Original Research

SAGE Open
October-December 2021: 1–14

DOI: 10.1177/21582440211064895
journals.sagepub.com/home/sgo
SAGE

Improving Language Learners' Use of Self-Regulated Writing Strategies Through Screencast Feedback

Banu Inan-Karagul[1] and Meral Seker[2]

Abstract

The study aims to explore the impacts of an online training scheme developed for higher education learners that integrates self-regulated learning (SRL) writing strategies into screencast feedback in line with the cyclical model of SRL (i.e., forethought, performance, and reflection on performance phases). During each phase, cognitive, metacognitive, affective and socio-interactional SRL writing strategies were introduced through screencast feedback given to the learners' writing assignments. The participants were undergraduate English Language Teaching (ELT) students at two state universities ($n = 135$) in Turkey. Following a mixed-method research design, previous to and after the 6-week training sessions, both quantitative and qualitative data was gathered and analyzed statistically. The results regarding the learners' reported use of SRL writing strategies indicate a significant increase in the use of SRL writing strategy after the training. Also, the learners' opinions on receiving screencast feedback and on the SRL training were considerably positive. The findings are meant to contribute to both online education and teacher education pedagogy.

Keywords

EFL writing, self-regulated learning, screencast feedback, strategy training, written feedback

Introduction

School closures due to the Covid-19 pandemic brought surmounting challenges at higher education level to both learners and educators. These include issues about the accessibility to and the use of technology and infrastructure, managing optimum motivational and attitudinal states, and inefficient online teaching and learning-teaching approaches and methods. (e.g., Chen et al., 2020; Drane et al., 2020; Dwivedi et al., 2020; Khan et al., 2021). From teachers' front, recent research shows that teachers from different regions struggle adapting to this new model of instructional practices due to lack of training and experience in online pedagogy (Adnan & Anwar, 2020; Bao, 2020; Khan et al., 2021). For learners, however, continuous lack of social interaction, lack of sense of belonging to school environment, lack of timely feedback and teacher contact have been among the frequently reported challenges in addition to technological difficulties faced (Adnan & Anwar, 2020; Chen et al., 2020; Drane et al., 2020; Popa et al., 2020).

In the context of foreign or second language (F/SL) learning, learners and teachers have been experiencing other challenges as well. Language learning is more than acquisition of knowledge that could be framed in educational programs and delivered to learners gradually. Rather, it is mostly skill development, which requires educational programs and applications to engage learners in real world situations where they can develop the skills required for lifelong learning. Such a skill building process necessitates continuous motivation and engagement of learners; motivating and challenging tasks and materials; timely and efficient monitoring; and effective and constructive assessment and feedback practices (Fredricks et al., 2004; Gellin, 2003). In virtual language learning environments, it is even more difficult to ensure that learners are supported sufficiently in terms of these aspects (Chen et al., 2020; Popa et al., 2020).

Perceived as one of the most challenging tasks by learners, writing is a complex process that requires meeting predefined standards and criteria (McCutchen, 2011; Seker, 2018). In order to complete a writing task, learners go through a multi-layered process where they need to employ cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies, trigger their existing knowledge and accumulate sufficient relevant information on the content, use various resources in their environment to bridge any

[1]Kocaeli University, Turkey
[2]Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University, Antalya, Turkey

Corresponding Author:
Banu Inan-Karagul, English Language Teaching Department, Faculty of Education, Kocaeli University, Baki Komsuoglu Blv., Kocaeli 41380, Turkey.
Email: banu_inan@yahoo.com

deficiencies while focusing on sustaining motivation and concentration levels (Hidi & Boscolo, 2006; MacArthur, 2014; Wang, 2014). Furthermore, learners should be equipped with both sufficient knowledge not only on formal aspects of writing such as composing processes, formatting styles, or genre (Matsuda, 2012; MacArthur, 2014) and socio-cultural knowledge and linguistic and metacognitive skills to meet the structural, lexical, discoursal, or stylistic standards of the target language (Hamman, 2005; Harris & Graham, 2009; Sasaki et al., 2018; Teng & Zhang, 2016).

Despite the additional complexities faced during writing processes in F/SL contexts, the substantial role that writing plays in the learners' personal, academic, professional, and social development in addition to their language improvement has stimulated researchers and educators to challenge the difficulties encountered. Through writing experiences in F/SL, learners can improve their language skills while developing critical thinking skills, learning effective communication in F/SL contexts, and increasing their knowledge on the content areas (Bruning & Horn, 2000). However, the transition from face-to-face classes to a completely online environment has exacerbated the challenges and the complexities faced in F/SL writing education contexts (Bailey & Lee, 2020). According to Xu (2021), insufficient online teaching experience has been among the main challenges for F/SL writing teachers whereas lack of online learning strategies and sustaining learning motivation have been the main obstacles for learners.

In this respect, cumulative research on F/SL writing recommends equipping learners with effective strategies, skills, and knowledge to cope with the new challenges faced in online learning environments in addition to increasing learner motivation and engagement (Bai & Guo, 2018; Hamman, 2005; Khan et al., 2021; Kummitha et al., 2021; MacArthur, 2014; Xu, 2021; Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2007). However, in spite of the frequently mentioned need for SRL strategy in writing, research on F/SL writing has paid insufficient attention to the effective instructional recommendations for teachers (Bai & Guo, 2018; Xu, 2021). Therefore, there is a growing need to provide F/SL teachers with practical and effective models and tools to assist them training learners to gain online learning strategies (Bailey & Lee, 2020; Khan et al., 2021; Xu, 2021). As an attempt to provide an alternative tool for teachers, SRL online strategy training scheme has been developed. The present study, in this respect, aims to find out the effects of the SRL online strategy training scheme, developed to equip learners with SRL strategies for academic writing courses, on higher education learners' reported strategy use. The training has been designed to introduce SRL strategies implicitly and to provide learners with tips and suggestions on how to use them through screencast feedback videos shot for writing assignments in an online course during COVID 19 pandemic. The study also explores the participant learners' opinions about screencast feedback and SRL writing strategy training. Based on the aim of the study, the following specific research questions are sought:

(1) What are the higher education learners' levels of self-reported SRL writing strategy use previous to the SRL writing strategy training?
(2) Does SRL training delivered through screencast feedback affect the higher education learners' levels of self-reported SRL writing strategy use?
(3) What are the participant learners' opinions on SRL writing strategy training?
(4) What are the participant learners' opinions on receiving feedback through screencast feedback?

Literature Review

Feedback in Writing

In the context of writing instruction, effective feedback plays a crucial pedagogical role. It is regarded as a means of effective communication between learners and the teacher, as a result of which expected standards and learner responses are set (Parr & Timperley, 2010). Providing quality and timely feedback is accepted to positively correlate with learner engagement and motivation (Bahrouni & Tuzlukova, 2019; Li & Barnard, 2011; Strijbos et al., 2010), however, it is frequently suggested that teachers decide on the scope and the type of the feedback that best suits their learners' needs and learning styles (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Parr & Timperley, 2010).

There has been an increasing recognition of the use of technology for teachers' pedagogic processes such as providing feedback in a context where technology-enhanced modes of delivery have gained significance (Orlando, 2016). One of the most recent modes of technology-enhanced feedback is screencast feedback, which is defined as "a video capture of events that happen in a portion of a monitor along with voice narration" (Orlando, 2016). The use of screencast feedback has been investigated in different contexts so far focusing on the students' attitudes, preferences, and whether it leads to more successful revisions. For instance, Ali (2016) investigated the perceptions of university students toward a writing course including screencast feedback at a university in Egypt. The results of the study revealed that learners responded positively to screencast feedback because they found it clear, personal, supportive, and engaging. Similarly, Henderson and Phillips (2015) studied the attitudes of a sample consisting of 126 graduate and undergraduate learners toward video-based assessment feedback on their assignments. The researchers found out that the learners valued this type of feedback more compared to text-based feedback and stated that it was individualized, motivating, and unambiguous.

Another research focus for screencast feedback is its comparison and contrast with other types of feedback such as audio-feedback. The results of the studies reported more

successful revisions (Cavaleri et al., 2019) completed in a shorter period of time with more global changes made (Cunningham, 2019). In a more recent study, Cheng and Li (2020) compared screencast feedback with text-only feedback in an online TESOL class. Learners in the screencast feedback group benefited more from teacher feedback and they also stated that they preferred screencast feedback as they found it more detailed and more personal. However, to the best of our knowledge, no previous study in the literature has focused on the provision of strategy training through screencast feedback.

Self-Regulated Learning Strategies

In the context of educational psychology, SRL is regarded as a process where learners exhibit, monitor, and regulate their cognitive, emotional, and behavioral efforts while strategically orchestrating and executing appropriate strategies and evaluating the outcomes. During this process, self-regulated learners manifest cognitive, meta-cognitive, affective, and socio-cultural strategies (Oxford, 2017; Rose et al., 2018; Zumbrunn et al., 2011). These strategies are indicated to be operated in three cyclical phases: forethought, performance, and evaluation (Ramdass & Zimmerman, 2011; Zimmerman, 2004; Zumbrunn et al., 2011). The forethought phase is the first step and involves planning, setting clear learning goals, organizing resources, and selecting appropriate strategies, and self-motivation. In the performance step, learners implement strategies, monitor the execution processes, alter strategies when necessary, and sustain motivation and concentration. The third step, the evaluation phase, is mainly geared toward evaluation of the learning outcomes, reflecting, and planning for future learning. When learners effectively implement self-regulation strategies, they have the necessary cognitive, behavioral, affective, and social features to become active, autonomous, and constructive learners. Learners successfully employing SRL strategies are also reported to have enhanced academic achievement; improved study skills; set clear realistic learning goals based on their learning progress and outcomes; organize a more supportive learning environment; comfortably seek help from others; maintain their motivation and concentration for longer periods; implement multiple strategies to complete a task and monitor and assess their progress better (de Bruin et al., 2011; Elstad & Turmo, 2010).

In the context of F/SL learning, research has revealed that self-regulated language learning (SRLL) strategy use is significantly and positively correlated with language achievement (e.g., Andrade & Evans, 2013; Hu & Gao, 2018; Seker, 2016) and leads to higher performance in language skills (Andrade & Evans, 2013; Oxford, 2017). Specifically, when learners use SRL writing strategies effectively, they display higher levels of L2 performance with an increased quality in their L2 production as a result of planning and conducting their writing tasks more effectively (e.g., Bai & Guo, 2021; De Silva & Graham, 2015; Han & Hiver, 2018; Limpo & Alves, 2013; Sun & Wang, 2020; Xu, 2021).The quasi-experimental study conducted by Wilby (2020), for instance, investigated the relationships between writing task motivation, self-regulation, and writing scores of students at post-graduate level. Having completed an intense month-long EAP course, the participants' writing scores and reported strategy use and self-efficacy beliefs were investigated. The results of the study indicate that the learners' writing scores were significantly correlated with SRL strategies such as mastery goals, performance approach goals, and utility value. Furthermore, the participant learners' self-efficacy levels were found to have increased significantly while showing strong inter-relationship with self-regulation (Wilby, 2020).

Self-regulated learning strategies in writing. Similar positive correlations between the use of SRL strategies and achievement have also been reported for F/SL writing performance. Teng and Zhang (2016), for example, conducted a cross-sectional study with Chinese university students to explore the predictive role of SRL strategy use in writing in English. The findings of the study showed that four dimensions of SRL strategies, that is, cognition, meta-cognition, motivation, and social behavior, predicted writing test scores. In an English medium of instruction (EMI) context, Hu and Gao (2018) conducted a study in Hong Kong with secondary school students in which they investigated self-regulated strategic processes of high achievers and underachievers. The results indicated that high achievers utilized more SRL strategies (e.g., reorganizing, evaluating, reviewing, memorizing, imitating, adopting, etc.) while only two strategies (i.e., imitating and reorganizing) were identified with the underachievers' group.

As the studies focusing on SRL strategy use frequently indicate positive influence on learners' academic success, SRL instruction is frequently recommended (e.g., Bai & Guo, 2021; Bai & Wang, 2021; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015; Ekholm et al., 2015; Graham et al., 2013; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2013; Labuhn et al., 2010; Sasaki et al., 2018) and alternative methods and instructional suggestions for integrating SRL into writing classes have been shared. In the study conducted by MacArthur (2014), for instance, a curriculum for college level writing classes was developed integrating the instruction of SRLL strategies such as goal setting and task management. The results of their longitudinal study indicated that the overall quality of the learners' writing was positively affected by SRLL strategy instruction. Sasaki et al. (2018), on the other hand, conducted a longitudinal study with Japanese students and explored the development of three L2 writing strategies: global planning, local planning, and L1-to-L2 translation as a result of SRL instruction. Based on the analyses of the qualitative and quantitative data, it was found that the instruction of some of the strategies was influential on the learners' writing performance. However, it was also evident that the development and the

use of strategies showed variations based on individual and environmental factors while retention of strategy use depended on subsequent SRL instruction and learner involvement in SRL strategy use. While tailoring SRL instructional practices based on learners' language proficiency levels, their motivational levels and readiness to adopt strategies can affect learners' acquisition of strategies; contextual factors have a significant influence on SRL instructional practices and learner engagement. Therefore, researchers and educators state that some important factors such as learner characteristics (Csizér & Tankó, 2017; Han & Hiver, 2018) and contextual factors (The Douglas Fir Group, 2016) should be considered in the planning and the implementation of SRL strategy instruction. In line with this suggestion, screencast feedback was chosen as the most appropriate way of providing SRL strategy instruction.

In addition to the aforementioned important factors, the abrupt transition into online education has brought new challenges in virtual learning environments, which require learners to be equipped with necessary SRL strategies (Bai & Guo, 2018; Xu, 2021). At this point, teachers need practical and effective instructional models and tools for training learners to gain online learning strategies. As an attempt to provide an alternative tool for teachers, SRL writing strategy training scheme has been developed for higher education. The present study, in this respect, aims to find out the effects of the SRL online strategy training scheme, developed to equip learners with SRL strategies for academic writing courses on higher education learners' reported strategy use while exploring their opinions on such a training experience.

Methodology

Context and Participants

The study took place in the English Language Teaching (ELT) departments of two state universities in Turkey. The participants were the second-year students taking the "Critical Reading and Writing" course, which is offered as a 14-week compulsory course. The courses at these two ELT departments were delivered by the two researchers as the course instructors. As a part of this course, learners are expected to write different types of essays; namely, argumentative essay, research-integrated essay, etc. The course instructors followed the same process writing approach through which learners were supposed to write multiple drafts and receive feedback for each submitted draft until the expected standards are met. Prior to this study, the learners in both groups took a two-semester writing course at their universities, which conveyed studying English sentence structures, formal, and informal email writing, and formal paragraph writing. Having completed their two-semester writing courses successfully, the learners were able to enroll in Critical Reading and Writing course. The English proficiency level of the participants was B2, which was determined by the departments' proficiency exams conducted at the beginning of the semester. The demographic information of the participants is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Information of the Participants.

	Gender		Age			
	Female	Male	17–19	20–22	23–25	26+
N	96	39	8	104	10	13
%	71.1	28.9	5.9	77.0	7.4	9.6
Std. Dev.	0.455		0.69213			

The participants, who are all native speakers of Turkish, are prospective teachers studying ELT. They were asked to participate on a voluntary basis. Out of 148 total learners registered to these courses, 135 of them agreed to participate and signed informed consent forms. Ethical approval for this study was waived by the Research Ethics Committee of one of the universities (Date and Number 2020/14-6). The majority of the participants are female, and their ages varied between 20 and 22 (71.1% and 77%, respectively). The researchers were their course instructors who are also native speakers of Turkish with a PhD in ELT.

Data Collection Tools and Procedure

Following an extensive review of the studies conducted on SRL in F/SL writing contexts and the conceptualizations of SRL presented in the field of educational research, the Self-Regulation Scale in Writing developed by Kanlapan, and Velasco (2009) was chosen as the data collection tool for the study. The rationale for choosing this scale is that (a) the scale has the dimensions in line with the three cyclical phases: forethought, performance, and evaluation (Zimmerman, 2004) adapted for strategy training conducted during feedback sessions; (b) the dimensions are represented by a wide range of items ($n=115$); (c) the majority of the items are appropriate for the context of the participants in the study. After the items were identified, the accuracy and the clarity of the items were revised by the researchers. The items which were not relevant to the phases covered in the SRL training or the ones that could be confusing/vague for or not applicable to the context of the participants were excluded from the scale ($n=48$). Upon the modifications made, two other educational researchers, an expert in statistics and an expert in educational assessment, revised the survey. Moreover, an educational statistician's opinion was sought to confirm the consistency of the dimensions determined and the final version of the survey to the training program and also the appropriateness of the methods for research design and data analyses. Upon his recommendations, the items related to the "Attributing Causations" ($n=8$) were eliminated from the

survey used in the study as they would not be covered in the feedback sessions.

After the revisions and the alterations suggested were completed, the survey at this stage had two parts. The first part had questions related to learners' demographic information: age, gender, their universities and grades. The second part included six dimensions with a total of 59 items in a 5-point Likert Scale format, anchored by "always" (1), "often" (2), "sometimes" (3), "rarely" (4), and "never" (5). The six dimensions included items related to Goal Setting Strategies ($n=10$), Time Management Strategies ($n=8$), Performance Strategies ($n=11$), Attention Control Strategies ($n=10$), Evaluation Strategies ($n=13$), and Reflections for Future Adaptations ($n=7$). The participants were asked to indicate their agreement to each item by choosing the number corresponding to their frequency of use of the strategy in each statement. For example, in response to Item 36 (under Evaluation Strategy dimension) "*I evaluate my written outputs after every session*," the participants could circle "1" if they often used this strategy, "2" if they sometimes used it or "5" in case they never applied the strategy. Then, the survey was transformed into Google Forms and the participants were asked to complete it online. A total of 135 higher education learners completed the survey previous to and following the six-week SRL training they received through screencast feedback.

The SRL training scheme via screencast feedback. The writing courses were delivered by the two researchers synchronously through the online course management (OCM) systems of these two universities due to Covid-19 pandemic. OCM systems are the software programs provided by the universities to deliver online education. They consisted tools and resources to integrate and utilize variety of teaching and learning technologies such as communication tools (e.g., online chat, email, messages, etc.); resources (e.g., digital documents or links); instructional tools (e.g., course materials, notes, etc.); assessment tools (online quizzes, exams, etc.); or administrative tools (e.g., tracking attendance, calendar, etc.). Through these tools, the courses and SRL training were delivered.

The registered ELT learners ($N=135$) were evaluated over three research-integrated argumentative writing assignments within the scope of the key competences of the course. Research-integrated argumentative writing tasks are considered to be cognitively demanding as they require learners to use both lower-level and higher-level writing skills (Wilson et al., 2016), and thus, it is thought to require implementation of more writing strategies.

To give video feedback to the learners' assignments, annotating and screen sharing functions of Zoom and Microsoft Teams were used. These tools allowed the course instructors to record their comments and to provide longer and more detailed feedback. The instructors used the talking head option so that the learners could see the teachers' face and their written document and hear the oral comments simultaneously. Prior to the recordings, the instructors read the student essays they sent through email to get familiar with the content of their writing and took notes to use during screencast video feedback. Afterward, they used the Track Changes function of Microsoft Word and the comment balloons. They also utilized the annotation tools while sharing their screen to highlight particular aspects of the essays and giving oral comments. These comments served the purpose of integrating SRL training to the screencast feedback given to the participant learners. Depending on the achievements and weaknesses present in the assignments, the instructors provided the learners with relevant tips and suggestions to introduce and to assist implementations of SRL writing strategies.

In line with the cyclical model of SRL (i.e., forethought, performance, and reflection on performance phases) (Zimmerman, 2004), the training included three main phases: pre-writing, writing, and post-writing. Under each phase, the learners were introduced cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and socio-interactional SRL strategies to improve their writing skills through screencast feedback. However, rather than providing feedback on every aspect at one single feedback session, the instructors focused and commented on the strategies relevant to one of the phases in the cyclical model (for the strategies at each phase see Appendix B). Accordingly, the first screencast feedback sessions for the learners' first writing assignment were geared toward the pre-writing stage in the forethought phase, and thus, included tips and suggestions relevant to strategies for goal setting and adopting necessary strategies. During their second assignment, the feedback delivered focused on the performance phase by introducing and suggesting using monitoring, attention control, and time management SRL strategies. The final feedback sessions, however, aimed at aiding learners to use the strategies for the post-writing stage in the reflection phase that covered the writing strategies implemented to edit and evaluate their written products and to reflect on the strategies to be adapted in their future assignments. Each phase was communicated in a 2-week period through screencast feedback videos (See Appendix B for further details). Feedback videos were between 9 and 14 minutes with the sizes from 18 to 38 MB. The videos were recorded and saved to the researchers' Drive accounts or computers. The feedback videos or the links in the drive accounts were then shared with the learners so that they could access the videos in their convenience. A total of 401 essays have been annotated during screencast feedback sessions, recorded, and then shared with the participant learners via emails or drive links. The learners were asked to watch the recordings, improve their writing assignments and write the second draft using the suggested strategies and the recommendations within the following week.

Following the training, online interviews were conducted with the volunteering participant learners in order to find out their opinions on the SRL training they received as well as on

Table 2. Descriptive Results of Pre- and Post-Implementations of the SRL Writing Scale.

	Goal setting		Time management		Performance strategies		Attention control		Evaluation strategies		Reflections for future	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Mean	2.05	1.84	3.11	2.73	2.08	2.06	2.38	2.44	2.75	2.16	2.58	1.77
Std. Dev.	0.705	0.573	0.891	0.800	0.770	0.722	0.716	0.768	0.840	0.639	0.848	0.584

Table 3. The Differences Between Pre and Post-Training Results for Each Dimension.

	Pre-posttraining comparisons					
	Goal setting strategies	Time management strategies	Performance strategies	Attention control strategies	Evaluation strategies	Reflections for future
Z	−2.172	−2.960	−2.937	−0.211	−2.694	−2.913
Asymp. Sig. (two-tailed)	0.030*	0.003*	0.003*	0.833	0.007*	0.001*

*$p < .05$.

the mode of feedback delivered. As a result, semi-structured online interviews were conducted with 48 learners. The questions were prepared by the researchers in line with the training and the scope of the study (see Appendix A).

The volunteer learners were interviewed through Zoom and these interviews were recorded by the researchers. The interviews were held in English. The recordings were transcribed verbatim and analyzed through inductive content analysis conducted by the two researchers. Since the interview data yielded a large set, the analysis of the qualitative data comprised three main phases. In the first phase, in order to identify the emerging themes, the data was segmented and classified broadly based on the relevancy to the strategies in the cynical model of SRL in order to condense the data by eliminating less pertinent verbal reports (Cooksey et al., 2007). Having determined the emergent themes, the next phase involved detailed re-readings to generate the categories for the emerging themes. These steps were conducted by the two researchers separately. The final step involved first comparing and merging the emerging categories while organizing the classified themes under each category and condensing the recurrent ones. Cohen's kappa inter-coder reliability test was used to identify the degree of agreement between the themes elicited by the two researchers. The obtained agreement value indicated high reliability (.87) (Cohen, 1988). This thematic coding approach, which was in line with the related research question, was supplemented with data including representative quotes (Mason, 2002).

Findings

The internal consistency of the survey used is 0.870, which indicates high reliability (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). In order to explore learners' reported strategy use frequencies, the survey was analyzed descriptively (Table 2). Accordingly, the Mean scores between 1 and 2 are considered to indicate very frequent use, scores between 2 and 3 are accounted for frequent use whereas scores between 3 and 3.5 indicate the participants sometimes used the mentioned strategy. Mean scores between 3.5 and 5 suggested that the strategy stated is rarely or never used.

The results of the descriptive analyses show that the participants reported to be using goal setting, performance, attention control, evaluation, and reflection strategies frequently ($M = 2.05$, 2.08, 2.38, 2.75, and 2.58, respectively) while using the strategies for time management sometimes ($M = 3.11$). After the training they received through screencast feedback, the frequency of reported implementation of the strategies in the scale was between "often" and "always." The results from the Mean scores indicate differences for the strategies in Goal Setting, Time Management, and Reflections for Future Adaptation.

In order to find out whether these differences are statistically significant, further analyses were conducted. Initially, Kolmogorov–Smirnova and Shapiro–Wilk normality tests were run to see whether the data set was normally distributed and to decide on the tests to run to explore the differences between pre-training and post-training self-reported strategy use of the learners. Tabachnick and & Fidell (2012) explain the weakness of each of these tests and advice to conduct both and to evaluate the normality result by comparing the results obtained from both of the tests. The results showed that the data is not normally distributed (between 0.00 and 0.02; $p < .05$). As a result, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test as a non-parametric test was conducted for each dimension separately and the pre-/post-training results were given in Table 3 below.

Table 4. Themes Regarding the Participants' Opinions on SRL and Screencast Feedback.

Focus	Themes	*F*	Percentage (%)
SRL writing training	becoming aware of the strategies	92	88.5
	benefiting from the training	82	82.2
	being motivated/encouraged to use the strategies	77	74.0
	learning how to employ the strategies	68	65.7
Screencast mode of feedback	more intimate	108	97.1
	easier	98	88.5
	clearer	95	85.7
	more motivated	79	71.4

As can be seen in Table 3 above, the findings indicate that there are statistically significant differences for Goal Setting, Time Management, Performance, Evaluation and Reflections for Future strategies ($p = .01 < 0.30$; $p = .00 < .03$; $p = .00 < .03$; $p = .00 < .007$, and $p = .00 < .001$, respectively). Considering the results of the analyses, it can be stated that the participants reported to have applied goal setting, time management, performance, evaluation strategies and reflections for future strategy adaptations more frequently. However, the strategies reported for attention control did not display any significant differences.

In the semi-structured online interviews conducted, the participants' opinions on the training and the screencast video feedback were elicited. The emerging frequent themes regarding the participant learners' opinions on the SRL training they received were directed toward "*becoming aware of the strategies*," "*benefiting from the training*," "*being motivated/encouraged to use the strategies*," and "*learning how to employ the strategies*" ($N = 104$). As for the opinions on the mode of feedback, several themes emerged: "*more intimate*," "*easier*," "*clearer*," and "*more motivating*" ($N = 111$) (Table 4).

Goal setting was one of the most frequently mentioned strategy dimensions and the learners repeatedly expressed how they benefited from the training in terms of setting goals and planning. As expressed by a participant learner, "*I have become more organized because now I plan and prepare an outline for my research. I can plan how to do my assignment better now.*"(L22). The learners also stated that the training process was helpful in becoming aware of and implementing strategies to monitor and evaluate their writing performances, as put by other learners; "*I exchanged my writing with my friend, and we gave each other feedback. Then we worked on our assignments again before we submitted them. I think this will help me get higher grades*." (L17); "*I learned what to do exactly to edit my writing. Previously, I would read my writing before handing it to the teacher and could hardly find anything to change*." (L9).

"Reflections for future strategy adaptation" was another frequently mentioned dimension in the interviews. The learners stated that the clear tips and the suggestions they received helped them realize that these strategies could be implemented to improve their writing performances (e.g., "*I watch the videos again and again and take notes of the strategies you mention*."(L12); "*Before, I would just start to write and then submit it. Now, I have learned that it needs a process and lots of things to do*." (L19); "*These will help my future assignments. I knew some of them, but I learned some, too. I will use them to prepare assignments for other courses*." (L6). Most of the participant learners (88.5%) stated that they became aware of SRL writing strategies, acknowledged the positive contribution of the training they received (82.8%), and that they would use those strategies in the future.

When the learners were asked to express their opinions about receiving feedback through screencast videos, the majority stated very positive comments. They indicated that they found this mode of feedback to be "more intimate," as one of the frequent themes (e.g., "*I felt that the teacher cared about us*." (L23); "*I felt that the teacher paid attention to everything I did*." (L13); "*I think this type of feedback is more intimate*" (L4); "*The feedback was individualized, and I felt like I was valuable*." (L11); "*I felt like I was chatting with you [the instructor]*." (L32).

While stressing that it was an intimate way of receiving feedback (97.1%), the participants also stated some other advantages of screencasting; namely, its practicality (88.5%) and clarity (85.7%) regarding the problems with their writing assignments and what was expected from them (e.g., "*Everything is clearly explained. I was like following a recipe, very easy. And if you miss something, you can always watch the video again."* (L17).

Another important theme emerging from the interviews regarding screencast feedback was "being motivating." A good number of learners felt that becoming aware of the strategies they could use in their writing tasks made them more motivated for future writing tasks, as the participants stated, "*I decided to do more research after your feedback because I think I learned a lot about it*." (L19); "*I learned new websites and new techniques to search online that I want to use for my future assignments*." (L12); "*I really benefited a lot. Why shouldn't I use them later too? I am sure they will help me get better grades*." (L10).

On the other hand, when the learners were asked to express their preferred mode of feedback, they all favored face-to-face feedback if possible (e.g., "*I always prefer face to face feedback because I can ask questions to you. But in the video, I cannot do that*." (L4); "*I did not have any technical problems [in receiving screencast feedback]. But the best is to get face to face feedback. But now, we cannot, so I think this [screencast feedback] is my second best*." (L17)

However, the learners felt that receiving screencast feedback videos was much more beneficial for them than receiving just written feedback (e.g., "*I prefer video feedback instead of just written comments*." (L20); "*From the video, I could see your reactions and emotions. When you said, for example, 'it is ok, but. . .', I knew it wasn't ok at all from your voice. I could not have realized this from some written notes on my paper*." (L22). Overall, the participant learners' views on the use of screencasting as a form of feedback were quite positive.

Discussion

The present study aimed to explore the impact of an online training scheme developed for higher education learners that integrates SRL writing strategies into screencast feedback in line with the cyclical model of SRL (i.e., forethought, performance, and reflection on performance phases). During each phase, the learners were provided with cognitive, metacognitive, affective, and socio-interactional SRL strategies that they could employ in pre-writing, writing, and post-writing stages of their writing assignments. The study also investigated the participant learners' opinions both on the SRL writing training they received and screencast videos as a mode of feedback were investigated.

In regards with the first and the second research questions of the study, the findings revealed that the learners' initial frequency of SRL writing strategy use varied between "often" and "sometimes." They reported to be using goal setting, attention control, performance, evaluation, and reflections on future adaptation of strategies quite often while time management strategies were reported to have moderate use. However, following the students' 6-week SRL writing strategy training through screencast feedback videos, the results of the analyses indicated significant differences. Accordingly, the participant learners' reported use of goal setting, performance, evaluation, and reflections on future adaptation of strategies showed statistically significant increase whereas no significant difference was found in the reported use of attention control strategies. This finding was also supported by the learners' opinions obtained during the interviews, which correspond to the third research question of the study. They indicated that the training helped them be aware of the various strategies they could employ in their writing tasks and encouraged them to apply some of the strategies successfully. They also expressed their willingness and motivations to use SRL writing strategies in their future studies. In line with the findings of this study, research highlights the significance of increasing learners' motivation in writing by providing personalized effective feedback during online learning (Bai & Guo, 2021; Xu, 2021). The finding of the present study is also corroborated by the results of the study conducted by Xu (2021), which showed that teachers' expanded online tutorials and feedback provided learners a comfortable space to review online feedback they receive, and thus enhanced their use of SRL writing strategies by motivating them to engage more deeply in their writing practices. As a result, it is stated that teachers' feedback plays a modeling role for learners and assists them in becoming self-regulated learners leading to better performance and higher motivation to learn and to be self-regulated Xu (2021).

Another of the factors affecting the participant learners' eagerness to adopt the strategies could be attributed to the personalized way of receiving the training based on their work as, during the interviews, all of the participants indicated that they benefited highly from the personalized constructive feedback they received. Similarly, studies in the field also highlight the importance of tailoring SRL instructional practices depending on the situational factors as learners' acquisition of strategies are influenced by contextual factors and learner characteristics (Csizér & Tankó, 2017; Han & Hiver, 2018; Sasaki et al., 2018; The Douglas Fir Group, 2016). The study conducted by Bai and Guo (2021), for instance, revealed that accounting for individual differences in the context of English writing positively influences learners' motivation and SRL strategy use.

As the last research question, the study also aimed to reveal the participants' opinions on the mode of feedback they received, that is, screencast feedback. They preferred to receive screencast feedback in their online education since it is "more intimate," "easier," "clearer," and "more motivating." Since intimacy and social interaction are highly valued in the Turkish culture (Mercan et al., 2012; Şişman & Turan, 2004), it is not surprising that Turkish higher education learners do not prefer written feedback but favor close social interaction and being engaged in feedback activities including social involvement (Ozdamar-Keskin et al., 2015). Similarly, when they were asked for their favorite mode of feedback, they all stated that they would rather have face-to-face feedback during which they could discuss, ask questions for further explanations and clarifications. Yet, during this compulsory online education period, they stated that screencast is the best option to receive their feedback. The participants also indicated that they had no technical problems in receiving or responding to the feedback and that it was a very efficient and convenient mode in terms of timing, clarity, and accessibility.

This finding is especially important in highlighting the efficiency of screencast feedback, which does not require learners to access synchronously. Recent research findings frequently indicate the difficulties that learners have during synchronous online education because of internet connectivity problems, high cost, or other challenges in accessing digital technologies (e.g., Adnan &Anwar, 2020; Bashir et al., 2021; Khan et al., 2021). The results of the present study, however, may suggest that screencast feedback mode could help learners to eliminate many technical challenges faced during online synchronous education by enabling them to review their feedback videos when they have connection, time, and suitable atmosphere.

Conclusion

As Dowden et al. (2013) state, feedback is at the heart of teaching and is a powerful tool in classroom pedagogy. In addition to being an assessment tool, feedback could also contribute to the development of social relationships, formative information accumulation thanks to exchanged ideas and shared responsibilities (Dowden et al., 2013). This mode of SRL training could be an effective way of equipping learners with effective strategies, skills, and knowledge in online educational contexts. As online education has become the major mode of education and seems to remain so, it is more important than ever to equip learners with necessary strategies to help them cope with the challenges in virtual learning environments. Screencast feedback videos could serve an effective and a convenient online teaching practice to integrate SRL strategy training for goal setting, planning, self-motivation, attention control, flexible use of learning strategies, self-monitoring, appropriate help seeking, and self-evaluation.

Considering the abrupt transition into online education, the need for practical and effective models and tools to assist F/SL teachers in training learners to gain online learning strategies has been frequently emphasized in recent research (Bai & Guo, 2018; Bailey & Lee, 2020; Khan et al., 2021; Xu, 2021). The present study, in this respect, is meant to contribute to the limited literature in the research field of F/SL online writing instruction by providing instructional recommendations for teachers to promote SRL writing strategy use in virtual settings. As Bai and Wang (2021) emphasize, it is necessary to provide more strategy-based instructions to equip learners with strategies and skills to achieve sustaining effects on students' English writing. The findings of the study indicate that using screencast feedback in online writing courses at higher education level could provide a viable venue for integrating skills and strategies. On the other hand, for more effective implementations, professional development workshops could be held for teachers in order to provide in depth understanding of SRL strategies, their role in learning, alternative tools and modes of implementations along with adaptable instructional recommendations.

The present findings are limited to self-report data gathered from higher education ELT learners in Turkish state universities. Therefore, further research is required to explore the longitudinal impacts of screencast feedback on learners' F/SL online writing performance. Furthermore, as different contextual influences may yield different results, research in different contexts and with larger sample sizes could contribute to better understanding the impacts of screencast feedback on learners' SRL writing strategy use. Last but not least, further qualitative and quantitative research is needed to explore the mediating role of screencast feedback between SRL writing strategy use and F/SL writing performance.

Appendix A

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

(1) How do you feel about screencast feedback?
(2) Was the feedback mode practical with respect to responding to it?
(3) How do you make use of the screencast feedback to help you revise your writing?
(4) Compared with other feedback modes, what kind of advantages and/or disadvantages have you encountered using this multimodal feedback?
(5) Do you think you have become familiar with self-regulated learning strategies? If yes, can you specify?
(6) Have you used any of the SRL strategies during the last 6 weeks? If yes, which ones? How and when? If not, why?
(7) Are you planning to use them in the future?
(8) Do you think these strategies can somehow help you improve your writing skills? How?

Appendix B . Weekly Training: Feedback Prompts.

SRL phases (Zimmerman, 2004)	SRL dimensions (Kanlapan, & Velasco, 2009)	Prompts
1. The Forethought Phase *(Weeks 1 & 2) Assignment 1*	*Setting specific proximal goals for oneself*	– Setting short term learning goals – Setting long term learning goals – Identifying individual needs and preferences – Preparing a detailed Schedule for daily / weekly assignments/tasks/ activities – Knowing and using the writing approach of planning, organizing, writing, editing and revising – Setting one's mind that the written output would be finished – Setting standards for writing – Creating certain goals for every writing task to be accomplished – Planning the contents of the things that to be written – Preparing guidelines – Taking notes of writing purposes for writing tasks – Visualizing written output first before engaging in it – Aiming to create a paper with no grammatical errors – Aspiring to create a paper that will satisfy the readers – Seeking to compose a paper that uses comprehensible vocabulary – Setting the required length in mind for the paper – Setting a specific time to write
	Adopting powerful strategies for attaining the goals	– Activating previous knowledge – Activating supportive emotions – Obtaining/accessing necessary resources – Getting ready for the writing assignment (e.g., brainstorming, outlining, using graphic organizers, free-writing technique, annotating, etc.) – Organizing study environment – Organizing study materials – Identifying and controlling anxiety level – Acknowledging time limitations for tasks/assignments – Creating a draft before writing the paper – Considering the target audience and reasons for writing a certain piece
2. Performance Phase *(Weeks 3 & 4) Assignment 2*	*Restructuring* one's *physical and social context for attention control*	– Organizing study environment – Organizing study materials – Eliminating distractions that might interfere with writing – Avoiding watching television/ using cell phones/talking with friends/ multi-tasking/listening to music, etc. while working on a writing task – Working on writing tasks at one's most productive times (e.g., early in the morning, late at night, in the afternoon, etc.) – Working on writing tasks at one's most productive places (e.g., at home, in one's own room, in a library, at school, in a park, etc.) – Working on writing tasks under one's most productive conditions (e.g., silence, darkness, crowd, organized or clean environment, etc.) – Avoiding disturbance from other people, physical environment, other thoughts or duties, psychological tensions, etc.
	Monitoring one's performance selectively for signs of progress	– Using word processing software to check errors in writing – Proofreading – Modifying if not contented – Rereading several times to find some errors in writing – Checking time limitations for tasks/assignments – Creating drafts while writing the paper – Considering the target audience and reasons for writing a certain piece – Making necessary revisions in writing whenever my teachers/peers/ professionals suggest to – Editing errors in compositions submitting them

(continued)

Appendix B. (continued)

SRL phases (Zimmerman, 2004)	SRL dimensions (Kanlapan, & Velasco, 2009)	Prompts
	Managing one's time efficiently	– Creating a time table of the writing outputs to be accomplished – Keeping a separate planner for all writing tasks – Using post-its to keep track of the writing tasks to be accomplished – Keeping a calendar where all the deadlines of writing outputs are written – Creating a checklist of all the writing tasks to be finished – Keeping a notebook to list a schedule of daily writing activities – Setting an alarm for every writing task scheduled – Allotting a specific time for every writing task – Using daily logs to track the writing tasks already accomplished – Setting the time to plan, start, evaluate, modify, and complete the writing assignments – Accomplishing all writing tasks before doing unnecessary things – Making sure to finish and submit writing tasks before their deadline
3. The Reflection Phase *(Weeks 5 & 6) Assignment 3*	*Evaluating one's performance*	– Taking into consideration the comments of other people about writing – Checking work on the general level then to the sentence level – Asking professionals to evaluate writing and give suggested revision – Asking my peers to edit writing – Asking an English teacher to evaluate writing and give suggested revision – Creating one's own rubric to check written output – Taking down the comments of everyone who reads writing outputs – Browsing through drafts to check the progress of writing – Cross checking if the writing output matches the outline created previously – Evaluating written outputs after every session – Taking notes of the improvements in written outputs – Asking others what changes should be done for further improvements – Reading aloud what written to check what sounds are good and what are not
	Adapting future methods	– Taking notes of the improvements in written outputs – Taking notes of the comments of the writing instructor and making sure that they are applied in the next writing activity – Making a list of the things needed to improve on in written outputs – Reading more so that a wide range of knowledge is obtained for the next writing task – Planning the next activity in a more detailed manner, especially when low marks are received – Rereading written outputs carefully and finding the reasons/points of weaknesses/errors – – Planning to familiarize with the next topic of writing – Asking one's teacher for possible improvements that could be made in the future written outputs – Asking someone for tutoring for the next writing task – Experimenting with writing strategies to see what suits best – Ensuring that the audience of the next writing task will be interested in the next composition – Using other resources (e.g., thesaurus) to enrich writing and vocabulary in the next writing activity – Compiling one's work so that the progress and development of writing could be tracked

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

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

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID iD

Banu Inan-Karagul https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8672-1383

Supplemental Material

Supplemental material for this article is available online.

References

Adnan, M., & Anwar, K. (2020). Online learning amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Students' perspectives. *Journal of Pedagogical Sociology and Psychology*, *2*(1), 45–51. https://doi.org/10.33902/JPSP.%202020261309

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/elt.v9n8p106

Andrade, M. S., & Evans, N. W. (2013). *Principles and practices for response in L2 writing: Developing self-regulated learners*. Routledge.

Bahrouni, F., & Tuzlukova, V. (2019). Investigating teachers' and students' perceptions of written corrective feedback in the context of tertiary education in Oman. *Language Testing in Focus*, *1*, 1–17. https://www.eurokd.com/doi/10.32038/ltf.2019.01.01?vId=238&aId=240.

Bai, B., & Guo, W. (2018). Influences of self-regulated learning strategy use on self-efficacy in primary school students' English writing in Hong Kong. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *34*(6), 523–536. https://doi.org./10.1080/10573569.2018.1499058

Bai, B., & Guo, W. (2021). Motivation and self-regulated strategy use: Relationships to primary school students' English writing in Hong Kong. *Language Teaching Research*, *25*(3), 378–399. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168819859921.

Bai, B., & Wang, J. (2021). Hong Kong secondary students' self-regulated learning strategy use and English writing: Influences of motivational beliefs. *System*, *96*, 102404. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102404

Bailey, D., & Lee, A. R. (2020). Learning from experience in the midst of COVID-19: Benefits, challenges and strategies in online teaching. *CAL [Magazine] Certified Akers Laboratories*, *21*(2), 178–198.

Bao, W. (2020). COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University. *Human Behaviour and Emerging Technologies*, *2*, 113–115. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.191

Bashir, A., Uddin, M. E., Basu, B. L., & Khan, R. (2021). Transitioning to online education in English departments in Bangladesh: Learner perspectives. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(1), 11–20. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i1.34614

Bruning, R., & Horn, C. (2000). Developing motivation to write. *Educational Psychologist*, *35*, 25–37. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3501_4

Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Biase, B. D, & Power, C. (2019), How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, *16*(4), 71–90, https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol16/iss4/6

Chen, T., Peng, L., Yin, X., Rong, J., Yang, J., & Cong, G. (2020). Analysis of user satisfaction with online education platforms in China during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Healthcare*, *8*(3), 200.

Cheng, D., & Li, M. (2020). Screencast video feedback in online TESOL classes. *Computers and Composition*, *58*, 58. Article nr. 102612 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102612

Cohen, S. S. (1988). *Practical statistics*. Arnold Press.

Cooksey, R. W., Freebody, P., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2007). Assessment as judgment-in-context: Analysing how teachers evaluate students' writing. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *13*(5), 401–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803610701728311

Csizér, K., & Tankó, G. (2017). English majors' self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, *38*(3), 386–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv033.

Cunningham, K. J. (2019). 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

de Bruin, A. B., Thiede, K. W., Camp, G., & Redford, J. (2011). Generating keywords improves metacomprehension and self-regulation in elementary and middle school children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *109*(3), 294–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2011.02.005

De Silva, R., & Graham, S (2015), The effects of strategy instruction on writing strategy use for students of different proficiency levels. *System*, *53*, 47–59, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.009

Dowden, T., Pittaway, S., Yost, H., & McCarthy, R. (2013). Students' perceptions of written feedback in teacher education: Ideally feedback is a continuing two-way communication that encourages progress. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(3), 349–362. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.632676.

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge.

Drane, C., Vernon, L., & O'Shea, S. (2020). *The impact of 'Learning at Home' on the educational outcomes of vulnerable children in Australia during the COVID-19 pandemic*. Literature Review Prepared by the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education. Curtin University.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, D. L., Coombs, C., Constantiou, I., Duan, Y., Edwards, J. S., Gupta, B., Lal, B., Misra, S., Prashant, P., Raman, R., Rana, N. P., Sharma, S. K., & Upadhyay, N. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on information management research and practice: Transforming education, work and life. *International Journal of Information Management*, *55*, 102211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102211

Ekholm, E., Zumbrunn, S., & Conklin, S. (2015). The relation of college student self-efficacy toward writing and writing self-regulation aptitude: Writing feedback perceptions as a mediating variable. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *20*(2), 197–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2014.974026

Elstad, E., & Turmo, A. (2010). Students' self-regulation and teachers' influences in science: Interplay between ethnicity and gender. *Research in Science & Technological Education*, *28*(3), 249–260. https://doi.org/10.1080/02635143.2010.501751

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(1), 59–109. https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543074001059

Gellin, A. (2003). The effect of undergraduate student involvement on critical thinking: A meta-analysis of the literature, 1991-2000.

Journal of College Student Development, *44*, 746–762. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2003.0066

Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & McKeown, D. (2013). The writing of students with learning disabilities: Meta-analysis of self-regulated strategy development writing intervention studies and future directions: Redux. In H. L. Swanson, K. Harris, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of learning disabilities* (pp. 565–590). Guilford Press.

Hamman, L. (2005). Self-regulation in academic writing tasks. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *17*(1), 15–26. https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/ijtlhe14.pdf

Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *40*, 44–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.03.001

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (2009). Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Premises, evolution, and the future. In R. Dixon & V. Kelly (Eds.), *BJEP monograph series II, number 6-teaching and learning writing* (Vol. 113, No. 135, pp. 113–135). British Psychological Society.

Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2015). Video-based feedback on student assessment: Scarily personal. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *31*(1), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.1878

Hidi, S., & Boscolo, P. (2006). Motivation and writing. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 144–157). Guilford Press.

Hu, J., & Gao, X. (2018). Self-regulated strategic writing for academic studies in an English-medium-instruction context. *Language and Education*, *32*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2017.1373804

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.

Kanlapan, T. C. E., & Velasco, J. C. (2009). Constructing a self-regulation scale contextualized in writing. *TESOL Journal*, *1*(1), 79–94. http://tesol-international-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/A6V1_TESOL[1].pdf

Khan, R., Jahan, A., Sultana, S., Naushaadkabir, M. M., Haider, M. Z., & Roshid, M. M. (2021). Accessing online instruction amidst COVID-19 in Bangladesh: Barriers and coping strategies. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *22*, 33–48. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.22.03

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2013). L1/L2/L3 writing development: Longitudinal case study of a Japanese multicompetent writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*, 4–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.11.001

Kummitha, H. R., Kolloju, N., Chittoor, P., & Madepalli, V. (2021). Coronavirus disease 2019 and its effect on teaching and learning process in the higher educational institutions. *Higher Education for the Future*, *8*(1), 90–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983650

Labuhn, A. S., Zimmerman, B. J., & Hasselhorn, M. (2010). Enhancing students' self-regulation and mathematics performance: The influence of feedback and self-evaluative standards. *Metacognition and Learning*, *5*(2), 173–194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-010-9056-2

Li, J., & Barnard, R. (2011). Academic tutors' beliefs about and practices of giving feedback on students' written assignments: A New Zealand case study. *Assessing Writing*, *16*(2), 137–148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2011.02.004

Limpo, T., & Alves, R. A. (2013). Modeling writing development: Contribution of transcription and self-regulation to Portuguese students' text generation quality. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(2), 401–413. https://doi.org/doi/10.1037/a0031391

MacArthur, C. A. (2014). Strategy instruction in writing in academic disciplines. In P. Klein, P. Boscolo, L. Kirkpatrick, & C. Gelati (Eds.), *Writing as a learning activity* (pp. 149–168). Brill.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Matsuda, P. K. (2012). On the nature of second language writing: Replication in a postmodern field. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*(3), 300–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.05.006

McCutchen, D. (2011). From novice to expert: Implications of language skills and writing-relevant knowledge for memory during the development of writing skill. *Journal of Writing Research*, *3*(1), 51–68. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2011.03.01.3

Mercan, N., Oyur, E., Alamur, B., Gül, S., & Bengül, S. (2012). İşyeri yalnizliği ve sosyal fobi arasindaki ilişkiye yönelik bir araştirma [A research study on the relationship between loneliness at work and social phobia]. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *4*(1), 213–226. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/oybd/issue/16339/171096

Orlando, J. (2016). A comparison of text, voice and screencasting feedback to online students. *American Journal of Distance Education*, *30*(3), 156–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2016.1187472

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge.

Ozdamar-Keskin, N., Ozata, F. Z., Banar, K., & Royle, K. (2015). Examining digital literacy competences and learning habits of open and distance learners. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *6*(1), 74–90. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/6140

Parr, J. M., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing*, *15*(2), 68–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.004

Popa, D., Repanovici, A., Lupu, D., Norel, M., & Coman, C. (2020). Using mixed methods to understand teaching and learning in COVID 19 times. *Sustainability*, *12*(20), 8726. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208726

Ramdass, D., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2011). Developing self-regulation skills: The important role of homework. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *22*(2), 194–218. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1932202X1102200202

Rose, H., Briggs, J. G., Boggs, J. A., Sergio, L., & Ivanova-Slavianskaia, N. (2018). A systematic review of language learner strategy research in the face of self-regulation. *System*, *72*, 151–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.12.002

Sasaki, M., Mizumoto, A., & Murakami, A. (2018). Developmental trajectories in L2 writing strategy use: A self-regulation perspective. *Modern Language Journal*, *102*(2), 292–309. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12469

Seker, M. (2016). The use of self-regulation strategies by foreign language learners and its role in language achievement. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(5), 600–618. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168815578550

Seker, M. (2018). Intervention in teachers' differential scoring judgments in assessing L2 writing through communities of assessment practice. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *59*, 209–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2018.08.003

Şişman, M., & Turan, S. (2004). A study of correlation between job satisfaction and social-emotional loneliness of educational administrators in Turkish public schools. *Eskisehir Osmangazi University Journal of Social Sciences*, *5*(1), 117–128. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ogusbd/issue/10984/131461

Strijbos, J. W., Narciss, S., & Dünnebier, K. (2010). Peer feedback content and sender's competence level in academic writing revision tasks: Are they critical for feedback perceptions and efficiency? *Learning and Instruction*, *20*(4), 291–303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.008

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

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson Education.

Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2016). A questionnaire-based validation of multidimensional models of self-regulated learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal*, *100*(3), 674–701. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12339

The Douglas Fir Group. (2016). A transdisciplinary framework for SLA in a multilingual world. *Modern Language Journal*, *100*(Suppl. 2016), 19–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12301

Wang, W. (2014). Students' perceptions of rubric-referenced peer feedback on EFL writing: A longitudinal inquiry. *Assessing Writing*, *19*, 80–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.008

Wilby, J. (2020). Motivation, self-regulation, and writing achievement on a university foundation programme: A programme evaluation study. *Language Teaching Research*, *5*(5), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820917323

Wilson, J., Olinghouse, N. G., McCoach, D. B., Santangelo, T., & Andrada, G. N. (2016). Comparing the accuracy of different scoring methods for identifying sixth graders at risk of failing a state writing assessment. *Assessing Writing*, *27*, 11–23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2015.06.003

Xu, J. (2021). Chinese university students' L2 writing feedback orientation and self-regulated learning writing strategies in online teaching during COVID-19. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *30*(6), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00586-6

Zimmerman, B. J. (2004). Sociocultural influence and students' development of academic self-regulation: A social-cognitive perspective. In D. M. McInerney & S. Van Etten (Ed.), *Big theories revisited* (pp. 139–164). Information Age.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). A writer's discipline: The development of self-regulatory skill. In S. Hidi & P. Boscolo (Eds.), *Motivation and writing: Research and school practice* (pp. 51–69). Kluwer.

Zumbrunn, S., Tadlock, J., & Roberts, E. D. (2011). *Encourage self-regulated learning in the classroom*. MERC Publications.