

## Impact of teacher written vs. audio feedback on EFL undergraduates' writing

Mohammed Abdullah Alharbi<sup>a\*</sup>, Majmaah University, Department of English, College of Education, Majmaah, Saudi Arabia <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5548-2340>

### Suggested Citation:

Alharbi, M. A., (2021). Impact of teacher written vs. audio feedback on EFL undergraduates' writing. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(3), 1141-1153. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i3.5836>

Received from January 23, 2020; revised from March 10, 2021; accepted from June 04, 2021.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Huseyin Uzunboylu, Higher Education Planning, Supervision, Accreditation and Coordination Board, Cyprus.

©2021 Birlesik Dunya Yenilik Arastırma ve Yayıncılık Merkezi. All rights reserved.

### Abstract

Research comparing written and audio feedback from feedback analysis and students' perspectives showed the effectiveness of audio feedback in learning writing. Yet, there is a rarity of research on the impact of written and audio feedback in students' performance in writing. Therefore, the present study aimed to compare between teacher written and audio feedback in terms of its impact on students' performance in argumentative writing and students' perception of feedback. The results of this experimental study obtained from the scores of undergraduates in argumentative essays revealed that the experimental/audio feedback group of students (n.40) outperformed the control/written feedback group (n.40) in argumentative writing, which implies that audio feedback was more effective than written feedback in enhancing students' writing. Moreover, the results of the students' responses to the survey and their comments on the open questions showed that students perceived both types of feedback equally satisfactory and accessible. However, while audio feedback was more efficient in details, clarifications and personalization, written feedback was perceived clearer and easier to understand and interpret.

**Keywords:** learning feedback; audio and written feedback; teaching writing ; L2 education.

---

\* ADDRESS OF CORRESPONDENCE: Mohammed Abdullah Alharbi \*, Department of English, College of Education, Majmaah University, Majmaah, Saudi Arabia  
Email Address: [maalharbi@mu.edu.sa](mailto:maalharbi@mu.edu.sa)

## 1. Introduction

Feedback is considered as a type of educational assistance given to English as Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners to learn writing (Hyland, 2010; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). While teacher written feedback has a positive impact on students' text revisions (e.g., Alvarez, Espasa, & Guasch, 2012; Sundrarajun, 2020), it is challenging for some students to comprehend some written feedback and productively apply it to their writing (Jonsson, 2013). These issues have shifted the attention of teachers and researchers to think of different ways and strategies in promoting learners' engagement with feedback (e.g., Cramp, 2011; Jonsson, 2013). One of these strategies is delivery of teacher feedback in the form of voice or audio files (Olesova, Richardson, Weasenforth, & Meloni, 2011; Rodway-Dyer, Knight, & Dunne, 2011; Parkes & Fletcher, 2017; Voelkel & Mello, 2014). Audio feedback is defined as voice feedback which is recorded by the instructor/teacher and delivered to students through technological tools and devices, such as MP3.

Researchers have been attracted by the question of whether teacher feedback should be delivered to students through written comments or audio files. Several researchers recommend the use of audio feedback for it is time-efficient (it takes less time in recording it and can be timely, cheap or free and applicable to various written assignments as long as students are familiar with technology use (Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Lunt & Curran, 2010; Olesova et al., 2011; Rodway-Dyer et al., 2011). Research also provides evidence on students' highly perceived value of audio feedback in comparison to written feedback (Fawcett & Oldfield, 2016; Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Ice et al., 2010; Rodway-Dyer et al., 2011). Yet, studies on the impact of teacher audio feedback on students' performance in writing that adopt experimental research designs are rare. While there is evidence that students prefer audio feedback, there are a few studies that compare the outcome of written and audio feedback in improving student performance in writing (Chalmers, MacCallum, Mowat, & Fulton, 2014; Morris & Chikwa, 2016). Therefore, the present experimental study examines the impact of both types of teacher feedback on EFL undergraduates' text revisions in writing over an academic semester. It also explores learners' perception of both types of feedback. It attempts to address the following research questions:

RQ1: Do the written and audio modes of teacher feedback result in significant differences in its impact on students' performance in writing?

Q2: How do students perceive teacher written vs. audio feedback on their writing?

### 2.1 Literature Review

Studies have focused on comparative investigations of teacher written and audio feedback in different aspects, including the quantity of each mode of feedback, quality of feedback and issues in writing addressed by each mode of feedback. For instance, Dagen, Matter, Rinehart and Ice (2008) investigated the differences between types or categories of feedback on students' writing when providing it through written and audio modes. The results show significant differences between the two modes in terms of the issues addressed, especially content and subject matter and clarity and flow of ideas. Analysis of students' self-reports questionnaire indicates that most of the audio feedback they received focused on issues related to content and subject matter. Similarly, while most audio feedback focused on global issues, including content, organization and overall structure, written feedback focused on local issues, such as grammar, punctuation, word choice, and spelling (Cavanaugh & Song, 2014). Similarly, audio records provided significantly more feedback that was less negative and contained more directed feedback (Nemec & Dintzner, 2016).

In comparing teacher audio/taped feedback and written feedback on students' writing, Morra and Asís (2009) revealed that the differences between students' number of errors at the macro (content and organization) and micro-levels (grammar, lexis and mechanics) before and after teacher written and audio feedback were statistically significant because the group of students receiving the number of micro-level errors of the audio feedback group increased in the final draft. In evaluating the impact of audio feedback and written feedback on students' academic performance, Macgregor et al. (2011) analyzed the academic performance of both groups (group receiving audio feedback vs. group receiving written feedback). First, both groups showed an identical performance, which is poor in the formative assessment. However, in the summative assessment (after conducting the experiment), the performance was better than that in the formative assessment and the group receiving written feedback performed better than the group receiving audio feedback although an unpaired two-tailed t-test at  $p \leq 0.05$  showed no differences in the performances between the two groups.

In another study by (Morris & Chikwa, 2016) on comparing audio and written feedback, similar results were reported, indicating that the mode of feedback received did not have effect on students' grades in the subsequent assignments. In other words, no significant differences in students' attainment in writing between students who received only audio feedback and those who received only written feedback in the second assignment. In the same vein, Voelkel and Mello (2014) found no significant differences in either the formative assessment or the final summative exam between the average scores of both groups. From this result, it seems the mode of feedback delivery may not be critical as students can make a good use of either written or audio feedback as long as the feedback is constructive and can be used by them revising their tasks.

## **2.2 Related Research on written vs. audio feedback**

Studies have also focused on how students perceive audio feedback in comparison to written feedback. Findings indicate that students prefer audio feedback over written feedback. According to Morra and Asís (2009), students preferred taped or audio feedback because in comparing it to other types of feedback, they found it effective in shortening the distance with the teacher, making them see it as face-to-face feedback in which they engage in dialogues with the teacher, and developing their sense of commitment. Hennessy and Forrester (2014), students preferred audio feedback for it is more detailed than written feedback and critical and constructive-it pointed at areas of weaknesses in their assignments and helped them to improve their tasks.

Lunt and Curran (2010) found that most of the students felt very positive about receiving audio feedback since it allowed them to see what they missed out in their assignments and it was clear and detailed. Another reason behind this positive perception of audio feedback is the poor quality of written feedback-students reported difficulty reading such hand-written feedback. As reported by Olesova et al. (2011), some students showed preference for audio feedback for it was clear and detailed and it helped them to develop a sense of presence of the course instructor. Similarly, Rodway-Dyer et al.(2011) attributed students' preference for audio feedback to the detailed instruction it provided and the suggestions it offered for future improvement. Similar results were reported by Parkes and Fletcher (2017) illustrating that audio feedback for assessment was perceived positive by the majority of students due to its clarity and easiness to follow. It was also seen more efficient in identifying areas of strengths and weakness in students' assignments.

According to Voelkel and Mello (2014), the receivers of audio feedback in both case studies reported a high level of satisfaction with audio feedback since it contained comments that are more exploratory

and motivational than those of written feedback. In addition, students preferred audio feedback as they felt it more personal in nature than written feedback (Nemec & Dintzner, 2016). As reported by Macgregor et al. (2011), although students in both groups appeared equally satisfied about the feedback received, results of the survey suggest that audio feedback was perceived more positive than written feedback in terms of its details and understandability of feedback as evidenced by the statistically significant differences between the audio feedback group and written feedback group). Moreover, the interviews show that the audio feedback was found to be clearer and easier to understand and interpret. In a study by McCarthy (2015), the results show that students perceived both written and audio feedback were equally easy to understand and accessible to them. Yet, they considered the audio feedback more detailed and more personal than written feedback.

On the other hand, the results of Fawcett and Oldfield (2016) are contradictory to the results of the above studies as it was found that only the least percentage of students showed positive perception of audio feedback in comparison to written feedback. Moreover, the results show no significant differences in students' perceptions of audio feedback and written feedback. The researchers justified this result by stating that as opposed to previous studies showing that hand-written feedback was not of a good quality, in this study, written feedback was of a good quality and therefore, was highly and positively perceived by learners. In a study by Ice et al. (2010), students preferred written feedback alone than audio feedback alone. However, they preferred the combination of both written and audio feedback on their assignments because this helped them to see the issues in their assignments and fix them. According to Olesova et al. (2011), EFL students perceived written feedback more efficient than audio feedback owing to its visual support (i.e. being able to re-read the written comment for better understanding) that assisted them to better revise their texts. As found by Rodway-Dyer et al.(2011), despite students' preference for audio feedback, they found it time consuming and some of them did not see it 'feedback' in the same sense as written feedback because of its details. According to Morra and Asís (2009), students reported that students could grasp teacher's written feedback easily because they were able to see what the teacher was aiming at by the feedback and understand the exact issues in the text.

## **2. Method**

### *Study design*

The present study is quantitative in nature and it used an experimental design. The experimental design suits studies intended to measure the effect of an intervention on participants' performance and or attitudes and perception (Creswell, 2013). In this study, the intervention is represented by teacher audio feedback implementation in a writing course taken by 80 EFL undergraduates.

### *Participants*

The participants in this study were 80 first-year students joining English at Majmaah universities. Specifically, the students were joining a writing course that introduces them to paragraph writing of different genres: descriptive, narrative and argumentative. However, this study is exclusive to argumentative writing because the tasks collected and assessed were argumentative paragraphs. The participants were taught by one instructor and received the same lectures and sessions except for narrative writing. During the narrative paragraph sessions, the students were randomly allocated in two groups according to the feedback that they would receive from the instructor: written or audio

feedback. So, the written feedback group (control group) consisted of 30 students and the audio feedback group (experimental group) consisted of 30 students.

### *Study procedure*

The study was conducted during the second semester of the academic year of 2018-2019. Specifically, it covered a period of 4 weeks, the period during which the students were taught argumentative writing as one unit in the writing textbook. The study was conducted in two main phases: in the first phase, the students were randomly assigned to the control and experimental groups. They were informed of the purpose of research and were assured of protecting their confidentiality. They were also given a consent on their participation to sign. The students were also taught how to write argumentative paragraphs on several controversial topics and were assigned to write an argumentative paragraph each. During this phase, both groups were given the writing task on similar topics from which each student had to select one topic for writing. The first drafts written were uploaded by the students in two pages of the blackboard discussions.

In the second phase, both groups were asked to given teacher feedback. While the control group was given written feedback in the blackboard discussions, the experimental group was given audio/voice feedback. The audio feedback was first recorded through Talk &Comment for Android and then, the link was copied and shared under the first draft of each student in the blackboard discussion. Once receiving teacher feedback, each student had to revise the first draft and upload the revised version as final draft for teacher assessment. These final drafts were also assessed by the instructor using the same criteria for assessing the first drafts.

### *Research instruments*

The study used the following research instruments:

#### *Assignment marks*

The average marks scored by the students in each group in the final drafts of argumentative paragraphs after conducting the experiment obtained by both groups were compared to determine whether the mode of feedback (written vs. audio) had an impact on the overall performance of students in argumentative writing. The final drafts written by the students in both groups were assessed by the course instructor and another instructor based

#### *Students' responses to the survey*

The participating students in both groups were asked to respond to a web-based survey that consists of 7 items (Item 1-7 in Table 1) on a 5-point-Likert scale. The survey was adopted from previous studies on students' perception of written and audio feedback. The items of the survey were designed to elicit information pertaining to students' perception of written and audio feedback in the control and experimental groups, respectively. The survey focused on different aspects of comparison: students' satisfaction, clarity of feedback, easiness to interpret, clarifying how to enhance the task, details of feedback, accessibility and personalization. The survey was administered to the two groups after they submitted the final drafts of argumentative writing.

---

Item
1. I was satisfied with the feedback provided.
2.The feedback was clear for me.
3.The feedback was easy to interpret.
4.The feedback clarified how to improve my assignment.
5.The feedback was sufficiently detailed.
6.The feedback was accessible.
7.The feedback was personal to me.
8.What do you think of the feedback you received on your assignment?
9.What do you like about teacher feedback most?
10. How do you feel about teacher feedback?
11. Is there any difficulty in receiving and or accessing and understanding the feedback?

---

Table 1. Survey items and open questions on students' perception of written and audio feedback

*Students' comments on the open questions*

The students were also requested to respond to four open questions (8-11 see the above table) by commenting on them in the space provided for them under each question in the web-based survey. The questions were intended to provide detailed information on students' overall opinions of teacher written and audio feedback, their likes about it, their feelings about it and the difficulties/challenges encountered by them in accessing and understanding the feedback once received by them.

*Data analysis*

The data obtained from students' scores on the final drafts of writing in both groups were analyzed using SPSS statistical package version 22 (SPSS Inc.,2016). The data analysis was performed by using a Mann-Whitney U Test in order to measure the differences in the scores of both groups or the differences in the impact of feedback on writing between the written and audio modes.

Moreover, the students' responses to the seven-item survey were imported in the form of Excel (Microsoft). Then, it was transferred to the SPSS program. In analyzing the data, descriptive and inferential statistics, including the mean values, medians and the P value. In determining the differences between the written feedback group and audio feedback group, the Mann-Whitney U Test was performed for this purpose.

A thematic analysis of students' comments on the open questions was performed in order to obtain more information about students' perception of both types of teacher feedback. In this regard, the comments were read carefully and assigned to different codes that were later clustered under themes based on the literature review and results of the survey. Then, each theme was presented and explained with a sample comment or a segment of comment accordingly. The themes are discussed in the finding section.

### 3. Results

#### *The impact of written vs. audio feedback on students' writing*

In this study, the students' scores in the pre-feedback drafts and post-feedback drafts were used for the purpose of measuring the impact of both written and audio feedback on students' performance in descriptive writing based on the criteria of academic writing development used in the writing course. The results (Table 2) obtained from the Shapiro-Wilk test revealed there was a significant deviation of the data from a normal distribution,  $p < .5$ . Based on this, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted in order to examine the students' writing development after the intervention in the written feedback group and the audio feedback group. As illustrated in Table 5, the mean ranks of the audio feedback group students (Mean Rank= 39.95, Mdn =1.00) were higher than the mean ranks of the written feedback students (Mean Rank = 33.6, Mdn = .50). This result suggests that the audio feedback revealed more improvements or was more effective in improving students' writing than the written feedback in descriptive writing tasks. However, the analysis demonstrated significant differences in the scores in writing scores between the written feedback-based group and the audio feedback-based group ( $U = 524$ ,  $z = -1.51$ ,  $p = .131$ , and  $r = .17$ ).

Mode of feedback	n	Mean	Sum of ranks	Mdn	U	Z	P (2-tailed)
Written	40	33.6	1190	.50	524	-1.51	.024*
Audio	40	39.95	1440	1.00			

Table 2. Results of the Mann-Whitney U test on participants' scores in writing

#### *Students' perception of written vs. audio feedback*

Table 3 presents the results obtained from the quantitative analysis of students' responses to the survey items in both groups, specifically, the results of the Mann-Whitney U test. Rerunning the Mann-Whitney U test on students' responses to each single item of the survey, it was found that no significant differences were found between the two groups' perception of the feedback they received on their writing in relation to their satisfaction about it and its accessibility. This is evidenced from the results, particularly the results of item 1 (P value=0.272) and item 6 (P value=0.275). Moreover, the median of each item is equal in both groups.

The results of students' responses to item 4, 5 and 7 of the survey illustrate notable median differences between the two groups in relation to the clarity of feedback, clarifications of feedback on how to enhance the task, the sufficient details of feedback and personification of it, respectively. As noticed by the p values of these four items suggest statistically significant differences between the two groups in favour of audio feedback over written feedback. This result indicates that the audio feedback was better than the written feedback in terms of the clarifications on enhancing the text, sufficient details and personification.

On the other hand, the written feedback was clearer and easier to interpret than the audio feedback as illustrated by the result of items 2 and 3. In other words, the median shows notable differences between the two groups, which is also supported by the p value of 0.047\*.

Table 3. Results of the Mann-Whitney U test on participants' responses to the survey items

Survey items	Written feedback group		Audio feedback group		U	Z	P value
	Mean	Mdn	Mean	Mdn			
1. I was satisfied with the feedback provided.	4.02	4	4.16	4	50.00	-1.061	0.272
2. The feedback was clear to me.	4	58.00	3.40	3.5	58.00	-0.629	0.064*
3. The feedback was easy to interpret.	3.15	3	2.3	2	40.00	-1.966	0.047*
4. The feedback clarified how to improve my assignment.	4.00	4	3.2	3	48.00	-1.050	0.043*
5. The feedback was sufficiently detailed.	3.49	3.6	3.54	4	59.00	-0.633	0.060*
6. The feedback was accessible.	4.13	4	4.19	4	51.00	-1.051	0.275
7. The feedback was personal to me.	2.79	3	3.56	3.5	37.00	-2.028	0.041*

*Results of the responses to open questions*

The thematic analysis of students' responses to the open questions revealed several themes, five of which are common for both groups of students, and two are exclusive to the audio feedback group. Moreover, some of these themes support the results of the survey. As shown in Table (4), both types of feedback were perceived satisfactory among the majority of students in both groups. In addition, both types of feedback were perceived to be motivational and encouraging for almost half of students in both groups to revise their tasks. Although both types were seen as enablers of students to notice the issues in writing, written feedback was more highly perceived to be so because the number of students in the written feedback group commenting on this feature was higher than that of students in the audio feedback group.

Table 4. Themes generated from analysis of students' comments on the open questions

Theme	Sample response		Frequency	
	Written feedback group	Audio feedback group	Written feedback group	Audio feedback group
1. Satisfactory	We were satisfied because it highlighted all our mistakes.	I am totally satisfied as the feedback helped me to improve our weaknesses.	36	33
2. Motivational	I like it as it encouraged me to enhance my writing.	I was also motivated to do more revisions after listening to the voice.	21	27

<b>3. Noticing issues</b>	It allowed for me to reflect back on each mistake and think what ways I can do.	It helped me to see the errors in my writing.	23	12
<b>4. Accessibility</b>	And I can really read the online feedback wherever I am with mobile and refer to it anytime.	However, I find it troublesome I need to download another app for it.	36	37
<b>5. Clarity</b>	It was very clear for me.	It was somehow clear to listen to it.	37	9
<b>6. Understability</b>	I couldn't understand some feedback in the Google doc comments.	I do have some misunderstanding when listening to some audio feedback	12	27
<b>7. Detailed</b>	No comment	The feedback gave more details to make adjustments.	0	29
<b>8. Personal</b>	No comment	I loved it as if the instructor was talking to me in real.	0	17

In relation to accessibility of feedback, although the survey results showed that both types of teacher feedback were almost equally accessible, the results from the responses to the open questions were contradictory because the written feedback was more accessible to students and easy to refer to anytime using the mobile. However, more than two thirds of students in the audio feedback group pointed at the difficulty accessing the audio feedback because they needed to upload an App for it.

In relation to clarity and understandability of feedback, students' written responses to the open questions highly support these features in the written feedback as shown by the higher number of students in the written feedback group commenting on the clarity of feedback and the lower number of students commenting on the difficulty understanding some written feedback.

Finally, two features that support the results of the survey on the efficiency of audio feedback are the detailed and personal features of audio feedback, which were lacking in the students' responses to the open questions in the written feedback group.

#### 4. Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the impact of teacher's written vs. audio feedback on students' performance in argumentative essay writing. The study also explored students' views on both types of teacher feedback. In relation to the first research question, the results of the current study show that audio feedback has a significant impact on students' writing. Like previous studies on comparing the impact of written and audio feedback on students' writing (Gleaves & Walker, 2013; Macgregor et al., 2011; Morra & Asís, 2009; Morris & Chikwa, 2016; Voelkel & Mello, 2014), the current study showed differences in the impact of feedback on students' performance in writing between written and audio modes of feedback. However, the present study provided evidence that contradicts the results of these previous studies. In other words, the above studies reported non-statistically

significant differences in the impact of both modes of teacher feedback. They also attributed this to several reasons. First, the opportunities to apply teacher feedback in writing is important regardless of the mode in which the feedback was delivered (Morra and Asís, 2009). Moreover, it seems that the mode of feedback is not critical (Morris & Chikwa, 2016). Another reason is the difficulty in understanding the recorded feedback among students who are non-English native speaker (Voelkel & Mello, 2014).

On the other hand, in this study, statistically significant differences in the impact of feedback between the two modes were found. This suggests that audio feedback was more effective than written feedback in enhancing students' performance in argumentative writing. As opposed to these above-mentioned studies, the mode of feedback appears critical in influencing students' quality of text revisions. There are several possible reasons that may explain such contradictory results. The first reason is that since the focus of this study was on the impact of teacher written vs. audio feedback was on the task of argumentative essay writing, so it was exclusive to determine the impact of both modes of feedback on students' performance in formative assessment in writing rather than summative assessment. This means that students were given a task to write an argumentative essay (first draft), and one group received written feedback, while the other group received audio feedback. Then, they revised the first draft based on the feedback they received and could make a good use of the feedback in enhancing it and re-producing it as a final draft. Another reason could be the detailed information and instruction carried by the audio feedback that helped students to revise their essays well and improve their performance in argumentative writing.

Regarding the second research question, interesting results were obtained from students' responses to the close and open questions of the survey. First, they were satisfied with the quality of both modes of teacher feedback. This supports earlier research of Macgregor et al. (2011) on students' equal levels of satisfaction about audio and written feedback. This could refer to the good quality of electronic feedback either written or audio.

On the other hand, most of the students of the current study perceived audio feedback more efficient than written feedback in relation to sufficient details of feedback. This is not new given that several studies have reported the detailed nature of audio feedback as one important factor contributing to students' positive views or perception of audio feedback (Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Lunt & Curran, 2010; Olesova et al., 2011; Macgregor et al., 2011; McCarthy, 2015). Being recorded rather than written, it allows teachers to provide more details efficiently without consuming much effort and time (Lunt & Curran, 2010).

Other two important features of audio feedback that could explain students' positive perception of the audio feedback on their writing are the clarifications it offers and feeling of personalization it develops or creates among students. Audio feedback provides learners with information pointing at the weaknesses of their writing and suggestions on how to enhance it (Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Voelkel & Mello, 2014). Moreover, being aided by teacher's voice and tone, students perceived audio feedback more personal than written feedback. This result supports results reported by previous research (Chalmers et al., 2014; McCarthy, 2015) on the personal nature of audio feedback.

Although the above results on the efficiency of teacher audio feedback are encouraging, such audio feedback was not as clear as written feedback. Unlike other studies (Lunt & Curran, 2010; Olesova et al., 2011; Macgregor et al., 2011; Parkes & Fletcher, 2017), in this study, audio feedback is not perceived more efficient than written feedback in terms of its clarity and understandability. This result from the

survey was also supported by the students' responses to the open questions in this study (The number of students commenting on the clarity of the feedback in the written feedback group was higher). This suggests that some of the audio records were not clear for some students, which could be due to the quality of recording. Moreover, audio feedback was more difficult to understand than written feedback as also evidenced by students' responses to the open questions in both groups (Only 12 students in the written feedback group commented on their failure to understand some feedback, while 27 students in the audio feedback did so).

The above result could be owing to the following reasons. First, the details contained in audio feedback required a few minutes to listen to and made students unable to figure out the exact intended message. Therefore, while recording audio feedback, teachers should not give a detailed instruction because details may turn the feedback into instruction (Rodway-Dyer et al., 2011). As a result of more details, students will heavily rely on teacher explicit details in feedback to correct their tasks. Effective feedback should challenge students' thinking about how to fix the issues in their assignments.

The second reason is the poor quality of voice records. The poor quality of voice in audio feedback is an important that affects students' perception of teacher feedback (Hennessy & Forrester, 2014; Olesova et al., 2011; Parkes & Fletcher, 2017). Therefore, teachers should make sure that their recordings are clear and free from external noises. Another reason could be the visually of written feedback that made it easier than audio feedback in grasping the message. Morra and Asís (2009) found that students could grasp teacher's written feedback easily because they were able to see what the teacher was aiming at by the feedback and understand the exact issues in the text.

Finally, audio feedback was not perceived by many students as easy as written feedback to access since they needed to download the App to listen to it. Therefore, teachers should use another tool for recording and providing audio feedback (e.g. mobile voice messages shared to WhatsApp) that is more easily accessible by learners.

## **5. Conclusion**

There are some limitations of the present study that need to be addressed for future research. The first limitation is that the students participating in this study were drawn from only a single course at the a single university. This implies that the findings reported were based on the views and experiences of students in a specific course. Hence, the small-scale nature of the study does not help in making any generalizations of the findings. It is necessary, therefore, for future work to conduct similar research that involves a larger number of students at different university levels and from different disciplines in order to allow for a comparison of the results. Another limitation of the current study is the use of in-depth qualitative data that can provide more details explaining their perception of both types of feedback. In other words, the study used open questions to elicit further information about students' views which were expressed through written comments. However, in order to enrich the data, future studies should consider conducting follow-up face-to-face interviews, which will enable researchers to obtain in-depth information. A final limitation is that although the study helps us to better understand the impact of teacher written and audio feedback on writing, it did not focus on the relationships between students' scores and their feedback preferences. It did not also explore how certain types of feedback impact students' performance in writing when given written and audio feedback. This is an interesting research topic for future research.

Alharbi, M. A., (2021). Impact of teacher written vs. audio feedback on EFL undergraduates' writing. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 16(3), 1141-1153. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i3.5836>

## 6. References

- Ibis Alvarez, Anna Espasa & Teresa Guasch (2012) The value of feedback in improving collaborative writing assignments in an online learning environment, *Studies in Higher Education*, 37:4, 387-400, [DOI: 10.1080/03075079.2010.510182](https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2010.510182)
- Cavanaugh, A. J., & Song, L. (2014). Audio feedback versus written feedback: Instructors' and students' perspectives. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 122.
- Chalmers, C., MacCallum, J., Mowat, E., & Fulton, N. (2014). Audio feedback: richer language but no measurable impact on student performance. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 8(1), 64-73. <http://ojs.cumbria.ac.uk/index.php/prhe/article/view/150>
- Cramp, A. (2011). Developing first-year engagement with written feedback. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 12(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787411402484>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating*. W. Ross MacDonald School Resource Services Library.
- Dagen, A. S., Matter, C., Rinehart, S., & Ice, P. (2008). Can you hear me now? Providing feedback using audio commenting technology. *College Reading Association Yearbook*, 29, 152-166.
- Hannah Fawcett & Jeremy Oldfield (2016) Investigating expectations and experiences of audio and written assignment feedback in first-year undergraduate students, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 21:1, 79-93, [DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2015.1115969](https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2015.1115969)
- Claire Hennessy & Gillian Forrester (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](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.870530)
- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 171-182. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119251>
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language teaching*, 39(2), 83-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- Jonsson, A. (2013). Facilitating productive use of feedback in higher education. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(1), 63–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412467125>
- Tom Lunt & John Curran (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](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930902977772)
- Olesova, L., Richardson, J., Weasenforth, D., & Meloni, C. (2011). Using asynchronous instructional audio feedback in online environments: A mixed methods study. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 7(1), 30-42.
- George Macgregor, Alex Spiers & Chris Taylor (2011) Exploratory evaluation of audio email technology in formative assessment feedback, *Research in Learning Technology*, 19:1, 39-59, [DOI: 10.1080/09687769.2010.547930](https://doi.org/10.1080/09687769.2010.547930)
- Ana María Morra & María Inés Asís (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](https://doi.org/10.1080/10790195.2009.10850319)
- Mitchell Parkes & Peter Fletcher (2017) A longitudinal, quantitative study of student attitudes towards audio feedback for assessment, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42:7, 1046-1053, [DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2016.1224810](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1224810)

- Alharbi, M. A., (2021). Impact of teacher written vs. audio feedback on EFL undergraduates' writing. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*, 16(3), 1141-1153. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v16i3.5836>
- Sue Rodway-Dyer, Jasper Knight & Elizabeth Dunne (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](https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2010.524197)
- Sundrarajun, C. . (2020). Voices from EFL Thai learners towards English writing. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 15(6), 1495–1507. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.v15i6.5293>
- Susanne Voelkel & Luciane V. Mello (2014) Audio Feedback – Better Feedback?, *Bioscience Education*, 22:1, 16-0, [DOI: 10.11120/beej.2014.00022](https://doi.org/10.11120/beej.2014.00022)
- Nemec, E. C., & Dintzner, M. (2016). Comparison of audio versus written feedback on writing assignments. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 155-159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2015.12.009>
- Morris, C., & Chikwa, G. (2016). Audio versus written feedback: Exploring learners' preference and the impact of feedback format on students' academic performance. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(2), 125–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416637482>