

Student Feedback to AI Tools

Question 1: Which tool did you evaluate?

Tool	# of Students	Notes
Bongo	3 (explicit)	Commonly used; likely part of the course toolset
YouGlish	2	Used for pronunciation via YouTube clips
ChatGPT / Chatbot	3 (Chat GPT, chatbot)	Used for feedback or clarification
Transcript Tools	2 (transcript, AssemblyAI Playground)	Used for auto-generated speech-to-text
SpeakPal.AI	1	AI for pronunciation coaching
Speechling	1	Personalized feedback from native speakers
Language Reactor	1	Enhances language learning through subtitle manipulation
Tips and Feedback Tool	1	Likely a built-in feedback AI (possibly in Bongo)

Preliminary Observations:

- **Tool Diversity:** Students explored a **wide range of tools**, from structured platforms like Bongo and Speechling to experimental tools like AssemblyAI Playground and ChatGPT.
- **Frequent Mentions:**
 - **Bongo** was the most evaluated tool, likely due to integration with coursework.
 - **ChatGPT** and **YouGlish** also emerged as notable tools for interactive or pronunciation-based support.
- **Naming Variation:** Some entries (e.g., “transcript tool” or “chatbot”) are generic—so in your final analysis, grouping them with specific tools may help improve clarity (e.g., “chatbot” = ChatGPT?).

Question 2: Does this tool provide feedback on specific sounds? Does it correct incorrectly pronounced sounds or does it go more in depth about open/closed vowels, for example?

Theme	# of Mentions	Examples
No specific phonetic feedback	10+	“Did not go into depth about vowels”; “does not evaluate sounds”
Surface-level or vague feedback	5–6	“Told me which words were unclear”; “gave tips and examples but no phonetics”
Tool only offers word-level examples (e.g., YouGlish)	3–4	“Just plays videos of people saying the word”; “not helpful in giving feedback on how <i>I</i> speak”
Accent issues / regional misclassification	2	“Only showed Canadian French”; “told me what region my language sounded like”
Some general pronunciation feedback (Bongo, possibly)	2–3	“Provided helpful feedback for general pronunciation and liaisons”

No audio playback or ability to self-correct	2–3	“Only provided written feedback”; “you can’t hear what you’re saying wrong”
Negative overall experience	2–3	“Really bad and did not help me”; “I didn’t see any of that”

Key Insights:

- **Most tools did *not*** offer detailed phonetic feedback like correction of individual sounds, open/closed vowel distinctions, or liaison patterns.
- Tools like **YouGlish** were found useful for *model pronunciation*, not for analyzing students’ own speech.
- A few tools highlighted unclear words but lacked **actionable feedback** or explanations for improvement.
- Some students reported **technical or accuracy limitations**, such as misclassifying accents or lacking audio playback.

Question 3: Does this tool use visual feedback (waveforms, pitch contours, phonetic transcription)?

Theme	# of Mentions	Example Quotes
No visual feedback at all	6–7	“No”; “No it does not”; “No just words”
Waveform visualizations only	3–4	“It gives waveforms”; “provided waveforms but no transcription”

Partial visual feedback / Highlighting words	2–3	“Highlighted unclear words”; “yes, all of the above” (unclear but positive)
Limited or inaccurate transcription	1–2	“ChatGPT provides French transcription but not always accurate”
Model video pronunciation only (YouGlish)	2–3	“Only shows video of someone pronouncing a word”

Key Insights:

- The **majority of tools did *not*** provide visual feedback such as pitch contours, phonetic transcription, or articulatory diagrams.
- **Some tools** (likely Bongo or AssemblyAI Playground) offered **waveform displays**, which students found helpful for pinpointing recording issues.
- **No tool consistently offered full phonetic transcription** or pitch contours—two features that would deepen pronunciation awareness.
- Students using tools like **YouGlish** only received **video modeling**, not feedback on their own speech or visualizations of it.

Question 4: How useful was the feedback, in your opinion?

Theme	# of Mentions	Example Quotes
Generally Useful (but with limitations)	6–7	“It was useful for general speaking...”; “somewhat useful”; “helpful if motivated to figure out what was wrong”

Very Useful / Accurate	2–3	“Very helpful”; “surprised at how accurate the AI was”
Helpful for word-level pronunciation only	2–3	“Great if you're having trouble with a specific word”; “native speaker pronouncing a particular word”
Lacked specificity / Actionable guidance	3–4	“Wasn't very specific”; “didn't spell out exactly what I messed up on”
Not Useful / No Feedback Received	4–5	“There was no feedback so it was not useful”; “not useful at all”; “I was not able to get real feedback”
Better or worse compared to other tools	2–3	“Better than some, but nothing compares to the first AI tool”; “not useful compared to Bongo”

Key Insights:

- **Mixed reviews:** Most students found the feedback **somewhat helpful**, especially for general awareness or single-word pronunciation.
- The tool was **most effective at highlighting unclear words** or providing external models, but **did not give clear or in-depth phonetic feedback**.
- **Motivated learners** could extract value from it, but **less guided students** may have struggled to benefit meaningfully.
- Several students explicitly stated the feedback was **not helpful**, especially when they **received no personalized or actionable insights**.

Question 5: AI-Based vs. Human Comparison: Does it compare against native speakers or use AI-generated analysis?

Theme	# of Mentions	Example Quotes
Uses AI-generated analysis	6–7	“AI-generated analysis”; “automatic language detection and transcription”
Preference for native speaker feedback	5–6	“Native speakers are far more helpful”; “a human perspective would have been more beneficial”
Mixed or comparative perspective (AI vs. Human)	3–4	“Both are helpful in different ways”; “AI helps with rules, native speakers help with conversation”
Not sure / unclear comparison	1–2	“Not sure, would have to compare them”
Provides modeled speech from native speakers (e.g., videos)	1–2	“AI tool pulls up videos of native speakers”
Mentions AI transcription features	1–2	“Transcribed full audio with punctuation and accents”

Key Insights:

- The majority of students recognized that the tool uses **AI-generated analysis**, not human comparison or feedback.
- Several **preferred native speaker input**, emphasizing conversational nuance, understanding, and flexibility that AI currently lacks.

- A few acknowledged **complementary strengths** of both: AI for rule-based feedback (e.g., rhythm, clarity), and humans for meaning, context, and interaction.
- Some tools (like YouGlish) **incorporate native speaker videos**, which students found useful but not personalized.

Question 6: Can it be customized by instructors? Can students upload their own video?

Theme	# of Mentions	Example Quotes
Students can upload recordings (audio or video)	7–8	“Yes, students can upload their own videos”; “students can send their own audio recording”
Uncertainty or unclear answers	4–5	“I’m not sure”; “I didn’t look into it for instructors”
Uploads are limited (short clips or paywall)	2–3	“Has to be less than 5 seconds”; “videos only if they pay”
Tool cannot be customized by instructors	5–6	“It cannot be customized”; “I don’t think the teacher can customize”
Some features malfunctioned / didn’t work	1–2	“I tried to upload and it wasn’t working”; “transcription is very off”
One possible yes for instructor customization	1	“I believe it could”

Key Insights:

- **Most tools allowed student uploads**, though often limited to **short recordings**, **audio-only**, or **behind a paywall**.
- **Instructor customization was rarely available or visible**, and most students didn't observe any settings for teacher use.
- A few experienced **technical issues or unclear functionality**, especially around uploading longer videos or getting accurate transcriptions.
- Overall, the tools appear to be **more student-facing and self-directed**, with little integration for instructor-controlled feedback loops.

Question 7: What are the pricing vs. accessibility options?

Theme	# of Mentions	Example Quotes
Free or Free Version Available	6–7	“It is free and open source”; “free for basic membership”; “accessible and easy to use”
Freemium Model (Free with limitations)	4–5	“Free option with limits”; “more practice with premium plan”; “free trial up to 416 hours”
Premium Subscription / Monthly Fee	5–6	“\$10/month or \$60/year”; “\$20/month for pro”; “\$30/month for plus”
Institutional Access (university-paid)	1–2	“Access was provided at no charge... paid for by the university”

Uncertainty or Didn't Check

2-3

“I didn't look into pricing”; “idk”; “was not able to find those options”

Key Insights:

- Most tools followed a **freemium model**: free basic use with optional upgrades offering more features like detailed pronunciation feedback or unlimited uploads.
- Some tools were **completely free** or open source, though often limited in functionality or support.
- **Premium plans** ranged from **\$10–\$30/month**, with some offering **annual discounts**.
- **Institutional access** made at least one tool free to students, eliminating pricing barriers.
- A few students didn't explore pricing, suggesting it may not have been emphasized or was unclear within the tool interface.