compared to a traditional or blended environment.

Additionally, our finding that video feedback added emotional expression is consistent with Garrison's (1999) multidimensional understanding of social presence, which includes affective expression as one of the three dimensions. Thus, our findings clearly demonstrate a connection between video feedback and an increased social presence. Previous research has demonstrated the positive outcomes related to increased instructor social presence, including student performance (Swan & Shih, 2005) and positive learning communities (Pollard et al., 2014). Understanding the impact of improving instructor social presence in a fully online learning environment could therefore have important implications for student experiences in online courses.

One unexpected finding from this study was the impact weekly videos had on students' experience. While we set out to explore the impact of video feedback, specifically, we found that students were often unable to separate the video feedback they received from the weekly videos they viewed to hear course updates, announcements, and content from the instructor. Given that both forms of videos were an important way for students to "hear" from the instructor each week, it is not surprising that the weekly videos served as an alternative way to build instructor social presence. This may be a particularly relevant finding for instructors seeking to increase their social presence in an asynchronous online course. While

video feedback can be time intensive, weekly videos tend to be less so and serve multiple purposes for the entire class.

## Implications for Practice

Online learning is attractive for several reasons, including its ability to reach learners for whom work schedules and geographic distance might have previously been barriers (Alexander et al., 2012; McIsaac & Gunawardena, 1996). However, asynchronous courses have the potential to be impersonal and "dehumanizing" (Miller & Mazur, 2009). It can be easy for learners and instructors alike to view each other as names on a screen, not as real people. This study's findings echo those found in previous studies suggesting that the use of video-based feedback helps to humanize the instructor and foster greater instructor social presence (Darby & Lang, 2019; Marshall et al., 2020). Research suggests that feedback is both important for student learning and that it often fails to meet student needs (Nilsen, 2016). As such, feedback that is well received by students deserves attention. Additionally, understanding the practicality and time commitment for instructors is also important. Instructors must have a clear plan and time set aside to interact with their students asynchronously, similar to the time they would spend in class for a traditional in-person course. Throughout this study, the researchers learned to use different digital tools and Learning Management Systems, and each came with its own set of strengths and weaknesses. Exploring these options and understanding how they will support course objectives is another element to consider when planning for video feedback.

Given the research findings related to video feedback and the increasingly user-friendly applications available to provide it in various ways, it may be that video feedback or video engagement becomes an accepted, perhaps expected, best practice for online courses. As such, it will be important for instructors to become knowledgeable and trained in implementing video tools appropriate for their context.

## Limitations and Future Research

There are some limitations that are worth noting. While students shared that the individual video feedback they received on their writing was helpful, they also shared that the weekly videos that were posted on the course learning management system were also helpful. We cannot state with certainty that the video feedback received on writing was solely responsible for enhancing instructor social presence; it is likely the case that all forms of video-based communication contributed to this. Although we did receive at least survey responses from over 70% of the students enrolled in the course and conducted in depth interviews with 10 additional students, it is always possible that those who agreed to participate in the study had experiences with the video feedback that differed from those who elected not to participate. We believe that the very act of conducting this study led to improved learning outcomes for the students enrolled in this asynchronous online graduate-level educational psychology course. Future work should continue to explore the importance of video feedback in graduate settings and should seek to

continue to find ways to use video and/or other digital tools to improve the feedback that students receive on their writing and improve instructor-student relationships.

## Conclusion

This paper has discussed the extent to which video feedback enhanced instructor social presence in an online asynchronous course. Overall, findings highlighted the positive outcomes associated with video feedback, including that it helped students perceive the instructor as a real person, added emotional expression to the feedback they received, and made students feel more connected to the course and instructor. Additionally, findings pointed to the improved student experience associated with weekly videos. These findings add to the research on video feedback by exploring the specific context of a fully online, asynchronous graduate course for pre-service teachers. There are also important implications for instructors who wish to design and implement effective online courses.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

## References

Alexander, M. W., Truell, A. D., & Zhao, J. J. (2012). Expected advantages and disadvantages of online learning: Perceptions from college students who have not taken online courses. *Issues in Information Systems*, *13*(2), 193–200. https://doi.org/10.48009/2_iis_2012_193-200

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

Anderson, T., Rouke, L., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in a computer conferencing context. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *5*(2), 1–17. https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/article/view/1875

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

Bahula, T., & Kay, R. (2021). Exploring student perceptions of video-based feedback in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, *21*(4), 248–258. https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v21i4.4224

Benito, Á., Dogan Yenisey, K., Khanna, K., Masis, M. F., Monge, R. M., Tugtan, M. A., ...& Vig, R. (2021). Changes that should remain in higher education post COVID-19: A mixed-methods analysis of the experiences at three universities. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, *11*, 4. https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v11i0.1195

Borup, J., West, R. E., Thomas, R., & Graham, C. (2014). Examining the impact of video feedback on instructor social presence in blended courses. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance*, *15*(3), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v15i3.1821

Borup, J., West, R. E., & Thomas, R. (2015). The impact of text versus video communication on instructor feedback in blended courses. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *63*(2), 161–184. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-015-9367-8

Collins, K., Groff, S., Mathena, C., & Kupczynski, L. (2019). Asynchronous video and the development of instructor social presence and student engagement. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *20*(1), 53–70.

Darby, F., & Lang, J. M. (2019). *Small teaching online: Applying learning science in online classes.* Jossey-Bass.

Deeley, S. J. (2018). Using technology to facilitate effective assessment for learning and feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(3), 439–448. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1356906

Edwards, K., Dujardin, A. F., & Williams, N. (2012). Screencast feedback for essays on a distance learning MA in professional communication. *Journal of Academic Writing*, *2*(1), 95–126. https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v2i1.62

Foote, M. Q., & Bartell, T. G. (2011). Pathways to equity in mathematics education: How life experiences impact researcher positionality. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *78*, 45–68. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10649-011-9309-2

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (1999). Critical inquiry in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *2*(2–3), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6

Gunawardena, C. N. (1995). Social presence theory and implications for interaction and collaborative learning in computer conferences. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, *1*(2), 147–166. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/15156/

Harper, F., Green, H., & Fernandez-Toro, M. (2012, September). Evaluating the integration of Jing screencasts in feedback on written assignments. In *2012 15th International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning (ICL)* (pp. 1–7). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICL.2012.6402092

Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2015). Video-based feedback on student assessment: Scarily personal. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *31*(1). https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1878

Hyde, E. (2013). Talking results: Trailing an audio-visual feedback method for e-submissions. *Innovative Practice in Higher Education*, *1*(3).

Lamey, A. (2015). Video feedback in philosophy. *Metaphilosophy*, *46*(4–5), 691–702. https://doi.org/10.1111/meta.12155

Lowenthal, P. R. (2015). A mixed methods examination of instructor social presence in accelerated online courses. *Handbook of Research on Strategic Management of Interaction, Presence, and Participation in Online Courses*, 147. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-4666-9582-5.ch006

Marshall, D. T., Love, S. M., & Scott, L. (2020). "It's not like he was being a robot": Student perceptions of video-based writing feedback in online graduate coursework. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *14*(1), Article 10. https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2020.140110

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Sage Publications.

McCarthy, J. (2015). Evaluating written, audio and video feedback in higher education summative assessment tasks. *Issues in Educational Research*, *25*(2), 153–169.

McIsaac, M. S., & Gunawardena, C. N. (1996). Distance education. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology* (pp. 403–437). Simon & Schuster Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609519

Miller, C., & Mazur, J. M. (2009). Toward a person-centered model of instruction: Can an emphasis on the personal enhance instruction in cyberspace? In A. Orellana, T L. Hudgins, & M. Simonson (Eds.), *The perfect online course: Best practices for designing and teaching* (pp. 275–296). Information Age Publishing.

Nilsen, L. B. (2016). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors* (4th ed.)*.* Jossey-Bass.

Oyarzun, B., Barreto, D., & Conklin, S. (2018). Instructor social presence effects on learner social presence, achievement, and satisfaction. *TechTrends*, *62*(6), 625–634. DOI:10.1007/s11528-018-0299-0

Parton, J., West, R. E., Thomas, R. A., & Graham, C. R. (2010). Examining the impact of video feedback on instructor social presence in blended courses. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *15*(3), 232–256. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1033092.pdf

Pollard, H., Minor, M., & Swanson, A. (2014). Instructor social presence within the community of inquiry framework and its impact on classroom community and the learning environment. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *17*(2).

Rourke, L., Anderson, T., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (1999). Assessing social presence in asynchronous text-based computer conferencing. *The Journal of Distance Education/Revue de l'ducation Distance*, *14*(2), 50–71. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/92000/

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage, London.

Swan, K., & Shih, L. F. (2005) On the nature and development of social presence in online course discussions. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *9*(3), 115–136. http:// doi.org/10.24059/olj.v9i3.1788

Thompson, R., & Lee., M. J. (2012) Talking with students through screencasting: Experimentations with video feedback in higher education. *The Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy*, *1*(1). https://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/ias_pub/229

## Appendix A

Interview Questions

1. How many online classes have you taken prior to this semester?
   a. What has been your experience in previous online courses?
   b. In terms of feedback on assignments?
   c. If you have not taken an online course, what were your expectations coming into this course?
2. Describe your online course experience for EDUS 607.
   a. To what extent did you feel connected to your classmates?
   b. To what extent did you feel connected to your instructor?
   c. What elements do you believe contributed to your online class community?
      i. What elements did not contribute to a positive class community?
3. Describe the process you went through in writing your Review of Research and Application Project
4. What was your perception of the feedback that you received throughout the RRAP process?
   a. What was your general perception of the feedback you received
   b. How was the feedback you received related to the revision process
5. To what extent was your experience receiving feedback on this project similar or different from previous writing experiences in higher education?
   a. Elaborate on the type of feedback you have received in previous courses
      i. If they have online experience, focus on that
   b. Elaborate on the type of feedback you received in this course
      i. To what extent did the feedback you received help you see you instructor as a "real person"?
      ii. Probe about tone and non-verbal cues (emotional expression) associated with video-based feedback
      iii. To what extent did the feedback you received help you build a relationship with your instructor?

*Thank you for your time and willingness to participate in our research. This data will be used to advise and inform our knowledge of how feedback impacts student writing.*