

Audio versus written feedback: Multilingual students' perspective in a U.S. composition class¹

Sukanto Roy*

Assistant Professor, Department of English & Modern Languages, North South University, Bangladesh

Matthew A. Vetter

Professor of English, Composition and Applied Linguistics Ph.D. Program, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA

Correspondence

Email: sukanto.roy@northsouth.edu

Abstract

This article aims to fill the existing gap in the research which indicates that few researchers have examined multilingual writers' preference between audio and written feedback, and the impact of feedback format on their revision process in a U.S. composition class. To explore these, eight multilingual writers were interviewed, and their first drafts and revised drafts of the final research paper on which they received both audio and written feedback were compared using the "Compare" option in Microsoft Word. In addition to these, an early semester participatory survey and a reflection survey were conducted among the multilingual writers of a composition course. Results indicated that those who were confident about their English listening proficiency preferred audio feedback over written feedback. Results also indicated that multilingual writers expected directive explicit feedback from their instructors. Their perceptions regarding the effectiveness of audio and written feedback on their revision process varied depending on their own self-efficacy. Finally, the author recommends further investigating the potential of audio feedback in creating student-teacher connections, particularly in online composition courses.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 07 February 2023

Revised: 16 September 2023

Accepted: 26 October 2023

KEYWORDS

audio feedback, written feedback, multilingual writers, preferences, U.S. composition class

Introduction

Instructor feedback is one of the most important factors in the writing process irrespective of the writers' background, and it is more crucial for multilingual writers because of multilingual writers' different linguistic knowledge (Ferris, 2014; Ferris et al., 2015; Miao et al., 2023; Huachizaca Pugo & Yambay de Armijos, 2022). With regard to writing or composition courses, it is essential that teachers or instructors take into account the L2 students' cultural as well as prior academic knowledge and

¹ An earlier, unpublished draft of this work, as a dissertation, is submitted to Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education.

providing feedback accordingly can help immensely in this case (Cui, 2019; Fithriani, 2018). Another challenge related to feedback on L2 writings is the considerable increase of L2 students in many U.S. colleges and universities in recent decades (Vo et al., 2017).

The development and mass proliferation of audio recording technologies in the twentieth century led to experiments in audio feedback practices which have shown to be beneficial to both students and teachers (Alharbi, 2021; Cann, 2014; Cavaleri et al., 2019; Cavanaugh & Song, 2014, 2015; Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Killingback et al., 2019; Levin & Regalia, 2019; Li & Vuono, 2019; Morris & Chikwa, 2016). However, while the majority of prevailing research on audio feedback has been conducted on L1 writers, little to no work has been done with the multilingual writers of composition courses in the United States. This indicates “monolingual bias” in the field of second language acquisition (Ortega, 2014; Cook, 2016). Currently, little is known about if different forms of feedback have any bearing on the students’ revision process and whether multilingual students’ prefer written feedback or audio, specifically in a U.S. writing class. Also, little is known about their expectations from the instructor’s feedback in a U.S. composition class. The number of multilingual students is increasing in the USA every year. Therefore, this case study addressed this under-researched area of multilingual writers’ preference between audio and written feedback, and their expectations from the instructor feedback. This study also measured whether different forms of feedback have any bearing on the students’ revision method.

Review of Literature

Researchers are exhorted to stop seeing feedback as a mix of positive and negative data with predetermined outcomes. For low-achieving students to be inwardly motivated to interact with feedback, educators must foster students' beliefs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ajjawi et al., 2022). On the other hand, high achievers often self-regulate, participate in optional formative feedback interventions, report more favorable experiences, and outperform their counterparts who do not engage in optional feedback (Bird & Yucel, 2015). Students were motivated to participate in feedback interventions when such interventions satisfied their requirements for autonomy, relatedness, and/or competence. As a result, outcomes such as enhanced performance, the emergence of evaluative judgment, self-efficacy, and learning were mobilized (Ajjawi et al., 2022). Corrective feedback is a significant subject that has drawn academics' attention to L2 acquisition during the past three decades. The potentials of text-based computer-mediated interactions and audio- or video-based interactions for L2 development differ qualitatively (Rassaei, 2019). A growing number of studies have examined how various forms of technology assist L2 education, in particular, computer-assisted language learning (CALL), which has grown to be an important and integrated aspect of L2 instruction in recent years. This is due to the current overriding interest in the use of technology in different areas of education and language teaching as well. However, as far as researchers are aware, no empirical research has looked at how computer-mediated audio-based feedback

affects L2 development. It is also conceivable that the learners preferred the encouragement, interest, and instruction provided by audio-based feedback. In this regard, prior research in the context of online education has shown that students view teachers' asynchronous audio-based feedback as more compassionate and helpful than teachers' text-based feedback (Ice et al. 2007, as cited in Rassaei, 2019). Writing skills in the acquisition of English as a foreign language (EFL) is valuable, and it needs tools for enhancing students, such as providing feedback (Huachizaca Pugo & Yambay de Armijos, 2022). In order to strengthen students' knowledge, feedback is an approach that may be given by a representative who is interested in the students' performance and comprehension, such as a teacher, peer, book, parent, or self-experience (Brookhart, 2017). According to published research, feedback should have certain qualities, including timing, accuracy (Roothoof, 2014; Yang, 2016; Alvira, 2016, as cited in Huachizaca Pugo & Yambay de Armijos, 2022).

Among all different types of feedback, the most utilized feedback is corrective feedback, which informs learners of utterance errors. Written comments are one of the most popular ways to provide students feedback, which is a crucial component of both teaching and learning. Written feedback has been criticized by students for its poor quality, hazy style, and dearth of specific examples and suggestions for improvement (Killingback et al., 2019). Different feedback formats include audio, video, podcasts, and screencasts. With more individualized input, alternative feedback modalities aid students in understanding feedback at a deeper level. The alternate forms of feedback encourage a sense of connection to the course of study and to the faculty. Teachers should think about implementing cutting-edge media strategies that might enrich and raise the standard of the student feedback process (Killingback et al., 2019). One of the most popular forms of student feedback is written feedback, which has drawn criticism from students for its subpar quality (McCarthy, 2015, as cited in Killingback et al., 2019). Another potential feedback method could be screencasting, which is the practice of recording a digital display with narration. Although it is frequently used to create tutorials, it also has the potential to deliver multimodal feedback (Cunningham, 2019). Learning more about how students respond to feedback delivered through technology might help us better understand their perspectives and provide ideas for improving learner training and feedback. Moreover, in contrast to the video feedback, some survey and interview responses highlighted the need to seek someone, typically a teacher or feedback-giver to help understand the written comments (Cunningham, 2019). The way in which instructors provide feedback may become even more crucial as technology advances and automated writing evaluation systems are more integrated. Mode selection and a thorough grasp of the implications of technological choices may be crucial to accomplishing teacher goals through feedback, especially when instructors stress the relational and human element they contribute to feedback (Cunningham, 2019).

Future research may deepen our understanding of how our mode selections affect teachers, students, revision, and feedback. Well-developed research supports the need

of feedback and frequent formative evaluations for improved learning outcomes, but the manner in which feedback is delivered is as crucial. Better feedback practices do not need major adjustments or even a lot of extra labor. Instead, making a few little adjustments to our current procedures might significantly enhance both the quality of our feedback and the way in which students use it. Professors can offer thorough, accessible advice regarding writing style in written comments, such as suggestions for grammar, word choice, and word arrangement at the sentence level (Levin & Regalia, 2019). However, audio feedback enables academics to go further and interact in a different way, opening up new lines of dialogue to address advanced structuring and analysis and to give more thorough justifications for criticisms also, because students can hear the professor's tone and inflections, audio recordings are more intimate and engaging (Levin & Regalia, 2019). There are some dissimilarities between written corrective and oral feedback. In contrast to written corrective feedback, which often provides information graphically, oral corrective feedback involves the encoding and decoding of information conveyed aurally. While written corrective feedback is frequently delayed and delivered after a written job is finished, oral corrective feedback is typically offered online during speech creation (Li & Vuono, 2019). As a result, oral corrective feedback is an integrated focus on form where linguistic forms are addressed in context and the acquired information is used or proceduralized in the immediate, future output (Li & Vuono, 2019). The research has looked at oral and written corrective feedback from comparable angles despite the distinctions in their features and instructional procedures. From a theoretical standpoint, whether to offer oral or written corrective feedback, centers on the question of whether learning a second language should only be based on conclusive evidence (Li & Vuono, 2019).

One important area of research for both oral and written feedback is on teachers' classroom practices. The usefulness of audio feedback in teaching writing has been demonstrated by studies where written as well as audio feedback from students' views and feedback analysis were compared. However, research on the effects of written and auditory feedback on students' writing performance is scarce. In order to assess the efficacy of written and audio feedback provided by instructor on the performance of students with regard to writing along with their views on feedback, this study has compared both kinds of feedback. Students preferred audio or video feedback over other forms of input because it reduced the distance between them, and the teacher gave them the impression that they were speaking face-to-face with the teacher, and increased their sense of commitment (Alharbi, 2021). The explanations it provides and the sense of personalisation it fosters in students are two other crucial aspects of audio feedback that may help to explain why students have a favorable opinion of it in relation to their writing (Alharbi, 2021). Learners can improve their writing by listening to audio feedback that highlights its flaws and offers recommendations for improvement (Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Voelkel & Mello, 2014, as cited in Alharbi, 2021). Additionally, it has been noticed that emphasizing to students that the feedback is formative by isolating it from grades may be helpful (Rawle et al., 2018). As we are aware of that in writing, constructive comments about the appropriateness or

correctness of students' writing are referred to as corrective feedback (Solhi & Eğinli, 2020). The intention of corrective feedback is to improve students' writing skills and teach them how to write effectively and giving writing comments to students is seen to be vital to help them develop their abilities and knowledge (Solhi & Eğinli, 2020). On the other hand, as opposed to written feedback, the advantage of one-on-one sessions is that the teacher and the students are able to interact with each other that is difficult with written feedback. Individual conferences are thought to take less time than writing comments on students' papers, but in some situations, such as those without office hours or if the instructor or student is not available outside of class, they may not be practicable (Solhi & Eğinli, 2020). "One of the key features of audio feedback is the ability to re-access it, which is hugely significant for factors such as clarification, review, ability to identify areas that can be improved upon, etc..." (Carruthers et al., 2014, p.6) A timely response to student feedback is crucial for learning; the longer a student waits between submission and response, the less applicable the comments may be and a way to deal with this issue is through audio feedback (Pearson, 2018). Students claimed that they felt it was simpler to re-access criticism that was presented in an audio format, in addition to it being clearer to grasp. This may have more to do with students' judgments of the effort level that should be engaged with each type of file than it may have to do with practicalities, given that both the audio and textual feedback files were initially accessed through the exact same interface (Pearson, 2018). Giving students useful, engaging feedback is still a major problem in higher education today, especially when it comes to academic language assistance, where feedback helps students become used to academic writing conventions. As the usage of technology-enhanced feedback, such as audio and video feedback, grows, it is crucial to assess if new techniques encourage students to interact with the feedback more successfully than traditional techniques (Cavaleri et al., 2019). Research indicates that this is not always the case; students frequently appear to disregard or fail to comprehend and internalize criticism and claim that it can be confusing, unclear, impersonal, and lacking in specific instructions on how to improve (Douglas et al., 2016; Han & Hyland 2019, as cited in Cavaleri et al., 2019). The most typical type of asynchronous feedback is written feedback, and both its advantages and disadvantages have been extensively covered in the literature. As written feedback ensures permanent records of performance for accountability, as well as commentary in a variety of modalities responsive to individual learning needs, it is crucial that the students also receive formal, clear, and developmentally focused written feedback (Flushman et al., 2019). This echoes best strategies with respect to teacher education. Digital feedback on assessments, such as electronic notes and recordings, is becoming more and more common. The widespread consensus is that digitally recorded feedback is more thorough than text-based input. Furthermore, it is not apparent if offering different feedback types is preferable than using only one. We already know that for students and teachers, numerous feedback formats, such as in-person discussions, electronic annotations, handwritten remarks, rubrics, and digital recordings, present both advantages and difficulties. Although arduous and transient, face-to-face feedback exchanges are thorough and personalized, however, permanent, text-based comments

may lack nuance and clarity (Ryan et al., 2019). Digitally recorded feedback has the advantage of being personalized, comprehensive, and repeatable, thus, recordings are viewed as a viable replacement for both spoken communication and text-based remarks (Ryan et al., 2019). The method applied to give feedback comments may have an effect on the information's amount of depth, level of personalization, and usability. The most thorough, individualized, and accessible forms of feedback remarks for students may be electronic annotations and digital recordings when delivered in a single manner (Ryan et al., 2019). Rubrics are a helpful additional resource for students to place their performance, but when they are the only type of evaluation, students are less likely to view them favorably than other modalities, also multiple commenting options for learners provide a balancing impact that may improve the message by decreasing the restrictions of a single individual mode, especially if one of those options allows for spoken information transmission (Ryan et al., 2019).

Research on audio feedback is not conclusive, and therefore, researchers have recommended further research in this field. For example, Solhi and Eğinli (2020) have concluded that “Needless to say, more research on examining the effect of using oral feedback at different language proficiency and education levels will enlighten both teachers and teacher educators” (p. 10). Although a plethora of research has been performed on the written corrective feedback relating to second language writing (Miao et al., 2023), there have not been many studies that contrast digital recordings with other popular feedback formats, such as face-to-face discussions or non-digital forms (Ryan et al., 2019). Similarly, Morris and Chikwa (2016) have recommended, “further investigation into the link between students’ learning styles and their preferences for different types of feedback” (p. 135). In the same way, Woodcock (2017) has suggested for further research on audio feedback in the perspective of teacher-student relationship pointing out “audio feedback might not suit all people on all occasions” (p. 204). Additionally, Parkes and Fletcher (2016) have suggested “to explore the effectiveness and perception of diverse student groups” (para. 57). Similarly, Cui (2019) has pointed out how a critical gap exists, particularly with regard to students’ writing knowledge, where a limited amount of studies have been conducted on L2 students as opposed to L1 students. Therefore, further studies in this field are necessary.

In the entire existing empirical studies on audio feedback, it is clearly noticeable that few studies particularly targeted the multilingual student writers as the participants in a U.S composition class, and therefore little is known about whether multilingual students’ gravitate more towards audio feedback as opposed to the written one and whether or not, with regard to a U.S writing class, it indeed has an effect on the students’ revision process in relation to the format of the feedback. So, there is an opportunity to explore multilingual students’ preference between audio and written feedback and the impact of feedback format in their revision process in a U.S composition class. This case study will contribute to the existing knowledge regarding multilingual writers’ preference between audio and written feedback and the impact

of feedback format on their revision process in a U.S. composition class. More precisely, the results from this study will be helpful to both L2 writing instructors and L2 writers, because becoming aware of multilingual writers' perceptions and reactions will enable L2 writing instructors to select suitable feedback techniques to use in order to best help the varied needs among multilingual writers to be competent writers.

Research Questions

This study had several purposes: 1. to understand the expectations of multilingual writers from instructors' feedback, 2. to understand multilingual writers' perceptions regarding the advantages and disadvantages of audio and written feedback, 3. to learn about their perceptions of the effectiveness of audio and written feedback on their revision process, 4. to examine the distinguishable impacts of audio and written feedback on multilingual writers' revision process, and 5. to explore multilingual preferred form of feedback between audio and written feedback. This study sought to answer the following research questions:

RQ₁: What are the expectations of multilingual writers from instructors' feedback on their writing assignments?

RQ₂: What are the perceptions of multilingual writers regarding the advantages and disadvantages of audio and written feedback?

RQ₃: What are the perceptions of multilingual writers regarding the effectiveness of audio and written feedback on their revision process?

RQ₄: What is multilingual writers' preferred form of feedback between audio and written feedback?

RQ₅: What are some distinguishable impacts of audio and written feedback on multilingual writers' revision process?

Materials and Methods

In order to accomplish the aim of the study, an early semester participation survey was conducted among the multilingual writers of English 202 (Composition II). Then, an in-depth interview with eight multilingual writers was conducted after they had received both audio and written feedback on their writing assignments. Their first drafts and the revised drafts of the final research paper were collected and compared by using the "Compare" option in the Microsoft Word program to measure the revision. Finally, a reflection survey was conducted among the multilingual writers of the English 202 (Composition II) course at the end of the semester.

Participants

Participants for this study were selected from the MLW section of the Composition II (English 202) course at Western Pennsylvania University. The early semester participatory survey was taken by 15 multilingual writers, and the reflection survey was taken by 12 multilingual writers of a composition course. Both surveys were anonymous. Eight participants voluntarily took part in the interviews each of which lasted about 20-30 minutes. Out of the eight participants who took part in the

interviews, four participants were female, and four participants were male. Six of the participants were from Saudi Arabia, one participant was from South Korea, and one was from China. All the participants have been living in the USA at least for two years and speak English as their second language.

Early Semester Participatory Survey

An early semester participatory survey was designed using Qualtrics (Please see Appendix A). There were nine questions in that survey. The purpose of the early semester participatory survey was to get an idea about the multilingual writers' home country, first language, duration of stay in the USA, English listening proficiency, their comfortability of using technology for working with teachers' feedback, and to recruit participants for the interview. This anonymous survey was emailed to the students of the whole class.

Interview Protocol for Students

Semi-guided interview protocol for multilingual student participants was designed (Please see Appendix B). The interview questions were devised according to suggestions that they should be open-ended and aligned with the research questions (Bless, 2017; Creswell, 2013; Dille, 2004; H. Rubin & I. Rubin, 2011; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Miles et al., 2014; Patton, 2015). The interview protocol also included several types of questions, including background and experience questions, opinion and feeling questions, and knowledge questions, as Merriam (2009) recommended. Before the interview was conducted, participants had to sign the consent form.

Collection of Drafts

For measuring the revisions in the two drafts based on the instructor's feedback format, the first draft and the revised draft of the final assignment (research paper) on which the students received both written and audio feedback were collected. On the first assignment, all the students received written feedback and on the second assignment, all the students received audio feedback. On the final assignment, four participants received audio feedback and other four participants received written feedback on their first drafts and final drafts. Their drafts were collected at the end of the semester after the final grade was given. So, the collection of their sample writings did not affect their grades in any way. Wingard & Geosits' (2014) "taxonomy of revisions" was used with some modifications to suit my study.

Reflection Survey

Like the early semester participatory survey, the reflection survey was designed (Please see Appendix C) using Qualtrics. It was also anonymous, and no data was collected concerning the participants' identity. Their participation in this reflection survey was completely voluntary. It was clearly stated that their decision would not result in any loss of benefits to which they were otherwise entitled. There were 10 questions in the reflection survey. Some of the questions in the reflection survey were overlapped with the interview questions. However, the purpose of the reflection survey

was to get an idea of the participants' preference between audio and written feedback, and their perceptions of using the technology.

Data Analysis Procedures

Based off of Bless's (2017) study, the collected data was analyzed for this study. Bless's (2017) work was followed because her process of data analysis suited best for this study. For the early semester participatory and reflection surveys, the data was exported to an Excel spread sheet and then was analyzed. However, since both the surveys were anonymous, the survey data was not directly tied to the interview data in line with the respective participants. For the interview data, all the tape-recorded interviews were put in the researcher's password protected computer. Then, all the interviews were transcribed manually and made separate word document for every interviewee. The collected first drafts and the revised drafts of the final research paper were compared by using the "Compare" option in the Microsoft word program. The "Compare" option in the Microsoft Word provided the researcher with the opportunity to see what changes have been made in the revised drafts. It also showed the total number of revisions in a new third document. The "taxonomy of revisions" as propounded by Wingard & Geosits (2014) was followed. However, it was modified to a little extent to present the number of revisions in accordance with higher order and lower order concern. In the revised drafts, the number of high order concern (HOC) and low order concern (LOC) revisions was manually counted. Thus, the researcher was able to find out the number of revisions based on the audio and written feedback. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the revisions based on audio feedback and written feedback with a view to measuring the impact of feedback format on the revision process. For the interviews, Bless's (2017) "line-by-line coding technique" (p. 144) was adapted. Then, the coded data were analyzed using the comparative method that Merriam (2009) suggested.

Results and Discussion

Multilingual Students' Expectations from Instructor Feedback

The first research question was: "What are the expectations of multilingual writers from instructors' feedback on their writing assignments?" The major finding in relation to this question was that most of the multilingual writers expected feedback on their grammatical issues. In the interview, five out of eight participants explicitly stated that they would expect feedback on their grammatical errors. It indicates that they are more concerned about sentence-level errors than content-based ideas. For example, Safa said, "*Actually, I expect that they tell me about my grammar mistakes, about my vocabulary.*" So, multilingual writers expect clear feedback on their writing. They also expect such feedback which will save them time and labor. For example, Zilao said, "*I expect them to give me the answers so that I do not have to look for the answers by myself.*" Another important thing that became clear is that though they are more concerned about grammatical mistakes in their papers, they expect their instructors to highlight their strengths as well. So, they expect positive feedback. Research on multilingual writers' expectations from instructors' feedback supports

this finding. For example, Moussu (2013) explored that multilingual writers expected their instructors to correct their grammatical errors in their writing. Similarly, Ferris (2011) has found that L2 writers expect their teachers will first tell them their sentence level mistakes before they point out their content or idea-based mistakes. K. Hyland and F. Hyland (2006) have stated that multilingual writers' educational background is responsible for putting more emphasis on grammatical issues of writing rather than the organizational issues of writing.

Ferris (1997) scrutinized over 1,600 marginal and end comments written on 110 first drafts of papers by 47 advanced university EFL students. The researcher, accordingly, inspected the drafts of the papers, which were revised to detect the first-draft commentary's impact on the adjustments made by the students and evaluated whether the alterations made in the response to the teachers' feedback upgraded the papers. Ferris (1997) discovered the fact students appreciated instructors' positive and encouraging feedback which helped them make effective revisions. For the L2 writing instructors, it is important to realize the expectations of multilingual writers from their instructors before they give feedback for L2 writers. Similarly, Canagarajah and Jerskey (2009) have recommended L2 writing instructors to be aware of the fact that multilingual writers struggle with the feedback which they receive on their writing. In this connection, Agbayahoun (2016) has stated that multilingual students cannot become competent writers without effective feedback from their teachers on their writing assignments. Therefore, without becoming aware of the multilingual writers' expectations, L2 writing instructors will not be able to give effective feedback.

Multilingual Students' Perceptions Regarding the Advantages and Disadvantages Audio and Written Feedback

The second research question was: "What are the perceptions of multilingual writers regarding the advantages and disadvantages of written and audio feedback?" Here, it should be acknowledged that by the word "disadvantages," it was meant to include the "limitations." The interview data indicate that participants perceived the advantage of written feedback is that it can give more specific and more directive feedback than audio feedback. For example, Hamim said, *"I think the advantage of written feedback is that the teacher can locate your mistakes like where the mistake is."* Research conducted by Bitchener and Knoch (2010) supports this finding. Bitchener and Knoch (2010) have explored that written feedback has the potential to "raise the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers" because of its specificity and directedness.

Regarding the limitations of written feedback, participants mentioned that written feedback does not create a personal connection as audio feedback does. For example, Ahad said, *"I don't feel connected with it because someone is not talking to me as in audio feedback."* Some participants expressed their frustration over the fact that while giving written feedback, instructors tend to give more comments than necessary. For example, Zilao said, *"The problem about written feedback is that sometimes professor gives us too much written feedback."* Alwa has mentioned that written feedback does

not have a lasting impact as the audio feedback does. This finding reaffirms Lee's (2011) discovery of multilingual writers' dissatisfaction with the instructor written feedback. Lee suggested that teachers should shift their focus from a "teacher-centered approach to a student-centered approach" (p. 11) by allowing multilingual students to write multiple drafts. In another related research, Martin (2015) has found that multilingual writers were confused with the longer comments provided by their teachers.

Regarding the advantages of audio feedback, participants have mentioned that it can create a more personal connection with them, and it is more motivating than written feedback. According to them, audio feedback can give them the sense of whether the teacher likes their papers or not, because they can hear the teacher's voice. For example, Ahad said, "*Audio feedback hooks me more and I feel connected to it. I think the instructors can express their ideas more freely.*" Mentioning the lasting effect of audio feedback, Alwa said, "*The mistakes which I correct from audio feedback, I won't do that again. So, the knowledge lasts longer or maybe forever.*" This conclusion is backed by the research studies conducted on the perspective of the students regarding the positive aspects of audio feedback. Many researchers (e.g. Bless, 2017; Bilbro et al., 2013; Cavanaugh & Song, 2014, 2015; Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Wood et al., 2011) have discovered that audio feedback is more personal, more detailed, and more inspiring than written feedback. In this study, participants have clearly expressed the potential of audio feedback in regard to creating a personal relationship with the instructor.

Regarding the limitations of audio feedback, participants have mentioned several things. Firstly, there are technical difficulties associated with audio feedback. Two out of the eight participants have talked about the technical difficulties they faced. Ahad was unable to download the audio file on his mobile, and Safa could not download the audio file at the first attempt because she did not have the updated software on her laptop. Secondly, audio feedback is unable to point out the specific location of the students' errors. Thirdly, sometimes they do not understand the teacher's accent. In this connection, Zilao has said:

The problem of audio feedback is that professors speak with accent and speak very fast, so, if you miss something in the middle, you will not understand the rest of the thing. So, it is a problem with the international students.

Similarly, Reen said, "*sometimes, audio feedback is not understandable if the instructor has a difficult accent and talks too fast.*" Here it is important to notice that multilingual students face problems in understanding audio feedback particularly because of the instructor's accent and speed of giving audio feedback. This finding reaffirms Bingol et al.'s (2014) remark that multilingual students "have significant problems in listening comprehension" because their former institutions gave more importance to "structure, writing, reading and vocabulary" (p. 1).

In line with the limitations of audio feedback, the result of this study matches with previous research. For example, Morris and Chikwa (2016) have found that students stated that in audio feedback “it was harder to link the comments to the relevant sections of the essay” (p. 134). Similarly, Rodway-Dyer et al. (2011) have also reported that “the personal nature of feedback was not always sufficient to enhance student learning and could in some cases negatively impact on student engagement” (p. 1). Rodway-Dyer et al. (2011) also discovered that students “had difficulty finding the point in the essay to which the audio feedback referred” (p. 219). Similarly, Hennessy and Forrester (2014) have pointed out that “Problems with technology were serious enough for this to negatively influence some students’ opinion of receiving audio feedback (p. 781). Therefore, technical difficulties related to providing audio feedback is one of the major concerns. However, with the ongoing advancement of technology, it can be expected that access to audio feedback will become more widely available to students in the future.

Multilingual Students’ Perceptions Regarding the Effectiveness of Audio and Written Feedback on Their Revision Process

The third research question was: “What are the perceptions of multilingual writers regarding the effectiveness of audio and written feedback on their revision process?” In the interview, out of the eight participants, four participants strongly believed that written feedback was most beneficial for their revision. Two participants supported audio feedback. One of the participants said that audio feedback was better for the early drafts. Another participant was unable to judge. Participants expressed their own perceptions regarding the effectiveness of audio and written feedback on their revision process. Here it is seen that the majority of the participants believed that written feedback was more beneficial for their revision. Now, their positive notion to written feedback can largely be attributed to the written feedback’s potential to address the local concern of their writing. For example, Zilao stated:

I think the written feedback is useful because sometimes in an essay, international students have grammar problems. So, the professor can point out what mistake I made and what I can improve, what I can do more. So, written feedback was most beneficial for my revision in this course.

Here, Zialo perceived that written feedback helped him to make a better revision. However, when his first and revised draft of his final research paper was compared, it was found that he made total 39 revisions, out of which 9 was higher-order concern and 30 was lower order concern. Now, compared to Hamim, he made fewer revisions. It is interesting to notice that regarding the perceptions of the effectiveness of the feedback format, Hamim said, “*I don't know if I can really judge yet. It is too early for me to tell.*” Both Zialo and Hamim received written feedback on their first draft. However, when Hamim’s drafts were compared, it was found that he made a total of 195 revisions, out of which 15 were high-order concerns, and 180 were low-order concerns. So, Zilao made fewer revisions than Hamim. Therefore, multilingual writers’

perceptions of the effectiveness of the feedback format on their revisions are based on individual learners. Their perceptions are affected by their self-efficacy which will be elaborated in the interpretation of findings.

Multilingual Students' Preferred Form of Feedback

The fourth research question was “What is multilingual writers’ preferred form of feedback between audio and written feedback?” Three, out of the eight participants who took part in the interview, preferred audio feedback. Another three participants preferred written feedback, and the rest two participants preferred the combination of both written and audio feedback. Reen clearly pointed out the benefits of combining audio and written feedback:

I think if we can mix audio and written feedback together, it will be great. Audio feedback is good for the general feedback on your writing, and if you need improvement in some parts of your writing, instructor should give us written feedback-like highlight and underline some parts. So, combining written and audio feedback will be a good idea to improve our writing.

It is interesting to note that in the reflection survey, when asked about their preferred form of feedback, out of 12 participants, six participants preferred audio feedback and the rest six participants preferred written feedback. However, when asked about what kind of feedback they would like to receive on their writing assignments in their next courses, out of 12 participants, two participants indicated “Audio,” two participants indicated “Written,” and interestingly eight participants indicated “Both.”

In the existing literature, there are mixed results regarding students’ preferred form of feedback between audio and written feedback. For example, Ice et al. (2007) found “an overwhelming student preference for asynchronous audio feedback as compared to traditional text-based feedback” (p. 18). They have also discovered that audio feedback “increased feelings of involvement” (p. 18). The study further exposed that, “audio feedback enhanced learning for our students” (p. 19). Ice et al. (2007) have emphasized the advantages of audio feedback both for students and instructors in their findings stating that “students were far more likely to apply higher order thinking and problem-solving skills” (p. 17). On the other hand, Morris and Chikwa (2016) have discovered that students “indicated a strong preference for written feedback” (p. 125) because “it was harder to link the comments to the relevant sections of the essay” (p. 134). Again, Rasi and Vuojärvi (2018) have stated that “the majority of students welcomed the audio feedback, and also expressed a wish for the integrated use of text and audio” (p. 292). In the same way, Ice et al. (2007) have suggested that depending on the purpose, different media modalities might be more suitable. According to them, written feedback can be better for giving feedback on students’ “micro-level” and audio feedback can be better for “macro-level” (p. 125).

Distinguishable Impacts of Audio and Written Feedback on Multilingual Students' Revision Process

It is found that four of the participants who received written feedback on their final assignment made a total of 354 revisions in their revised draft. Out of 354 revisions, 50 was a high-order concern and 304 was a low-order concern. On the other hand, four of the participants who received audio feedback made a total of 375 revisions. Out of 375 revisions, 53 was a high-order concern, and 322 was low-order concern. It is important to notice that participants' preference for feedback format did not influence their revisions to a great extent. A *t-test* reveals that there is no significant impact on the revisions based on the participants' preference for feedback format. For example, Kalim whose preferred form of feedback was "written feedback" received written feedback. He made only 34 revisions where only 4 was higher-order concern. Contrarily, Safa whose preferred form of feedback was "written feedback" received audio feedback. She made 66 revisions where 14 was a higher-order concern.

This finding regarding the impact of feedback format on multilingual writers' revision contradicts the finding of Bless (2017) who has found that audio feedback helped High School students to make better revisions compared to written feedback. Similarly, this finding also contradicts the finding of Grigoryan (2017) who has found that audio feedback helped "students' revision practices" (p. 466). However, this finding aligns closely with the finding of Morris and Chikwa (2016) whose study established that the type of feedback received did not impact students' grades in the subsequent assignments. Similarly, Chalmers et al. (2014) reported that though the audio feedback offered "richer language" than the written feedback, there was no noteworthy variance in the accomplishment scores of students who got audio feedback (p. 64).

Here, the findings of this study establish that receiving their preferred form of feedback (audio or written) does not necessarily lead to better revisions by multilingual writers. Therefore, it can be argued that both audio and written feedback have the potential to help the multilingual writers to make good revisions, provided the feedback is given in the appropriate manner. This reaffirms the suggestions of Bilbro et al. (2013), "students do not need more feedback from their instructor, but rather, *better* feedback that fosters a positive relationship between students and their writing audience" (p. 68). Though Cavanaugh and Song (2014) have found that "teachers tended to give more global commentary when using audio comments and more local commentary when using written comments" (p. 122), based on the finding of this study, it can be claimed that both audio and written feedback can be equally helpful for L2 writers' revision process. Therefore, it reaffirms the argument of Holmes & Papageorgiou (2009) that "feedback needs to feed forward, encouraging further learning; and feedback needs to help students note gaps between their performance and the desired standard" (p. 87), no matter what the modality of the feedback is.

Interpretation of Findings

From the perspective of Bandura's (1991) social cognitive theory, the perception of human preferences is affected by both external and internal factors i.e. the external surroundings and the conditions under which they occur as well as their own power of understanding or "self-efficacy" (Bless, 2017, p. 200). Bandura (2012) has further illustrated that "personal, behavioral and environmental" are the three determinants of how learners will react to new exposures or new knowledge (p. 10). Personal determinant refers to whether a learner possesses "high or low self-efficacy" towards the feedback (Bandura, 2012, p. 12). Behavioral determinant refers to the "response" a learner exhibits after receiving the feedback (Bandura, 2012, p. 12). Environmental determinant refers to the "external setting" that affects a learner's response to the feedback (Bandura, 2012, p. 12). So, when a multilingual writer shows a preference for a particular feedback format, these three determinants are positively correlated which means both the internal and external factors are supporting the exposure to the particular feedback format. For example, if a multilingual writer prefers written feedback over audio feedback, it can be inferred that a multilingual writer has high self-efficacy for comprehending written feedback and low self-efficacy for comprehending audio feedback.

In this study, during the interview, Ahad, Alwa, and Hamim expressed their preference for audio feedback over written feedback. Contrarily, Kalim, Safa and Zilao leaned towards feedback in written form rather than audio form. From the perspective of Bandura's (1991) social cognitive theory, participants' preference for one feedback format over the other is due to their own self-efficacies. A clear connection is found between the participants' preference for audio feedback and their self-perceived proficiency in English listening. For example, Alwa, Ahad and Hamim who preferred audio feedback, claimed their English listening proficiency to be good. On the other hand, Kalim, Safa and Zilao stated that they were not confident about their English listening proficiency. It is seen that the three participants who preferred audio feedback had higher confidence in English listening proficiency than the other three participants who did not prefer audio feedback.

Based on the findings in this study, the majority of the participants expected explicit, directive feedback on their grammatical issues. In relation to their expectations, K. Hyland and F. Hyland (2006) stated that multilingual writers' educational background is responsible for putting more emphasis on grammatical issues of writing rather than the organizational issues of writing. Now, from the perspective of Bandura's social cognitive theory, their expectations are shaped by the "environmental determinant" to which they have long been exposed (Bandura, 2012, p. 12).

In this study, all the participants expressed their desire to receive feedback on grammatical issues. However, it is interesting to notice that Kalim, Safa and Zilao who preferred written feedback put more emphasis on grammar correction than Alwa, Ahad and Hamim who preferred audio feedback. Therefore, there is a correlation

between their preferred form of feedback and their expectations from instructors' feedback. According to Bandura's (1991) social cognitive theory, "students' self-efficacy determines their level of aspiration, motivation, and level of accomplishments" (p. 12). Each L2 writer has his or her sense of self-efficacy which affects his or her perceptions of instructors' feedback. Recently, Rubenstein et al. (2018) have applied Bandura's (1991) social cognitive theory to investigate how teachers perceive factors that influence creativity development based on their self-efficacy.

Implications for Action

In the reflection survey, when asked about what kind of feedback they would like to receive on their writing assignments in their next courses, out of 12 participants, two participants indicated "Audio," two participants indicated "Written," and interestingly eight participants indicated "Both." Therefore, it clearly indicates that combining audio and written feedback provides more effective feedback with multilingual writers. In the interview, both Rima and Reen mentioned about the benefits of combining audio with written feedback. Rima pointed out:

Audio feedback is good for creating relationship and general information for our writing, and written feedback is good for specific information for our writing. So, I think that a combination of audio and written feedback is the best for our writing assignments.

So, based on this finding, it can logically be suggested that L2 writing instructors should adopt the system of providing a combined form of feedback of both audio and written in order to enhance multilingual writers' overall writing skills. A combination of audio and written feedback will also improve multilingual writers' English listening proficiency which is crucial for many multilingual writers. Of course, it is true that to provide both audio and written feedback together will be more time consuming for the L2 writing instructors. However, using multiple modes of feedback reaches different learners. Most importantly, the benefits of providing both audio and written feedback together cannot be ignored particularly for the multilingual writers. Participants in this study have clearly pointed out that audio feedback has the power to create social connections. This power of creating social connections might be useful for some multilingual writers particularly those who are shy. Sometimes, some multilingual writers are too shy to ask any questions in the class and to participate in the class activities. However, when they listen to the audio feedback, they participate in the class activity to some extent. One of the participants mentioned that she feels shy to participate in the class activities, but when she listens to the audio feedback, she feels that she is participating in class activities. In another word, audio feedback helps some multilingual writers to overcome their shyness. Therefore, the benefits of combining audio and written feedback should be taken into consideration by the L2 writing instructors.

Further, writing teachers for multilingual students should consider giving grammar lessons in class. Because some of the multilingual writers need grammar lessons. In this connection, it is relevant to state the conflict between Truscott (1996, 1999) and Ferris (2004, 2011) on the grammar correction for multilingual writers. Truscott (1999) argued that grammar correction for L2 writers is harmful and should be abolished. In response to Truscott, Ferris (2004) conducted an empirical study and established that grammatical correction for L2 writers played a positive role in developing their writing skills. Based on the findings of this study, Ferris proves to be right that some multilingual writers need grammar lessons. Multilingual students come to the USA from different countries, and many of them have room for improvement in grammatical knowledge in English. Therefore, if writing teachers for multilingual sections devote some time to teaching contextualized grammar, it will save them time to give feedback on grammatical issues of L2 writers. Most importantly, many multilingual writers will benefit from the grammar lessons.


In addition, L2 writing instructors should be provided with training on how to give effective feedback to L2 writers before they start teaching multilingual sections of composition classes in the USA. There are considerable differences between L1 and L2 writers. This is not the question of good or bad, rather this is the point of difference. L2 writers have different linguistic knowledge than L1 writers. Besides, L2 writers come from different educational, social, cultural, and economic backgrounds. Therefore, providing training with L2 writing instructors is crucial for giving effective feedback to L2 writers. Now, there might be a question regarding the structure of the training for the L2 writing instructors. Based on this study, L2 writing instructors should be provided with training that will make them aware of the different needs and expectations of multilingual writers. The training should focus on the diverse sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics aspects of multilingual writers. It should also focus on how L2 writing instructors can be more understanding and more motivating for multilingual writers because some multilingual writers need a little more caring and motivation.


Conclusion

This study was devoted to investigating multilingual writers' preference between audio and written feedback, and the impact of feedback format on their revision in a U.S. composition classroom. Results indicated that those who were confident about their English listening proficiency preferred audio feedback over written feedback. Results also indicated that multilingual writers expected directive explicit feedback from their instructors. Their perceptions regarding the effectiveness of audio and written feedback on their revision process varied depending on their own self-efficacy. There was no significant impact of the feedback format on their revision process. Certainly, the perceptions of eight multilingual writers may not represent the perceptions of all the multilingual writers in the composition classes in the USA. Therefore, the result of this study is not conclusive. Further research can be conducted on instructors' perspectives and experiences while giving audio and written feedback to multilingual

writers in composition classes. More to the point, how the same instructor adopts different feedback policies while giving audio and written feedback, and whether audio feedback has the potential to reduce instructors' grading workload for teaching multilingual sections of composition classes. Secondly, further research can be conducted to investigate the potentialities of audio feedback in creating a social connection with instructors with diverse populations in diverse contexts. In this study, participants expressed that audio feedback helped them to establish a personal relationship with the instructor. This potential of audio feedback in creating connections might be positively utilized in online courses. With the advancement of science and technology and with the change in the socio-economic status quo, the number of online composition courses is increasing all over the world. Therefore, exploring the potentialities of audio feedback in creating a social connection with instructors with diverse populations in diverse contexts might open new avenues for writing teachers. With these recommendations for further research, there are immense possibilities because giving feedback on students' writing is always a complex reciprocal process.

ORCID

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4376-5911>

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4590-5677>

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Ethics Declarations

Competing Interests

No, there are no conflicting interests.

Rights and Permissions

Open Access

This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which grants permission to use, share, adapt, distribute and reproduce in any medium or format provided that proper credit is given to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if any changes were made.

References

- Agbayahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher written feedback on student writing: Teachers' and learners' perspectives. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(10), 1895-1904. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0610.01>
- Ajjawi, R., Kent, F., Broadbent, J., Tai, J. H. M., Bearman, M., & Boud, D. (2022). Feedback that works: A realist review of feedback interventions for written tasks. *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(7), 1343-1356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1894115>
- Alharbi, M. A. (2021). Impact of teacher written vs. audio feedback on EFL undergraduates' writing. *Kıbrıslı Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 16(3), 1141-1154. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i3.5836>
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248-287. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90022-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90022-L)

- Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management*, 38(1), 9-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311410606>
- Bilbro, J., Iluzada, C., & Clark, D. E. (2013). Responding effectively to composition students: Comparing student perceptions of written and audio feedback. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 24(1), 47-83.
- Bird, F. L., & Yucel, R. (2015). Feedback codes and action plans: Building the capacity of first-year students to apply feedback to a scientific report. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 40(4), 508-527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2014.924476>
- Bingol, M. A., Celik, B., Yildiz, N., & Mart, C. T. (2014). Listening comprehension difficulties encountered by students in second language class. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 4(4), 1-6.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002>
- Bless, M. M. (2017). *Impact of audio feedback technology on writing instruction [Doctoral dissertation]*. Walden University.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Ascd.
- Canagarajah, S., & Jerskey, M. (2009). Meeting the needs of advanced multilingual writers. *The SAGE Handbook of Writing Development*, 472-488.
- Cann, A. (2014). Engaging students with audio feedback. *Bioscience Education*, 22(1), 31-41. <https://doi.org/10.11120/beej.2014.00027>
- Carruthers, C., McCarron, B., Bolan, P., Devine, A., & McMahon-Beattie, U. (2014). Listening and learning: Reflections on the use of audio feedback. An excellence in teaching and learning note. *Business & Management Education in HE*, 1(1), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.11120/bmhe.2013.00001>
- Cavaleri, M., Kawaguchi, S., Di Biase, B., & Power, C. (2019). How recorded audio-visual feedback can improve academic language support. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 16(4), 6. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.16.4.6>
- Cavanaugh, A. J., & Song, L. (2014). Audio feedback versus written feedback: Instructors' and students' perspective. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 122-138.
- Cavanaugh, A. J., & Song, L. (2015). Audio and written comments in an online undergraduate composition class: Student and instructor approaches and preferences. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 29(4), 248-259. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08923647.2015.1085754>
- Chalmers, C., MacCallum, J., Mowat, E., & Fulton, N. (2014). Audio feedback: Richer language but no measurable impact on student performance. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 8(1), 64-73.
- Cook, V. (2016). Where is the native speaker now? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 186-189. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.286>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Cui, W. (2019). Teaching for transfer to first-year L2 writers. *Journal of International Students*, 9(4), 1115-1133. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i4.755> ojed.org/jis

- 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>
- Dilley, P. (2004). Interviews and the philosophy of qualitative research. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(1), 127-132. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2003.0049>
- Douglas, T., Salter, S., Iglesias, M., Dowlman, M., & Eri, R. (2016). The feedback process: Perspectives of first and second year undergraduate students in the disciplines of education, health science and nursing. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 13(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.53761/1.13.1.3>
- 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>
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588049>
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 49-62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005>
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6-23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2013.09.004>
- Ferris, D. R., Jensen, L., & Wald, M. (2015). Writing instructors' perceptions of international student writers: What teachers want and need to know. *The CATESOL Journal*, 27(2), 55-72.
- Fithriani, R. (2018). Cultural influences on students' perceptions of written feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.3124>
- Flushman, T., Guise, M., & Hegg, S. (2019). Improving supervisor written feedback: Exploring the "what" and "why" of feedback provided to pre-service teachers. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 28(2), 46-66.
- Grigoryan, A. (2017). Feedback 2.0 in online writing instruction: Combining audio-visual and text-based commentary to enhance student revision and writing competency. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 29(3), 451-476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-017-9152-2>
- Hechinger, J., & Lorin, J. (2020). Ready or not, colleges go online. *Bloomberg Businessweek* (4650), 12-14.
- Hennessy, C., & Forrester, G. (2014). Developing a framework for effective audio feedback: A case study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 777-789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.870530>
- Holmes, K., & Papageorgiou, G. (2009). Good, bad and insufficient: Students' expectations, perceptions and uses of feedback. *The Journal of Hospitality Leisure Sport and Tourism*, 8(1), 85-96. <https://doi.org/10.3794/johlste.81.183>
- Huachizaca Pugo, V. T., & Yambay de Armijos, K. (2022). *Audio-visual and text-based feedback in writing competency: Experimental study* [Doctoral dissertation, ESPOL. FCSH]. <http://www.dspace.espol.edu.ec/handle/123456789/53580>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444806003399>

- Ice, P., Curtis, R., Philips, P., & Wells, J. (2007). Using asynchronous audio feedback to enhance teaching presence and students' sense of community. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11*(2), 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v11i2.1724>
- Killingback, C., Ahmed, O., & Williams, J. (2019). 'It was all in your voice'-Tertiary student perceptions of alternative feedback modes (audio, video, podcast, and screencast): A qualitative literature review. *Nurse Education Today, 72*, 32-39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.10.012>
- Lee, I. (2011). Working smarter, not harder: Revisiting teacher feedback in the L2 writing classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 67*(3), 377-399. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.67.3.377>
- Levin, A., & Regalia, J. (2019). The feedback feeding frenzy: Adding audio and technology to the mix. *Perspectives: Teaching Legal Research and Writing, 27*(2), 60-65.
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System, 84*, 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006>
- Martin, R. (2015). Rhetoric of teacher comments on student writing. *Young Scholars in Writing, 8*, 16-29.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Miao, J., Chang, J., & Ma, L. (2023). Research trends of written corrective feedback in L2 writing: A bibliometric analysis. *Sage Open, 13*(1), 21582440221135172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221135172>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Morris, C., & Chikwa, G. (2016). Audio versus written feedback: Exploring learners' preference and the impact of feedback format on students' academic performance. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 17*(2), 125-137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416637482>
- Moussu, L. (2013). Let's talk! ESL students' needs and writing center philosophy. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(2), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i2.1142>
- Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for a bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Eds.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32-53). Routledge.
- Parkes, M., & Fletcher, P. (2016). A longitudinal, quantitative study of student attitudes towards audio feedback for assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(7), 1046-1053. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1224810>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative method and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Pearson, J. (2018). Engaging practical students through audio feedback. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education, 11*(1), 87-94. <https://ojs.cumbria.ac.uk/index.php/prhe/article/view/467>
- Rasi, P., & Vuojärvi, H. (2018). Toward personal and emotional connectivity in mobile higher education through asynchronous formative audio feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 49*(2), 292-304. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12587>
- Rassaei, E. (2019). Computer-mediated text-based and audio-based corrective feedback, perceptual style and L2 development. *System, 82*, 97-110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.03.004>

- Rawle, F., Thuna, M., Zhao, T., & Kaler, M. (2018). Audio feedback: Student and teaching assistant perspectives on an alternative mode of feedback for written assignments. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(2), 2. <https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2018.2.2>
- Rodway-Dyer, S., Knight, J., & Dunne, E. (2011). A case study on audio feedback with geography undergraduates. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 35(2), 217-231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2010.524197>
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46, 65-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.07.012>
- Rubenstein, L. D., Ridgley, L. M., Callan, G. L., Karami, S., & Ehlinger, J. (2018). How teachers perceive factors that influence creativity development: Applying a Social Cognitive Theory perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 70, 100-110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.012>
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Sage.
- Ryan, T., Henderson, M., & Phillips, M. (2019). Feedback modes matter: Comparing student perceptions of digital and non-digital feedback modes in higher education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(3), 1507-1523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12749>
- Solhi, M., & Eğinli, I. (2020). The effect of recorded oral feedback on EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(1), 01-13. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.712628>
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80124-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6)
- Vo, H. M., Zhu, C., & Diep, N. A. (2017). The effect of blended learning on student performance at course-level in higher education: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 53, 17-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2017.01.002>
- Wingard, J., & Geosits, A. (2014). Effective comments and revisions in student writing from WAC courses. *Across the Disciplines: A Journal of Language, and Academic Writing*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.37514/ATD-J.2014.11.1.03>
- Wood, K. A., Moskovitz, C., & Valiga, T. M. (2011). Audio feedback for student writing in online nursing courses: Exploring student and instructor reactions. *J Nurs Educ*, 50(9), 540-543. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20110616-04>
- Woodcock, P. (2017). Towards dialogue: Audio feedback on politics essays. *European Political Science*, 16, 193-205. <https://doi.org/10.1057/eps.2015.101>
- Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error. *System*, 61, 75-86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.08.004>

Appendix A

Early Semester Participatory Survey

Q1 Where are you originally from?

Q2 How long have you been in the USA?

Q3 What is your first language?

Q4 What other languages do you speak?

Q5 Please rate your English listening proficiency

Advanced (1)

Good (2)

Average (3)

Novice (4)

Click to write

Statement 1 (1)

Q6 What technology do you use for composing and receiving feedback on your writings?

MS Word (1)

PDF (2)

Audio File (3)

Video File (4)

Other (5)

Click to write

Statement 1 (1)

Q7 If other, please specify

Q8 What kind of feedback have you received so far on your writing assignments?

Written (1)

Oral/Audio
(2)

Conference
(3)

Letter
(4)

Grade

No Feedback
So Far (5)

Click to write

Statement 1

(1)

Q9 Have you ever received audio feedback? (recorded teacher comments)

Yes (1)

No (2)

Q10 If yes, please describe in detail (when? where? amount of feedback?)

Q11 Please rate your comfortability of using technology (computer/mobile/laptop) for working with teachers' feedback (downloading, opening, listening or reading to teacher comments).

Expert (1)

Moderate (2)

Novice (3)

Click to write Statement

1 (1)

Q12 Do you have anything else you want to share about feedback?

Appendix B

Interview Questions

1. Where are you originally from?
2. How long have you been in the USA?
3. What is your first language? What other languages do you speak?
4. What do you think about your proficiency in English listening?
5. What technology do you use for composing and receiving feedback on your writings?
6. What kind of feedback have you received so far on your writing assignments? Did you receive audio feedback prior to this course?
7. Why do instructors give feedback?

8. What do you generally expect from your instructor when he/she gives you feedback on your writing assignments?
9. Now you have received both audio and written feedback on your writing assignments:
 - A) Would you please tell me your experience of receiving the audio feedback?
 - B) Would you please tell me your experience of receiving written feedback?
10. Did you have any difficulty in understanding your instructor's feedback?
11. What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of written feedback?
12. What do you think are the advantages and disadvantages of audio feedback?
13. Which kind of feedback format was most beneficial for your revision in this English 101 course in this semester?
14. Which feedback format do you prefer between audio and written feedback? Why?
15. In you next courses, what kind of feedback would you like to receive on your writing assignments?
16. Do you have anything more to say about your feedback experience?

Appendix C

Reflection Survey

Q1 Now that you have received both audio and written feedback, which one do you prefer?

- Audio Feedback (1)
- Written Feedback (2)

Q2 Based on your previous answer, why do you prefer that particular feedback?

Q3 In you next courses, what kind of feedback would you like to receive on your writing assignments?

- Audio (1)
- Written (2)
- Both (3)
- I do not want feedback (4)

Q4 Do you agree or disagree that audio feedback was easy to understand?

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
Click to write Statement 1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5 Do you agree or disagree that audio feedback was helpful to revise your draft?

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
Click to write Statement 1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Do you agree or disagree that written feedback was easy to understand?

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
Click to write Statement 1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q7 Do you agree or disagree that written feedback was helpful to revise your draft?

	Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat agree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Somewhat disagree (5)	Disagree (6)	Strongly disagree (7)
Click to write Statement 1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 What technology did you use for receiving or accessing feedback on your writing?

	MS Word (1)	Adobe Acrobat (2)	Audio (3)	Player	Video (4)	Player	Other (5)
Click to write Statement 1 (1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

Q9 If other, please specify

Q10 How well did this technology work for you?

	Extremely well (1)	Very well (2)	Moderately well (3)	Slightly (4)	well	Not well at all (5)
Click to write Statement 1 (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		<input type="radio"/>

Q11 In the following Likert scale, rate your:

	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Average (3)	Poor (4)
Comfort using technology (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Usefulness of teacher feedback (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Helpfulness of feedback for revision (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall comfort with writing (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12 Do you have anything else you want to share about feedback?