Minnesota State University, Mankato

Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato

All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects

2017

Multilingual Students' Perceptions of and Experiences with Instructor Feedback Methods in a U.S. First-Year Composition Class

Hong Thi Tuyet Vo
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds

 Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Vo, H. T. T. (2017). Multilingual Students' Perceptions of and Experiences with Instructor Feedback Methods in a U.S. First-Year Composition Class [Master's thesis, Minnesota State University, Mankato]. Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds/692/

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects at Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Multilingual Students' Perceptions of and Experiences with Instructor Feedback Methods in a U.S. First-Year Composition Class

By Hong Thi Tuyet Vo

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

English

Teaching English as a Second Language

Minnesota State University, Mankato

Mankato, Minnesota

April 2017

Date: April 7th, 2017

This thesis paper has been examined and approved.

Examining Committee:

_____

Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee, Chairperson

_____

Dr. Karen Lybeck, Committee Member

Abstract

While instructor feedback has generally been recognized as an essential factor in enhancing writing proficiency for multilingual writers, little known research has focused on students' perceptions of and their experiences with different modes of instructor feedback. In addition, impacts of various feedback methods on students' writing have remained debatable. This case study seeks to gain an in-depth understanding of the meaning and significance of three instructor feedback methods, namely written, oral, and audio-visual feedback, from students' perspectives. Furthermore, it offers additional insights into the impacts of these three instructor feedback methods on students' writing. To be more precise, this study aims to answer two main research questions: (a) What are multilingual students' attitudes toward instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback)? and (b) How do these instructor feedback methods impact multilingual students' writing and their writing experiences? In order to answer these questions, qualitative data, including three open-ended questionnaires administered after each specific feedback method is employed, transcriptions of thirty-minute recorded interviews with individual students after the implementation of the three feedback methods, and students' written artifacts from their three ENG 101 essays, were collected from the two consenting students within one-semester of their first-year composition class at a Midwestern state university. Thematic content analysis of the questionnaire and interview data through the use of NVivo software program were organized into four critical areas: (1) Students' introduction of their experiences with feedback, (2) Students' various attitudes toward feedback, (3) Students' applications of feedback,

and (4) Various impacts of feedback. Additionally, the qualitative analysis of students' written artifacts resulted in three emergent themes, including completely successful revision, considerably successful revision, and little successful revision. The findings show that although the two students perceived the three instructor feedback methods positively, there were not only variations in their perceptions of and experiences with each feedback format, but also different levels of success in their applications of each form of instructor feedback into their revisions. Based on these research results, possible implications are discussed for second language writing instruction and for further studies on the important topic of feedback in writing instruction.

Table of Contents

Abstract i

Table of Contents iii

List of Tables vi

Dedication vii

Acknowledgements viii

Chapter I: **Introduction** 1

Background of the Problem 1

Purpose of the Research 5

Research Questions 5

Significance of the Research 5

Definition of Key Terms 7

Structure of the Thesis 8

Chapter II: Review of the Literature 9

Conceptions of Instructor Feedback 9

Importance of Instructor Feedback 10

Types of Instructor Feedback Methods 11

Written feedback 12

Oral feedback 19

Audio-visual feedback 23

Student Perceptions of Instructor Feedback 30

Impacts of Various Instructor Feedback Methods....37

Chapter III: Methodology 44

Research Design 44

Research Setting 45

Participants 46

Data Collection Procedure....48

Data Analysis and Organization 49

Limitations of the Research....50

Chapter IV: Results 53

Emergent Themes from Questionnaires and Interview Data....53

Students' introduction of experiences with instructor feedback 53

Students' various attitudes towards instructor feedback 58

Students' applications of instructor feedback....64

Various impacts of instructor feedback....66

Thematic Patterns of Students' Practical Revisions of their Writing....71

Chapter V: Discussions 79

Students' Perceptions of and Experiences with Instructor Feedback Methods....79

Written feedback....79

Oral feedback....82

Audio-visual feedback....84

Impacts of Instructor Feedback Methods on Students' Revisions....85

Chapter VI: Conclusions and Implications 90

Summary of Research Outcomes....90

Pedagogical Implications....94

Recommendations for Further Research....96

References....100

Appendices....110

Appendix A: Student Consent Form....110

Appendix B: Questionnaire 1....112

Appendix C: Questionnaire 2....113

Appendix D: Questionnaire 3....114

Appendix E: Sample Interview Questions....115

List of Tables

Table 1

Demographics of the Student Participants 47

Table 2.1

A Comparison of Rita's Drafts Based on Written Feedback Received.....72

Table 2.2

A Comparison of Puran's Drafts Based on Written Feedback Received 72

Table 2.3

A Comparison of Rita's Drafts Based on Oral Feedback Received 73

Table 2.4

A Comparison of Rita's Drafts Based on Audio-Visual Feedback Received 75

Table 2.5

A Comparison of Puran's Drafts Based on Audio-Visual Feedback Received 76

Dedication

To:

My most beloved American grandparents, William and Mary Mensing

Copyright© Hong Thi Tuyet Vo

Minnesota State University, Mankato

April 2017

Acknowledgements

In the efforts to complete this thesis, I have received a great deal of assistance from many supporters. Thus, I would like to express my sincere thanks to all those who have offered encouragement, guidance, and space throughout my research. Without these valuable contributions, my thesis would not be possible.

First and foremost, my deepest gratitude is directed to my research advisor, Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee, for her dedicated time, expertise, and patience that guided, encouraged, and kept my professional and academic focus reinforced and flourished throughout the research process. I fully appreciate her endless time spent on providing me with enthusiastic help, great advice, and effective feedback until the completion of my thesis.

Second, I am deeply grateful to my second reader, Dr. Karen Lybeck, for her constructive feedback and suggestions which greatly contributed to the completion of this thesis. I also extend my gratitude to Dr. Glen Poupore for his significant encouragement as well as the information and feedback obtained in his Research class which nurtured and motivated me to delve into this investigation.

Third, I faithfully thank Ryosuke Aoyama and Charlotte Harris-Hoffstrom, the instructors of ENG 101 composition classes, for offering me convenience to approach the participants for this research study. My special thanks go to the students who willingly and consistently participated in this case study.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my family, and my friends for their precious encouragement throughout my research. My deep appreciation goes to my mom, and my aunt who prayed tirelessly for me, and consistently encouraged me

never to give up, and do my best even when the task was challenging.

Many thanks to everyone who, in one way or another, supported me to complete this thesis. Thank you all!

Chapter I

Introduction

Background of the Problem

For most multilingual learners, writing in a second language (L2) is indeed a demanding task. This is because writing in general, and L2 writing in particular, is highly regarded as a socio-cognitive activity which involves a wide range of capacities and skills in planning, drafting, and revising coupled with knowledge of language, context, and audience (Celce-Murcia, Brinton, & Snow, 2014; K. Hyland, 2003; Matsuda, Cox, Jordan, & Ortmeier-Hooper, 2011). Accordingly, it is argued that students can hardly become competent writers by simply reading and writing (Agbayahoun, 2016; Goldstein & Conrad, 1990). Instead, apart from such inputs and practices, they are in need of several forms of teacher feedback that would help them strengthen their revision, and eventually ameliorate their writing competencies as independent and autonomous writers. Thus, it is accepted in academic circles that feedback is a vital component in enhancing writing proficiency for multilingual learners and providing for reflection, evaluation and development (Denton, 2014; Magno & Amarles, 2011; Weaver, 2006).

In essence, throughout the history of L2 instruction, there has been an ongoing debate among scholars and teachers regarding the role of feedback in L2 writing. While several researchers who drew on the conventional sense of feedback seemed to argue against the effectiveness of feedback due to its main focus on grammatical error correction of students' writing (Lalande, 1982; Truscott, 1996), others and particularly those who pay more attention to the socio-cognitive perspective have

advocated for the efficiency of using feedback methods in L2 writing classrooms (Ferris, 2004; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; K. Hyland, 2003). According to K. Hyland and Hyland (2006), the most significant and perhaps ultimate goal of teacher feedback is to help students engage in the writing process and develop into independent writers who are able to critique and improve their own writing with autonomous skills. Hence, instructors should provide appropriate feedback from which students are able to learn and benefit for their revised papers as well as to effectively reinforce their writing skills for their continued language and literacy development (Amara, 2014; Hajimohammadi & Mukundan, 2011). Most importantly, Magno and Amarles (2011) highlight that no matter what the purposes of instructor feedback are, it is worthwhile for students to understand the feedback they are given and be capable of applying it into their revision as well as subsequent papers. However, as mentioned in previous studies (Dunne & Rodway-Dyer, 2009; Rotheram, 2009), students seemed dissatisfied with the quality and the quantity of the feedback they received because it was too little, too late, and generally ambiguous or obscure. Despite student expectations and the perceived importance of teacher feedback on L2 students' writing, there is still little certainty about which feedback methods would be most beneficial for multilingual learners (Morra & Asís, 2009; Poulos & Mahony, 2008).

Another challenge facing L2 writing instruction and feedback effectiveness is the increase of multilingual population in most of American educational institutions. Particularly, in recent decades, the number of L2 learners, largely known as multilingual students, pursuing degree programs in U.S. colleges and universities has

increased considerably. As presented by Hinkel (2004), during the 2000-2001 academic school year, roughly 547,867 international students enrolled in U.S. schools, along with approximately 1,800,000 immigrant students. This number has increased dramatically in subsequent years. For example, according to the most recent Open Doors Report published by the Institute of International Education (IIE) (2016), there were almost one million international students participating in U.S colleges and universities, with an increase of about seven percent from the previous year. At these higher education institutions, they are expected to successfully read and produce different kinds of texts during their academic years, with a major focus falling into writing compositions (Hinkel, 2004). The challenge is that since multilingual writers come from different educational, national, and cultural backgrounds, they enter L2 writing classes through various lenses of their personal identities, cultural practices, and educational experiences, which tremendously influence their success in developing L2 writing skills (Amara, 2014; Celce-Murcia et al., 2014; Matsuda et al., 2011). Specifically, not only do L2 learners have their own personalities and different characteristics in terms of age, sex, ideology, and socioeconomic status, but they also bring to their composition classes diverse writing experiences, different aptitudes, various levels of motivation, and differing metacognitive knowledge of their L1 writing. Therefore, it has been typically argued that these differences will intervene and impact how students react to the feedback they receive, as well as how they actually employ the provided instructor feedback methods to revise their drafts in order to enhance their writing (K. Hyland, 2003). Most strikingly, F. Hyland (2010) points out that much of the previous research has focused on error correction and

teacher written corrective feedback without carefully considering what students bring and contribute to the feedback situation, particularly in reference to their own perceptions and understandings of feedback as well as their writing skills and use of feedback strategies.

In response to such an increasing concern, within the last decade, more attention has been paid to different aspects of students' responses to instructor feedback through various investigations (Amara, 2014; Cavanaugh & Song, 2014; Cunningham, 2015; Denton, 2014; Johnson & Cooke, 2014; McGrath, Taylor, & Pychyl, 2011; McMartin-Miller, 2014; Merry & Orsmond, 2008; Morris & Chikwa, 2016). However, there have been several limitations embedded in these previous studies. First, most of these studies examined just one instructor feedback method or a combination of traditionally written feedback with audio feedback *(*Amara, 2014; Cavanaugh and Song, 2014; Cunningham, 2015; Merry & Orsmond, 2008). Especially, there seemed to be very little examination of students' responses to oral feedback. Second, most of the previous research was likely to lack multiple sources of data collection and analysis, which restricted triangulation of the research results. To be more precise, these studies tended to dominantly use quantitative survey questionnaires (Denton, 2014; Johnson & Cooke, 2014; McGrath et al., 2011), along with a general lack of collecting and analyzing students' written artifacts based on the feedback they received (McMartin-Miller, 2014; Merry & Orsmond, 2008). Finally, and perhaps most noticeably, among these previous studies, very few have been specifically carried out to explore how multilingual learners actually perceive and engage with various instructor feedback methods, and how feedback shapes their

writing practices, revision process, and their self-evaluation capacities.

Purpose of the Research

In order to address the research gaps already outlined and to make an attempt to get over shortcomings of the previous studies on instructor feedback methods, this case study aims to explore two critical aspects of instructor feedback methods from students' perspectives. Firstly, this research is to delve into students' perceptions of and their experiences with the three different types of instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) given to their three different ENG 101 essays in a U.S. first-year composition class. Secondly, the study attempts to investigate the impact of these three instructor feedback techniques on students' writing and their experiences within the revision process in relation to the feedback they have received.

Research Questions

Based on the research aims, this case study attempts to seek answers for the following two specific research questions.

- What are multilingual students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) in a U.S first-year composition classroom?
- How do instructor feedback methods impact multilingual students' writing and their writing experiences in a U.S. first-year composition classroom?

Significance of the Research

This case study contributes to the existing pool of literature on instructor feedback methods in L2 writing by expanding empirical knowledge and illuminating

how students perceive instructor feedback, as well as how different modes of instructor feedback impact students' writing and their writing experiences. More specifically, the results from this current study will be helpful to both L2 writing teachers and multilingual learners. First, through qualitative data highlighting students' attitudes toward and experiences with instructor feedback methods, teachers will gain a deeper understanding of how the learners view the instructor feedback they receive, what they like and dislike about these feedback methods, how they practically apply the provided feedback into their revision process, and what instructor feedback is viewed as effective modes for their writing development. In addition, the findings from examining students' written artifacts will provide teachers with more insights into the impacts of different instructor feedback methods on students' writing practices. In fact, being aware of students' perceptions, reactions, and experiences will enable L2 writing teachers to choose appropriate feedback methods to use in order to best serve the diverse needs among multilingual writers and ultimately to orientate them towards becoming effective, independent, and autonomous writers. Second, this study sheds light on different instructor feedback methods, namely written, oral, and audio-visual feedback, which are believed to offer multilingual writers excellent opportunities through which they can enhance their writing skills and achieve more success in L2 writing. Finally, a discussion of pedagogical implications in Chapter 6 will help both teachers and students further understand and know how to apply various instructor feedback methods effectively in their L2 teaching and learning context.

Definition of Key Terms

Within the scope of this case study, some important terminologies as well as key terms have been used to draw the central focus of the current investigation.

Audio-visual feedback. This innovative form of feedback enables the teacher to digitally voice their responses to students' writing and at the same time to point to student's specific textual problems in their writing by using available editing tools supported by web-based screen capture applications such as Screenr, Screencast, Screencast-O-Matic, or Snagit (Anson et al., 2016; Cunningham, 2015; Denton, 2014; Jones, Georghiades, & Gunson, 2012).

Composition. A short written text or an academic essay generally known as part of school writing assignments (Hornby & Wehmeier, 1995).

Instructor feedback. The responses, comments, and suggestions provided by the instructors on the student's writing (Goldstein, 2005; K. Hyland, 2003; McGrath et al., 2011).

Multilingual students. This population includes international visa students, refugees, and permanent residents as well as naturalized and native-born citizens of an English speaking country, who are able to speak more than one language with English being their second, third, fourth, or fifth language (Matsuda et al., 2011).

Oral feedback. This feedback form refers to one-to-one writing conferences where both teachers and students meet face-to-face to discuss and negotiate issues related to the students' composition (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ewert, 2009; K. Hyland, 2003).

Perception. An idea, an attitude, a belief or a view someone has as a result of

how someone sees or understands something (Hornby & Wehmeier, 1995).

Written feedback. This mode of instructor feedback involves teachers making handwritten or electronic (e.g., track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word program) edits and comments on students' texts.

Structure of the Thesis

This research paper is comprised of six chapters. The next chapter provides a theoretical and empirical framework for this current study, including conceptions of instructor feedback, importance of instructor feedback, and three different types of instructor feedback (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback). Additionally, learners' perceptions of instructor feedback, along with previous studies on impacts of various instructor feedback methods will be addressed in this review of literature. In Chapter 3, issues related to research design, research setting, participants, data collection procedure, data analysis, and limitations of the research will be described and discussed in detail in order to highlight the research methodology utilized in this case study. The qualitative findings of this research will be organized and presented in Chapter 4. It is then followed by Chapter 5 which will discuss the results of this case study in response to the research questions and the relevant previous studies. Finally, Chapter 6 will summarize the research outcomes, coupled with pedagogical implications for L2 writing instruction, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter II

Review of the Literature

Conceptions of Instructor Feedback

Feedback has been conceptualized in various ways deriving from different perspectives of scholars and researchers. A relatively broad notion of feedback emerges from Hattie and Timperley (2007), viewing feedback as "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, or experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding" (p. 81). In an earlier understanding of feedback, Han (2001) referred to feedback as a two-way, interdependent process, involving the giver and the receiver, with both being information providers. Amara (2014) echoes this view by considering feedback as a process of two parties' engagement through which one side is taking a role of a knowledge provider and the other is performing as a knowledge receiver of the subject matter. Within the scope of this present study, the conception of feedback is, however, narrowed to merely teachers' responses to students' writing. It adopts Goldstein's (2005) standpoint which perceives instructor feedback as a process of not grading or evaluating, but carefully responding to what students have written within a rhetorical context in order to help students identify where they have been with the text, where they need to go, and what strategies they should enact to solve rhetorical problems in their current as well as subsequent texts. In a simple manner, instructor feedback could be understood as a technique employed by instructors in order to communicate to students about their writing and provide strategies for students' revision of their drafts (McGrath et al., 2011). Most noticeably, instructor feedback can take different forms of responses

to students' writing such as commentary, minimal marking, audiotaped comments, or computer-based feedback (Ferris, 1997; K. Hyland, 2003). Under this case study investigation, instructor feedback involves three different methods: 1) written feedback in the electronic format of using track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word program, 2) oral feedback through one-on-one teacher-student conferences, and lastly 3) audio-visual feedback via the screen capture audio-visual program, namely Screencast-o-matic.

Importance of Instructor Feedback

Drawing on different theoretical perspectives of L2 writing instruction, it has been widely acknowledged that instructor feedback is an essential factor for improvements in L2 writing, in conjunction with its potential for promoting students' learning and engagement in the writing process (Gascoigne, 2004; Goldstein, 2005; K. Hyland, 2003; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006). First and foremost, within the process-centered paradigm where the focus has shifted from students' final finished product to students' multiple drafts, instructor feedback is seen as a crucial tool to guide students through various stages of their multiple drafting, which facilitates their revisions and assists them during such a step-by-step learning-to-write process in order to achieve competences of self-employed writers (Harmer, 2004; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006). From the interactive perspective, instructor feedback is viewed as an important means of providing scaffolding to learners, which enhances meaningful interaction between teachers and students (Morra & Asís, 2009). From the genre-based perspective, feedback is regarded as a key element to support the development of students' academic and professional literacy skills, offering students

better chances to take part in target communities of practices (F. Hyland, 2010). This is because the teacher's feedback helps inform students about the quality of their writing in terms of both strengths and weaknesses as well as its effects on the audience (Agbayahoun, 2016).

Despite the critical importance of instructor feedback, Cavanaugh and Song (2014) note that one of the most significant challenges facing composition instructors is how to successfully respond to students' writing assignments so as to help students engage in the writing process, learn from their revisions, and apply the provided feedback to strengthen their subsequent texts. In effect, on account of the complexity and proliferation of instructor feedback in the field of L2 writing, many teachers and researchers have long been concerned about which modes of feedback should be implemented and whether instructor feedback methods could help students effectively enhance their writing (Huang, 2000; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Van Beuningen, 2010). In response to such a concern, Merry and Orsmond (2008) underscored that no matter what the purposes of feedback are, it is imperative that instructor feedback be detailed and comprehensible to students, be given at the right time and in the appropriate context, and address such problematic issues of students' writing as content, organization, style, grammar, and mechanics. Likewise, Rodway-Dyer, Knight, and Dunne (2011) suggest that instructor feedback should be timely, relevant, precise, understandable, encouraging, constructive, and manageable so that students are able to apply the feedback received into their writing.

Types of Instructor Feedback Methods

Over the last two decades, a large number of changes in writing pedagogy and

research have resulted in variations of feedback practices (K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006). In fact, it has ranged from a highly conventional method of teacher written feedback on students' papers, to alternative and supplementary approaches of peer feedback, writing workshops, and teacher-student conferences, with the most recent mode of audio-visual feedback, under influences of technological advances, to promote computer-assisted language learning (CALL) principles. Inevitably, feedback can take a variety of forms when provided to students' writing, which depends on various factors such as the teacher's own preferences for the feedback type, the course objectives, classroom conditions and facilities support, types of writing students are performing, as well as learners' characteristics (Goldstein, 2005; McGrath et al., 2011; Van Beuningen, 2010). Evidently, many researchers cited in Cunningham's (2015) study have stressed that the mode of instructor feedback plays an indispensable role in determining how students approach the writing process, how students perceive feedback and how they engage in the writing revision process. Hence, teachers should not only carefully choose what to comment on, but should also take into account what type of feedback is the most appropriate for multilingual or L2 learners (Amara, 2014). Within the scope of this current research, three instructor feedback methods, including written, oral, and audio-visual feedback, are explicitly examined in order to offer more insights into what these methods look like, how they have been previously applied, and how these methods could be beneficial for students' writing development.

Written feedback. Among various feedback methods given to students' writing, teacher written feedback is seen as the primary and conventional form of

instructor response to inform students about their writing performance and orientate their revisions (Agbayahoun, 2016; Ferris, 1997; McGrath et al., 2011). Traditionally, written feedback is known as error correction or grammar correction, facilitating students' ability to locate mistakes in their papers and then correct them (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Weaver, 2006). The main purpose of giving written feedback to students, according to AbuSeileek (2013), is to draw students' attention to the problems in their writing and to help them aware of expectations towards being competent in an L2 writing setting as multilingual writers. In this regard, the underlying nature of written feedback seems to support the noticing hypothesis proposed by Schmidt (1990) which indicates that language learners must attend to and notice details and differences between the target language and their interlanguage, manifested in the production of their output. In a more condense sense, written feedback is employed to coach students from the margin to the point of producing better texts containing minimal errors and maximal clarity (Amara, 2014). Drawing on this new sense, along with the incorporation of CALL principles (Higgins, 1983), teacher written feedback described in this current study takes the form of teachers' responses to students' writing by using track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word computer program. As highlighted in Ho and Savignon's (2007) study, the prominent feature of track changes is to document every change made in a text, which allows the users to insert feedback adjacent to a problematic sentence or paragraph in diverse forms such as questions, comments, insertions, and deletions. In the same vein, AbuSeileek (2013) affirms that the track changes feature allows users to strikethrough deletions and write insertions

in a different color, which draws students' attention to their writing problems. Such an advanced feature of the Microsoft Word program enables the users, especially the teacher, to not only identify an error, but also suggest a reformulation to display the correct form of that error. At the same time, the comment textbox occurring to the side of the text allows the teacher to write short comments on, or explanations about students' writing problems. Therefore, it has the characteristics of a combination of both implicit and explicit instructor feedback. What's more about this type of instructor feedback is that although the feedback may appear in a different place, depending on the version of the Microsoft Word program, it is worth noting that these changes and comments automatically appear in a different font color in conjunction with a text box (Ho & Savignon, 2007).

Regarding implicit and explicit trends of instructor feedback, there have been considerable debates on whether written feedback should be direct or indirect. The primary factor distinguishing these two modes of written feedback is the learner's engagement in the feedback process. Van Beuningen (2010) refers to direct written feedback as an explicit form of teacher correction on students' papers, particularly consisting of an indication of errors and the corresponding correct linguistic forms. It means that the teacher provides all correct forms of student's writing problems on their papers, and students only need to transcribe the correction into their final version without making any cognitive efforts when revising their own texts. In this sense, Amara (2014) claims that direct written feedback can be desirable when the proficiency level of students does not enable them to approach the correct forms of the target text. In addition, this type of written feedback can help teachers avoid the

confusion of their comments on students' writing. In contrast, indirect written feedback exhibits an implicit way of teacher response to students' papers by only coding, underlining, circling or recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line to bring students' attention to the fact that an error exists; however, the teacher does not provide any explanation of what the errors are, nor offer any correct target forms, but leaving students to solve their own writing problems (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

Second language acquisition theorists and L2 writing specialists alike argue that learners would benefit more from indirect written feedback because they have to take part in a more profound form of language processing when they are self-editing their compositions (Lalande, 1982; Van Beuningen, 2010). In this view, the value of indirect written feedback lies in the fact that it urges learners to engage in the process of constructed learning and problem solving to promote self-reflection and foster long-term writing skills. However, as pointed out in the literature by Ferris (2004), and K. Hyland and Hyland (2006), it is possible that indirect corrective feedback pose more challenges for lower proficiency L2 learners since they may lack the linguistic competence to effectively self-edit their writing problems. To gain further insights into the differential effectiveness of direct and indirect written feedback, it is important to take a closer look at previous studies with largely inconclusive results. For example, a longitudinal study conducted by Lalande (1982) showed that students who received indirect feedback outperformed students in the direct correction group, but the difference of between-group accuracy was not statistically significant. On the contrary, Chandler's (2003) empirical study concluded that direct feedback is the

most effective written feedback approach, helping students gain the largest accuracy not only in revisions but also in subsequent writing. In particular, the author argued that while direct feedback allows learners to instantly internalize the correct form as offered by their teacher, the indirect approach seems ineffective because it provides learners inadequate information to resolve complex errors. However, the difference found in this study again failed to reach statistical significance. From Van Beuningen's (2010) perspective, the main causes of lacking convergence among these research outcomes might be prone to design-related and analytical problems.

More recently, in a cautious examination of the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy, Van Beuningen, De Jong, and Kuiken (2008) tried to overcome some shortcomings and design-related drawbacks by including proper control groups and time-on-task differences between treatment groups. The results show that both direct and indirect feedback were beneficial for short-term improvement of students' written accuracy, but only direct feedback proved to offer significant long-term effects despite the fact that the difference between the two feedback groups was not significant. Based on these research findings, it is essential for this current study to carefully focus on issues related to research methodology, specifically on research design as well as data collection and analysis to further investigate how multilingual learners perceive and experience the written feedback provided in their first-year composition classroom through the use of track changes and comments which exhibit both explicit and implicit functions of innovative written feedback.

Admittedly, there have been different opinions about the efficacy of written

corrective feedback among researchers. In order to easily follow the flow of research on effects of written feedback, it is vital to divide the previous studies into specific groups according to their research methodology and research design. The early body of studies involving no control groups (Ferris, 1997; Lalande, 1982) reported improvement in grammatical accuracy after students are given instructor written feedback. At best, these studies have been an indicative of the potential of written feedback in helping students enhance the accuracy in their writing. However, Truscott (1996; 1999) claimed that such studies could not be used to indicate that written feedback is effective in facilitating student's accuracy improvement because it is always possible that improvement would have taken place without any provision of instructor feedback. In order to respond to this claim, it is believed that an inclusion of either a control group or multiple sources of data collection and analysis from different writing contexts would provide clearer and more convincing evidence for the effectiveness of teacher written feedback. Thus, more recent research has been conducted with better method designs to include control groups and a multiple set of data (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Bitchener et al., 2005; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa, 2009). Particularly, in the latest study done by AbuSeileek (2013), three treatment groups and one control group, coupled with pre- and post-tests were utilized to investigate the effect of using track changes through a word processing program on EFL students' writing. The results from all these studies showed that instructor feedback substantially helped students improve their writing accuracy, irrespective of written feedback forms given to them. However, most of these studies confronted general

shortcomings of mainly focusing on examining the improvement of one or some grammatical features through error correction in student's writing rather than their writing as a whole.

Taken all together, it is worth noting that although the outcomes from most of previous studies suggest that instructor written feedback plays an important part in multilingual students' writing, the conclusion on such an issue has not been finally reached. In other words, its role is still a complex and ever-going debate, which requires more careful examination in order to intensify the literature on the effect of this crucial form of instructor feedback, especially in relation to CALL principles as a new trend of language pedagogy. The reason for such inconclusive findings could be that most of these studies quantitatively concentrated on students' accuracy improvement in terms of one or a few specific grammatical features in either new pieces of writing or subsequent revised papers, but not covering the actual nature of students' writing practices which are featured by such factors as forms of language use, organization, contents of writing, and a sense of audience. Therefore, a body of well-designed studies is needed to fully delve into the efficiency of instructor written feedback. As noted by Ferris (2010), despite recent research efforts of proving the effectiveness of written feedback, many questions have been left unanswered such as how instructor feedback impacts various aspects of students' compositions, including content, organization, cohesion and coherence apart from linguistic accuracy, and how students actually apply the feedback into their revised papers, as well as how students perceive and experience instructor feedback. In an attempt to answer these questions, the present study set out to qualitatively examine students' perceptions of

and experiences with instructor feedback methods, with written feedback through the use of electronic track changes and comments being one of the three main feedback forms under this focused investigation.

Oral feedback. Oral feedback in writing instruction is generally known as one-on-one writing conferences, face-to-face conferencing, or teacher-student writing conferences (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ewert, 2009; K. Hyland, 2003). Whatever technical terms are employed, this kind of instructor feedback involves the discussions and negotiations taking place between the teacher and the student either inside or outside the classroom, focusing on students' paper in progress by examining their current drafts and ways of revising to improve them (K. Hyland, 2003). Most peculiarly, K. Hyland (2003) notes that oral feedback is beneficial for both teachers and learners. First, oral feedback offers teachers opportunities to deeply understand and fully respond to students' diversities in terms of their personal, sociocultural, and educational backgrounds embedded in their writing. It additionally helps instructors clarify and resolve ambiguities in students' writing through negotiating with them while saving teachers a lot of time spent on detailed marking of students' papers. Second, oral feedback assists students in developing autonomous skills by figuring out their own strengths and weaknesses in writing through raising and answering questions during teacher-student conferences. Plus, it helps students understand more clearly what to revise, how to revise, and why they need to revise, which further supports their subsequent revised papers (Goldstein & Conrad, 1990).

In comparison with written feedback, oral feedback is believed to be more beneficial since it provides better communication between teachers and students,

especially with more opportunities for clarification, instruction and negotiation than the written feedback method does (Goldstein, 2005). Therefore, students can get more individual attention to, as well as detailed and full discussions about their writing through more focused and usable comments produced within face-to-face negotiations over their written texts (K. Hyland, 2003). In this respect, the oral feedback method seems to work in tandem with the communicative principle proposed by Canale and Swain (1980) because both models emphasize the significance of communicative competence, namely verbal communication skills to heighten the learner's motivation, boost their engagement, and promote interactions between the teacher and the student through offering and receiving feedback with regard to the writing process. K. Hyland (2003), however, suggests that in order to make use of the benefits of oral feedback, students need to actively participate in asking questions, clarifying meanings, and elaborating on their papers rather than passively accept all suggestions and comments provided by their instructors. Aside from these substantial payoffs, there are several pitfalls that should not be overlooked when dealing with oral feedback. According to Goldstein and Conrad (1990), multilingual or L2 learners are not always equal in taking most advantages of one-on-one conferencing. This is because individual students are different in terms of their experiences with teacher-student conferences, their communicative and interactive abilities, coupled with their L1 cultural and social beliefs, which might inhibit their engagement in raising questions and negotiating meanings during face-to-face writing conferences. Another possible challenge of implementing conferences facing the teacher and the student is that it requires a considerable amount of time to set up and

manage each individual teacher-student appointment to fit into both teachers' and students' meeting schedules (K. Hyland, 2003).

Most strikingly, as noted by K. Hyland and Hyland (2006), the use and effectiveness of oral feedback or conferencing is intuitively appealing and largely supported by teachers' experiences rather than by evidence of numerous empirical studies. To put it another way, research on oral feedback in writing is still relatively scarce and the impacts of oral response on students' revision have not been fully investigated. Thus, more studies are needed to examine students' perceptions of and experiences with one-on-one conferences or oral feedback, as well as how students actually apply this type of feedback into their revised papers and what effect this feedback might have on their writing development. Despite such a dearth of empirical evidence on the effect of oral feedback, several attempts have been made, especially with exclusive focuses on exploring and analyzing what happened during teacher-student conferences. Early research on this topic by Patthey-Chavez and Ferris (1997) examined four teachers' writing conferences, each with one weaker and one stronger student discussing the revision of their drafts. The results showed that all eight students employed the teachers' suggestions in their revisions in two different manners. While the weaker students were more likely to follow the teacher's suggestions far more directly to their next drafts, the stronger students more dynamically participated in the teacher-student conferences, and were able to make more significant revisions by generating new ideas based on the teacher's suggestions. The authors also suggested that with the lower proficiency learners, there were more risks that conferences would entail appropriation rather than intervention.

Another significant study investigating student input and negotiation in L2 writing conferences was conducted by Goldstein and Conrad (1990). Their study focused on students' written texts in order to determine how students dealt with the revisions discussed in the conferences between one teacher and three advanced L2 students, and what role the negotiation of meaning played in the success of such revisions. Similar to Patthey-Chavez and Ferris's (1997) findings, analyses of the conference transcripts and students' papers from this study revealed that there were more active participations and negotiations between the teacher and the more proficient students than the less proficient writers. More importantly, the results showed that the more both teacher and students negotiated meaning for revisions, the more students' revised papers were improved. Although the research outcomes suggest that negotiation of meaning plays an essential role in subsequent revisions, the study concluded that the teacher-student conference does not necessarily ensure students' successful revision since multilingual students might bring with them a diversity of cultures, educations, personal traits, language proficiency, and sociolinguistic backgrounds to the conference. Such inconsistency between the findings and the conclusion implies that further research is necessary to provide a more comprehensive picture of the impact of oral feedback on students' revised papers.

More recently, Haneda's (2000) research on negotiating meaning in writing conferences has contributed to a small but growing number of investigations on the discursive quality of face-to-face writing conferences associated with students' subsequent revisions. Although the author did not directly employ the framework of

negotiation and scaffolding, the qualitative and quantitative analyses of conference discourses and students' revised papers unveiled that the differences in students' participation in the conference were likely to be influenced by their revision goals, the topics selected for conference discussions, and their target language proficiency. Specifically, the more advanced learners were keen on ideational contents and rhetorical choices whereas intermediate students tended to focus more on language use issues. The results also indicated that students generally applied specific pointers highlighted during the teacher-student conferences to revise their texts. Most noticeably, students reported that metalinguistic and metacognitive capacities were valuable for their engagement in the revision process.

Collectively, the three already mentioned studies, to a large extent, have outlined a critical role of teacher-student conferences in students' revised texts. However, these studies have exclusively focused on exploring what took place in the conferences rather than how students perceived and experienced the oral feedback as well as how students actually applied the feedback they received into their revision. These limitations have called for further qualitative examinations on students' perceptions of and experiences with teacher oral feedback and their actual use of this feedback into their revision process, which this current case study is trying to seek answers for.

Audio-visual feedback. With enormous advances in technology during the last two decades, there has been a new trend in offering feedback to students' writing, particularly marked by a current occurrence of the audio-visual format. As noted by Denton (2014), the use of audio-visual feedback has pinpointed the latest

advancement in an alternative emergent method for organizing instructor feedback systems, opening up new possibilities for students to virtually interact with their instructors in relation to CALL principles. The dramatic evolution of formats of this novel digital feedback include the initial emergence of audio-taped commentary (Patrie, 1989; Sommers, 1989) followed by electronic audio feedback via the employment of the Audacity audio software, namely MP3 files (Hajimohammadi & Mukundan, 2011; Lunt & Curran, 2010; Merry & Orsmond, 2008; Rotheram, 2009), as well as the newest form of audio-visual feedback through the use of web-based screen capture applications, including Screenr, Screencast, Screencast-O-Matic, or Snagit (Anson et al., 2016; Cunningham, 2015; Denton, 2014; Jones et al., 2012). Created and distributed by TechSmith, Screencast is a free, downloadable screenshot program that captures video display and audio output, allowing the user, particularly the teacher, to record audio-visual comments and at the same to use the mouse pointer to refer to a certain part of students' problematic texts on their writing file to show examples (Jones et al., 2012).

Likewise, Anson et al. (2016) emphasize that screencast programs have significant implications for teachers to provide feedback on students' writing because this innovative application enables the teacher to digitally voice their responses to students' writing while pointing out student's specific textual problems in their compositions by using available editing tools supported by the program. Most notably, unlike previous applications which have lacked visual effects, screencasting offers vivid, engaging, interactive, and asynchronous feedback, which combines the two major senses of learning, namely sight and hearing (Thompson & Lee, 2012).

Additionally, it has a superior advantage to other modes of feedback in the sense that students are able to replay the feedback received when they are revising their papers (Rotheram, 2009). Based on these merits, the audio-visual feedback method described in this case study specifically focuses on the instructor's use of screencasting programs (e.g., Snagit, and Screen-O-Matic) as an innovative mode of instructor feedback on students' compositions.

This new trend in instructor feedback has indeed drawn a great deal of attention from current studies whose emphasis is on comparing such a cutting-edge design of feedback with other common methods, especially teacher written feedback and oral feedback. To start with, there have been a large number of identified advantages that audio-visual feedback displays over written feedback. As highlighted by Morra and Asis (2009), written feedback fundamentally focuses on mechanical surface errors (e.g., grammar, vocabulary, and spelling) and does not provide sufficient details, which results in the feedback being too impersonal, vague, confusing, and time consuming to provide. In contrast, audio-visual feedback is believed to offer teachers a better chance to pay more attention to global issues of students' writing (e.g., content, organization, cohesion, and coherence), apart from its great value in engaging students in revising and editing their writing (Ice, Curtis, Phillips, & Wells, 2007; Jones et al., 2012). Additionally, audio-visual feedback is more individualized and more efficient for generating and delivering detailed comments to students, which promotes students' revised writing (Denton, 2014; Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Merry & Orsmond, 2008; Rodway-Dyer, Dunne, & Newcombe, 2009; Sipple, 2007). Furthermore, audio-visual feedback seems to be

quicker to provide than written feedback with a rough estimate of one minute of giving audio-visual feedback being equivalent to six minutes of producing written feedback (Lunt & Curran, 2010). Moreover, although both oral and audio-visual feedback contribute to heightened levels of students' engagement as well as increased interactions between the teacher and the student during the feedback process, the former is highly associated with dialogic interaction, which requires better communication skills and consumes more time for scheduling and locating face-to face meetings (K. Hyland, 2003). On the contrary, the latter is a monologic form of teacher-student interaction, which saves time for the teacher (Anson et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2012). In addition, while audio-visual feedback provides students with opportunities and advantages of replaying feedback during their revision process (Rotheram, 2009), the oral feedback requires the students to dynamically participate in negotiating for meaning and seriously take note of teacher's comments during the face-to-face conference in order to help them recall, retrieve and apply when revising their papers (Harris, 1986).

Despite its enormous advantages, audio-visual feedback also has some drawbacks. According to (Morra & Asís, 2009), lack of direct interaction with the teacher for meaning negotiation of their written texts could be viewed as one of the major disadvantages. Additionally, audio-visual feedback requires strong listening skills, which sometimes leads students to concentrate on listening to the feedback more for comprehension than for application, making audio-visual feedback somewhat time-consuming and difficult for students to process (Rodway-Dyer et al., 2011). Besides this, a number of technical issues seem to hamper the effectiveness of

audio visual feedback as well. These include sound quality, as well as incompatibility of large files with students' virtual learning systems (e.g., D2L, E-learning, Moodle) (Merry & Orsmond, 2008). From the teacher's perspective, the issue of technical inertia, meaning the unfamiliarity of creating audio-visual feedback, may result in teachers' reluctance to employ this innovative form of instructor feedback in their teaching practices (Cann, 2014).

To date, there has been a growing body of literature on the use and impact of this emerging digital feedback on students' academic writing although most of these studies are typically small scale. For instance, Merry and Orsmond (2008) investigated the effectiveness and feasibility of audio feedback on students' developmental writing within a three-week implementation of feedback in a biology course at Staffordshire University. Data collected from semi-structured interviews with fifteen undergraduate students were qualitatively analyzed to find out students' perception and utilization of audiotaped feedback. In addition, teachers' comments on twelve of the participants' written artifacts from each group who received audio and written feedback, respectively, were classified and quantitatively analyzed. The results showed that students had very positive responses to the audio feedback method, viewing it as an in depth, and more personal commentary in providing strategies for their writing improvement. Despite its constructive outcomes, this pilot study, as acknowledged by the authors, has some limitations including a small size of sampling, and no focus on students' type of writing. Additionally, it was not clear from the description of the research design whether the students were asked to modify and resubmit their revised papers after the feedback was provided. These defects

particularly pertinent to research methodology might contribute to an incomplete understanding of real impacts of audio feedback method on students' writing among researchers and teachers alike.

In a follow-up flow of research on effects of audio-visual feedback, Roy-Dyer et al. (2011) conducted a case study on audio feedback with first-year geography students. The pros and cons of such a technique were explored through data collection and analysis of student questionnaires, focus group and individual interviews, coupled with an examination of the content of feedback, and a stimulated recall interview session with the tutor. The results indicated that when students received audio feedback in their first year of study, their experiences were more likely to be harsh and unfavorable due to their difficulties in adjusting to university academic life. It was thus suggested that various factors such as optimum time, length, style, tone of voice, register of language, and timing should be carefully taken into account when offering audio feedback. Another reason for students' discomfort with audio-only feedback, as pointed out earlier by Roy-Dyer et al. (2009), could be that it lacked visual features pointing to students' textual problems in their writing, which led to a recommendation for applying screen capture video as an alternative medium of audio-visual feedback.

Following such a recommendation, Denton (2014) carried out a case study to investigate the impact of using screen capture feedback on the compositions of 36 undergraduate students in a teacher education course at Seattle Pacific University. Such a study indeed offered more insights into the effectiveness of audio-visual feedback. Data were collected from students' initial and revised submissions,

accompanied with a survey administered after the four-week implementation of the feedback method. The results from quantitative analysis of data revealed the positive effect of audio-visual feedback on students' academic writing performance. The findings also showed that students preferred audio-visual feedback method than the traditional one as it helped them identify the correct and incorrect issues in their writing. In spite of its importance in proving the efficiency of audio-visual feedback on students' revision process, the study still lacks students' actual voices on their experiences with the feedback, which makes the picture of how audio-visual feedback impacts students' writing seem incomplete.

In an attempt to overcome some shortcomings of the previous studies, the recent research done by Rabi (2014) looked into how meaning-focused audio-visual feedback affects young adult Iranian EFL learners' writing motivation. There were one hundred female learners and six English language teachers involved in this qualitative study. The data were gathered through questionnaires, individual interviews, and the learners' composition papers. The research outcomes indicated that the meaning-focused audio-visual feedback not only helped to increase students' motivation to write, but also had influences upon changing their negative attitudes towards writing in order to make more progress in English language learning. One missing piece in this study is that students' own views and their actual experiences with such audio-visual feedback were not explicitly examined or deeply discussed.

In short, notwithstanding several limitations existing in the aforementioned small-scale studies, which made the research findings more indicative than generalizable, such a growing pool of research has provided illuminating glimpses

into the prospective effects of audio-visual feedback, a novel mode of instructor feedback, on students' writing. These studies have especially offered useful guidelines and recommendations for teaching and learning practices in order to address ubiquitous problems related to feedback delivery in writing. Most importantly, since there has been a paucity of research empirically conducted to document the beneficial effects of audio-visual feedback method, further examinations are needed to shed more lights on students' perceptions of and experiences with this form of instructor feedback in academic writing classrooms, as well as how such a mode of instructor feedback will shape multilingual students' compositions. This case study indeed makes an attempt to contribute to this research need.

Student Perceptions of Instructor Feedback

As noted by K. Hyland and Hyland (2006), the effects of instructor feedback are significantly influenced by personal views and attitudes the learners generate from their experiences with the feedback they are given. Accordingly, Amara (2014) emphasizes that exploring students' perceptions of teacher feedback is vital in order to understand students' minds since it reflects what and how students actually think, experience and react to the input they receive within their learning process. Therefore, it is crucial to take a deeper look at student perception and consider its impacts on students' writing in connection with the instructor feedback they have experienced.

Richardson (1996) grouped attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions as a set of mental constructs that "name, define, and describe the structure and content of mental states that are thought to drive a person's actions" (p. 102). In Weaver's (2006) study,

these terms were used interchangeably to investigate students' perceptions of tutors' written responses. Within the scope of this present research, the term "student perception" refers to learners' personal opinions, ideas, responses, and attitudes about the feedback they receive, including issues such as what students understand about specific feedback given to their writing, how they respond to the feedback when receiving it, what they like and dislike about the feedback, how they apply the feedback into their revised papers, and what they think about the effectiveness of each feedback method in improving their writing.

With regard to the impacts of student perception on writing, Schulz (2001) stressed that student perception not only plays a significant role in students' motivation, selection of learning strategies, but also is of great pedagogical values to writing instruction. To be more precise, being aware of students' perceptions of instructor feedback will help teachers understand learners' cultural practices, social identity differences, previous educational backgrounds, and challenges facing their interaction with the feedback. As a result, the teacher can select and apply appropriate feedback types or strategies to meet diverse needs of multilingual or L2 writers (Amara, 2014). In order to better understand student response to instructor feedback with respect to its prominence to learners' writing development, a large body of research has been carried out from different aspects.

One of the most noticeable studies was done by Weaver (2006) to explore student perceptions of tutors' written feedback through a multi-method study. Data collection including survey questionnaire, coupled with open-ended questions, and comment samples, from 44 students majoring in Business, and Art and Design, were

quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed. The results showed that students highly valued the written feedback they received, but were in need of advice on understanding and using the feedback before engaging in the treatment process. Additionally, the content analysis of feedback samples and student responses indicated four main themes regarding pitfalls of feedback, being comprised of general or vague comments, lacking guidance, focusing on negative aspects, and irrelevance to assessment criteria. Weaver's (2006) study in fact spelled out the effectiveness of instructor feedback from students' perspective, accompanied with meaningful implications for future implementations of instructor feedback, especially in terms of taking into account the drawbacks of feedback found in the results. However, since the study limited its scope to only an investigation of one teacher feedback method, namely written feedback, the impacts of various kinds of instructor feedback have been neglected.

To gain an in-depth understanding of student perceptions of feedback, Poulos and Mahony (2008) carried out a qualitative study enabling students to speak for themselves on their attitudes toward the feedback they received, pertaining to their understanding of and preference for the feedback, as well as how they used it. The study involved four focus groups of undergraduate students of differing levels from the Faculty of Health Sciences at University of Sydney. Thematic content analysis resulted in three key dimensions, including perceptions of feedback, impact of feedback and credibility of feedback. A number of factors influencing students' perceptions of feedback effects were also identified, involving modes of feedback, timeliness, and credibility of instructor feedback. One important finding in this

research is that students viewed feedback effective not only in providing information on how to improve assessment marks, but also in offering emotional support and facilitating integration into university. Admittedly, this report study has provided detailed functions of instructor feedback for first year composition students. Therefore, it helps increase a general understanding of the meaning of effective feedback for student learning and progress.

McGrath et al. (2011) paid specific attention to the effectiveness of two types of instructor feedback, namely developed and undeveloped feedback, on students' subsequent writing performance in order to explore the relationship between student feedback perceptions and their writing achievement. Thirty students in an introductory psychology course at a Canadian university participated in this whole research process, involving their completion of a seven-point Likert scale questionnaire and their submission of two writing assignments. The quantitative analysis of all collected data showed that student perceptions of feedback were considerably influenced by the type of feedback they received. Though the findings from this study did not provide statistically significant proof to support the hypothesis that student perceptions of feedback positively correlate with their writing achievement, it has demonstrated a potential trend in which students who positively perceived feedback outperformed their peers who had negative attitudes toward the feedback they received. Together, the results suggest that student feedback perceptions have profound implications on their writing motivation, achievement, and development.

In a recent study, Amara (2014) carried out a qualitative investigation by

using think-aloud protocol approach to deeply understand how L2 learners perceive teacher written feedback. Data were collected from three think-aloud protocol interviews with 15 multilingual students in intermediate and advanced English writing courses at a state university in the Northwest U.S. The transcriptions were then analyzed with the use of NVivo software to find out emerging themes for data interpretations. The results revealed several illuminating aspects in students' perceptions of teacher written feedback. Specifically, students were genuinely interested in teacher positive feedback; however, they complained about some vague marginal comments, which led to misinterpretations of the feedback. The study also noted that students requested writing conferences for more discussions on their writing issues relevant to language use, coherence, organization, and content. Apparently, this study is of a great value on students' explicit opinions about the effect of teacher written feedback. Particularly, the results indicated that the traditional way of giving written feedback through red ink and handwriting seemed unfavorable for students' writing improvement. That is, an additional investigation on a new form of teacher written feedback is needed, especially through the use of electronic track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word program. Furthermore, as acknowledged by the author, more research should be done to compare the effectiveness of teacher written feedback with that of other forms in order to demonstrate impacts of different modes of teacher feedback on students' writing process.

In the same year, McMartin-Miller (2014) added to a growing pool of research on students' perceptions of instructor feedback by investigating students' attitudes

toward two forms of written feedback, namely selective and comprehensive error treatments. The participants included three instructors and 19 multilingual students of a first-year U.S. composition course. A qualitative analysis of the interviews with the student participants revealed that students preferred comprehensive error treatment and overwhelmingly relied on instructor feedback when editing although they were still satisfied with the selective approach. An additional finding in this study showed that what students described about the feedback they received did not always correspond to the description provided by their instructors. Such a mismatch might result from the fact that students lacked a complete understanding of the instructor feedback method, as well as students' insufficient exposure and experience with the feedback received. Therefore, this current case study will delve into investigating not only students' perceptions of instructor feedback, but also their actual experiences with such feedback through analyzing their written artifacts so as to triangulate the research results.

New interests in incorporating technology advancements into writing instruction and providing feedback has resulted in an important, though restricted, pool of studies on students' perceptions of audio-visual feedback. Jones et al. (2012) conducted a case study to examine students' responses to the teacher's use of screen capture digital video feedback in relation to their modified actions. Primary data from questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with target groups, coupled with tutor reflection of using the feedback, were collected for both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The results suggest that although screen capture digital video feedback is monologic and asynchronous, it has great influences on stimulating students'

engagement with the revision process and it possesses numerous advantages over traditional written feedback. Also, the findings indicated that students positively viewed this medium as informative for figuring out the strengths and weaknesses in their writing assignments along with potential ways for improvement. Despite its valuable outcomes though, there are several restrictions emerging from Jones et al.'s (2012) research. First, as mentioned in the study, one half of the student participants received written feedback while the other half experienced video capture files; it was not, however, obviously described in the research design and procedure whether both instructor feedback methods (i.e., written and audio-visual feedback) were actually implemented during the investigation or not. Hence, there might be some doubt about the confirmation of the merits of audio-visual feedback over traditional written feedback within the scope of such an investigation. Second, there was no clear indication that students were required to revise and resubmit their modified texts after the feedback was given, which means that an analysis of students' actual use of the feedback provided was missing. Thus, this current case study will make an attempt to fill such a gap by examining students' practical use of the feedback they receive in their revision so as to offer more evidence on the effect of audio-visual feedback on students' revised papers.

In brief, what can be concluded from the aforementioned review of previous research is that a large number of studies have been conducted to explore students' and teacher's perceptions of instructor feedback; however, their scopes were limited to examining only one single feedback method rather than comparing effects of different teacher feedback methods from the learner perspective. Most noticeably, the

review of previous studies has shown that while research on students' perceptions of audio-visual feedback is relatively scarce, there seems very little to no attention paid to examine students' responses to oral feedback or one-on-one conferences. Despite these facts, a few efforts have recently been made to gain more insights into effects of different instructor feedback methods in various writing contexts.

Impacts of Various Instructor Feedback Methods

In a very early attempt to compare impacts of different instructor feedback methods, Huang (2000) conducted a quantitative study comparing audiotaped feedback with traditional written feedback provided by the teacher-researcher. In this study, 23 EFL students in a sophomore composition class at a Taiwanese university were recruited and their fifth and sixth writing assignments were used for data analysis. Only written feedback was provided on the former writing assignment while the later was associated with a combination of both written and audio-taped feedback. The participants filled out a questionnaire at the end of the academic year to report their perceptions of the two feedback methods they received. The findings from a statistical data analysis argued strongly for the usefulness of audio-taped feedback over written feedback in terms of students' preferences for and the quantity of feedback. However, as acknowledged by the author, because of a limit on the scope of the study, the students' revised papers were not discussed in this research article, which calls for further examination to explore the quality of revision made by students in response to the feedback they receive. Another limitation of Huang's (2000) study is that since the teacher was also the researcher, there might be some influences caused by the author's favorable or biased attitudes toward a specific type

of feedback when implementing it. In order to overcome these shortcomings and to provide a clearer picture of the impact of different types of instructor feedback methods on students' writing, this current case study will be conducted objectively from a non teacher-researcher perspective, and especially with a further inclusion of analyzing students' revised papers apart from the use of open-ended questionnaires and interviews in order to triangulate the research results.

Recently, Cavanaugh and Song (2014) investigated students' and instructors' perceptions of audio commentary and written feedback provided in online composition classes at a large accredited university on the east coast of the United States. The study focused on students' two writing assignments through which students received teacher written comments and audio comments, respectively. Data were collected through surveys and interviews with seven students and four instructors for both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The results revealed that while instructors had mixed feelings about the use of audio feedback, students viewed it positively. In addition, the findings indicated that teachers were likely to provide more global commentary (e.g., ideas, content, and organization) when audio comments were concerned. In contrast, more local commentary (e.g., spelling, grammar, and punctuation) was given when it came to teacher written comments. Lastly, the study suggested that students' preferences for specific feedback, as well as their strategies of engaging in the revising process, were largely based on the mode of the feedback they received. These research outcomes indeed shed light on the effectiveness of two different types of feedback on students' writing in terms of their perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods. One possible

question emerging from this study is whether the results from the research involving participants of a face-to-face composition course, who experience more various teacher feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) will yield the same or different insights into impacts of instructor feedback. This present study will make an attempt to respond to such a concern.

In an effort to strengthen the literature on students' use of different types of instructor feedback, Johnson and Cooke (2014) conducted a quantitative study to explore the relationship between students' three psychoeducational characteristics (i.e., learning modality preference, self-regulated learning, and learning style) and their actual use of the three feedback formats provided by the teacher (i.e., video, audio, and written). Data collected from online surveys were quantitatively analyzed to find out the correlation between these two variables, namely feedback use and student characteristics. The results indicated that there were complex patterns of the relationship between student learning characteristics and their utilization of the three feedback methods. This is because, according to the author, teacher feedback behaviors and student individual identities are the two major elements contributing to the differences in such relationship. Furthermore, the result indicated that there was no one best mode of instructor feedback for students' writing. The problem associated with this research is that its quantitative results cannot be triangulated based on its unique source of survey data. In addition, the students' use of these three feedback methods have not been firmly confirmed due to the fact that there was a lack of data collection and analysis of students' actual writing.

With the same concern about students' views of diverse modes of feedback

given to their writing, Best, Jones-Katz, Smolarek, Stolzenburg, and Williamson (2015) carried out an empirical study about how multilingual students in an advanced academic writing course at University of Wisconsin perceived, responded to, and made meaning of comments and texts on their writing, peer feedback, and one-on-one interactions with their instructors. Through semi-structured interviews with focus groups among 20 undergraduate students, the teacher-researchers found that participants held mixed and often negative reactions to peer feedback, but they positively responded to personal communications with the teachers during conferencing. Most evidently, the value of this study is two-fold. On the one hand, this research offers more evidence on the effectiveness of conferencing as a feedback method from students' perspectives. On the other hand, it provides a better understanding of students' reflections on their own experiences with various types of feedback given to their written texts in an advanced writing class. However, it is believed that the findings might be different if other varying feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, audio-visual feedback) are implemented in a different setting and with different participants, particularly with the less advanced proficiency level multilingual learners in a U.S. first year composition class, who are still adjusting to a new academic learning environment. This is where the current study attempts to contribute in order to bridge such existing gaps in the literature.

In the same year as Best et al.'s (2015) study, Cunningham's (2015) research set out to explore pre-medical students' perceptions of two types of instructor feedback, namely written feedback and audio screencasting, provided on their short written essays. Data collected from this population included a post-course survey of

students' views on different types of feedback they received, along with their written artifacts and the instructor's feedback comments. The qualitative and quantitative analyses of such collected data highlighted the importance and the need for using audio screencast feedback in encouraging and engaging students' writing. Additionally, the results revealed that students expressed preferences for audio screencasting, but showed their strongest preference for a combination of both written and audio screencast feedback. Drawing on these significant findings, it is suggested that instructors should implement and provide different feedback formats as well as combinations of feedback types on students' writing with a deep consideration of learning styles, learning situations, learning environment, learning goals, and learning objectives. Despite its significance in providing insights into students' perceptions of both traditional written feedback and audio screencast feedback, coupled with students' performance in writing when exposed to these types of feedback, there exists one noticeable limitation in the design of this research. Specifically, the study focused on participants whose first language is English, which raises a question about the research finding on a shift to those whose native language is not English. Therefore, it is believed that fully or partially replicating this study with multilingual learners could provide a more comprehensive picture about effects of various instructor feedback methods from student perspectives.

Most recently, Morris and Chikwa (2016) examined learners' preference for instructor feedback types and the impact of audio and written feedback formats on their academic performance in subsequent assignments. This experimental study involved 68 student participants divided into either audio or written feedback group.

Data collection and analysis included students' results obtained in the second assignment after the feedback was given to their first assignment, accompanied with an online questionnaire survey focusing on students' views of the mode of feedback received. The findings revealed that there was no impact of the type of feedback on students' grades in their subsequent assignments. Additionally, although students generally had positive attitudes towards audio feedback, they showed a stronger preference for written feedback in future assignments. Notwithstanding the importance of this research to understanding learner perceptions of various instructor feedback methods, it still reveals several weaknesses. First, as acknowledged by the author, the use of semi-structured interviews would help to articulate students' perception in greater depth than online surveys. Second, a question raised from Morris and Chikwa's (2016) study is that how the research results would be if students were not divided into different feedback groups, but experienced varied instructor feedback methods themselves and were asked to revise their papers based on the feedback received.

Although the previous studies have greatly contributed to researchers' and teachers' knowledge about the significance of instructor feedback as well as the student's views of the feedback given to their writing, several aspects related to instructor feedback methods have been left under-researched. First and foremost, research on students' responses to different forms of instructor feedback remains sparse, especially with very little focus on oral feedback in relation to other instructor feedback forms. Therefore, the current study would make an attempt to reinforce the literature by investigating three instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and

audio-visual feedback) provided in a U.S. first-year composition class. One important point is that the written feedback method described in this case study would not follow a traditional way of marking students' papers with red ink and handwriting, but be offered in an electronic manner through the use of track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word program. Second, it is evident from the review of the previous studies that very few investigations have been conducted to examine multilingual writers' perceptions of and experiences with various instructor feedback methods, as well as what individual students actually do with instructor feedback. In an effort to bridge this gap, the present research would focus on multilingual learners as the primary source of sampling to explore how they respond to and apply the feedback methods received. Last but not least, most of the previous studies seemed to experience several shortcomings in their research design, which resulted in the findings that could hardly be triangulated due to a lack of multiple sources of data collection and analysis. This current study set out to gain a deeper understanding of students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback by collecting various data from the student participants, including open-ended questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and students' written artifacts so as to triangulate the research outcomes. In addition, a qualitative approach has been chosen to enable students to speak for themselves on their perceptions of and experiences with the three various modes of instructor feedback received in their composition class. The following chapter will provide more details about the methodology utilized in this case study.

Chapter III

Methodology

Research Design

The purpose of this study is to better understand multilingual learners' perceptions of and experiences with different instructor feedback methods in a U.S. first-year composition class. In effect, exploring the attitudes and the experiences multilingual writers have with instructor feedback will provide teachers and researchers with richer insights into the appropriateness and effectiveness of the feedback given to students' writing. It is argued that a qualitative method could be useful to respond to such a research aim because it focuses on examining the intricate details of a certain phenomenon pertaining to feelings, emotions, thinking processes, and interactions among people (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Hence, a qualitative approach was employed in this present research in order to investigate students' responses to and experiences with various instructor feedback methods as well as how the feedback influenced their writing revisions.

To be more specific, the design of this study is typically a case study embedded in the qualitative methodology. According to Nunan and Bailey (2009), one of the principal advantages of case studies is that they are strong in reality, which represents multiple viewpoints to support alternative interpretations. In addition, case studies allow researchers to focus on the particularity and complexity of a single case in rich contextualization (Dörnyei, 2007; Mackey & Gass, 2005). Based on such benefits, a case study is believed to fit well into the scope of this current research, which centralizes its investigation into multilingual learners' perceptions of and

experiences with the three instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) provided in their U.S. first-year composition class.

Research Setting

The study was conducted during the Fall 2016 semester when participants were enrolled in a multilingual section of English 101 (ENG 101) Composition, a first-year composition class at a Midwestern state university in the U.S. According to the general course description, ENG 101 aims at helping students develop a flexible writing process, practice rhetorical awareness, read critically to support their writing, research effectively, represent others' ideas in multiple ways, reflect on their writing practices, and polish their work (MNSU 2016-2017 Undergraduate Catalog).

As one of the aims of English 101 is to develop student revision processes, the participants were asked to write multiple drafts of their essays, with an average of three drafts per essay. More precisely, during the ENG 101 classes, the students were assigned to complete four writing assignments. Three of them (i.e., narrative essay, argumentative essay, and research essay) were closely connected with the three instructor feedback methods provided (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback). Thus, these three compositions along with the three types of instructor feedback provided were referenced as the main sources of data collection within this investigation. Although the order to implement each feedback method varied between the two investigated classes, depending on the class syllabus design as well as the instructor's personal preferences, it is believed that such a difference would not influence the scope of this current study which focuses on students' responses to and experiences with the feedback received. Accordingly, the specific information

relevant to the implementation of each feedback method from the instructor perspective will not be discussed further in this case study.

Participants

Students in two ENG 101 classes were invited to participate in this study through a recruitment process in which the researcher visited with potential participants in each class at the start of the semester to introduce the study, review and collect the consent forms, and answer any questions (see Appendix A for more information on the student consent form). The participant population of this study falls into the category of convenient or purposeful sampling (Dörnyei, 2007). This is because members of the target population were selected based on certain key characteristics, which highly supported the purpose of this case study investigation (e.g., being multilingual writers in ENG 101, experiencing three different instructor feedback methods in a U.S. first year composition class, including written, oral, and audio-visual feedback). After the recruitment meeting, 14 students consented to participate in the research study. However, within the sixteen-week study, only two of the consenting participants completed the whole data collection process, which was composed of completing three open-ended questionnaires, joining a face-to-face interview, and sharing their written artifacts from the course. Due to the attrition of the participating students, this present research looked specifically at data analysis and data interpretation for the two cases in order to gain a deeper understanding of the individual participants' perceptions of and experiences with the three instructor feedback methods received in their U.S. first-year composition classes, was well as the impact of these feedback methods on their revised papers.

The two participants who finally took part in this case study included one male and one female students. Pseudonyms, Puran and Rita, respectively, were used for both the participants in this case study. Both of them are multilingual learners with English being their second language. Puran is 23 years old, from Nepal, and has been studying English for approximately twenty years. His first language is Nepali while English and Hindi are his second languages. Rita is 17 years old, from Nigeria and has been formally learning English for roughly 14 years. She speaks Urhobo as her first language. English and Esako are her second languages. At the time of data collection, Puran has been in U.S. for about eleven months whereas Rita has been in U.S. for five months. To enroll in ENG 101, their English proficiency satisfied the course requirement with a Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) score of 89 or above (internet-based-iBT) or 575 or above (paper-based-PBT), or an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of 6.5 or above. That is, their general English proficiency level was upper-intermediate. A summary of the participants' demographic information is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1.

Demographics of the Student Participants

Name	Age	Gender	Home country	L1(s)	L2(s)	Years of studying English	Length of stay in U.S.
Rita	17	female	Nigeria	Urhobo	Esako English	14	5 months
Puran	23	male	Nepal	Nepali	English Hindi	20	11 months

Data Collection Procedure

In order to triangulate the research results on students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods, data was collected from three sources, including three open-ended questionnaires, a thirty-minute recorded interview with each participant, and students' written artifacts from their ENG 101 classes. The three questionnaires (see Appendices B, C, and D) were designed to collect data related to students' attitudes toward and experiences with the three instructor feedback types received in ENG 101. Each questionnaire contained six open-ended items asking students about their understanding of the feedback they received, their reaction to the feedback, their likes and dislikes of the feedback, their application of the feedback to their revision, and their evaluation of the effectiveness of the feedback received. As for the interview, one-on-one, semi-structured interviews (see Appendix E for sample interview questions) were employed to gain deeper insights into students' individual perceptions of and experiences with the instructor feedback formats received. The collection of students' written artifacts (e.g., outlines, first drafts, second drafts, and final drafts related to the three writing assignments) helped to strengthen the evidence on how the instructor feedback methods impacted students' writing, as well as how students actually applied the feedback received in revising their writing.

The procedure of data collection followed several steps. First of all, based on the syllabi of the two ENG 101 classes, each of the three open-ended questionnaires was sent individually to the participants who consented to participate in this study via their MavMail after they submitted their final drafts of each writing assignment. At the end of the semester course, each of the participants received an email inviting him

or her to take part in a thirty-minute recorded interview with the researcher. Upon the completion of the one-on-one semi-structured interview, the participants were asked to share the written artifacts of their three ENG 101 essays.

Data Analysis and Organization

In order to proceed the data analysis, the audio-recorded interviews were manually transcribed. Then, all the data collected from the open-ended questionnaires and the transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews were analyzed qualitatively by using NVivo software program to code and organize the data into themes and categories. Particularly, the thematic analysis model proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006) was used to code such qualitative data. This analysis approach consists of six major phases. The process starts with familiarizing with data, which includes transcribing data, reading and rereading the data, and noting down initial ideas. In the second phase, generating initial codes, the focus is on coding emergent features of the data systematically throughout the entire data set and collating data relevant to each code. When it comes to phase three, searching for themes, the emphasis is about collating codes into potential themes, and gathering all data relevant to each potential theme. This is followed by reviewing themes which are related to whether the themes work in tandem with the coded extracts and the entire data set in order to generate a thematic map. The next step involves generating clear definitions and names for each theme. The endpoint is the reporting of the content and meaning of themes in the data. Drawing on Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis approach, four critical themes emerged from the qualitative data analysis in this case study: (1) students' introduction of experiences with feedback, (2) students' various attitudes towards

feedback, (3) students' applications of feedback, and (4) various impacts of feedback.

After the data obtained from the questionnaires and the interviews had been qualitatively analyzed to identify emergent themes, students' written artifacts were carefully examined to find out how the instructor feedback methods actually influenced students' writing as well as how students revised their papers based on the feedback they received. To be more precise, students' drafts, which were provided with instructor feedback, were compared with their revised drafts after the feedback was given so as to explore which revision had been made and how successful these had been. Through this process, certain thematic patterns began to emerge. Following the suggestions from Goldstein and Conrad's (1990) study, emerging themes from students' revisions in this case study were categorized into completely successful revision, considerably successful revision, and little successful revision, with completely successful revisions referring to students' full improvement and resolution of the major writing problems pointed out through the feedback received, considerably successful revision demonstrating a majority of students' improvement and resolution of the main writing problems, and little successful revision indicating a small portion of their improvement and resolution of the main writing problems in their essays.

Limitations of the Research

As with any case study, there exists several limitations within the scope of this current research. First, attrition or the loss of subjects from the sample is one of the biggest issues challenging the sufficiency of data for a case study (Nunan & Bailey, 2009). In fact, this present study began with fourteen students who consented to

participate in the investigation; however, after a sixteen-week period of data collection, only two of them recruited from two English 101 classes followed the whole data collection process (i.e., returned three open-ended questionnaires sent to their Mavmail, took part in a thirty-minute recorded interview, and shared their written artifacts). It is believed that without the attrition, there would be more voices from the multilingual population to intensify the research results on the effects of various instructor feedback methods provided on students' writing. Second, the restricted sample size of this study limits its generalizability but not its transferability. Through thick, rich descriptions of a shared experience (i.e., students receiving instructor feedback from various methods), readers will be able to make applications to their contexts. Finally, the participants in this study were likely to have a variety of student individual characteristics when reporting their perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods in their U.S. first year composition classes, particularly in terms of their prior experiences with instructor feedback, learning styles, personal preferences for feedback, as well as their motivation levels. Although these factors go beyond the scope of this current investigation, it is worth noting that further research on the relationship between students' personal differences and their use of feedback provided in practice would provide a more comprehensive picture of the impact of instructor feedback on students' writing.

In summary, the methodology of this case study was specifically designed to seek answers for the research questions regarding multilingual learners' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods in a U.S. first-year composition class. Data collected from the two consenting students included three open-ended

questionnaires, a thirty-minute recorded interview with each participant, and their written artifacts from three ENG 101 essays. A qualitative analysis of the questionnaire and interview data supported by the NVivo software program resulted in four major themes, including students' introduction of their experiences with feedback, students' various attitudes towards feedback, students' applications of feedback, and various impacts of feedback. Additionally, a comparison of students' original drafts with their revised papers produced three critical emergent themes, consisting of students' completely successful revision, considerably successful revision, and little successful revision. The following chapter will present such research results in more detail.

Chapter IV

Results

Emergent Themes from Questionnaires and Interview Data

A qualitative analysis of the data collected from both open-ended questionnaires and individual interviews have resulted in four major emergent themes, including students' introduction of experiences with instructor feedback, students' various attitudes toward instructor feedback, students' applications of instructor feedback, and various impacts of instructor feedback. Each of these broad themes will be presented with students' general views about the issue being addressed, followed by their specific responses to three sub-themes exhibiting the three instructor feedback methods provided (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback). Students' quotations taken from the questionnaires and interview data will be cited to demonstrate and explain how students perceived and experienced the instructor feedback received in their first-year composition classes.

Students' introduction of experiences with instructor feedback. These experiences were included, but not limited to students' prior experiences with instructor feedback as well as their understanding of and experiences with the three current instructor feedback methods received in ENG 101. With regard to students' previous experiences with instructor feedback, both the participants shared the same voices in that prior to their ENG 101 class in U.S., they had not been exposed to many different types of instructor feedback. Rita recalled her experiences with instructor feedback in high school when she said, "The teacher just picked out like the common everybody had to explain to the class. And I did expect that he actually gave feedback

like here in university" (Interview, Appendix E). Likewise, Puran indicated in the interview, "It is not like that kind of feedback we have now. They gave the verbal feedback, the oral feedback" (Interview, Appendix E). It is evident from the students' sharing that prior to the U.S. first-year composition class, their experiences with instructor feedback had been restricted to not only the mode of feedback received, but also the amount of feedback involved. In particular, although both the participants agreed that at the beginning of their ENG 101 classes, they had received generally explicit instruction on how different instructor feedback methods would be provided within their first-year composition classes, the results of data analysis showed that the participants' experiences with each instructor feedback method (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) seemed to vary.

To be more precise, in reference to students' understanding of and experiences with the written feedback in ENG 101, Rita reported how the feedback was given to her writing: "[The teacher] highlighted some places with issues and wrote short comment notes and what was supposed to be, and that's what I had to meet for my final draft essay" (Interview, Appendix E). In the same vein, Puran described how such feedback was provided on his essay when he said, "He highlighted already my mistakes and words to be changed...and also put a suggestion which will help in my writing" (Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). Then, in his follow-up interview, Puran added more details: "[The teacher] gave the feedback on the paper itself. He submitted it on the D2L, we need to look at that" (Interview, Appendix E). As a whole, although both the students were from two different composition classes, they had quite similar experiences with the written feedback. This could be due to the fact

that both instructors had gone through the same teaching assistant training session on how to apply such a feedback format into their writing classrooms. More specifically, the two participants admitted that the instructors pointed out the problematic issues of their writing by highlighting and adding suggestions along with changed words to such problematic texts through the use of track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word program before the writing was returned to them for revision.

Moving onto the participants' experiences with oral feedback, Rita wrote in her questionnaire with a detailed description of how this form of instructor feedback looked:

> My instructor made us schedule a time among the list of time slots she provided, that can fit in with our schedule. She asked for the reference list, tried to go through the essay and explained what I did right or what I did wrong and how I could make it better. She also answered questions that I had and she explained what she wanted for my essay. (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C)

Rita then elaborated in her interview to show her preferences for this type of instructor feedback:

> We met one-on-one. She looked through my paper and I could share my ideas with her at that time and not like wait for her to give me feedback and I meet her in class or office hours. She answered my questions at that time...I did take notes. And maybe if she like suggested something I was not comfortable with… I asked and told her I was not comfortable with this and how I can do it the other ways. (Interview, Appendix E)

While Rita had an elaborate sharing of how she was exposed to the oral feedback, Puran's experience with this instructor feedback method seemed simple, though concise when he said, "He gave us verbal feedback...We had a face-to-face conversation...I took notes about his feedback" (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). In general, despite their various ways of expressing their experiences with the oral feedback received, both the participants showed their understandings of this instructor feedback by pointing out its key characteristics, featured in its one-on-one conversations, coupled with direct and immediate negotiations between the student and the teacher, which requires students' note-taking skills in order to retrieve the information needed for their revisions.

With regard to students' experiences with audio-visual feedback, there were insightful descriptions between the two participants. Rita noted her experiences with this feedback in her questionnaire: "[The teacher] made a clip where I could hear her speak and be able to see my work. She spoke on each paragraph stating if I made a good point or not...she was using the mouse pointer to show exactly where I am supposed to work more on" (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D). Similarly, Puran positively described how he experienced this mode of instructor feedback:

> He gave me feedback by recording the screen video...he asked me for permission to record...he told me everything about that program, the software, and everything and explained it...he's gonna show off with the pointer and he's gonna explain everything by highlighting that or whatever the things he's gonna say that...he gave the feedback and posted it on the D2L…We have to check on the internet and download it. (Interview, Appendix E)

Based on the participants' detailed descriptions of what the audio-visual feedback looked like, deriving from their exposure to the feedback received, it has shown that both of them had a shared understanding of and rich experiences with this innovative feedback method. Particularly, they both highlighted its typical features in providing asynchronous feedback on their writing. Most noticeably, this type of instructor feedback was acknowledged by its simultaneous sight and hearing functions through which the students could view the feedback on their electronic devices while the pointer indicated their writing problems, accompanied with the teacher's voices in explaining such problematic texts.

In sum, both the students had hands-on experiences with the three instructor feedback methods provided in their first-year composition classes. However, based on their more detailed descriptions of oral and audio-visual feedback, it was more likely that the students paid more attention to these two alternative modes of instructor feedback than the written one within their experiences. The plausible reason for such an inclination could be that oral and visual feedback methods seemed novel, but impressive to the students as already indicated in their experiences with instructor feedback, which captured their concrete recollections. Evidently, although the information on students' experiences with instructor feedback methods has provided a clear picture of how instructor feedback looked and its interactions with students' writing, it is argued that a better understanding of these feedback methods might be further reinforced if students' specific reactions to such types of feedback were included. Thus, the focus is now turned into how students reacted to and perceived the instructor feedback they received.

Students' various attitudes towards instructor feedback. By and large, the two students had relatively positive attitudes towards all three instructor feedback methods provided on their writing. Rita voiced in the interview: "In general, all three feedback methods are clear" (Interview, Appendix E). This view was echoed by Puran in his follow-up interview as well when he said, "Everything, every time he gave feedback. It was very good for me" (Interview, Appendix E). Despite their generally positive responses to all the three instructor feedback methods received, their views on each type of instructor feedback varied greatly.

Apparently, among these three types of instructor feedback, the written feedback appeared to be the students' least preferred. In fact, the two participants showed their both favorable and unfavorable stances on this instructor feedback. In response to the questionnaire, Rita wrote, "I felt relieved...when I got the feedback. It wasn't as bad as my friend claimed...I liked that she was able to state my mistakes nicely compared to some of my former English teachers and I was able to understand and fix the mistakes I made easily" (Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). To put it another way, the main reason for Rita's positive attitudes towards written feedback is that it was understandable, and encouraging, which facilitated her in fixing her writing problems more easily in comparison with the ones provided by her previous teachers. Thus, it can be inferred that teachers' styles and personalities in offering feedback could contribute to how students respond to the feedback they receive. Puran liked written feedback because as he said, "This feedback was more intense and helped me to find my mistake easily rather than finding by myself...it is already highlighted and it also saves my time" (Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). It is clear from the comments

of both the participants that their positive attitudes toward the written feedback generally originated from a number of its merits as already noted. However, there were several drawbacks associated with the written feedback, which led to the participants' negative views on such instructor feedback. In the interview, Rita highlighted some weaknesses of the written feedback she received when she stated, "Written feedback was sort of upsetting...Because I saw some highlighted places with small notes. Maybe sad. I thought that I wrote a good essay but I got lots of highlights and notes" (Interview, Appendix E). Besides her discomfort with so many highlighted parts and notes on her returned writing, Rita also agreed that written feedback prevented students from directly interacting with their instructor as well as from appropriately interpreting what the instructor meant by their written comments. Likewise, Puran commented in his interview:

> He writes about that and sometimes we don't understand what he writes. We want the explanation more about what comments are about. So, it was kind of sometimes challenging to overcome what he says about that and figure out what he means and what we have to do. That's the biggest challenge that I have had. (Interview, Appendix E)

Overall, both the participants reached some common ground in their perceptions of written feedback. Although they both perceived that written feedback was useful in helping them figure out and fix several problems of their writing, they admitted that this type of instructor feedback was not clear enough to fully compensate their success in revising their papers. Such a concern indeed led Rita to a strong suggestion regarding how to make instructor written feedback more effective

to students. In her interview, Rita proposed, “If you are gonna still stick with the written feedback, I prefer like it should be more explanatory because I see most students have issues that they don’t understand what it was. It should be more explanatory in the essay and in class too” (Interview, Appendix E). Her specific suggestion, on the one hand, revealed the nature of written feedback, irrespective of the format being provided, either in the traditional form of red ink and handwriting or in an alternative form of using track changes and comments, is inherently ambiguous due to its lack of direct interaction between the writer and the reader. On the other hand, Rita’s proposal is of great significance to pedagogical implications of L2 writing instruction, especially in terms of considering providing more detailed explanations on students’ writing through written feedback.

With respect to students’ attitudes towards oral feedback, both the participants had good impressions of this mode of instructor feedback although their views tended to draw on different aspects. For Rita, oral feedback was the one she liked best and hoped to receive in the future, not only because of its clarity as she commented, “I was satisfied. I understood what I was supposed to do and what not to do compared to the written feedback” (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C), but also because of its direct, immediate, and interactive response when she said, “I was able to meet her one-on-one and show her my work directly. I liked it because I was able to state my point and get immediate answer to the question I had” (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). Puran’s reaction to oral feedback was similar in that he received interactive and direct feedback. He wrote in his questionnaire: “The main reason I liked this method is we can have face to face conversation and can directly ask questions to our instructor,

which was much more clear and understanding...It helped me a lot with which I can look at my mistake and can correct it" (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). Notwithstanding his satisfactions with the oral feedback received, Puran pointed out the downside of this feedback method in that it was easy to forget what the instructor commented about the student's writing. Specifically, in his follow-up interview, Puran provided more details about why he did not really like this feedback:

> As in a conference, we write the feedback...sometimes we lose our paper...sometimes we forgot because we have a lot of things to do and we forgot each of important points and we have to go to the writing center and it also consumes time and we don't have that much time. (Interview, Appendix E)

In short, as supported by the two students in this case study, oral feedback is a good and satisfactory method of instructor feedback because it offers direct, immediate, and interactive responses which are clearer and more understandable than the written feedback method. However, the challenge with oral feedback is that it requires students' careful attention to as well as their good note-taking skills of the feedback verbally provided on their writing. Otherwise, it will be time consuming to retrieve the important points highlighted during the teacher-student conference, or students have to seek for help from different sources (e.g., friends, tutors, writing centers) when their revisions are involved.

Regarding students' attitudes towards audio-visual feedback, both students showed their highly positive reactions to this instructor feedback type. To be more specific, Rita had a strong preference for audio-visual feedback because she could

hear her instructor's voice and see her writing at the same time. Rita commented in her questionnaire: "I was able to see my essay and I felt that she was just sitting in front of me and telling me exactly what to do" (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D). She also noted its superior advantage to other feedback methods she received by saying, "It is more explanatory than the other types of feedback" (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D). In a more enthusiastic way, Puran expressed that audio-visual feedback was the method he liked best and wished to receive in the future. His highly favorable attitudes towards audio-visual feedback were confirmed in the interview:

> I was very very much impressed about this method. And audio-visual I think is one of the best methods I have ever seen. It is very good for the students...It saves time...This is also the method for students that I definitely recommend all instructors to apply. (Interview, Appendix E)

Talking about the benefits of this innovative feedback method, Puran constantly and positively pointed out a range of its merits. First and foremost, audio-visual feedback was convenient and time-saving to access and retrieve as Puran noted, "I can go anywhere and access it anytime, it saves time. I don't have to go home and check out my previous paper or something like that. I don't have to carry all my things, I can use my mobile phone to see that also" (Interview, Appendix E). Most importantly, Puran appreciated its multiple functions in facilitating students' writing, particularly when revising their writing. He emphasized, "The most important thing is that you can look at and listen at the same time...I can pause it and look at that and again do that. So, I don't have to go back and forth and it was complete for my first time" (Interview, Appendix E). In addition, audio-visual

feedback was not only clear and comprehensive, but also helpful in reducing information load for students, especially for multilingual writers. Puran continuously elaborated in his interview:

> In the audio-visual, he's gonna show off with the pointer and he's gonna explain everything by highlighting that or whatever the things he's gonna say about that. And it would be more easier for the students to understand as for the students of ESL [English as a second language]...If you click there…the audio-visual, bump, you don't have to remember anything. That's the best point. (Interview, Appendix E)

Despite the participants' strong satisfactions with audio-visual feedback, both of them came up with some concerns about a few pitfalls associated with the use of this alternative feedback method. Puran cared about its confidentiality, stating in the questionnaire: "As long as it is confidential, then I do not have any problems" (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D), whereas Rita was more concerned about technical issues. She reported, "When she changed it into audio feedback, it was not very clear and most students could not get it because of some issues related to computers" (Interview, Appendix E). These two comments are indeed of paramount significance to the pedagogy of L2 writing instruction, making L2 writing instructors aware of what should be taken into account when implementing audio-visual feedback into their classroom so as to minimize any risks involved and at the same time best serve diverse needs of multilingual writers. In order to gain further comprehensive insight into the effects of instructor feedback methods on students' writing, attention is currently paid to how multilingual learners apply the instructor feedback received into

their revision process.

Students' applications of instructor feedback. Overall, both the participants shared that when revising their papers, they had to review the feedback received. However, the process each of them went through was differing not only in terms of their individual preferences, but also with regard to each type of instructor feedback method provided on their writing. Generally, Rita read the whole paper after receiving written feedback; alternatively, she just read the short notes when revising her papers related to oral feedback and audio-visual feedback. The reason for this, as explained in her interview, is that she was not really interested in the subject of writing, but felt more comfortable with her speaking. Clearly, Rita stated, "I did not really like the subject. But I need to like it. So, I just wanted to get it done" (Interview, Appendix E). Conversely, Puran shared that during the revision process, he had to see the paper all the way through from the top to bottom twice or three times after receiving written feedback and oral feedback. This was, however, not the case for the audio-visual feedback when he said, "I don't have to go back and forth and it was complete for my first time" (Interview, Appendix E). Drawing on the participants' general comments, it is obvious that they underwent different processes of revising their papers based on the feedback received. Literally, a closer look at the participants' detailed reflection on how they applied each type of instructor feedback methods into revisions would reveal a richer understanding of students' use of the instructor feedback methods provided in their composition classes.

As for written feedback, Rita did not supply a lot of explicit details of how she revised her paper, except for the fact that she read the entire draft containing

numerous highlighted sentences along with short notes and suggestions. In a more overt manner, Puran described how he revised his paper based on the written feedback received: “He highlighted already my mistakes and words to be changed. So, according to his suggestions I did my revision” (Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). However, as indicated in his interview, Puran had to read the draft two or three times to make clear what he needed to revise. In reference to oral feedback, Rita revised her draft by reading the short notes taken from the face-to-face conference with her instructor. Likewise, Puran remarked in his questionnaire, echoing Rita’s response: “I took notes about the feedback which helped me a lot to correct my essay when revising” (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). Further evidence was indeed found in the participants’ descriptions of their applications of audio-visual feedback. Rita cautiously reported how she revised her paper on the basis of the audio-visual feedback provided by first turning on the audio-visual file and looking through it, then she said, “I marked the place she pointed that I needed more work and used some of the things she said to develop my essay” (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D). Similarly, in the follow-up interview, Puran clarified the way he worked on his revised paper: “By reviewing my video and according to his voice recording, it is clear and hence I can write easily...I can just listen and I can see the visual...I can pause it...and it was complete for my first time” (Interview, Appendix E).

Based on the participants’ reflections on their utilization of instructor feedback, it seemed that they strictly follow their instructor’s comments and suggestions. This fact was indeed supported by their confession of carefully reviewing the feedback received, either through reading notes, scanning their entire

paper or listening to the recording feedback file in order to identify and recall what they had to work on when revising their papers. Whether students' applications of the instructor feedback methods had positive or negative impacts on their writing, such a concern gives more attention to the following section which addresses the influences of instructor feedback.

Various impacts of instructor feedback. In general, both the participants had relatively positive perceptions of impacts of the instructor feedback methods provided on their writing. Specifically, Rita gave a brief answer on how instructor feedback generally affected her revision by stating, "It was a little bit better" (Interview, Appendix E). In contrast, Puran offered a more confident and informative response: "It was much more better...everything like grammar, organization, content, and ideas" (Interview, Appendix E). He also shared that instructor feedback helped him overcome his problems with chronological process, grammar, and the APA format. More importantly, Puran firmly asserted, "I was very confused about that and he clarified me. Now, I can do my things" (Interview, Appendix E). What can be inferred from his statement is that instructor feedback helped students, especially multilingual learners develop their independent skills, to a large extent on identifying, understanding, and fixing problems on their own. However, as a matter of fact, there were variations in how each type of instructor feedback impacted students' writing.

To start with written feedback, Rita commented on its effects on her writing with specified explanations: "The feedback helped my essay a bit because I was able to find most of my weak points in essay writing and it is helping me in the critical analysis essay...I was able to understand and fix the mistakes I made easily"

(Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). A quite similar view was found in Puran's response to the questionnaire, stating that written feedback helped him improve his writing skills. The reason for this claim was further elaborated in his follow-up interview, "The written feedback helps me to find my mistake easily rather than myself because it is already highlighted...And he also puts a suggestion, so it is helpful for my study and my writing skills" (Interview, Appendix E). Although both the participants generally agreed on the effectiveness of written feedback on their revision, they also pointed out some negative sides of this feedback method. Rita claimed in her interview that written feedback made her feel most dependent on her instructor because she sometimes found it unclear to comprehend what the instructor meant through the highlighted parts and notes on her paper, which led her to suggest, "It should be more explanatory in the essay and in class, too" (Interview, Appendix E) if the written feedback was supposed to be continuously used in providing feedback on students' writing. In the same vein, Puran complained in his interview, as previously indicated, "He writes about that and sometimes we don't understand what he writes. We want the explanation more about what comments are about" (Interview, Appendix E). Together, what can be deduced from the participants' views about the impacts of written feedback on their writing is that although written feedback usually helped students notice their writing problems and revise their papers better, based on highlighted texts along with suggested notes and changed words, such a process might lead students to being dependent writers due to its frequently explicit correction accompanied with its intrinsic nature of teachers' obscure comments on students' writing.

Regarding the impacts of oral feedback on students' writing, there seemed to be different views between the two participants. Rita tended to hold the most positive stance on the effects of one-on-one conference. For her, oral feedback was the most beneficial method to her revision process, which helped her feel most independent, revise the paper much better, and increase her engagement level in writing. This is because, as Rita previously explained in her questionnaire and follow-up interview, she could get immediate answers to the questions she posed and at the same time she could share her ideas with the instructor during the one-on-one conference. Specifically, Rita clarified how the oral feedback meant to her revision: "She goes through the essay and explains what I did right or what I did wrong and how I can make it better...She explained what she wanted for my essay...which is very nice" (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). Although Puran admitted the merit of oral feedback to his revision when saying, "It helped me a lot with which I can look at my mistakes and can correct it." (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C), he felt that this form of instructor feedback made him most dependent on his instructor. In his interview, Puran explained how he relied on the instructor when receiving oral feedback:

> Sometimes I forgot the things and I have to go to search and have to email him 'I forgot this one sir, can you please explain me'. I think I'm disturbing his time also. And I'm disturbing my time also. I think I am much more dependent on that time. (Interview, Appendix E)

On the whole, despite having quite opposite views about the impacts of oral feedback on writing, both the participants concurred that this instructor feedback method helped them a lot with their revision, especially with clear explanations and

immediate responses resulted from teacher-student negotiations during the conference. Their stances on being dependent and independent writers under the influence of oral feedback were varied due to their personal preferences and different interpretations. While Rita considered voicing herself during the conference as a sign of having independence in opting for what should be revised, Puran regarded disturbing teacher's time as an act of heavily relying on the instructor to get the paper revised.

As far as the impact of audio-visual feedback is concerned, both the students had highly favorable responses to its effects on their writing. Rita acknowledged that audio-visual feedback helped her gain the most improvement in her writing. She gave detailed explanations for such a claim in her questionnaire: "It is more explanatory than the other type of feedback...Most of her response was like a tip that did not just help my essay but gave me some points that I later use to improve my essay" (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D). In a more positive manner, Puran admitted that audio-visual feedback was the most beneficial instructor feedback method, which made him feel most independent, most engaged in the writing and revision process. In his follow-up interview, Puran elaborated his admission in great detail:

> I got very much motivations than other methods with audio-visual. It makes me confident. 'Yeah, I can do it right now'...because it is clear and one thing is that we can see our mistakes easily and correct it immediately. (Interview, Appendix E)

He also made a meaningful comparison, stating in the interview, "Doing, writing, and listening make the man perfect. And all the three qualities are seen in the

audio-visual feedback...in that I see there, listen there and write also, and I can remember as my all time" (Interview, Appendix E).

In brief, it is noticeable from the participants' responses that all three types of instructor feedback were helpful for their writing, especially for their revision; however, the rate of their impacts was varying among the three feedback methods. Although Rita admitted the effects of written feedback on helping her figure out weaknesses in her essay, understand and fix the mistakes easily, she confessed that such a mode of instructor feedback made her feel most dependent as a writer. For her, oral feedback was the most beneficial method, which resulted in her most independence and engagement with her writing. Conversely, while Puran expected more explanations from written feedback because of its ambiguous comments, he felt that oral feedback led him to be more dependent on his instructor's time. Hence, he perceived audio-visual feedback as the most effective type of instructor feedback, which provided him with the most motivation and independence to engage in his revision process.

Apparently, the qualitative analyses of questionnaires and interview data have offered a great deal of insight into the students' perceptions of and experiences with the instructor feedback methods provided in their first-year composition classes. The attention is now moved onto how these feedback methods realistically impacted the participants' revised papers. Accordingly, the following section will present the findings of analyzing students' written artifacts to find out how successful their revision processes were, based on the feedback they received.

Thematic Patterns of Students' Practical Revisions of their Writing

A comparison of students' original drafts with their revised papers based on the feedback provided resulted in the three major emergent themes, including students' completely successful revision, considerably successful revision, and little successful revision, with completely successful revision referring to students' full improvement and resolution of all main writing problems pointed out through the feedback received, considerably successful revision demonstrating a majority of students' improvement and resolution of the main writing problems, while little successful revision showing a small portion of their improvement and resolution of the main writing problems in their essays. Such a closer look at students' written artifacts indeed illustrated how each type of instructor feedback methods influenced their writing, as well as how students practically applied each feedback method into their revisions.

In terms of written feedback, the comparison revealed various degrees of improvement in the revised papers of the two participants as shown in Table 2.1 and Table 2.2 below.

Table 2.1

A Comparison of Rita's Drafts Based on Written Feedback Received

Writing elements	Before feedback	After feedback
Lexical items	- Wrong word and phrase choices (e.g., well-tared roads; having that taught)	- Correct word and phrase choices (e.g., well-paved roads; having the belief)
Grammar	- Sentence fragment (e.g., Since there was a little difference between the British and American English.)	- Complete complex sentence (e.g., I also tried to communicate with some Americans at the embassy since there was a little difference between the British and American English.)
Organization	- Lack of a transition - Unseparated paragraphs	- Inclusion of a transition - Split body paragraphs

Table 2.2

A Comparison of Puran's Drafts Based on Written Feedback Received

Writing elements	Before feedback	After feedback
Ideas	- Lack of citations	- Include citations in each supporting paragraph

As indicated in Table 2.1, Rita's final draft witnessed a number of changes after the instructor written feedback was provided on her narrative essay. Specifically, her revised paper improved considerably with respect to appropriate uses of lexical and grammatical features, along with a more coherent organization when a transition

was employed to split a long body paragraph into two well-organized paragraphs. Less successful than Rita, Puran's revised paper, as summarized in Table 2.2, was only different from his original draft in terms of an inclusion of a citation for each supporting paragraph.

With regard to oral feedback, since the participant's written artifacts pertaining to this type of instructor feedback were not voluntarily shared by Puran, the comparison and data analysis could only be presented from Rita's perspective as indicated in Table 2.3 below.

Table 2.3

A Comparison of Rita's Drafts Based on Oral Feedback Received

Writing elements	**Before feedback**	**After feedback**
Format	- Did not follow the APA citation format. For example, + according to Clark, C. S. (1992) + Dorothy, N. et al. 2009 + by Jerome Jeanblanc.	- Some improvements in APA citations. For example, + according to Clark, C. S. (1992) + Dorothy, N. et al. 2009 + by Jerome, J. (2015).
Organization	- Unclear parts: no heading for each part (e.g., abstract, introduction, literature review, etc.) - Incomplete draft: lack of research methods, results, conclusion, and references	- Clear headings for all parts of a research paper (e.g., abstract, introduction, literature review, etc.) - Complete draft: abstract, introduction, literature review, research methods, results, conclusion, and references
Ideas and contents	- Not well-organized, separate ideas, and too much wordy - Lack of citations	- Much condensed, and coherent with a lot of paraphrasing - Including more citations

As can be seen from Table 2.3, in comparison with the original draft, Rita's final draft experienced considerably successful revision, especially in terms of including all necessary parts for a research paper, following the APA format, along with more condensed and cohesive ideas. In addition, citations were added to strengthen any claims stated in her writing; however, not all of these citations successfully followed the APA format. The possible reason for Rita's relative success in revising her paper when oral feedback was involved might be relevant to her favorable responses to the feedback received as well as her strategies in using such feedback. As already noted, Rita held the most positive attitudes towards oral feedback over the other two formats (i.e., written, and audio-visual feedback), viewing it as the most beneficial instructor feedback method in helping her understand what she was supposed to do and what not to do. To apply the feedback into revision, she shared that she read the notes taken from the one-on-one conference with her instructor, recalling what was negotiated during the conference while revising her paper. It was likely that Rita was a well-organized student with a good memory to retrieve information at her best efforts, which considerably assisted her in modifying her research paper successfully on the basis of the oral feedback provided.

With respect to the participants' revisions based on audio-visual feedback, both of them had completely successful revisions as illustrated in Table 2.4 and Table 2.5.

Table 2.4

A Comparison of Rita's Drafts Based on Audio-Visual Feedback Received

Writing elements	Before feedback	After feedback
Organization	- Incomplete draft: only half of essay done, no reference list - Separate paragraphs	- Complete paper: a five- paragraph essay, a reference list included - Coherent organization with the use of linkages among paragraphs (e.g., firstly, secondly, thirdly, fourthly, finally)
Ideas	- Separate and wordy ideas	- Much condensed with combined sentences
Contents	- Irrelevant information - Lack of statistical numbers and reasons to support the claim	- Deletion of irrelevant information - Including statistics and stated reasons for any claims involved

Table 2.5

A Comparison of Puran's Drafts Based on Audio-Visual Feedback Received

Writing elements	Before feedback	After feedback
Format	- Citations did not follow the APA format: + Underline the title + Use incorrect citation format - The reference list did not follow the APA format.	- Citations followed the APA format: + Delete the underlined + Use correct citation format - The reference list followed the APA format.
Organization	- Not well-organized: misplacing information: + Method: charts and diagrams preceding an introductory paragraph + Conclusion: direct quote preceding generalization or summary of findings	- Well-organized: replacing the information: + Method: an introductory paragraph preceding charts and diagrams + Conclusion: generalization or summary of findings preceding direct quote
Ideas	- Too much wordy with separate sentences, and lengthy direct quotes - Lack of elaborations of abstract terms (e.g., SODEXO)	- Combined sentences coherently with lots of paraphrasing instead of direct quotes - Including clear explanations for abstract terms

It is clear from the summarized data in Table 2.4 that Rita's final draft experienced dramatically positive changes after the revision had been made on the basis of the audio-visual feedback received. To be more specific, her revised paper became better organized to include five full paragraphs, coupled with a reference list, fitting well into the standard format of an academic scientific essay. Plus, most of the paragraphs and ideas were intimately linked together through an appropriate use of connectors (e.g., firstly, secondly, and just to name a few). Also, within the revision process, irrelevant information was deleted and separate ideas were condensed, making Rita's argumentative essay more concise. Apart from these, supporting information (e.g., statistics, and reasons) was added to make more sense to her argumentative essay. Likewise, Puran's revised paper indicated a large number of significant changes based on the audio-visual feedback provided as illustrated in Table 2.5. In particular, the final draft of his research paper was substantially improved, not only in terms of the correct use of APA format for citations and the reference list, but also in response to its well-organized ideas and contents. More precisely, these improvements included the rearrangement of misplaced information, the combination of separate sentences through using connectors, the elaborations of abstract terms, and the paraphrasing of wordy ideas and direct quotes to make condensed passages. Collectively, it is evident from the analysis of students' written artifacts that irrespective of the type of writing assignments involved, students made critically significant improvements in their revisions based on the audio-visual feedback received. Remarkably, most of the changes in the participants' revised papers fell into mainly global issues, including organizations, contents, ideas, and

formats of academic writing.

All in all, the results obtained from the thematic analysis of the participants' questionnaires and interview data, coupled with the qualitative analysis of their written artifacts revealed variations in their perceptions of and experiences with the three instructor feedback methods provided in their U.S. first-year composition classes, as well as the impacts of these feedback methods on their revisions. How such findings contribute to each of the research questions and corroborate with the previous research results will be discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter V

Discussions

Students' Perceptions of and Experiences with Instructor Feedback Methods

Overall, both the students expressed positive perceptions of and rich experiences with the three instructor feedback methods received in their ENG 101 classes. While Rita stated, "In general, all three feedback methods are clear" (Interview, Appendix E). Puran commented, "Everything, every time he gave feedback, it was very good for me" (Interview, Appendix E). Drawing on the students' views, it seems that not only the format of feedback provided matters, but the way it is offered as well as the person who gives feedback also plays an important role in students' responses to the feedback received. However, in order not to distract the flow of information discussed in this research which focuses on the students' perceptions of and experiences with the instructor feedback, attempts will be made to interpret the results from the student perspective only, instead of the teacher position. One noticeable fact is that although the participants held favorable attitudes towards all types of instructor feedback received, their preferences for and experiences with each mode of instructor feedback revealed a spectrum of variations in their responses.

Written feedback. Both the participants had similar experiences with how written feedback was provided on their writing. More precisely, they shared that within the written feedback, their writing problems were pointed out with highlighted parts and changed words along with short comment notes through the use of track changes and comments in the Microsoft Word program before the paper was electronically returned to them for revision. That is, the participants received the

written feedback in a combination of explicit and implicit manner of error correction which was beneficial for their self-edition. Such a fact was supported by Rita's experience with the written feedback received when she commented in the questionnaire: "She highlighted most of my sentences and stated the reason and the reason was self-explanatory. So, I was able to understand and fix the mistakes I made easily" (Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). This result indeed corroborates the findings from Van Beuningen, Jong, and Kuiken's (2008) study which indicated the effectiveness of combining implicit and explicit error correction on students' revisions.

When it comes to students' perceptions of written feedback, both the participants had relatively positive responses to the written feedback. As indicated in their answers to the questionnaire, the main reason they liked this instructor feedback mode was that it made their writing mistakes easily identifiable. Specifically, Rita noted, "I was able to find most of my weak points in essay writing" (Questionnaire 1, Appendix B). To put it another way, the written feedback provided through the electronic use of track changes and comments helped students easily recognize their writing problems thanks to highlighted parts and suggestion notes, which basically enhanced their awareness of problematic issues in their writing along with expectations for their writing improvements. In effect, such a finding further supports AbuSeileek's (2013) claim on the importance of written feedback in attracting students' attention to their writing problems, and in orientating them towards the target writing competences, which is in line with Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, suggesting that nothing is learned unless it has been noticed. However, in

order to understand and achieve the noticing input generated from the written feedback, as shared in the interviews, both the students had to go through an intensive process of reviewing their papers several times until they could pick up what was supposed to be revised. As a result, it was likely that written feedback made it more difficult to be digested and more time consuming for students' revision.

Another downside associated with written feedback as pointed out by the two participants was that it was quite ambiguous, providing inadequate information to facilitate their resolution of complex writing issues. Puran commented in his interview: "He writes about that and sometimes we don't understand what he writes. We want the explanation more about what comments are about" (Interview, Appendix E). Based on this concern along with her own observation, Rita came up with a strong suggestion: "If you are gonna still stick with the written feedback, I prefer like it should be more explanatory because I see most students have issues that they don't understand what it was" (Interview, Appendix E). Drawing from both the students' comments on the weaknesses of the written feedback received, it is evident that multilingual learners have encountered several challenges when integrating the written feedback into their revisions, especially with their high aspirations for more scaffoldings and explanations coming from their teachers. Such findings seem to be consistent with two previous studies' outcomes (Amara, 2014; Weaver's 2006), which revealed that students demanded more clarifications from written feedback. One possible explanation for such a demand could be that students' linguistic competence was insufficient to support their full understanding of the feedback received (Ferris, 2004; K. Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Furthermore, differences in and

interferences of their prior knowledge might prevent multilingual writers from successfully interpreting the written feedback received as well as from applying it into their revisions.

Oral feedback. Students' perceptions of and experiences with oral feedback revealed a more interesting picture of how they understood, responded to and applied the instructor feedback into their revisions. As described by the two students, this form of instructor feedback was characterized by its one-on-one meeting through which students could directly interact and negotiate with their instructor to get immediate answers for any concerns they had about their writing. In other words, compared with written feedback, oral feedback seemed to be friendlier, clearer, more interactive and more understandable thanks to its inherent nature of face-to-face conversations. Therefore, Rita who personally preferred speaking to writing expressed her most favorable attitudes towards oral feedback, viewing it as the most beneficial mode of instructor feedback for her revision, making her feel most independent as a writer, and boosting her engagement in writing. This is because of its significant advantages as pointed out in Rita's questionnaire: "I understood what I was supposed to do and what not to do compared to the written feedback...I was able to state my point and get immediate answer to the question I had..."(Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). This finding is indeed consistent with Best et al.'s (2015) research results, which showed that students positively responded to oral feedback thanks to its personal communication with the teacher during conferences.

Apart from this fact, in this current case study, although Puran acknowledged the merits of oral feedback in offering him clear, direct and comprehensive feedback,

which facilitated his revision, he could hardly deny several major challenges posed by this form of instructor feedback. Puran claimed that oral feedback required students' intensive attention to what was taking place during the conference along with their careful note-taking skills and a good memory to retrieve the information needed for revision otherwise it would be time consuming to seek for help from other sources such as friends, tutors or writing centers. Evidently, such a research outcome corroborates Harris's (1986) and K. Hyland's (2003) perspectives on the requirements of oral feedback, especially in terms of students' dynamic participation in negotiating with the teacher and their cautious note-taking skills of the teacher's comments in order to magnify the benefits of this instructor feedback method. These enquiries led Puran to perceiving oral feedback as the most dependent mode of instructor feedback. However, it is worth noting that being dependent or independent writers seemed to be interpreted differently between the two students, based on their own ideologies and personal understandings of the issue. For example, Puran perceived disturbing teacher's time and his own time as a sign of dependence, stating in the interview: "Sometimes I forgot the things and I have to go to search and have to email him... I think I'm disturbing his time. And I'm disturbing my time also. I think I am much more dependent on that time" (Interview, Appendix E). Rita, however, regarded the chance of voicing herself and expressing her opinions during the conference as the independence from the instructor's authority in giving feedback to students' writing when she pointed out, "If she like suggested something I am not comfortable with...I asked and told her I am not comfortable with this and how I can do it the other ways" (Interview, Appendix E).

Audio-visual feedback. More insightful findings on students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods have emerged from the audio-visual feedback provided on their writing. As indicated in the questionnaires and follow-up interviews, both the participants expressed their highly positive perceptions of and experiences with this mode of instructor feedback. First of all, the participants described their positive experiences with audio-visual feedback in specific details, revealing their good understanding of the feedback received. Within their descriptions, audio-visual feedback was featured by a clip using the recorded screen video through which the mouse pointer was utilized to indicate exactly which part was supposed to work more on, along with the teacher's oral speech explaining and giving suggestions for students' revisions. Based on these two integrated functions of audio-visual feedback, namely sight and hearing, which was previously highlighted by Thompson and Lee (2012), both the students in this case study demonstrated their strong preferences for this innovative form of instructor feedback. Rita was really impressed with such a feedback method because of its superiority as she noted, "I was able to see my essay and I felt that she was sitting in front of me and telling me exactly what to do...It is more explanatory than the other types of feedback...Most of her response was like a tip that did not just help my essay, but gave me some points that I later use to improve my essay" (Questionnaire 3, Appendix D).

In the same way, Puran added more benefits to audio-visual feedback, including its more convenient access, less information load and being more time saving in comparison with oral feedback. He clearly articulated in the interview: "I can go anywhere and access it anytime, it saves time. I don't have to go home and

check out my previous paper or something like that. I don't have to carry all my things, I can use my mobile phone to see that also...don't have to remember anything" (Interview, Appendix E). This explained why Puran perceived audio-visual feedback as the most beneficial mode of instructor feedback method, helping him feel most independent and most engaged in the revision process. In his explanation, Puran admitted, "By reviewing my video and according to his voice recording, it is clear and hence I can write easily...I can just listen and I can see the visual... I can pause it ...and it was complete for my first time" (Interview, Appendix E). It is obvious from Puran's comment that the two intertwined functions, especially hearing and seeing, along with its chances of replaying and pausing, made audio-visual feedback privileged over the others. Furthermore, he compared that it took him twice or three times to read the whole drafts and notes when revising his papers based on written and oral feedback received while it was complete for his first time when applying audio-visual feedback. Together, these findings are in accord with the previous studies' outcomes (Cavanaugh & Song, 2014; Cunningham, 2015; Huang, 2000; Morris & Chikwa, 2016) which revealed students' positive attitudes towards audio-visual feedback over other types, particularly the written feedback.

Impacts of Instructor Feedback Methods on Students' Revisions

The findings obtained from analyzing the participants' written artifacts along with their voices in the questionnaires and follow-up interviews have provided richer insights into how instructor feedback methods impacted students' writing from both their own perceptions and their actual practices. In terms of students' perceptions on impacts of instructor feedback methods received, it is apparent from the participants'

comments in the questionnaires and follow-up interviews that all three types of instructor feedback were helpful for the improvement of their revised papers. This is because in general all these feedback methods were perceived clear, and understandable, which facilitated the participants in recognizing and fixing the problems in their writing quite easily. However, there were indeed variations in their perceptions of the effectiveness of each individual type of instructor feedback when the revision process was actually involved. In particular, audio-visual feedback was perceived as the most effective form of instructor feedback promoting students' revisions, followed by oral and written feedback, respectively. More importantly, according to the students' suggestions, in order to maximize the efficacy of written feedback, it should be provided with more explanations otherwise students would be left ambiguous about what was supposed to work more on their writing. Similarly, oral feedback could only be beneficial to students' revisions if they actively participated in negotiations for meaning during teacher-student conferences, coupled with their cautious note-taking of the instructor's comments in order to easily retrieve the information needed for their revisions.

Regarding students' practical utilization of the feedback received, there were differences in the level of success when they actually applied these feedback methods into their revisions. The results from analyzing the participants' written artifacts showed that both the students were completely successful in revising their writing when employing feedback received from audio-visual format, particularly in terms of improving their global writing issues (e.g., format, organization, ideas, and contents). Such a full success could result from the superior advantages of the audio-visual

feedback, including its intertwined and simultaneous functions in providing feedback, namely hearing and seeing, coupled with its chances of replaying and pausing, as well as its more convenient access, less information load and being more time saving in comparison with other types of instructor feedback, as previously acknowledged by the two participants. This result indeed supports Cavanaugh and Song's (2014) study outcome which indicated that audio-visual feedback was beneficial because it was focused more on global issues of students' writing.

In reference to students' application of oral feedback, the analysis of Rita's written artifacts revealed that such a type of instructor feedback considerably helped her revise her writing successfully, particularly with respect to global issues such as format, organization, contents and ideas. What could explain for Rita's considerable success in applying oral feedback into her revision might be due to her strong satisfaction with this feedback mode, accompanied with her good use of strategies to integrate this feedback into her revision as already pointed out in her questionnaire: "I understood what I was supposed to do and what not to do compared to the written feedback...I was able to meet her one on one and show her my work directly...I was able to state my point and get immediate feedback" (Questionnaire 2, Appendix C). Such direct, immediate, and interactive responses embedded in the oral feedback along with its more explanations undoubtedly facilitated Rita's revision, particularly on the basis of her making good use of the notes taken during the conference.

When it comes to written feedback, there was a mismatch between the two students' revised papers. To be more precise, Rita's revision showed enormously positive changes pertaining to lexical and grammatical issues, coupled with a more

coherent organization. On the contrary, Puran's paper was revised less successfully, especially with the only difference in an inclusion of citation to each supporting paragraph in comparison with his original draft. Indeed, the differences in the revisions between the two students could be explained by two plausible factors. The first factor, which should be taken into account, is associated with the kind of writing task students were performing. It is clear from the participants' written artifacts data that both the students received the written feedback on two different types of their writing. While Rita worked on her narrative essay when receiving the instructor written feedback, Puran applied this form of instructor feedback to revise his argumentative essay. It is believed that such a difference in writing genres might give rise to various levels of success in students' revision, which goes beyond the scope of this current investigation. Secondly, differences in the way various writing instructors offered feedback which result from their personalities, styles, and preferences, might bring about variations in students' revisions of their papers as well. Despite the possibilities of such relationships, deeper discussion of this issue seems to exceed the focus of this case study which was about students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods in a U.S. first-year composition class. Irrespective of which factor exists, it cannot be denied that written feedback has helped students improve their writing in their revision process, to a certain extent of their success.

In brief, the results from this case study have revealed two significant aspects of the investigation, which not only responds to the two research questions, but also interacts with the previous studies' outcomes. First, thematic analysis of the participants' questionnaires and interview data indicated that the two multilingual

students had generally positive perceptions of and rich experiences with the three instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) received in their U.S. first-year composition classes. Additionally, although both the students generally viewed all these instructor feedback methods as effective means of feedback for their writing, their responses to each mode of instructor feedback seemed widely varied. To be more specific, their strong impression on and beliefs in the effectiveness of the instructor feedback fell into the audio-visual mode, followed by the oral and written feedback, respectively. Second, the qualitative analysis of the participants' written artifacts showed that audio-visual feedback seemed to be the most effective mode of instructor feedback which assisted the students in successfully revising their papers, followed by the oral feedback method, and with the written feedback having the least impact on their revisions. In the following chapter, the research outcomes will be summarized in order to give reasons for pedagogical implications in L2 writing, coupled with directions for future research on instructor feedback.

Chapter VI

Conclusions and Implications

Summary of Research Outcomes

This case study examines multilingual students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods in a U.S. first-year composition class. Data collected from open-ended questionnaires and transcriptions of semi-structured recorded interviews with two students, along with their written artifacts, were qualitatively analyzed to identify emergent themes. Coding and thematic analysis of the questionnaires and interview data resulted in four critical themes, including students' introduction of experiences with instructor feedback, students' various attitudes towards instructor feedback, students' applications of instructor feedback, and various impacts of instructor feedback. Additionally, emerging themes resulting from comparing students' original drafts and their revised papers based on the instructor feedback method received were categorized into three main patterns of completely successful revision, considerably successful revision, and little successful revision.

Collectively, the findings from this case study showed that students had positive perceptions of and experiences with all three instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) used in their first-year composition classes. However, their responses to each type of instructor feedback varied widely. Regarding written feedback, both the participants not only shared their similar experiences of how this mode of instructor feedback looked, but also expressed their relatively favorable attitudes towards such feedback thanks to its highlighted parts,

changed words, and comment notes, which made the problematic issues in their writing identifiable and correctable. Despite their acknowledgement of these advantages given to their writing, both the students pointed out some weaknesses along with this feedback method, which included its ambiguous comments and its requirement of intensively reviewing their writing, accompanied with properly interpreting the instructor's written commentary in order to know what was exactly supposed to be revised. Such an arduous process seemingly makes written feedback less friendly and more time consuming for the learners to digest and apply. Consequently, it led the participant to strongly suggest for more explanations if written feedback would be further implemented in writing instruction classrooms.

In comparison with written feedback, oral feedback was perceived much friendlier, clearer, more direct and interactive, as well as more comprehensive. This is because of its typical characteristics in providing students with one-on-one interactions through which they could directly express their own opinions about what they had written, along with opportunities to negotiate with the instructor so as to approach immediate answers for any concerns about their writing problems. Hence, Rita personally viewed oral feedback as the most beneficial mode of instructor feedback, making her feel most engaged and most independent as a writer. On the contrary, even though Puran agreed on the benefits of oral feedback in offering him coherent, responsive and understandable feedback, which facilitated his revision, he felt that this form of instructor feedback made him most dependent as a writer. Specifically, Puran pointed out that oral feedback demanded students' particular attention to what happened during the teacher-student conference, coupled with their

critical note-taking skills and a good memory in order to retrieve the information needed for their revisions otherwise it would be either disturbing to their instructor's time for reiterating the feedback already provided or time consuming for students to seek assistance from other sources such as friends, tutors, or writing centers.

When it comes to audio-visual feedback, it is obvious from the student perspective that this mode of instructor feedback is viewed superior to the others. To be more precise, both the participants demonstrated their strong preferences for this feedback based on its two interwoven functions, particularly sight and hearing, which was highly supportive to their revisions. As clarified by the two students in their follow-up interviews, they were very satisfied with this feedback because they could see their writing problems pointed out through the mouse pointer on the computer screen and at the same time they were able to hear their instructor's voice commenting on their writing. As a result, it did not take them a lot of time to review the feedback and then successfully revise their papers as well. Puran also acknowledged its convenient access, no burden of memorization, and chances of replaying or pausing, which saved students' time. Relying on these privileges, Puran perceived audio-visual feedback as the most effective form of instructor feedback, which made him feel most independent, most motivated and most engaged in his writing. He also recommended this feedback for all instructors to implement into their classrooms in order to benefit multilingual learners.

With respect to the impacts of instructor feedback methods on students' writing, it is likely that there were some consistencies between students' perceptions of the feedback effects and their actual applications of the feedback into their

revisions. On the basis of analyzing students' questionnaires and follow-up interviews, the results showed that the students viewed all the three instructor feedback methods provided in their ENG 101 classes as effective means of feedback for their writing, especially with their strong impression falling into audio-visual feedback, followed by the oral and written feedback, respectively. More specifically, while Rita perceived oral feedback as the most beneficial type of instructor feedback on her revision, Puran recognized audio-visual feedback as the most productive form of feedback which made him feel most engaged, most motivated and most independent as a multilingual writer. Quite similarly, the results from the qualitative analysis of the participants' written artifacts indicated that audio-visual feedback helped both the students revise their papers most successfully, especially in terms of global writing issues (e.g., formats, organizations, contents, and ideas). Likewise, the oral feedback promoted Rita's revised paper considerably with respect to its format, organization, contents and ideas. Furthermore, although written feedback had significant impacts on Rita's revised paper, this mode of instructor feedback played a less important role in Puran's revision due to the downsides of this feedback method as previously highlighted in the participants' comments.

Taken altogether, it can be concluded that the students in this case study held strongly favorable attitudes towards audio-visual and oral feedback, respectively with their high expectations to receive these forms of feedback in their future writing courses. In addition, the findings from the qualitative analysis of the participants' written artifacts suggest that audio-visual feedback is the most effective mode of instructor feedback in helping students successfully revise their papers, followed by

the oral feedback method and with the written feedback having the least impact on students' revisions. Such results are partly contrary to Morris and Chikwa's (2016) research, which revealed that although students generally had positive attitudes towards audio feedback, they showed a stronger preference for written feedback in their future assignments. Despite these differences in the research outcomes, which might result from underexplored factors such as effects of students' learning styles and their personal characteristics or teachers' various styles in providing feedback, it is noticeable that the students have had very favorable reactions to the innovative forms of instructor feedback, namely audio-visual feedback. Thus, it is recommended that there should be more replications of this feedback method in writing instruction at the aim of best serving diverse needs and styles of multilingual writers on the basis of its stand-out advantages over other types of feedback as previously indicated. Drawing on the significant results of this case study, specific pedagogical implications are subsequently discussed in order to address any challenges involved.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings from this study imply that several issues are worth highlighting when L2 instructors provide different modes of feedback on students' writing in order to not only maximize the benefits of the feedback provided, but also best serve varying needs and styles of multilingual learners. First of all, as stated earlier, the multilingual students in this case study did not have good prior knowledge of various forms of instructor feedback, which in some circumstances might contribute to their challenges in understanding, interpreting and applying the feedback received. Therefore, it is essential, at the very start of the course, to provide students with clear

instruction or a short training on how the feedback looks, how it works, as well as what strategies should be employed to best utilize the feedback received.

Second, one of the participants in this case study strongly suggested that there should be more explanations both on the paper and in class when written feedback is involved. Thus, it is important for current and future L2 instructors who are going to use written feedback, either traditionally or electronically, to make sure that their written comments are fully comprehensive to students in order to facilitate their revisions. To reach this goal, it is argued that more elaborations of students' problematic issues related to their individual writing should be pointed out clearly not only through highlighting the problems but also by providing suggestions and stating reasons for making such comments. Since the nature of written communication is lacking simultaneous voices from the two parts, namely writers and readers, it is recommended that written feedback be coupled with or followed by oral feedback through which the instructor and the students could meet and discuss writing issues in depth.

Third, as far as the oral feedback is concerned, in order to maximize the merits of this instructor feedback method, it is suggested that students be trained on how to actively negotiate with their instructor during the conference so that they are able to voice themselves and show their own identities on certain aspects of their writing instead of passively accepting the instructor's suggestions. In doing so, it is believed that students will be gradually move towards becoming more independent writers. The main reason for making this suggestion is that some multilingual students, especially those who are normally from the culture of highly asymmetrical and

hierarchical relationship, are shy or unwilling to raise questions and dynamically interact with their instructors, which prevents them from most benefiting from the oral feedback provided. Another significant implication associated with oral feedback is that it would be better to record student-teacher conferences and provide students with the audio-files so that they can easily access the feedback information when it comes to their revisions.

Fourth, this present case study raises the possibility that within the use of audio-visual feedback, it is important to make sure that not only do the learners possess the type of electronic devices which will allow them to easily access the feedback provided, but also they have the basic knowledge of technology needed in order to unpack the feedback received as well as to resolve some common technical problems involved. Additionally, it is believed that a short training session with an explicit demonstration on how audio-visual feedback works will be more beneficial to students' understanding of the feedback format and its functions to their writing. Lastly, both the participants pointed out that besides the three instructor feedback methods, they also sought help from other resources, especially friends and the writing center. Thus, it is critical to encourage students to make use of available campus resources for supporting their revisions and enhancing their writing skills, such as discussions with peers and consultations with the writing center.

Recommendations for Further Research

Although a number of significant results pertaining to multilingual learners' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods have been unveiled in this case study, there still exist several limitations which have previously been

highlighted in the methodology of this paper. Drawing on those restrictions, coupled with the results found in this case study, several recommendations and suggestions are offered for further investigations to make efforts to expand and generalize the specific findings of this present research. First of all, notwithstanding the potential transferability of this current study results, its restricted sample size due to the attrition of the intended participants has limited its generalizability. It is thus possible that a collection of data from a larger sample of multilingual students along with more detailed information related to their diverse cultures, various personalities, and educational backgrounds would help to interpret why students' responses to the feedback received have been different. Second, since the focus of this study was on students' perceptions of and experiences with the instructor feedback methods, it looked only at the student perspective while the teacher voices on how they actually provided the feedback and what effects of the feedback on students' writing they could find, have not been included. Therefore, it is feasible that further investigation on comparing both the teachers' and students' perceptions of instructor feedback methods could provide more comprehensive insights into the implementations as well as the impacts of instructional feedback on students' writing.

Third, the current study is also limited by the fact that it overlooked the potential factors which might influence students' perceptions of and experiences with the instructor feedback methods such as learning styles, learning situations, learning environments, learning goals, learning objectives, and the instructor's own preferences and personalities. Perhaps, a deeper understanding of this new piece of the feedback puzzle can be gained if future research makes an attempt to delve into

investigating the correlation between students' perceptions of feedback methods and influential factors through quantitative factor analysis. Finally, the current study examines the influences of the three instructor feedback methods (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) on students' revised papers, especially through their three different types of writing (i.e., narrative, argumentative, and research paper). There is no doubt that the research outcomes might be generated differently if only one genre of writing was involved in the investigation, instead of the intersection of the three various writing genres. Based on these possibilities, it is recommended that further research pay its more specific attention to any of the suggested issues. In particular, it is believed that more longitudinal investigations in different writing instruction contexts would strengthen qualitative designs. Apart from this, a mixed method design which includes both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis would help triangulate and paint a complete picture of how multiple instructor feedback methods influence students' writing.

In spite of several limitations involved in the scope of this case study, it is worth noting that the current research has made some breakthroughs in empirically examining how multilingual students perceived instructor feedback, as well as how the three significant modes of instructor feedback (i.e., written, oral, and audio-visual feedback) impacted students' writing and their writing experiences. The qualitative results from this case study have provided comprehensive insights into how the learners reacted to the instructor feedback received, what they liked and disliked about these feedback methods, how they actually applied the provided feedback methods into their revisions, and what instructor feedback was considered as effective

modes of feedback for their writing development. Such findings indeed support the incorporation of students' voices into L2 writing pedagogy. In addition, the results obtained from analyzing students' written artifacts have offered more evidence on significant impacts of different instructor feedback methods on students' revised papers. It is acknowledged that being aware of these aspects in students' perceptions of, reactions to, experiences with, and applications of various instructor feedback methods would be highly beneficial for L2 writing instructors in order to establish effective writing classrooms. Most importantly, such information greatly assists the instructors in choosing appropriate feedback methods to provide on students' writing so as to best serve diverse needs among multilingual writers and ultimately to orientate them towards effective independent and autonomous writers. It is hoped that the results from this small scale study along with further subsequent investigations based on the previously highlighted recommendations would tremendously contribute to greater awareness of and reflection on instructor feedback and students' revisions, two of the most significant components of any enlightened writing class.

References

AbuSeileek, A. F. (2013). Using track changes and word processor to provide corrective feedback to learners in writing. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 29*(4), 319-333. doi:10.1111/jcal.12004

Agbayahoun, J. P. (2016). Teacher Written Feedback on Student Writing: Teachers' and Learners' Perspectives. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6*(10), 1895-1904. doi:10.17507/tpls.0610.01

Amara, T. M. (2014). *ESL learners' perceptions of teacher written feedback in a writing classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (3628802)

Anson, C. M., Dannels, D. P., Laboy, J. I., & Carneiro, L. (2016). Students' Perceptions of Oral Screencast Responses to Their Writing Exploring Digitally Mediated Identities. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 30*(3), 378-411. doi:10.1177/1050651916636424

Best, K., Jones-Katz, L., Smolarek, B., Stolzenburg, M., & Williamson, D. (2015). Listening to Our Students: An Exploratory Practice Study of ESL Writing Students' Views of Feedback. *TESOL Journal, 6*(2), 332-357.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(3), 409-431. doi:10.1177/1362168808089924

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191-205. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1-47.

Cann, A. (2014). Engaging students with audio feedback. *Bioscience Education, 22*(1), 31-41.

Cavanaugh, A. J., & Song, L. (2014). Audio Feedback versus Written Feedback: Instructors' and Students' Perspectives. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 10*(1), 122.

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D. M., & Snow, M. A. (2014). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 267-296. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Conrad, S. M., & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments: Text, contexts, and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 147-179.

Cunningham, M. A. (2015). *Using Audio Screencast for Feedback on Short Written Essays*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (3733157)

Denton, D. W. (2014). Using screen capture feedback to improve academic performance. *TechTrends, 58*(6), 51-56. doi:10.1007/s11528-014-0803-0

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dunne, E., & Rodway-Dyer, S. (2009). *Is audio feedback a useful way of enabling students to learn? A case study.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the European Conference on E-learning, University of Bari, Italy.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System, 36*(3), 353-371. doi:10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Ewert, D. E. (2009). L2 writing conferences: Investigating teacher talk. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(4), 251-269. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2009.06.002

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161-184. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X

Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(2), 315-339. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2011.04.004

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. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 181-201. doi:10.1017/S0272263109990490

Gascoigne, C. (2004). Examining the effect of feedback in beginning L2 composition. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(1), 71-76. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2004.tb02174.x

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 negotiation of meaning in ESL writing conferences. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 443-460. doi:10.2307/3587229

Hajimohammadi, R., & Mukundan, J. (2011). Contrasting audio-taped feedback with minimal marking feedback in EFL writing. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, 19*(1), 17-24.

Han, Z. (2001). Fine-tuning Corrective Feedback. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*(6), 582-599. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.2001.tb02105.x

Haneda, M. (2000). *Negotiating meaning in writing conferences: An investigation of a university Japanese-as-a-foreign language class*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (NQ53702)

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited, Longman.

Harris, M. (1986). *Teaching One-to-One: The Writing Conference*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research, 77*(1), 81-112. doi:10.3102/003465430298487

Hennessy, C., & Forrester, G. (2014). Developing a framework for effective audio feedback: a case study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(7), 777-789. doi:10.1080/02602938.2013.870530

Higgins, J. (1983). Computer assisted language learning. *Language Teaching, 16*(2), 102-114.

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ho, M.-c., & Savignon, S. J. (2007). Face-to-face and computer-mediated peer review in EFL writing. *CALICO Journal, 24*(2), 269-290.

Hornby, A. S., & Wehmeier, S. (1995). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huang, S.-y. (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, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*(2), 171-182.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83-101.

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.

Johnson, G. M., & Cooke, A. (2014). Student Use of Audio, Video, and Written Teacher Feedback: The Predictive Utility of Learning Modality Preference, Self-Regulated Learning, and Learning Style. *International Journal of University Teaching and Faculty Development, 5*(2), 111-127.

Jones, N., Georghiades, P., & Gunson, J. (2012). Student feedback via screen capture digital video: Stimulating student's modified action. *Higher Education, 64*(5), 593-607. doi:10.1007/s10734-012-9514-7

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal, 66*(2), 140-149. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb0697

Lunt, T., & Curran, J. (2010). 'Are you listening please?' The advantages of electronic audio feedback compared to written feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 35*(7), 759-769. doi:10.1080/02602930902977772

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. New York: Routledge.

Magno, C., & Amarles, A. (2011). Teachers' feedback practices in second language academic writing classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment, 6*(2), 21-30.

Matsuda, P. K., Cox, M., Jordan, J., & Ortmeier-Hooper, C. (2011). *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook*. Boston: National Council of Teachers of English.

McGrath, A. L., Taylor, A., & Pychyl, T. A. (2011). Writing helpful feedback: The influence of feedback type on students' perceptions and writing performance. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and learning, 2*(2), 5. doi:10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2011.2.5

McMartin-Miller, C. (2014). How much feedback is enough?: Instructor practices and student attitudes toward error treatment in second language writing. *Assessing Writing, 19*, 24-35. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.003

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

Minnesota State University Mankato. *2016-2017 Undergraduate Catalog*. Retrieved from http://www.mnsu.edu/supersite/academics/catalogs/undergraduate/2016-2017/2016-17_undergrad_catalog_revised_%2012-20-2016.pdf

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(2), 82-99. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.04.002

Morra, A. M., & Asís, M. I. (2009). The effect of audio and written teacher responses on EFL student revision. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 39*(2), 68-81. doi:10.1080/10790195.2009.10850319

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, 1*(1), 1-13. doi:10.1177/1469787416637482

Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide*. Heinle, Cengage Learning: Sherrise Roehr.

Patrie, J. (1989). The use of the Tape Recorder in an ESL Composition Programme. *TESL Canada Journal, 6*(2), 87-89.

Patthey-Chavez, G. G., & Ferris, D. R. (1997). Writing conferences and the weaving of multi-voiced texts in college composition. *Research in the Teaching of English, 31*(1), 51-90.

Poulos, A., & Mahony, M. J. (2008). Effectiveness of feedback: The students' perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(2), 143-154. doi:10.1080/02602930601127869

Rabi, M. T. K. A. (2014). Meaning-Focused Audiovisual Feedback and EFL Writing Motivation. *Journal of Language and Translation, 4*(2), 61-70.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education, 2*, 102-119.

Rodway-Dyer, S., Dunne, E., & Newcombe, M. (2009). *Audio and screen visual feedback to support student learning.* Paper presented at the In Proceedings of the 16th ALT-C International Conference, September 8–10, Oxford: Association for Learning Technology.

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. doi:10.1080/03098265.2010.524197

Rotheram, B. (2009). Sounds Good: using audio to give assessment feedback. *Assessment, Teaching & Learning Journal, 7*(1), 22-24.

Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29*(1), 67-100. doi:10.1017/S0272263107070039

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning1. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*(2), 244-258. doi:10.1111/0026-7902.00107

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System, 37*(4), 556-569. doi:10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002

Sipple, S. (2007). Ideas in practice: Developmental writers' attitudes toward audio and written feedback. *Journal of Developmental Education, 30*(3), 22-31.

Sommers, J. (1989). The effects of tape-recorded commentary on student revision: A case study. *Journal of Teaching Writing, 8*(2), 49-76.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Thompson, R., & Lee, M. J. (2012). Talking with students through screencasting: Experimentations with video feedback to improve student learning. *The Journal of Interactive Technology and Pedagogy.* Retrieved from https://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/talking-with-students-through-

screencasting-experimentations-with-video-feedback-to-improve-student-learning/

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Trustcott, 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. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6

Van Beuningen, C. G. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*(2), 1-27. doi:10.6018/ijes.10.2.119171

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL-Review of Applied Linguistics, 156*, 279-296.

Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31*(3), 379-394. doi:10.1080/02602930500353061

Witherell, S. (2016). IIE release open doors 2016 data. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/en/Who-We-Are/News-and-Events/Press-Center/Press-Releases/2016/2016-11-14-Open-Doors-Data - .WGhO2rYrKu4

Appendices

Appendix A: Student Consent Form

Dear Student,

My name is Hong Thi Tuyet Vo. I am a graduate student in the English Department's Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) program at Minnesota State University, Mankato. I would like to carry out research on second language writing under the supervision of my graduate advisor, Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee. The purpose of my study is to inform second language writing instruction by investigating multilingual students' perceptions of and experiences with instructor feedback methods in a U.S. first-year composition class.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will: 1) Complete a questionnaire regarding your perceptions of and experiences with the written feedback received on one academic essay, 2) Complete a questionnaire regarding your perceptions of and experiences with the oral feedback received on one academic essay, 3) Complete a questionnaire regarding your perceptions of and experiences with the audio-visual feedback received on one academic essay, 4) Submit any written artifacts (e.g., outlines, first drafts, and final drafts) related to the above academic essays, and 5) Participate in one audio-recorded interview, not to exceed 30 minutes. The total time commitment to participate in this study will not exceed two hours.

Your participation is completely voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. Discontinuing the study will not affect your relationship with Minnesota State University, Mankato and will not in any way influence your final grade in English 101. You can withdraw from the study at any time by contacting the faculty Principal Investigator (PI), Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee, at sarah.henderson-lee@mnsu.edu or (507) 389-1359.

The risks you will encounter as a participant in this research are not more than experienced in your everyday life. Possible benefits of participating in this study are associated with reflective writing practices and include a heightened awareness of the second language writing process. Additionally, you will gain a better understanding of effective use of different feedback methods on academic writing.

Consent forms will be collected by the faculty PI, Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee, and stored in a locked file cabinet in her office. All electronic documents, including questionnaires, written artifacts, and interview recordings and transcripts, will be stored on the faculty PI's password protected computer. Individual participants will be able to view their own questionnaires, written artifacts, and interview recordings and transcripts; No one other than the PIs (i.e., faculty PI, Dr. Henderson Lee and

Initials: _____

student PI, Hong Thi Tuyet Vo) will be able to view any data pertaining to individual participants. In any dissemination of this research (e.g., thesis, conference presentation, journal article), pseudonyms will be used for all names to ensure confidentiality of participants. All consent forms, audio-recordings, and collected data will be retained for three years before being destroyed, per federal regulations.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact my graduate advisor, Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee, at sarah.henderson-lee@mnsu.edu or (507) 389-1359. If you have any questions about rights of research participants, please contact Dr. Barry Ries, Administrator of the Institutional Review Board, at barry.ries@mnsu.edu or (507) 389-1242. If you have any questions regarding the security of electronic information, please contact, the Minnesota State University, Mankato Information and Technology Services Help Desk at (507) 389-6654 and ask to speak to the Information Security Manager.

A copy of this letter will be provided for you to keep. If you are willing to participate in this study, please initial the bottom of the first page and sign the second page before returning it to the faculty PI, Dr. Sarah Henderson Lee. Your signature indicates that you have read and understand the information above and willingly agree to participate. Thank you for your consideration.

Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and have read and understand the information above and willingly agree to participate.

Your name (printed) _____

Your signature_____

E-mail address (MavMAIL) _____

Date _____

MSU IRBNet LOG #: 887472

Date of MSU IRB approval: 04-01-2016

Appendix B: Questionnaire 1

1. Describe the instructor feedback you received on Essay 1.
Your answer:

2. How would you describe your reaction to this feedback and why?
Your answer:

3. Your instructor provided written feedback on Essay 1. What do you like about this feedback method and why?
Your answer:

4. Your instructor provided written feedback on Essay 1. What don't you like about this feedback method and why?
Your answer:

5. How have you applied your instructor's audio-visual feedback in your revision of Essay 1?
Your answer:

6. Do you think that the instructor's written feedback helped to improve your writing? Why or why not?
Your answer:

Appendix C: Questionnaire 2

1. Describe the instructor feedback you received on Essay 2**.**
Your answer:

2. How would you describe your reaction to this feedback and why?
Your answer:

3. Your instructor provided oral feedback (conference) on Essay 2. What do you like about this feedback method and why?
Your answer:

4. Your instructor provided oral feedback (conference) on Essay 2. What don't you like about this feedback method and why?
Your answer:

5. How have you applied your instructor's audio-visual feedback in your revision of Essay 2?
Your answer:

6. Do you think that the instructor's oral feedback helped to improve your writing? Why or why not?
Your answer:

Appendix D: Questionnaire 3

1. Describe the instructor feedback you received on Essay 3.
Your answer:

2. How would you describe your reaction to this feedback and why?
Your answer:

3. Your instructor provided audio-visual feedback on Essay 3. What do you like about this feedback method and why?
Your answer:

4. Your instructor provided audio-visual feedback on Essay 3. What don't you like about this feedback method and why?
Your answer:

5. How have you applied your instructor's audio-visual feedback in your revision of Essay 3?
Your answer:

6. Do you think that the instructor's audio-visual feedback helped to improve your writing? Why or why not?
Your answer:

Appendix E: Sample Interview Questions

1. Describe your understanding of the instructor feedback methods used in your ENG 101 class.
2. What prior experience did you have with the instructor feedback methods used in your ENG 101 class?
3. How were you introduced to each of the instructor feedback methods in your ENG 101 class?
4. In revising your ENG 101 essay drafts, how exactly did you use the corresponding instructor feedback? How was your writing strengthened in this process?
5. What resources besides the instructor feedback did you use in revising your ENG 101 essay drafts? Why were these additional resources helpful or not?
6. Which of the instructor feedback methods used in your ENG 101 class do you feel was most beneficial to the revision process and why?
7. Describe your engagement level in the writing process during your ENG 101 class. Did any instructor feedback method increase your engagement level?
8. What challenges have you encountered when applying instructor feedback to your essay draft? How did you overcome these challenges?
9. Which instructor feedback method used in the ENG 101 class made you feel most independent/dependent as a writer and why?
10. In your courses next semester, which instructor feedback methods do you hope to receive on your written assignments and why?