



This work is licensed
under a Creative
Commons Attribution
4.0 International
License.

Enhancing teacher feedback on speaking through interactive videos

 **Simon Wilkins**

Tokai University, Japan
wilkins@tokai.ac.jp

Providing effective feedback on spoken interaction remains a persistent challenge in language education. Immediate correction during speaking tasks can disrupt fluency, while delayed comments are often too general or disconnected from the original performance. This pedagogical practice paper explores the use of H5P interactive video within Moodle as a practical response to this problem. As a pedagogical practice paper, the article does not present a formal empirical study; instead, student and teacher reflections are used as illustrative practice-based evidence to examine how the feedback process was experienced. Drawing on feedback theory, feedback literacy, and recent work on technology-mediated feedback, the paper argues that H5P is valuable not simply because it places teacher comments online, but because it reorganizes feedback on spoken performance through three connected affordances: temporal control and alignment, multimodality, and structured interactivity. By embedding comments, audio explanations, and reflective prompts directly into recorded student performances, teachers can provide feedback that is contextualized, revisitable, and more closely connected to specific moments of language use. The reflections suggest that interactive video feedback may support learner noticing, self-observation, and more focused engagement with teacher comments, while also encouraging teachers to provide more selective and precise feedback. Practical challenges, particularly workload and teacher training, are also discussed. The paper concludes that interactive video feedback is not a universal solution but can offer a sustainable way to enhance feedback engagement on spoken performance when used selectively and strategically.

Keywords: feedback, speaking, interactive videos, Assessment for Learning, feedback literacy

Introduction

Feedback has long been recognized as central to learning, but its value depends on how learners understand, interpret, and use it. Sadler (1989) argues that feedback is meaningful only when learners understand the standard being aimed for, compare that standard with their current performance, and identify ways to close the

gap. Hattie and Timperley (2007) similarly frame effective feedback around three questions: where the learner is going, how the learner is progressing, and what the learner needs to do next. This also aligns with broader Assessment for Learning scholarship, which emphasizes the formative role of feedback in helping learners understand current performance and identify next steps for improvement (Black & Wiliam, 2009). These principles are especially important in speaking instruction, where feedback must support development without undermining fluency, confidence, or willingness to communicate.

In language education, providing useful feedback on spoken performance is particularly difficult. Immediate correction during live interaction can interrupt communication and may increase learner anxiety. Delayed feedback, by contrast, may be easier to provide but can become detached from the original performance. Students may receive comments such as “work on pronunciation,” “speak more fluently,” or “use more detail,” but struggle to connect these comments to specific moments in their speech. Teachers also face practical challenges: listening, assessing, taking notes, and preparing useful comments at the same time is demanding, especially in larger classes.

Interactive video offers one possible response to these challenges. H5P is an open-source content creation framework that can be integrated into learning management systems such as Moodle. Its Interactive Video activity allows teachers to embed comments, questions, audio, links, and other interactive elements directly into a video timeline (H5P Group, n.d.). In the context of speaking feedback, this means that a teacher can pause a recorded student performance at a precise moment and add feedback on pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, interactional choices, or communicative effectiveness.

This article is primarily a pedagogical practice paper. It does not present a formal empirical study, nor does it claim generalizable evidence of effectiveness. Instead, it offers a research-informed account of a classroom feedback practice and uses student and teacher reflections as illustrative evidence of how the process was experienced. The central argument is that H5P is valuable not simply because it places feedback online, but because it reorganizes the feedback process through three affordances identified in technology-mediated feedback literature: temporal control and alignment, multimodality, and structured interactivity. These affordances allow learners to pause, replay, and revisit feedback at their own pace; allow teacher comments to be connected to precise moments in student speech; and allow feedback to be delivered through different modes and embedded reflective prompts.

The paper first situates the practice within feedback and technology-mediated feedback scholarship, then describes the classroom procedure, and finally uses student and teacher reflections to illustrate how these affordances were experienced in practice. In doing so, it aims to contribute a practice-based account of how interactive video can be used thoughtfully in speaking instruction without recasting the classroom activity as a formal research intervention.

Feedback, technology, and learner engagement

Research on feedback has moved away from viewing feedback as information transmitted by the teacher and toward understanding it as a process of learner engagement. Boud and Molloy (2013) argue that feedback should not be understood as a one-way act of telling, but as a process in which learners develop the capacity to judge and improve their own work. Nicol (2010) similarly emphasizes the importance of dialogic feedback processes, arguing that students need opportunities to interpret, question, and act on comments. In this view, the central issue is not only whether feedback is accurate or detailed, but whether learners are able to make use of it. These studies provide the conceptual basis for the present paper: feedback is treated not as information delivered after performance, but as a process through which learners are supported to notice, interpret, and act on evidence of their own performance.

This shift is also reflected in work on feedback literacy. Carless et al. (2011) argue that sustainable feedback practices should help students become more capable of evaluating their own work and using feedback independently. Carless and Winstone (2020) further emphasize the relationship between teacher feedback literacy and student feedback literacy, suggesting that effective feedback depends on how teachers design opportunities for students to engage with comments. Feedback therefore becomes a pedagogical process rather than a discrete act of correction.

Recent work on L2 feedback engagement develops this point further. Mao and Lee (2022) argue that student engagement with written feedback is central to understanding whether feedback contributes to learning. Their sociocultural framing highlights that engagement is shaped by mediating factors such as learner beliefs, classroom practices, teacher support, and the design of feedback activities. Mao and Lee (2024) review student engagement with written feedback and identify the need to attend to cognitive, behavioral, and affective dimensions of engagement. Mao, Lee, and Li's (2024) synthesis of written corrective feedback in naturalistic classrooms also points to the importance of understanding feedback in relation to actual classroom conditions rather than only controlled intervention studies. Although much of this work focuses on writing, it has important implications for speaking because feedback on spoken performance also depends on whether learners can notice, understand, revisit, and act on comments.

Technology-mediated feedback research has developed alongside these broader changes. Earlier CALL and MALL discussions often emphasized access, flexibility, and the practical convenience of digital tools (Hampel & Stickler, 2005; Hubbard, 2009). More recent work, however, examines how particular technologies shape feedback processes themselves. The question is no longer only whether technology delivers feedback efficiently, but how digital feedback changes timing, mode, learner control, interpersonal meaning, and opportunities for engagement. Cavaleri et al. (2019), for example, examine recorded audio-visual feedback in academic language support and focus on how feedback mode affects student uptake. Cunningham (2019a) investigates student perceptions and use of text and screencast feedback in ESL writing, showing that learners may value video feedback for clarity, ease of use, and efficiency. Cunningham (2019b) also demonstrates that language choices in

feedback change across text and screencast modes, suggesting that feedback mode influences not only delivery but also interpersonal engagement.

Multimodal feedback research is especially relevant to the present paper. Elola and Oskoz (2016) show how combining modes can support second language writing feedback, while de Groot (2025) examines multimodal academic feedback through affect and critical digital literacies. These studies suggest that multimodal feedback may help learners interpret not only the content of feedback, but also its tone, focus, and relational meaning. For spoken language education, this is particularly important because spoken performance includes pronunciation, intonation, pausing, gesture, fluency, and interactional timing, all of which may be difficult to address through written comments alone.

This body of work provides the basis for the three affordances used to frame the present practice. First, interactive video offers temporal control and alignment: learners can pause, replay, and revisit feedback at their own pace, while teacher comments can be attached to the exact moment in the performance to which they refer. Second, it offers multimodality: teachers can combine written comments, audio explanations, visual information, and embedded prompts. Third, it offers structured interactivity: learners can be asked to pause, reflect, answer questions, or revisit parts of their performance. These affordances do not make H5P automatically effective. Rather, they create conditions in which feedback on speaking may become more situated, revisitable, and usable. The three affordances used to frame this paper therefore emerge from current discussions of feedback engagement and technology-mediated feedback rather than from the tool itself.

Pedagogical context and H5P implementation

The practice described here was implemented in a Japanese university EFL context with students completing short speaking tasks as part of regular coursework. The purpose was to provide more contextualized feedback on spoken performance without interrupting fluency during live speaking activities. The procedure involved three stages: recording spoken performance, embedding feedback into H5P, and guiding students to review and reflect on the interactive video.

Step 1: Recording spoken performance

Students record a short speaking activity, either individually or in pairs, using their own smartphones. Tasks might include role-plays, short presentations, or conversations based on classroom prompts. After recording, students upload their videos to Moodle through the Assignment activity. Teachers should clearly communicate file format and size requirements in advance to ensure smooth uploading.

This first stage is pedagogically important because it makes spoken performance revisitable. In ordinary classroom interaction, spoken language disappears as soon as it is produced. Recording the task creates an object that both teacher and learner can return to. This is the first condition for temporally aligned feedback: without a recorded performance, feedback on speaking usually depends on memory, notes, or general impressions.

Step 2: Embedding feedback in H5P

Once uploaded, the teacher downloads each student video and imports it into the H5P Interactive Video activity on Moodle. Within H5P, teachers can embed feedback directly into the video timeline. Feedback may take the form of text pop-ups, audio recordings, reflective questions, or links to external resources. Teachers can pause the video at a precise moment and add corrective or supportive feedback on pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary choice, interactional strategy, fluency, or use of supporting detail. At the end of the video, summary comments and reflection questions can be added to guide learners in processing the feedback.

This stage illustrates temporal control and alignment as well as multimodality. Instead of writing a general summary after watching the whole performance, the teacher can attach feedback to the point at which it is most relevant. Audio feedback can also be used when written comments are insufficient, particularly for pronunciation, intonation, or rhythm. Reflective questions can be added to encourage students to think about why a particular moment was effective or problematic.

Step 3: Student review and reflection

Students return to Moodle and view the interactive version of their performance containing their personalized feedback. As they watch, the video pauses at each feedback point, prompting them to read comments, listen to audio messages, or respond to reflection questions before continuing. This asynchronous process allows students to revisit feedback multiple times, compare it with their own self-assessment, and identify specific goals for improvement. Teachers can also encourage students to re-record and resubmit their videos after applying the feedback, creating an iterative cycle of learning.

By following these steps, teachers can establish a structured and repeatable workflow that provides targeted feedback. This process can improve the clarity and focus of teacher comments while creating more explicit opportunities for students to reflect on and act on feedback.

This stage is where structured interactivity becomes most important. Feedback is not simply delivered to students; it is built into a review process. Learners are asked to stop, look again, and consider the relationship between their performance and the teacher's comment. This process does not guarantee learning, but it creates more explicit opportunities for feedback engagement than general post-task comments.

Practice-based reflections on the affordances of interactive video feedback

As this is a pedagogical practice paper, the student and teacher comments below are not presented as formally coded research data or as evidence of generalizable effectiveness. Rather, they are used as illustrative practice-based reflections that help show how learners and teachers experienced the feedback process. The comments are interpreted in relation to the paper's central argument: that H5P interactive video may support feedback engagement by making spoken performance temporally aligned, multimodal, and interactively revisitable.

Temporal control, alignment, and learner noticing

After undertaking the interactive video process, students were asked to reflect on it. They responded to a set of open-ended questions adapted from Richards and Lockhart's (1996) framework for reflective practice, inviting them to consider both their performance and the feedback received.

One important perceived benefit of interactive video feedback was that it appeared to support learner noticing. Several students described becoming more aware of specific features of their spoken performance after viewing the annotated videos. One student wrote, "When the video stopped at the part where I hesitated, I could understand the teacher's comment clearly." Another commented, "I thought my answer was clear. But when I watched the part the teacher talked about, I noticed that I used the same phrase many times and did not explain my reason."

These comments should not be read as proof of effectiveness. However, for a pedagogical practice paper, they are useful because they show students beginning to identify specific moments in their own performance as objects for reflection. In live speaking activities, pronunciation, hesitation, repair, grammar choices, and interactional moves are often temporary and difficult for learners to examine after the event. By returning students to selected moments in their own recorded speech, interactive video created conditions for delayed noticing. Students could see and hear their own performance again, while also encountering teacher comments attached to relevant points in the recording.

A further student comment illustrates this shift more clearly: "I watched the same part three times because I wanted to understand why my explanation was not clear." This comment is important because it suggests active learner engagement rather than passive receipt of feedback. The student was not only the performer but also became an observer of the performance. This is a central affordance of interactive video feedback. It allows the speaking task to be reviewed from a distance, making it possible for learners to compare what they intended to communicate with what they actually produced.

Read through the lens of feedback engagement, this matters because learners need opportunities to interpret feedback in relation to their own work. A general comment after a speaking task may be accurate, but if students cannot connect it to a specific moment, its usefulness may be limited. Temporally aligned feedback reduces this distance by allowing students to revisit the relevant moment and process the teacher's comment alongside the performance itself. The comment, the performance, and the learner's reflection are thus brought together in the same space. This is the first way in which the student comments contribute to the paper's wider argument: they illustrate how interactive video can support noticing by reducing the distance between the spoken performance and the feedback provided on it.

Multimodality and contextualized teacher response

A second affordance of H5P interactive video is multimodality. Speaking performance includes sound, timing, gesture, facial expression, pausing, and interactional rhythm. These features are not always easy to address through written comments alone. H5P allows teachers to combine written comments, audio explanations, links,

and reflective prompts in response to the nature of the issue being addressed. This was reflected in one student's comment that "The audio comment helped me understand my pronunciation because I could hear the difference." For pronunciation, intonation, and rhythm, audio feedback may communicate information that written comments alone cannot easily provide.

Students appeared to value this contextualized form of feedback. One student stated, "It is very helpful to have such direct advice to improve," while another observed that "Obtaining feedback and comments is rare, and it makes my speaking skills better." These comments do not demonstrate improvement by themselves, but they help explain why students may have experienced the feedback as useful. The word "direct" is especially important. The feedback was not separated from the performance or delivered only as a general end comment; it was attached to particular moments in the recording. The student comments therefore support the discussion of multimodality and contextualization not because they demonstrate measurable improvement, but because they show that learners perceived feedback as more usable when it was tied directly to the performance being reviewed.

Teacher reflections also pointed to the value of contextualized response. One teacher noted, "I could reflect on my students' speaking as I might grade an essay." This comparison is useful because it highlights a common difficulty in speaking assessment. Written work can be marked, annotated, and returned with comments attached to specific sentences. Spoken performance, by contrast, is usually transient and more difficult to annotate. H5P made spoken performance more "markable" by allowing teachers to pause the video and attach feedback to a precise moment.

However, interactive video does not simply make speech resemble writing. It preserves the temporal, auditory, and visual qualities of spoken performance while allowing feedback to be embedded within them. This is where multimodality becomes significant. Teachers can use written comments to address grammar or vocabulary, audio comments to model pronunciation or intonation, and reflective questions to draw attention to communicative choices. The mode of feedback can therefore be matched more closely to the nature of the speaking issue.

Structured interactivity and feedback engagement

A third affordance of H5P is structured interactivity. Feedback can be designed so that students pause, read, listen, or respond before continuing. This matters because one persistent problem in feedback practice is that learners may receive comments without actively processing them. Interactive video does not remove this problem, but it allows teachers to design moments where students are prompted to engage with feedback. Some student reflections suggested that this structure encouraged learners to move from noticing toward future action. One student wrote, "Next time, I will prepare one example for each main point." This comment is important because it shows feedback being translated into a concrete strategy for future performance. Rather than simply acknowledging that improvement was needed, the student identified a specific action that could be applied in a later speaking task. This illustrates how structured interactivity may support feedback literacy by helping learners interpret comments and connect them to future learning decisions.

Teachers observed that the process encouraged more deliberate feedback practices. Several reported that interactive video made them more selective about the timing and phrasing of comments. Instead of giving broad summative remarks at the end of a task, they could choose key moments and add comments or questions that might guide student reflection. One teacher observed that the process “allowed students to reflect on, and review, their spoken language in context.” This comment points to the dialogic potential of the tool. Although the feedback was asynchronous, it was not necessarily one-way. Embedded questions and prompts could invite learners to reconsider specific moments of performance and think about possible improvement.

This connects directly to feedback literacy. If students are to use feedback productively, they need opportunities to interpret comments, compare them with their own understanding of performance, and decide how to act on them. H5P does not guarantee that students will do this. Poorly designed comments in an interactive video would still be poor feedback. However, the platform provides a structure that can encourage more active engagement by linking feedback to specific moments and prompting learners to pause and reflect.

The asynchronous and controllable nature of the feedback also appeared to affect how some students experienced correction. One student commented, “I was less nervous because I could stop the video and think.” This comment is significant because it suggests that interactive video may reduce some of the affective pressure associated with immediate correction in live speaking activities. The value here is not simply that feedback is delayed, but that students can control the pace of engagement, pause when necessary, and process comments privately before returning to classroom interaction.

Workload, training and sustainable use

The reflections also highlighted practical limits. One teacher commented that it “takes a lot of time to add feedback (3hrs+ for a class of 30),” while another noted that although “the software is intuitive and easy to use,” it “would require teacher training” for broader adoption. These comments are important because they prevent the practice from being presented as a simple technological solution.

The affordances of H5P are pedagogically valuable, but they also require careful decisions about scale, frequency, and focus. If teachers attempt to comment on every error in every student video, the process is unlikely to be sustainable. A more realistic approach is to use interactive video selectively: for one major speaking task, one assessed presentation, one peer interaction, or a limited number of priority criteria. The goal is not more feedback but better situated and more usable feedback.

Discussion: Understanding H5P as a feedback environment

The value of interactive video feedback lies not simply in its novelty, but in the specific design features that reshape how feedback is delivered and engaged with. Rather than functioning as a digital substitute for traditional post-task comments, interactive video changes the conditions under which feedback is experienced. Three

features are particularly significant: temporal control and alignment, multimodality, and structured interactivity. Temporal control allows students to pause, replay, and revisit feedback at their own pace, while temporal alignment connects teacher comments to precise moments in the spoken performance. Multimodality allows teachers to combine written comments, audio explanations, and reflective prompts. Structured interactivity encourages learners to pause, respond, and reflect rather than simply receive comments passively, which aligns with dialogic and feedback-literacy approaches to feedback engagement (Nicol, 2010; Carless & Winstone, 2020).

These features were introduced above as affordances of H5P, illustrated through the classroom procedure, and reflected in the student and teacher comments. The purpose of this discussion is therefore not to introduce a new set of benefits, but to explain how these affordances help make feedback on spoken performance more situated, revisitable, and usable. In this sense, H5P interactive video feedback is best understood not simply as a digital platform for delivering teacher comments, but as a feedback environment that changes how feedback on spoken performance is located, encountered, and revisited.

First, the student comments illustrate the importance of temporal alignment. When one student wrote that “the video stopped at the part where I hesitated,” the value of the activity was not merely that the speech had been recorded. Rather, the recording allowed the learner to return to the performance as an object of analysis. The comment from the student who watched the same part three times further illustrates how replay can support deliberate engagement with feedback. When feedback is embedded at the relevant moment in the video, students do not need to reconstruct the performance from memory. They can connect the teacher’s comment to the actual utterance, pause, hesitation, pronunciation feature, or communicative move being discussed. This helps explain why students described the feedback as “direct.” The benefit, therefore, lies in the reduced distance between performance and feedback.

Second, the teacher reflections show how H5P made spoken performance more available for detailed pedagogical response. The comparison with “marking an essay” captures how the tool allowed teachers to annotate speech in a way that is difficult during live interaction. This resembles findings from technology-mediated feedback research, where audio-visual and screencast feedback have been valued for clarity, detail, affective support, and learner engagement (Cavaleri et al., 2019; Cunningham, 2019a, 2019b; de Groot, 2025). However, the present practice applies this logic to spoken performance itself. Interactive video allows the teacher to comment on speaking while preserving the spoken qualities of the task. The student comment that audio feedback helped with pronunciation because they “could hear the difference” further illustrates this point.

Third, the comments suggest that H5P can support more active feedback engagement. This is especially evident in the student comment, “Next time, I will prepare one example for each main point,” which shows feedback being connected to a concrete future action. Students did not only receive a score or a general end comment; they were asked to revisit selected parts of their performance and consider how those moments related to future improvement. This connects the practice to feedback literacy because learners need opportunities to interpret comments, compare

them with their own understanding of performance, and decide how to act on them. H5P does not guarantee this kind of engagement, but it provides a structure in which such engagement becomes more possible.

The practice also illustrates why technology should not be treated as pedagogically neutral. Different feedback modes create different possibilities for teacher response and learner interpretation. Written comments, oral comments, audio recordings, screencasts, and interactive videos each organize feedback differently. In this case, H5P brought together several conditions that current feedback literature identifies as important: specificity, learner control, multimodal explanation, and opportunities for active engagement. Its value therefore lies not in technological novelty, but in the relationship between the tool's affordances and the teacher's feedback design.

At the same time, the workload concerns raised by teachers show that interactive video feedback must be implemented carefully. The teacher comment that feedback required "3hrs+ for a class of 30" suggests that sustainability depends on selective use. Teachers may need to focus on priority criteria, key moments, or representative examples rather than attempting comprehensive correction. This is consistent with the broader argument that effective feedback is not simply more feedback, but feedback that learners can understand, revisit, and use.

The contribution of this practice, then, is not the claim that H5P is inherently superior to other forms of feedback. Rather, it shows how interactive video can reorganize feedback on speaking in ways that align with current understandings of feedback engagement. Read in this way, the student and teacher reflections are not separate from the theoretical discussion; they illustrate how the affordances of temporal control and alignment, multimodality, and structured interactivity were experienced in one classroom context.

Conclusion

This pedagogical practice paper has argued that H5P interactive video feedback can help address a persistent challenge in speaking instruction: how to provide feedback that is specific, contextualized, and usable without interrupting live communication. The value of H5P lies not simply in moving feedback online, but in reorganizing the feedback process. By embedding comments and prompts into recorded performances, H5P allows feedback to be controlled and revisited by learners, temporally aligned with specific utterances, delivered through multiple modes, and supported through structured opportunities for reflection.

The student and teacher reflections discussed in this paper do not constitute formal evidence of effectiveness. They do, however, offer useful practice-based insight into how the tool was experienced. Students appeared to value the opportunity to review their own performance, notice specific areas for improvement, and receive direct comments connected to particular moments in their speech. Teachers, meanwhile, reported that the process encouraged more deliberate and precise feedback practices, while also noting important workload and training considerations.

The main contribution of this paper is therefore practical and conceptual. Practically, it offers a replicable procedure for using H5P to provide feedback on student speaking. Conceptually, it shows how interactive video can reconfigure



JALTCALL

Trends

Vol. 2 No. 1
2025 JALTCALL
Conference Papers
Special Issue

feedback from a brief post-performance comment into a more sustained process of review, noticing, and reflection. This does not mean that interactive video should replace in-class interaction or live teacher feedback. Rather, it can complement classroom speaking activities by moving some feedback work into an asynchronous space where learners have more time and control.

Future classroom-based inquiry could examine how students engage with embedded feedback over time, whether repeated use leads to more effective self-assessment, and how peer feedback might be incorporated into the same interactive video process (Topping, 2009). For teachers, the most sustainable use of H5P may be selective rather than comprehensive: focusing on key moments, priority criteria, or major speaking tasks. Used in this way, interactive video feedback has the potential to support learner agency, feedback literacy, and confidence in spoken language performance while remaining realistic within everyday teaching conditions.

References

- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). *Feedback in higher and professional education: Understanding it and doing it well*. Routledge.
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), 395–407.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003642449>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(6), 1–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Di Biase, B., & Power, C. (2019). How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 16(4), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.16.4.6>
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019a). Student perceptions and use of technology-mediated text and screencast feedback in ESL writing. *Computers and Composition*, 52, 222–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2019.02.003>
- Cunningham, K. J. (2019b). How language choices in feedback change with technology: Engagement in text and screencast feedback on ESL writing. *Computers & Education*, 135, 91–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.03.002>
- de Groot, F. O. (2025). Sticky voices: Affect and critical digital literacies in multimodal academic feedback. *System*, 134, Article 103808.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103808>
- 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>
- H5P Group. (n.d.). *Interactive Video*. H5P. <https://h5p.org/interactive-video>
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2005). New skills for new classrooms: Training tutors to teach languages online. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 18(4), 311–326.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220500335455>

- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hubbard, P. (2009). *Computer assisted language learning: Critical concepts in linguistics*. Routledge.
- Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2022). Researching L2 student engagement with written feedback: Insights from sociocultural theory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 56(2), 788–798. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3071>
- Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2024). Student engagement with written feedback: Critical issues and way forward. *RELC Journal*, 55(3), 810–818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221150811>
- Mao, Z., Lee, I., & Li, S. (2024). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies. *Language Teaching*, 57(4), 449–477. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000393>
- Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501–517. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559>
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569>

Author biodata

Simon Wilkins is the English Coordinator for the Department of Business Administration at Tokai University. His research interests include Assessment for Learning; Systemic Functional Linguistics, particularly its application through the genre-based approach; and Technology-Enhanced Language Learning. He holds a PhD in Applied Linguistics from Aston University in the UK.