Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response

Jennifer Ahern-Dodson
Duke University

Deborah Reisinger
Duke University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/journalrw

Part of the Arts and Humanities Commons, and the Education Commons

RW

JOURNAL OF RESPONSE TO WRITING

Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response

Jennifer Ahern-Dodson
Duke University

Deborah Reisinger
Duke University

This article examines teacher feedback on student compositions in an Advanced French Composition course at a Research 1 institution. Our study suggests that when teachers combine written corrective feedback with audio comments, their engagement in grading compositions may rise significantly. As teachers bring renewed energy to familiar responding practices, they shift from "grader" to "reader." These findings have important implications for teacher training and the role of feedback in L2 courses.

Keywords: response, L2 writing, teacher critical reflection, French, advanced courses

Deborah[1] had just found out that she'd be teaching Advanced French Composition again in the fall. She remembered with dread what it was like teaching the course the last time: papers stacked up on her kitchen table, weekends spent grading, and most of all, a sense of futility. The feedback she offered didn't seem to make much difference from one draft to another. While students were eager to fix grammatical errors, few seemed willing to revise their drafts and develop their ideas further. Deborah felt that her efforts were wasted, and she became increasingly disengaged from her students' work.

When Deborah shared her frustrations with Jennifer, who teaches faculty how to integrate writing and assessment into their courses, we discovered that we wanted to explore Deborah's frustration a bit more. We both teach writing; we're engaged in thinking about student learning; we both enjoy talking with students about their ideas and the process of articulating those ideas in writing, as well as the overall writing process. And yet both of us have had the experience of feeling that students overlooked our comments. Whether these comments were related to organizing ideas or to the content itself, our students often prioritized correcting grammar and mechanics, "quick fixes" that offered clear solutions. Ultimately, we began to feel less engaged in the feedback process and less motivated to "sit down and grade." This was not helpful to building rapport with students.

We decided to embark on a research project that would explore teacher feedback in the Advanced French Composition course that Deborah would be teaching the following semester. When we looked at the literature in L2 teacher feedback, we found that much of it focused on written corrective feedback (WCF). Despite mixed outcomes (Seker & Dincer, 2014; Truscott, 2007; Ferris, 2006), WCF remains a common practice in L2 teacher training programs (Vyatkina, 2011; O'Donnell, 2007). Instructors are often taught to highlight language errors either directly (naming the type of error or suggesting a correct form) or indirectly (noting an error, but not naming the type of error or suggesting a correction). Some teacher training programs give additional instruction on how to comment on content and organization, inserting comments in margins or adding a

1 Deborah is teacher-researcher and co-author; Jennifer is researcher and co-author.

summary paragraph at the end of the student work (Seker & Dincer, 2014). As research on foreign language (FL) programs has shown, however, this kind of training is uneven at best, and in practice, instructors more often fall back on line editing (Vyatkina, 2011; O'Donnell, 2007). Some instructors receive no training at all. In 2009 Lefkowitz conducted interviews with 20 FL instructors in the United States. Although they regularly taught upper-level FL composition, many had never received any training in writing instruction (Lefkowitz, 2009, quoted in Reichelt, Lefkowitz, Rinnert, & Schultz, 2012). And yet, in their essay exploring key issues in foreign language writing, Reichelt, Lefkowitz, Rinnert, and Schultz (2012) "urge FL practitioners to devote a significant amount of time and energy to writing instruction in their classrooms" (p. 38). In a similar vein, Vyatkina suggests that "more attention should be devoted to commenting on content and organization as well as to making students aware of various linguistic choices available to them, instead of having WCF markings hijack student self-expression suggesting that there is just one 'correct' form" (p. 85).

Research on L2 feedback extends beyond WCF, but as Dana Ferris notes in her robust overview of L2 response practices in *Response to Student Writing* (2003), "L1 composition research is decades ahead of the L2 research base, and we have much to learn from the strengths, weaknesses, successes, and missteps of our L1 composition colleagues" (p. 19). Hyland and Hyland (2006) provide a survey of four key issues (teacher feedback, peer feedback, computer mediated feedback, and conferences), and they stress the importance of considering sociocultural contexts when responding to student writing. Lynn Goldstein (2005) has argued that it is not the *type* of feedback (e.g., written commentary, audio feedback, oral feedback through teacher-student conferences) or the *focus* of feedback (sentence-level corrective, content, organization, writing process) that matters as much as how *effective* the feedback is at helping students "learn to revise, . . . produce stronger texts, and become stronger writers" (p. 7). As Ferris (2003) has noted, "L2 writers are well aware that they have linguistic deficits and make errors as they write, but they also know that improving their ideas is important as well" (p. 23).

Like Vyatkina and Goldstein, we agreed that it was important to focus our attention on sharing feedback on content, and we wanted to help students develop their ideas, not just correct errors. While WCF is important at all stages of the writing process (Ferris, 2003), the lack of consistent, robust research on content-based feedback in L2 (Vyatkina, 2011) posed problems for identifying responding strategies that might help cultivate a conversation about writing with students. When we turned to our own experience and reflected on the most productive and intellectually interesting dialogues regarding writing, these often took place outside of the classroom—after class, in our offices, or in coffee shops. We know this method of feedback is not sustainable, however, or scalable. Nor is it reliably productive, as Goldstein and Conrad (1990) have shown. One option that comes closest to an in-person conversation, however, is audio. In composition studies and in L2 research, audio feedback has been studied as a strategy for exploring a teacher's role in reading and responding to student work (Anson, 1997; 1999), providing students with more detailed commentary on their work and in greater depth than written feedback alone (Scrocco, 2012), encouraging revision (Bauer, 2011; Sommers, 1989), and fostering teacher-student rapport and community-building (Ice, Curtis, Phillips, & Wells, 2007). Additionally, research on audio feedback in L2 writing has included studies on student attitudes and preferences for audio, written, or some combination of audio/written feedback (Elola & Oskoz, 2016; Merry & Orsmond, 2008; Ware & Warschauer, 2006; Loel, 2004).

While research on audio feedback has been largely positive (Hyland, 1990; Johanson, 1999; Loel, 2004; Merry & Orsmond, 2008), instructors have been slow to adopt it as part of their feedback practices. Killoran (2013), for instance, explores over fifty years of audio feedback research to show that it remains a marginal practice for a number of key reasons. These include its perceived complexity (does the technology seem harder than it is?), its observability (is audio recording practiced by my colleagues?), and its pedagogical compatibility (does using audio recording devices seem compatible with my teaching philosophy?) (p. 47). In our view, the new mechanisms for audio content delivery, which include sending MP3 files via smart phones, suggest that audio feedback is poised to gain a stronger foothold among faculty who can meet students "where they are": in front

of their phones.[2] This more expedient form of content distribution avoids the previously clunky process of tape recorders, cassettes, and desktop programs that require on-site presence, as well as multiple programs. While we recognize that audio feedback as a mode of responding is not new, we do believe that the new methods of delivering audio feedback might lead to different conclusions and adoption practices. Like Killoran (2013), we conclude that "this method deserves to be adopted more widely than it already has been" (p. 47).

We wondered whether audio feedback might offer a way to look more closely at how Deborah responds to student writing, and to examine possible factors that might influence her engagement with her response practices. With that in mind, we designed a study that gathered and compared information on feedback that was shared in both written and audio formats.

Study Context

We implemented this study in an Advanced French Grammar and Writing Workshop at a Research 1 institution in the Southeast region of the United States. Students in this class included French Studies majors and minors, as well as students completing their language requirement. In addition to completing daily writing assignments related to cultural and literary texts, students were required to write five compositions that ranged from one to three pages. Each composition was drafted in 3 stages: (1) submitted for in-class paired peer review with tailored peer correction guidelines, (2) submitted to faculty for initial feedback, and (3) submitted in its final form. These multiple writing assignments allowed us to gather and compare feedback on content in both written and audio formats.

Study Description and Design

We collected quantitative and qualitative data from both teacher and student participants through the following methods:

1. two anonymous attitudinal student surveys, one at midterm (n=12) and one at end-of term (n=9). (See Appendix A.)

2 As of January 2014, Pew Research Internet Project results indicate 97% of American 18- to 29-year-olds use the Internet (general use), 89% use social media sites, 98% use cell phones, and 83% use smartphones. Retrieved from http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/mobile/cell-phone-and-smartphone-ownership-demographics/

2. four one-page writing process memos (n=48), submitted by students with each of the first four compositions. In this open-ended reflective writing document, which was submitted in English, students described the choices they made as writers, how they incorporated teacher or peer feedback, and where they struggled in the revision process. (See Appendix B.)
3. teacher journal (n=1). Deborah kept a written journal of her experience responding to student compositions.

At the beginning of the semester, Deborah divided the twelve students in her course into two groups by alphabetical order of their last names; students did not know to which group they belonged. Both groups submitted peer-reviewed drafts of each composition to their professor, Deborah, in PDF form via email. Both groups received written feedback on grammatical and lexical errors using a free note-taking application that allows the user to annotate PDF documents either by typing, highlighting, or recording oral comments. Deborah did not correct errors, but highlighted them according to a simplified four-color coding system. By separating grammar from content, she hoped to provide a constant in grammar feedback in order to isolate student feedback on teacher comments on content (see Appendix C).

For the first composition, Group A received audio feedback on the content of their composition via recorded comments that were sent to students in an MP3 file. Deborah chose to record comments using a free application on her tablet.[3] Group B received written feedback on the content of their composition; Deborah typed written commentary onto the PDF that contained the color-coded corrections; a single PDF was sent to students via email.

For the second composition, Group A received written feedback and Group B received audio comments. For the third composition, the first scenario was repeated and for the fourth, the second scenario was repeated. For the fifth and final composition, students did not submit a draft and were asked to choose their method of receiving feedback. See Appendix D for a visual rendering of the process.

---

3 There are many different mechanisms available to deliver audio content, from smart phones to tablets to content delivery and management systems such as Blackboard and Sakai.

Discussion

To analyze the teacher feedback on each composition, we began with a comparative analysis of the written and audio feedback, measuring word count in written teacher feedback and word count and total recording time in audio feedback. The results are presented in Appendix E. It did not surprise us that assignments of different length received differing amounts of feedback. The film review (the shortest composition) received the fewest comments, for instance, while the persuasive essay (the longest composition) received the most; this remained constant across both audio and written feedback.

What did stand out was the difference between written and audio feedback within a given assignment. Compositions with written content feedback received between 54 and 169 words of feedback, with written feedback averaging 117.99 typed words across the four assignments. Compositions with audio content feedback received between 42 and 659 words of feedback, averaging 320.91 spoken words across the four assignments. For each composition, then, the amount of audio feedback shared was more than double the amount of written feedback provided, or twice as many spoken as written words. Why was this? What might this reveal about Deborah's responding practices and preferences?

In order to understand why Deborah gave twice as much feedback in her audio comments, we decided to independently identify patterns and then come together to share those patterns and identify the most commonly occurring characteristics. We noticed three primary differences between the audio comments and the written comments: (1) Deborah's audio comments were conversational in tone, (2) she posed a greater number of questions to students, and (3) she offered students choices related to organization, content, and vocabulary.

Each of these characteristics adds to the overall word count and length of the audio recording, but most notably, they contribute to the building of a conversation around the process of writing. For this teacher, audio comments did not actually provide additional content, but they demonstrated her working through and trying to make sense of the student writer's ideas and communication of those ideas in French. While

we appreciate that quantity does not necessarily correlate with quality, the quantity captured here may in fact demonstrate Deborah's engagement with student writing. By posing questions and addressing each student directly, for instance, the nature of the feedback is notably different from the written feedback she gave students on the same assignment, where it was often confined to summary comments at the end of the paper.

In the audio samples, Deborah is in effect sitting next to the writer as she speaks, much as she would in a face-to-face conference in her office about the student's writing. In this way, she engages the *writer* rather than the *writing* because she is responding as a reader rather than as a grader. This process allows her to implicate the writer more than she would in written feedback, as the student listens to her professor talk through the writing in what sounds like a dialogue about the composition. Here, Deborah used a combination of surface feature corrective feedback with feedback on the students' ideas to best facilitate a response style that felt authentic to her. This shift is echoed in early audio-response adopter Chris Anson's analysis of his own response style: "What had been correcting and judging eased gently into coaching and advising" (1997, p. 106), a shift that allowed him to individualize his teaching by speaking to each student directly through audio response.

Our analysis of the audio comments led us to hypothesize that the teacher–student relationship might also be shifting in some way. To understand this, we analyzed the data from student process memos and surveys collected over the course of the semester. Three primary results emerged.

Students Preferred Receiving Audio Comments

In their process memos and surveys, students indicated a clear preference for audio commentary for receiving content-related feedback on their writing. Several students were initially skeptical of whether they would understand these comments, which were delivered in French. After the first composition, one student wrote, "Though I was concerned at first, it turned out I was able to understand almost everything that was said"

(Cody,[4] process memo 1). This response correlates with Boswood and Dwyer's (1995) findings that despite researcher doubts, second-language learners did not have trouble understanding audio feedback, and in fact preferred it.

Another student echoed this feeling, writing,

> I am not used to receiving oral feedback on papers, particularly in French, so I was a little intimidated at the idea. In the end, I found it to be extremely useful because I felt like she elaborated on changes I should make more than previous professors have in the past when they gave feedback in writing. (Lynn, survey)

One student shared that

> I don't always understand all the comments when they are written. By contrast, I was able to understand the commentaries almost verbatim in the audio and I also felt that it gave my professor more time and room to easily convey points she might have over simplified if written. (Riley, survey)

After expressing an initial relief in understanding, then, students noted the increased quantity of comments in the audio feedback; this, too, correlates with findings by Hyland (1990) and Huang (2000). Other students noted a specificity to the audio comments. After the first composition, a student in group B wrote, "I received oral commentaries on my piece and I found these extremely helpful. The suggestions for improvements were specific, and enabled me to target and fix the problems" (Dominique, process memo 1). Another noted,

> I find the audio comments the most beneficial. They are clear and concise and relate exactly to what needs to be done, sans the possible ambiguity that may arise [with] some written comments. I appreciate how the audio commentaries are detailed and are catered towards specific parts of the essay, telling us where our mistakes are and the possible suggestions to rectify them. (Logan, survey)

---

4 Pseudonyms are used for all student participants.

What did students like? Several students reported that they liked hearing their teacher's voice. One explained, "I liked how I could listen to the comments rather than read them. By listening you can hear the tone of the comments which is more helpful than reading comments off of the page" (Sam, process memo 2). Another noted that "the oral commentary was especially helpful when a sentence was read as it would be in its improved form" (Harper, survey). Other students noted that the audio feedback seemed more thought-provoking. Having received initial feedback in written form, this student explained that the audio comments caused her to reflect more thoughtfully about her writing: "Though I found both useful in different ways, the feedback I received orally was really thought-provoking. The comments I received on the audio largely influenced the changes I ended up making to my last essay" (Robin, survey). As the semester progressed, then, students seemed to interpret their teacher's comments as suggestive rather than prescriptive, and their comments regarding audio feedback revealed a more noticeable engagement in the writing process.

This conclusion correlates with Deborah's teaching journal comments that noted that students made more frequent appointments to discuss their writing. Comparing her experience to other semesters when she gave only written comments, she wrote in her final journal entry that students were more apt to stay after class and ask questions about the audio comments. In previous semesters, "questions were about the meaning of a specific word or deciphering a cursive notation in French." Students who received audio comments, however, "are requesting more follow-up meetings to explore how to improve the content of their writing (rather than how to 'fix' something)." These new conversations prompted the kinds of engaging questions about writing that Deborah found most rewarding in her work as an L2 composition teacher.

We wondered, what could attribute to this increased engagement? Did audio comments open up a space for conversation that Deborah's written comments alone did not? Did the teacher find audio commentary more engaging than written, and did students perhaps discern that affinity? We know that from our analysis of the audio comments, Deborah often posed questions, asked for clarification, and posited alternative ways to word or structure content. At the same time, we would hypothesize that in its very

nature, orality opens the door to continued discussion more than writing. For these students, as both recipients of feedback and agents who will use the feedback (ideally, in a productive way), Deborah's audio comments helped engage them with the writing process and with their teacher.

We must also consider potential researcher bias. As faculty interested in exploring whether audio feedback would lead to improved engagement with student writing, we interpret and even correlate comments in ways that may skew conclusions or eschew other interpretations. We worked to make our own bias visible by discussing possible bias throughout the process and by limiting Deborah's access to student data until after the semester was over. Deborah was positioned as both researcher and teacher in our project, and so any "objective" distance she might have had as a researcher was compromised by her role as teacher of the course we were studying. But we also feel strongly that teacher-researchers are uniquely situated to see the classroom as an object of study, and we sought to leverage Deborah's "insider knowledge" of her class, the students, and teacher engagement to inform our findings. Like Ruth Ray (1992), we value teacher research because of its "collaborative spirit, its emphasis on the interrelationships between theory and practice, and its interest in bringing about change . . . *from within the classroom* [emphasis in original]" (p. 183).[5]

The Teacher Is More Apt to Engage with Students as Writers

By engaging with student writing via audio feedback, teacher engagement with corrective and content feedback also began to shift. As Deborah became accustomed to the system, she wrote that instead of seeing "a looming stack of compositions to grade," she "began to look forward to 'talking with'" her students. "Somehow, I feel like I'm engaging them more intellectually and creatively, probably because it's so much easier to speak than to type, but also because I can be myself. I feel like I can trust that my tone will come across better." She elaborates on this idea later in her teaching journal, explaining,

> students seem to have trouble interpreting written comments. They
> sometimes perceive them as harsh, or they don't quite know what to do
> with them, but when I'm speaking to them—and it feels like that's what

---

5 See also Lee Nickoson (2012), "Revisiting Teacher Research."

I'm doing when I'm recording—I feel like I can get my meaning across to them better, suggesting ideas or posing more questions.

These journal comments indicate that Deborah's feedback—and the relationship she had to giving feedback—shifted in important ways. This experience is amplified by Sommers (2006), who wrote that "feedback plays a leading role in undergraduate writing development when, but only when, students and teachers create a partnership through feedback—a transaction in which teachers engage with their students by . . . offering honest critique paired with instruction" (p. 250). As Deborah noted in her journal, "I feel like I'm really walking through their papers with them." This metaphor of "walking with them" reminds us of the previous comment in which she enjoyed "talking with" her students during the audio recordings. The emphasis here is on "with," and the audio recording seems to facilitate her ability to somehow share her comments with her students rather than prescribe them. As Goldstein (2005) has shown, this communication between teacher and student is key to ensuring that students understand and implement teacher feedback. Such a partnership is possible when student and teacher see each other in conversation about ideas and beyond the "novice-expert" relationship, a typical outcome of corrective feedback exclusively.[6]

The Teacher Is More Engaged and Self-Reflective

Composition theorist Richard Straub (1996) notes that "The more a teacher's comments tap into her strengths as a teacher and the more they become an extension of herself, the better those comments will be" (p. 247). Tapping into Deborah's strengths meant finding the best way for her to communicate with her students. After commenting on the second set of compositions, for instance, she wrote, "I liked the oral comments because I could say a lot. I would never have expounded as much on these comments in writing. I am really enjoying this. I spoke for 6 minutes on a really problematic paper, when I would have lost steam in writing." In another entry, she noticed that the orality of the delivery method "will be clearer than if I were to try and write what 'sounds right.'" In other words,

---

6 For a discussion on the limits of written corrective feedback, particularly lack of partnership, see also Truscott (2007).

by speaking through an awkward sentence construction, Deborah is better able to explain what "went wrong" and propose suggestions that she would not have offered had it required her typing up the options. This response style allows her to be more flexible.

Conclusion

Our study suggests that teacher engagement in grading compositions may rise significantly when they include audio feedback in their responding practices. For Deborah, audio commentary allowed her to walk through students' papers "with them," to take more time with each paper, which is the opposite of what she thought she wanted to do at the beginning of the semester. She noted that because the time was well spent, the process was thus more rewarding. This shift had an impact on the teacher–student interaction as well, prompting more organic conversations about writing as both parties reflected more about the feedback process.

When teachers are learning new models for responding to student writing, they must also consider their own preferences, strengths and limitations, and attitudes toward feedback. As Straub (1996) reminds us,

> By understanding the great variety of ways teachers can create themselves in their comments . . . we will be more able to describe, reflect on, and develop our own responding practices and shape our comments to better fit our teaching styles, our classroom goals, and the needs of our individual students (pp. 246–247).

In regards to delivering audio feedback, we suggest that faculty consider not only the means by which they will record audio (smart phone, computer, tablet, etc.), but also details such as how long recordings should last and where they should be placed within the composition. While most teachers will probably find it simplest to make a single recording that summarizes teacher feedback, some programs (Noterize, VoiceThread) allow audio comments to be inserted within a text; a feature that allows students to "follow along" as the teacher provides feedback.

We also suggest that teachers consider where they will record comments. A quiet space is important for a clear recording; for Deborah,

this necessitated a change from her habit of reading papers in cafés, and may even have contributed to her positive response to giving audio feedback.

In addition to identifying their personal preferences, which may of course shift during a given semester, teachers should consider implementing audio feedback at different stages of the writing process. In this study, Deborah offered audio commentary after the first draft of a composition. This choice reflected the existing course design in which students turned in one draft to their teacher. Audio feedback, like written feedback, is most useful when shared early and often. We therefore encourage teachers to share audio feedback on composition outlines, and for students to experiment with it for peer evaluations of early drafts. In sum, we see three key considerations for integrating audio feedback into one's response practices: (a) Practical/logistical: Which technology or software to use (being mindful of ease of use for both students and teacher, access/availability, and cost); (b) Pedagogical: When would it best facilitate student revision within an assignment sequence or/and how often to include it during the semester; (c) Faculty attitudes: willingness and comfort level with pedagogical experimentation around responding practices and new technologies.

Like Vyatkina (2011), Lee (2009), Ferris (2014), and other theorists focused on teachers as "agents of change," we believe that it is paramount to begin with teachers. Ultimately, when we identify and implement effective responding practices, we can get beyond the drudgery of "grading stacks of papers" and move, instead, to a practice that allows us to respond as engaged readers. For over 50 years, research has consistently shown that audio response to student writing is an effective approach to offering feedback. Still, it has been rarely implemented on a consistent basis by L2 writing faculty. It is perhaps useful to consider this lack of implementation in the context of an era that is very different from the current one. With new technologies that facilitate audio capture and sharing, and a new generation of teachers and students who are accustomed to completing many of life's tasks on their phones, we are poised to revisit the ways in which we can best communicate feedback to our students.

References

Anson, C. (1997). In our own voices: Using recorded commentary to respond to writing. In M. D. Sorcinelli & P. Elbow (Eds.), *Writing to learn: Strategies for assigning and responding across the disciplines* (pp. 105–113). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 69. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Anson, C. (1999). Talking about text: The use of recorded commentary in response to student writing. In R. Straub (Ed.), *A Sourcebook on Responding to Student Writing* (pp. 165–174). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Bauer, S. (2011). When I stopped writing on their papers: Accommodating the needs of student writes with audio comment. *English Journal, 101*(2), 64–67.

Boswood T., & Dwyer, R. (1995). From marking to feedback: Audio-taped responses to student writing. *TESOL Journal, 5*(2), 20–23.

Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2016). Supporting second language writing using multimodal feedback. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(1), 58–74. doi:10.1111/flan.12183

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to Student Writing.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp.81–104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing, 19*, 6–23.

Goldstein, L. M. (2005). *Teacher Written Commentary in Second Language Writing Classrooms.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Goldstein, L. M., & Conrad, S. M. (1990). Student input and the negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 443–460.

Huang, S. (2000). A quantitative analysis of audiotaped and written feedback produced for students' writing and students' perceptions of the two feedback methods. *Tunghai Journal, 41*, 199–232.

Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 279–285.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 1–19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ice, P., Curtis, R., Phillips, 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.

Johanson, R. (1999). Rethinking the red ink: Audio-feedback in the ESL writing classroom. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education, 4*(1), 31–38.

Killoran, J. B. (2013). Reel-to-reel tapes, cassettes, and digital audio media: Reverberations from a half-century of recorded-audio response to student writing. *Computers and Composition, 30*(1), 37–49.

Lee, I. (2009). Feedback revolution. What gets in the way? *English Language Teaching Journal, 65*, 1–12.

Lefkowitz, N. (2009, November). The future of foreign language writing. Colloquium paper presented at the Symposium on Second Language Writing, Tempe, AZ.

Loel, K. (2004). Online technologies for teaching writing: Students react to teacher response in voice and written modalities. *Research in the Teaching of English, 38*(3), 304–337.

Merry, S., & Orsmond, P. (2008). Students' attitudes to and usage of academic feedback provided via audio files. *Bioscience Education, 11*(3), 1–11. doi:10.3108/beej.11.3

Nickoson, L. (2012). Revisiting teacher research. In L. Nickoson & M. P. Sheridan (Eds.), *Writing studies research in practice* (pp. 101–112). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

O'Donnell, M. (2007). Policies and practices in foreign language writing at the college level: Survey results and implications. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*, 650–671.

Ray, R. (1992). Teacher-research point of view. In G. Kirsch & P. Sullivan (Eds.). *Methods and methodology in composition research* (pp. 172–189). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Reichelt, M., Lefkowitz, N., Rinnert, C., & Schultz, J. M. (2012). Key issues in foreign language writing. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*, 22–41.

Scrocco, D. L. A. (2012). Do you care to add something? Articulating the student interlocutor's voice in writing response dialogue. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College, 39*(3), 274–292.

Seker, M., & Dincer, A. (2014). An insight to students' perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English Language Teaching, 7*(2), 73–83.

Sommers, J. (1989). The effects of tape-recorded commentary on student revision: A case study. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 8*(2), 49–75.

Sommers, N. (2006). Across the drafts. *College Composition and Communication, 58*(2), 248–257.

Straub, R. (1996). The concept of control in teacher response: Defining the varieties of "directive" and "facilitative" commentary. *College Composition and Communication, 47*(2), 223–251.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 255–272.

Vyatkina, N. (2011). Writing instruction and policies for written corrective feedback in the Basic Language Sequence. *L2 Journal, 3*, 63–92.

Ware, P., & Warschauer, M. (2006). Electronic feedback and second language writing. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix A

Student End-of-Semester Questionnaire

How did you access faculty comments most of the time in this course (tablet, personal computer, computer cluster)?

How would you rate your experience accessing faculty comments?

How would you describe the experience of reading faculty feedback on your writing? What did you like or dislike about the experience?

How would you describe the experience of hearing faculty feedback on your writing? What did you like or dislike about the experience?

Which mode of feedback did you prefer and why?

Describe the steps you generally used in this course to revise your writing after receiving faculty comments.

Did having a tablet enhance any aspect of your writing or revising process? If so, please describe.

Did having a tablet impede any aspect of your writing or revising process? If so, please describe.

Do you recommend faculty use oral feedback or written or both? Why?

Do you think the tablet changed any of your reading habits when reading faculty comments on your writing?

Do you have any other recommendations for how French 301 courses can use tablets in future courses?

What is your opinion about the potential for the tablet in an educational setting?

Appendix B

Process Memo Guidelines

Approximate length: 1–2 double-spaced pages <u>in English</u>
Submit as cover letter with your final paper

As part of your writing portfolio, you will turn in a process memo that details your reading, writing, and revising processes. The purpose of the memo is to give you a chance to reflect on your work and to give me a chance to learn about your progress as a writer and critical thinker. This memo should describe the work you've done writing and revising your work over the past few weeks, including the choices you've made, and the final text you've produced.

The following questions may give you some ideas to get you started, but don't feel limited by them or the need to answer all of them as you construct your memo.

- Did the tablet affect how you worked with faculty comments on your writing? If so, in what ways?
- When revising, did you begin with grammar or with content comments? Why?
- How did you work with peer and faculty feedback?
- What challenges did you face in writing and revising?
- Did you prefer oral or written feedback on this essay? If you preferred one, why?
- How could you have improved on this if you had time for one more draft?
- How did you try to integrate an insight from feedback on a previous essay?
- How did you try to integrate an insight from another course you're taking?
- How did you try to make your essay distinct from others?

Ahern-Dodson, Jennifer, and Deborah Reisinger. (2017). "Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response." *Journal of Response to Writing, 3*(1): 129–152.

Appendix C

Sample PDF with Annotation

C'est une expérience regarder fixement à la mort ; se sentir les doigts de la mort caressent ton corps, prennent t'âme doucement. Te berçant dans ses bras, elle t'intoxique avec son poison, sectionnent durement le lien entre ton corps et ton esprit. Les chuchotements séduisants de la mort calment t'âme comme elle t'aspirer avec sa finalité attrayante encore cruelle. C'est le phénomène dernier être touché par la mort, mais c'est plus magnifique faire face avec elle et avoir le Dieu t'écarte de la prise de la morte.

Je n'oublierai jamais ce-jour-là, le jour que j'ai enquêté sur les yeux seuls de la mort. Je coulais. Un force a pris prise de mon corps—il était m'aspirait. En s'ayant entouré autour de moi, l'eau a tiré plus loin dans une brume—je me noyais. Un brusque montée s'est bouchée mes narines et je n'ai pas pu respiré. La peur prenait le contrôle de mon corps et j'ai paniqué. Toutes les années de cours de natation ont disparu et dans ces moments-là, mes instincts étaient mes ressources seuls. Par un miracle, mon corps a flotté au surface et j'ai tenté appeler pour l'aide, mais mes cries étaient futiles—je me noyais encore. Le courant a attrapé à ma cheville et il m'a

Ahern-Dodson, Jennifer, and Deborah Reisinger. (2017). "Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response." *Journal of Response to Writing, 3*(1): 129–152.

Appendix D
Teacher Feedback Process

PAPER 1 Description (1 page)	9/1	Group A (students 1–6) typed comments on draft	Group B (students 7–12) oral comments on draft	Students submit process memo with final paper	Teacher journal entry
PAPER 2 Narration (2 pages)	10/7	Group A oral comments on draft	Group B typed comments on draft	Students submit process memo with final paper	Teacher journal entry
PAPER 3 Persuasive essay (2 pages)	10/24	Group A typed comments on draft	Group B oral comments on draft	Students submit process memo with final paper	Teacher journal entry
PAPER 4 Film critique (1 page)	11/11	Group A oral comments on draft	Group B typed comments on draft	Students submit process memo with final paper	Teacher journal entry
PAPER 5 Literary Analysis (2-3 pages)	12/7			Students submit final paper with optional process memo	Teacher journal entry— final thoughts

Ahern-Dodson, Jennifer, and Deborah Reisinger. (2017). "Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response." *Journal of Response to Writing, 3*(1): 129–152.

ed Response • 151

Appendix E
Word Count and Recording Time of Written and Audio Feedback

Student	Paper 1 DESCRIPTION	Paper 2 NARRATION	Paper 3 PERSUASIVE ESSAY	Paper 4 FILM REVIEW
Sam, Group A[i]	54 typed words	2:00 recording (242 words)	138 typed words	:28 recording (42 words)
Riley, Group A	156 typed words	2:06 recording (256 words)	116 typed words	:51 recording (94 words)
Lynn, Group A	65 typed words	2:04 recording (224 words)	169 typed words	3:10 recording (300 words)
AVERAGES GROUP A	91.66 typed words	240.66 recorded words	141 typed words	145.33 recorded words
Dominique, Group B	1:58 recording (190 words)	132 typed words	5:47 recording (659 words)	114 typed words
Cody, Group B	3:25 recording (432 words)	145 typed words	4:19 recording (398 words)	99 typed words
Logan, Group B	4:09 recording (451 words)	166 typed words	5:22 recording (563 words)	62 typed words
AVERAGES GROUP B	357.66 recorded words	147.66 typed words	540 recorded words	91.66 typed words

Ahern-Dodson, Jennifer, and Deborah Reisinger. (2017). "Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response." *Journal of Response to Writing, 3*(1): 129–152.

Ahern-Dodson, Jennifer, and Deborah Reisinger. (2017). "Moving Beyond Corrective Feedback: (Re) Engaging with Student Writing in L2 through Audio Response." *Journal of Response to Writing, 3*(1): 129–152.