Effects of Feedback Types and English Achievement on EFL Oral Presentation Performance of Thai Undergraduates

Raveewan Wanchid[*] and Valaikorn Charoensuk

King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand

Corresponding author: rwanchid@hotmail.com

Article information	
Abstract	This study investigated the effects of different feedback types and English achievement levels on students' oral presentation performance in an English as a foreign language (EFL) context. Specifically, the research aims were four-fold: 1) to compare the effects of oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback on students' English oral presentation (EOP) performance; 2) to examine the influences of students' levels of English achievement (high, moderate, and low) on their EOP performance; 3) to explore the potential interaction effects between feedback types and English achievement levels on students' EOP performance; and 4) to investigate students' perceptions of the feedback type they experienced. This study was of an experimental, 3x3 factorial design and was conducted with 108 engineering students with diverse levels of English achievement. They were randomly assigned to three groups: oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback. Data were analyzed using two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), descriptive statistics, and thematic analysis. The results revealed significant effects of feedback types and English achievement levels on students' EOP performance,

	although no interaction effect was found. Additionally, students in each group expressed positive perceptions of the feedback modality they experienced.
Keywords	oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, online written peer feedback, English oral presentation (EOP) performance, perceptions
APA citation:	Wanchid, R., & Charoensuk, V. (2024). Effects of feedback types and English achievement on EFL oral presentation performance of Thai undergraduates. *PASAA, 69*, 153–194.

1. Introduction

Cultivating learner autonomy and critical thinking skills have become focal points in English as a foreign language (EFL) instruction. Consequently, alternative assessment methods, particularly peer assessment, have drawn significant attention from researchers. Extensive literature highlights the advantages of peer assessment in promoting students' critical abilities, fostering active engagement, and nurturing a sense of responsibility and autonomy (Cheng & Warren, 2005). While the benefits of peer assessment in the learning process are well-documented, most empirical investigations have been conducted within L1 and L2 learning contexts. As peer assessment garners interest among EFL practitioners, concerns have arisen regarding its implementation, such as learners' lack of confidence and ability to provide quality feedback, potential biases in assessment, and understanding about damaging interpersonal relationships. These issues remain subjects of debate, underscoring the need for further research within the EFL context.

Grounded in Vygotsky's (1978) Sociocultural Theory, feedback can be conceptualized as a collaborative and socially mediated process. Language learning arises within a learner's zone of proximal development (ZPD), facilitated by scaffolding from experts or more capable peers (Wood et al., 1976). Pojslová (2023) contends that engaging the entire audience in providing feedback and

assessment bridges the gap between presentation experiences and real-life scenarios, where evaluation is not only from the teacher's views but a collection of diverse perspectives. This approach enhances the quality of feedback and ensures a more objective and equitable assessment overall. Some constraints, such as heavy workload and large class size, might obstruct the quality and frequency of the teacher feedback. As a result, receiving feedback from the teachers is probably not sufficient.

In Thailand, while peer feedback has been extensively studied in writing classes, limited research has explored its application in developing oral communication skills, particularly oral presentations (De Grez et al., 2010). Proficient presentation abilities are crucial for undergraduate students in today's labor market (Kovac & Sirkovic, 2012). Although some studies have investigated peer assessment in oral presentation courses, they have primarily focused on score ratings based on predefined rubrics rather than qualitative feedback through face-to-face comments and suggestions. Previous findings have yielded unsatisfactory results, such as overestimating peer performance and dishonest or indirect feedback. Concerns have been raised regarding the suitability of peer assessment in EFL instructional contexts, particularly in collectivist cultures that prioritize teacher feedback and group harmony. These challenges emphasize the need to explore strategies to optimize the benefits of peer assessment in EFL classes.

To overcome the challenges, integrating technology and peer feedback could provide a more comfortable learning environment. In this research, Google Sheets, designed as an online platform for anonymous peer feedback, was used in the online written peer feedback group. It is expected that the anonymity of feedback providers can be facilitated by using Google Sheets, and this can lead to higher quality peer feedback, which is more honest and direct, because the students do not know who provides comments.

Overall, each type of feedback has its advantages and disadvantages and may affect the students' presentation performance differently. Thus, different feedback types in the EOP course can affect the students' presentation performance differently, mainly when employed with students' mixed English ability levels.

To the best of the researchers' knowledge, it seems that no prior study exists or has been conducted that compares oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback. In order to fill this gap, this research aims to investigate whether different types of feedback—oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback—influence students' EOP performance. Additionally, the study examines the potential effects of learners' English achievement levels on their English oral presentation (EOP) performance across different types of feedback. Furthermore, exploring students' perceptions of the received feedback is valuable, as aligning feedback preferences with learners' needs could enhance learning outcomes and engagement.

1.1 Research Objectives

1.1.1 To compare the main effects of oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback on the students' EOP performance

1.1.2 To compare the main effects of the students' levels of English achievement (high, moderate, and low) on the students' EOP performance

1.1.3 To investigate the interaction effects between the types of feedback and the levels of English achievement on the students' EOP performance

1.1.4 To investigate the students' perceptions of using oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback

1.2 Statements of the Hypotheses

1.2.1 There are significant main effects of the types of feedback on the students' EOP performance at the 0.05 level.

1.2.2 There are significant main effects of the levels of English achievement on the students' EOP performance at the 0.05 level.

1.2.3 There are significant interaction effects of the types of feedback and the levels of English achievement on the students' EOP performance at the 0.05 level.

1.2.4 The students have positive perceptions of the feedback they have experienced in the English Oral Presentation (EOP) course.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Oral Presentations in Language Learning

Oral presentations, also known as public speaking, aim to deliver ideas or information to an audience (Rajoo, 2010). They are widely used in language classes, allowing learners to practice various integrated language skills (Brooks & Wilson, 2014; King, 2002). Group presentations require learners to use English to exchange ideas, negotiate meaning during preparation and practice, and respond to unexpected audience questions, potentially developing their language proficiency (Bunch, 2009). Oral presentations promote greater class involvement and attention, and remarkable language and personal skills improvements are valuable for future employment (Girard et al., 2011).

2.2 Peer Feedback in the EFL Context and the English Oral Presentation (EOP) Course

Various research studies have documented the benefits of using peer feedback, especially in EFL classrooms. These benefits encompass the development of various cognitive processes, superior domain-specific knowledge acquisition, meaningful social interactions in class, and students' better understanding and realization of criteria (Waluyo & Panmei, 2024; Zhang et al., 2022). Regarding cultural characteristics, students in the Confucian community, who are generally shy and mostly avoid offering criticisms to their friends, can overcome their cultural barrier and become involved in this process (Pham et al., 2020). Al Abri et al. (2021) found that anonymous feedback got positive reactions

from Omani students and it led to their increased confidence and reduction of social anxiety.

On the other hand, Li et al. (2022) and Waluyo and Panmei (2024) found that various factors inhibit the quality of peer feedback in EFL classrooms, including peers' low language competency, confidence, competitive classroom atmosphere, lack of assessment training, and information shortage resulting from classroom management. In addition, according to Nita and Anam (2021), the reliability and accuracy of students' judgment skills, the seriousness of the assessment, power relations between students and scholars, and pressure while giving assessments were reasons why peer feedback might not be effective in class.

Despite the challenges of peer feedback in the EFL context, peer feedback has been increasingly used in tertiary education due to its benefits for learning outcomes (Brown et al., 2005; Falchikov, 1995; Freeman, 1995; Purchase, 2000; Rust et al., 2003; Sluijsmans et al., 2003; Smyth, 2004). Peer feedback is particularly effective in EFL writing classes and can also be applied to speaking classes, as both skills involve productive language use (Li et al., 2022).

In EFL contexts, peer feedback and oral presentations can promote student-centered learning and improve communicative competence (Brooks & Wilson, 2014; Jones, 2007). While learners may not provide feedback as accurately as teachers, immediate peer feedback after presentations helps both presenters and peers better understand assessment criteria and apply learned concepts to improve their work (Ahangari et al., 2013; Gibbs & Simpson, 2004; Nicol & Macfarlane - Dick, 2006; Zhao, 2018).

All language skills are necessary for effective oral presentations, enabling students to apply their learning in real-life contexts (Ahangari et al., 2013; King, 2002; Nida, 2017). However, studies suggest that low-achieving ESL students rely

on memorizing scripts, neglecting other aspects like pronunciation and body language (Weissberg, 1993). Put another way, oral presentations may be more effective for high-achieving students (Jafarpur, 1991), as low-proficiency learners struggle with understanding and participating, and consequently experience limited language development (Chiu, 2004; Meloni & Thompson, 1980). No doubt, challenges exist in EFL contexts, particularly for low-proficiency learners who may experience anxiety, fear of appearing foolish, and difficulty understanding and participating in oral presentations and peer assessment (Cheng & Warren, 1997; Huxham et al., 2010; Joughin, 2007; Lydia et al., 2006; Pâquet & Des Marchais, 1998; Smith et al., 2002).

Additionally, constraints like large class sizes, lack of previous training in communicative language teaching, and exam-oriented curricula can hinder the use of communicative activities and oral presentations, even at the university level (Browne & Wada, 1998; Nishino, 2008; Taguchi, 2002; Tsou & Huang, 2012). Teacher support remains necessary throughout the peer assessment process, and peer feedback should be used sensibly in EFL contexts (Noonan & Duncan, 2005; Zhao, 2014).

2.3 Online/technology-mediated Peer Feedback

Traditionally, in-class peer feedback is delivered face-to-face. Students value its immediacy and personal interaction despite potential social tensions. To reduce tensions, structured peer feedback protocols like praise-question-polish may guide constructive feedback sequences (Mahasneh & Alwan, 2018).

However, with the rise of educational technologies, online peer feedback systems have emerged to facilitate peer feedback. In online peer feedback (OPF) activities, students can share project photos, view course announcements, improve material projects, and engage with each other online (Demirbilek, 2015). A separate review by Hsu and Wang (2022) confirm that asynchronous computer-mediated communication effectively promotes peer feedback, resulting in higher-

quality comments. Additionally, Zhang et al. (2022) note that from a social-affective viewpoint, students feel positive emotions when they see their peers demonstrating humility and mutual respect, which helps them to steer clear of negative feelings like embarrassment or anger. Ferris and Kurzer (2019) report that online anonymous peer reviews using video recordings enhance feedback quality and reduce social discomfort. Anonymous in-class feedback via polling apps or forms have also aimed to reduce discomfort (McDonald et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2020).

For multimodal peer feedback, studies conducted by Lim et al. (2021) and Yu and Wu (2013) combined written comments with audio/video annotations on recorded presentations. This combination allowed nuanced feedback on delivery aspects. In an oral presentation course, Yeh et al. (2019) found that online video blogging reduced EFL students' public speaking anxiety and improved presentation performance, especially high-achieving students. Nevertheless, when peer feedback is conducted through social networking platforms, constant Internet connectivity can heighten emotional strain and reduce peer-to-peer trust. Moreover, technical issues and increased workload have been cited as challenges (Latifi et al., 2021).

Overall, research highlights the value of face-to-face and online peer feedback formats, with the choice depending on factors like class size, technology access, and preferences for anonymity vs. personal interaction (Akbari, 2021; Lin et al., 2018).

3. Methodology
3.1 Research Design
A 3x3 factorial experimental research design was implemented in this study. The independent variables were the three types of feedback: oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback; and the levels of

English achievement: high, moderate, and low. The dependent variables were the students' EOP performance and their perceptions of the feedback they received.

3.2 Population and Sample

Usually, there are approximately 700 undergraduate students from five different faculties, namely Applied Science, Architecture and Design, Business and Industrial Development, Engineering, and Technical Education, enrolling in the EOP course, divided into 15-20 sections each semester, with ten to 15 teachers involved in this course. There are approximately 140-150 students from each faculty.

This study was conducted with 108 engineering students with different levels of English achievement who were willing to participate in the experiment. The sample size of this study was determined based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970), who suggest that the sufficient sample size for a population of 150 is 108. The study sample was composed of 61 females and 47 males. The students' age range was 19-21. They were divided into three different English achievement groups: high, moderate, and low achievers, based on the grades of the English course they had received in the previous course. The high achievers were the students who received grades A and B+, the moderate achievers were those with the grades of B, C+, and C, and the low achievers' grades were D+ and D. The stratified random sampling technique was used to select and assign the participants into the three experimental groups. The same instructor taught the three groups.

In this study, there were both one control group and two experimental groups. The control group used oral teacher feedback. There were 32 participants (ten high achievers, 12 moderate achievers, and ten low achievers) in this group. The first experimental group, with 43 participants (ten high achievers, 23 moderate achievers, and ten low achievers) received oral peer feedback, and the second experimental group, with 33 participants (ten high achievers, 13 moderate achievers, and ten low achievers), received online written feedback.

3.3 Setting

English Oral Presentation (EOP) is an elective English course offered to Thai undergraduate students who have completed the prerequisite fundamental English I and II courses. According to the course description, it aims to develop students' EOP skills. Upon completing the course, students are expected to demonstrate the ability to 1) deliver presentations with appropriate posture, gestures, eye contact, and vocal inflections; 2) produce comprehensible English messages; 3) effectively design and utilize a variety of visual aids; and 4) structure presentations with an introduction, body, conclusion, and appropriate transitions.

In this study, the class met once a week for three hours over a 15-week semester. The required textbook was Speaking of Speech (new edition) by David Harrington and Charles LeBeau, chosen for its alignment with the course objectives on developing oral presentation skills. All three groups followed the same syllabus, utilizing the same textbook, classroom activities, assessment criteria, and course evaluation methods.

For ethical considerations, the study was conducted following the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Bansomdejchaopraya Rajabhat University (COA No. BSRU-REC 6401001). Before the experiment commenced, study participants were briefed about the study objectives. The participants took part in the study on a voluntary basis, and they were asked to sign the informed consent form.

3.4 A Teacher's Role

One of the researchers played the role of the teacher who taught all three groups. She was a facilitator who helped the students learn, and at the same time, she had to facilitate active interaction between students during the feedback activities. She took the role of a consultant and resource in the teacher-student feedback. She was a coach in the students' training session, and she also functioned as a moderator to check whether the students were on the right track

in the feedback activities, encouraging the students to take responsibility for their learning. To control the teacher's potential bias, the role of the teacher was consistent across the three groups by providing instruction content and feedback based on the same presentation rubrics to students.

3.5 Research Instruments
3.5.1 Individual Pre-test and Post-test Speeches

The type of presentation for the pre-test and post-test speeches was a one-minute persuasive speech that compared two products or services. Due to manageable length, one-minute presentations allowed individuals, especially inexperienced presenters, to practice public speaking without feeling overwhelmed. Even though the presentations lasted only one minute, it was sufficient to evaluate the four aspects of the presentation performances (Yoshikawa, 2014).

The students had one week to prepare for the pre-test and post-test presentations. The rubric of the presentations, shown in Table 3, measured four aspects with 29 points: 1) physical delivery (10 points), 2) speech comprehensibility (8 points), 3) visual message (5 points), and 4) story message (6 points). The rubric was developed from the performance evaluation rubric in the textbook Speaking of Speech (2009) by David Harrington and Charles LeBeau.

To prevent any subjective issues from occurring while rating all of the students' presentation performance, two experienced teachers rated all the pre- and post-tests. The Pearson correlation coefficient was employed to check for inter-rater reliability. The results indicated acceptable inter-rater reliability for the four components of presentation performance (physical delivery = 0.99; speech comprehensibility = 0.99; visual message = 0.99; and story message = 0.99) and reached 0.99 for overall scores. Similarly, the post-test demonstrated satisfactory inter-rater reliability (physical delivery = 0.96; speech comprehensibility = 0.94; visual message = 0.85; story message = 0.83; and overall scores = 0.89). These

findings signified a high level of agreement between the two raters in evaluating presentation performance based on the rubric scores, indicating a robust and consistent assessment process.

3.5.2 Online Questionnaires

The study employed two primary online questionnaires to assess students' perceptions of different feedback types. The first instrument, designed for the oral teacher feedback group, comprised 33 items: 17 addressing the perceived benefits and 16 probing the perceived problems of the teacher feedback. The second questionnaire, created for the oral peer feedback and online written peer feedback groups, consisted of 70 items spanning two main aspects: 1) the perceived benefits of peer feedback as a receiver (20 items) and giver (15 items), and 2) the perceived problems of peer feedback as a receiver (20 items) and giver (15 items).

The questionnaires were constructed to elicit students' responses regarding their perceptions of the feedback type they experienced, underscoring the tripartite framework of perception components: affective, cognitive, and behavioral domains. A five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5) was utilized. Three experts validated the instruments, and the index of item objective congruence (IOC) of the qualitative instruments was 1. The reliability of the questionnaires calculated by the Cronbach coefficient alpha was 0.96 on average. The questionnaires were distributed via Google Forms to the students at the end of the course.

3.5.3 Semi-structured Interviews

Six volunteered students from each group—two high, two moderate, and two low English achievers, or 18 students—were privately interviewed after the course ended to gain more in-depth data about their perceptions of the feedback they received. Each interview lasted approximately 15 minutes. The interview sessions started with the main questions and then follow-up questions were used to achieve more profound reflections. The participants in the control group were

mainly asked to reflect on how they perceived the feedback they had received from the teacher, while those in the two experimental groups were asked to share their perceptions of receiving the feedback from their peers and giving feedback to their peers.

3.6 The experimental Process

The experimental period was 15 weeks, which corresponded with the EOP course. The students in the three groups were treated equally in order to prevent the occurrence of other extraneous variables. The treatment was different, as each group experienced a different feedback type. The features of the three feedback groups are shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1

Features of Three Feedback Groups

Features	Group 1: Oral Teacher Feedback	Group 2: Oral Peer Feedback	Group 3: Online Written Peer Feedback
1. Mode of communication	Oral	Oral	Written
2. Feedback giver(s)	Teacher	Peer	Peer
3. Feedback channel	Onsite	Onsite	Online
4. Anonymity of feedback giver(s)	No	No	Yes
5. Nonverbal components	Yes	Yes	No
6. Personal interaction	Yes	Yes	No
7. Power distance	High	Low	Low

The following are definitions to support a clear understanding of the last three features in Table 1. First, nonverbal components referred to the various ways of communication without using words, such as postures, gestures, eye contact, facial expressions, and tone of voice. Second, personal interaction referred to two-way communication, which facilitated interpersonal communication between a feedback giver and a feedback receiver and gave the sender indications as to whether the message had been received accurately. Third, power distance was

defined as the difference in hierarchical relations between a feedback giver and a feedback receiver; in this context, power distance markers varied depending on age differences and social status.

During the course, the students had to deliver six mini-presentations. Thus, they experienced the feedback activities six times. The feedback was given to the presenters in all three groups immediately after their presentations. The procedures of the feedback activities of each group are summarized below:

Table 2

The Procedures of Feedback Activities

Mini-Presentations 1-6	Group 1: Oral Teacher Feedback	Group 2: Oral Peer Feedback	Group 3: Online Written Peer Feedback
1. A Week Before Presentations (Weeks 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13)			
	1. Have the students watch the video showing good and bad examples of oral presentations. 2. Discuss the target presentation skills they have learned from the video. 3. Introduce scoring criteria for presentations in the following week. 4. For Group 2 and Group 3, train the students on how to give effective feedback based on the given presentation rubric.		
2. Six Mini-Presentation Weeks (Weeks 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 14)			
• **Before Each Presentation**	Have the students rehearse their presentations with their team.		
• **During Each Presentation**	Have the students give an actual presentation in front of the class.		
• **After Each Presentation**	1. After a student representative from each team finished his/her presentation, the teacher gave oral feedback to him/her based on the same	1. After a student representative from each team finished his/her presentation, the teacher randomly assigned another team to give oral peer feedback to the	1. After a student representative from each team finished his/her presentation, the teacher randomly assigned another team to give written peer feedback via

Mini-Presentations 1-6	Group 1: Oral Teacher Feedback	Group 2: Oral Peer Feedback	Group 3: Online Written Peer Feedback
	rubric used for Groups 2 and 3.	presenter in front of the class based on the given rubric.	Google Sheets anonymously online based on the given rubric.
	2. The teacher had the students write a self-reflection describing their feelings about their group presentation performance and what they had learned.	2. The teacher gave oral feedback to the presenter publicly.	2. The teacher gave oral feedback to the presenter publicly.
		3. The teacher assessed the quality of oral peer feedback.	3. The teacher assessed the quality of online written peer feedback.

With regard to Group 1, self-reflection written by students was not used as part of the study as it was not relevant to the research objectives. For Groups 2 and 3, as can be seen from Table 2, the training on how to give effective feedback to peers occurred a week before the mini presentations. Each training, which lasted 15 minutes, occurred after the lesson was completed. The training involved having volunteered students give feedback to presenters in the sample videos using scoring rubric for a particular week (shown in Table 3). After that, the teacher gave comments and suggestions to the volunteered students on how to give feedback more effectively.

For the six mini-presentations, the assessment rubric for each presentation gradually became more complex, corresponding to the structured and cumulative lessons, giving students time to internalize presentation skills learned throughout the course, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

The Presentation Rubrics

Assessment Criteria	Presentation							
	Pre-Test	1	2	3	4	5	6	Post-Test
Week	2nd	4th	6th	8th	10th	12th	14th	15th
A. Physical delivery (10 points)								
1. Posture	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Eye contact	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Gestures	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4. Voice inflection	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
B. Speech comprehensibility (8 points)								
1. Voice volume	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Speech pace	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Pronunciation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4. Language use	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
C. Visual message (5 points)								
1. Short & clear slides	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓
2. Correct English	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓
3. Appropriate visuals	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓
D. Story message (6 points)								
1. Introduction	✓						✓	✓
2. Body	✓					✓		✓
3. Conclusion	✓						✓	✓
Total points	29	13	15.5	18	23	25	27	29

3.7 Data Analysis

For the first three research objectives, the presentation performance scores of the students from the three groups were analyzed using two-way ANOVA. Prior to conducting the two-way analysis, the assumptions of normality (Shapiro-Wilk, $p > .05$) and homogeneity of variance (Levene's test, $p = .34$) were met.

Regarding the fourth research objective, the data obtained from the questionnaires were quantitatively analyzed by employing descriptive statistics analysis, including mean and standard deviation (SD). Additionally, the data from semi-structured interviews were qualitatively analyzed using thematic analysis (King et al., 2019). After repeated reading of the responses, coding units were identified and collated into potential themes. Then, another coder helped verify those potential themes. The two coders discussed any discrepancy until an agreement was reached.

4. Results/Findings

4.1 Effects of feedback types and English achievement on EOP skills

To answer the first three research questions, two-way ANOVA was used to calculate the main effects of the feedback types and English achievement levels on the EOP performance and their interaction effects. The results are shown in the following table.

Table 4

Results of the Main Effects and Interaction Effects of the Types of Feedback and Levels of English Achievement on the Students' Oral English Presentation Performance from Two-way ANOVA

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Types of feedback	35.849	2	17.925	3.877	.024*	.073
Levels of English achievement	190.296	2	95.148	20.577	.000*	.294
Types of feedback * Levels of English achievement	20.673	4	5.168	1.118	.353	.043
Corrected Total	707.912	107				

*$p< .05$

The study's first research objective investigated the effects of three feedback types (oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback) on the students' EOP performance. Two-way ANOVA results indicated a statistically significant effect (F = 3.877, p<0.05), albeit with a modest effect size (partial eta-squared = 0.073). The first hypothesis, stating that there are significant main effects of the types of feedback on the students' EOP performance at the 0.05 level, was therefore accepted. It was noted that Type III sums of squares were used due to the unequal group sizes. The partial eta squared effect size was 0.073, which means that the different types of feedback by themselves accounted for 7.3% of the total variability of the dependent variable or oral presentation performance. According to Becker (2000), this magnitude was small. The correlation of 0.073 was small, as per Cohen's d scale of magnitudes of a correlation (Cohen, 1988).

Since differences in the students' oral presentation performance according to the types of feedback were found, Scheffe's test, a post-hoc comparison test for equal variance, was performed. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5

Results of the Post-hoc Multiple Comparison Test for the Three Types of Feedback

Comparisons		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Oral Teacher Feedback (Group 1)	Oral Peer Feedback (Group 2)	-1.4672*	.53349	.026
	Online Written Peer Feedback (Group 3)	-.1546	.49764	.953
Oral Peer Feedback (Group 2)	Oral Teacher Feedback (Group 1)	1.4672*	.53349	.026
	Online Written Peer Feedback (Group 3)	1.3126*	.50203	.037
Online Written Peer Feedback (Group 3)	Oral Teacher Feedback (Group 1)	.1546	.49764	.953
	Oral Peer Feedback (Group 2)	-1.3126*	.50203	.037

*$p < .05$

Table 5 shows that 1) the students performed differently between A) Group 1 and Group 2 and B) Group 2 and Group 3. In contrast, the mean difference of the students in Group 1 and Group 3 was not found.

This finding suggested that while the different feedback types had some effects on the students' EOP performance, the effects were relatively small. The small effect size could be attributed to several factors. Firstly, the quality and usefulness of feedback depended more on the content rather than the delivery mode. Well-constructed feedback, whether oral, written, or online, could yield similar student benefits. Secondly, students may have similarly perceived or

utilized the different feedback types, reducing the differentiation between modalities. The inherent value students placed on receiving feedback, irrespective of the source, overshadowed the nuances between feedback types. The minor effects seen across the different types of feedback may be due to the study design. The study did not exclude teacher feedback for Groups 2 and 3 in order to treat all groups equally. Because of this, it was difficult to isolate the precise effects of each specific feedback type.

Nevertheless, scrutinizing the mean scores on the post-test presentation across groups revealed that the oral peer feedback group (M = 24.80) outperformed both the online written peer feedback group (M = 23.49) and the oral teacher feedback group (M = 23.33). Considering the four primary aspects of the presentation criteria, the highest gain scores between the pre-test and post-test for all three groups were observed in physical delivery, followed by story message, visual message, and verbal delivery, respectively.

A potential explanation for this finding is that students demonstrated the most significant improvement in physical delivery skills such as posture, eye contact, gestures, and vocal inflection. These aspects were commonly emphasized when providing feedback to peers on oral presentations. Conversely, the verbal components of delivery, especially language use and pronunciation, exhibited the lowest gains across all three groups. Enhancing proficiency in these areas tended to be more challenging for students and required more extensive practice.

Moreover, the oral peer feedback outperformed the online written peer feedback due to familiarity with the oral mode. While online written peer feedback afforded the advantage of anonymity, potentially facilitating more straightforward comments, the immediacy of oral peer feedback allowed presenters and assessors to remain focused on the recently delivered presentation. Additionally, oral feedback provided opportunities for immediate negotiation and discussion, which needed to be improved in online written peer feedback.

Addressing the second research objective, which investigated the effects of students' English achievement levels on the students' EOP performance, the two-way ANOVA results demonstrated a significant effect (F=20.577, p<0.05). The second hypothesis, stating there are significant main effects of the levels of English achievement on the students' EOP performance at the 0.05 level, was therefore accepted. The partial eta squared effect size was 0.294, meaning that the general English achievement levels accounted for 29.4% of the total variability of the dependent variable or English oral presentation performance. According to Becker (2000), this magnitude was moderate. The correlation of 0.29 was medium according to Cohen's d scale of magnitudes of a correlation (Cohen, 1988).

The results of the Scheffe test are presented in Table 6. The mean score on the post-test revealed that the high-achiever group (M = 24.69) slightly outperformed the moderate-achiever group (M = 24.07), and the moderate-achiever group outperformed the low-achiever group (M = 20.28). However, the post-hoc test showed that the participants at low English achievement levels performed differently from the high and moderate English achievement groups. Nonetheless, the difference in the mean scores between the high-achiever and moderate-achiever groups was not found. This may be because the measure of "achievement" might not capture all relevant skills for oral presentations. For instance, a student could excel in written English but needed help with verbal skills, or vice versa.

Table 6

Results of the Post-hoc Multiple Comparison Test for the Three Levels of English Achievement

Comparisons		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
High-Achiever Group	Moderate-Achiever Group	.6228	.46556	.412
	Low-Achiever Group	4.4181*	.72789	.001
Moderate-Achiever Group	High-Achiever Group	-.6228	.46556	.412
	Low-Achiever Group	3.7953*	.67644	.001
Low-Achiever Group	High-Achiever Group	-4.4181*	.72789	.001
	Moderate-Achiever Group	-3.7953*	.67644	.001

*$p < .05$

This finding suggested that students' baseline English achievement levels substantially influenced their oral presentation abilities, with higher achievement corresponding to better EOP performance. The medium effect size aligned with existing research highlighting the critical role of language skills in effective oral communication (Jafarpur, 1991; Jerdan, 1993, cited in Swatevacharkul, 2006; Wanchid, 2007). Specifically, students with lower English achievement likely faced more significant challenges comprehending presentation content, guidelines, and feedback. In comparison, higher English achievement facilitated better comprehension, integration of feedback, and overall language production during presentations. Moreover, oral presentations require the simultaneous use of multiple language skills (listening, speaking, and vocabulary), amplifying the effects on overall achievement levels.

Regarding the third research question, which explored the interaction effects between feedback types and English achievement levels, the two-way ANOVA results indicated no statistically significant interaction (F = 1.12, p>0.05). The third hypothesis, stating that there are significant interaction effects of the types of feedback and the levels of English achievement on the students' EOP performance at the 0.05 level, was therefore rejected.

The non-significant interaction effect (p = 0.353) and the very small effect size (partial eta-squared = 0.043) implied that the effects of different feedback types on the students' EOP performance did not significantly depend on their levels of English achievement and vice versa. These findings suggested that the effects of feedback types and achievement levels were relatively independent.

Several potential explanations account for the lack of a significant interaction effect. First, the feedback types had a similar effect across all achievement levels, rendering the interaction negligible. Second, students' existing language abilities may have overshadowed any differential effects of feedback modalities, with achievement being the primary determinant of presentation performance. As a result, further studies are needed to design peer feedback activities that may be effectively created for students' specific language needs. It is important to note that these explanations are speculative and based solely on statistical results.

4.2 Student perceptions of three feedback types

The following section answers the fourth research question by examining the students' perceptions of the types of feedback they received. Such data could shed light on students' experiences, perceptions, and actual utilization of the different feedback types and the challenges they face at various achievement levels. This evidence from the questionnaires and interviews would complement the quantitative findings and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the interplay between feedback types, achievement levels, and oral presentation performance in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL).

The present study examined student perceptions of three feedback modalities: oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback, categorized into perceived benefits and perceived problems. Data were collected from the respective groups and analyzed using mean scores and standard deviations. The students in the three groups responded to online

questionnaires, and their perceptions were analyzed and interpreted using the evaluation criteria described below:

1.00-1.80   means that the participants strongly disagree with the statement. (SD.)

1.81-2.60   means that the participants disagree with the statement. (D)

2.61-3.40   means that the participants moderately agree with the statement. (M)

3.41-4.20   means that the participants agree with the statement. (A)

4.21-5.00   means that the participants strongly agree with the statement. (SA.)

Table 7

Student Perceptions of Three Feedback Types

Types of Feedback		Perceived Benefits	Perceived Problems
A. Feedback Receivers			
Group 1	Mean	4.22 (SA.)	1.76 (SD.)
(Oral Teacher Feedback)	SD	0.98	0.86
Group 2	Mean	4.37 (SA.)	2.47 (D)
(Oral Peer Feedback)	SD	0.76	1.21
Group 3	Mean	4.68 (SA.)	2.08 (D)
(Online Written Peer Feedback)	SD	0.54	1.2
B. Feedback Givers			
Group 1	Mean	N/A	N/A
(Oral Teacher Feedback)	SD		
Group 2	Mean	4.13 (A)	2.54 (D)
(Oral Peer Feedback)	SD	0.81	1.11
Group 3	Mean	4.46 (SA.)	1.91 (D)
(Online Written Peer Feedback)	SD	0.68	0.68

Table 7 illustrates the student perceptions of the three feedback types as feedback receivers and givers.

4.2.1 Student perceptions of "feedback receivers"

Regarding the perceived benefits of feedback receivers, for Group 1, the students had positive perceptions of receiving oral feedback from the teacher (M = 4.22; SD = 0.98), which fell within the "strongly agree" range, signifying a robust appreciation for the merits of the teacher feedback. This finding aligned with previous research highlighting the perceived benefits of teacher feedback in language learning contexts (e.g., Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Nicol & Macfarlane - Dick, 2006) and enhancing language skills, facilitating learning, and promoting engagement (Carless, 2006; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Similarly, the oral peer feedback group (Group 2) and the online written peer feedback group (Group 3) reported mean scores of 4.37 (SD = 0.76) and 4.68 (SD = 0.54), respectively, for the perceived benefits of receiving peer feedback. These scores also fell within the "strongly agree" range, indicating high perceived benefits. Most interestingly, the result suggested that online written peer feedback was the most beneficial overall.

Regarding the perceived problems of feedback receivers, the mean score of Group 1 was 1.76 (SD = 0.86), interpreted as "strongly disagree." In contrast, Group 2 and Group 3 exhibited mean scores of 2.47 (SD = 1.21) and 2.08 (SD = 1.20), respectively, both falling within the "disagree" range. These results suggested that the students in all three groups did not perceive substantial problems when receiving feedback.

Qualitative data from the interviews revealed that most students held two themes of favorable perceptions of the feedback they received. However, one negative theme was also revealed through the interview.

Theme 1: Improvement of confidence and presentation skills

The students in all three groups reported that their confidence levels and presentation skills improved due to the constructive feedback they received, as can be seen in the following excerpts:

"Teacher feedback could help me improve my presentation skills, especially the story message, such as the structures of introduction and conclusion." (Student 4, Group 1 – Moderate Achiever)

"After I received the feedback from my friends from different groups, at first, I felt a bit discouraged, but later on, I realized that their feedback could really help me move my hands to support my keywords better." (Student 5, Group 2 – Low Achiever)

"I felt more confident after receiving suggestions from my classmates because I knew what my weaknesses were and how to improve them for the next presentation." (Student 2, Group 3 – High Achiever)

Theme 2: Satisfactory feedback quality

Most students in all three groups reported that they were satisfied with the quality of feedback they received. The students appreciated receiving feedback from peers, especially from peers with high English achievement, as it provided insights into their weaknesses that the teacher may have overlooked due to time constraints and large class sizes. Furthermore, students in Group 2 could negotiate and clarify any ambiguities with their peers during the oral feedback process.

However, each group was satisfied with different aspects of feedback, as exemplified below:

"I liked the feedback from my teacher because she could point out my language errors clearly, and she could give advice on pronunciation and grammar." (Student 1, Group 1 – High Achiever)

"I think my classmates could give me good suggestions on the physical delivery, such as posture and eye contact. And I could ask

my classmates to explain further when I didn't understand their comments" (Student 6, Group 2 – Low Achiever)

"I felt that the feedback from my friends was quite honest. This was because they knew that I wouldn't know who the comment writer was." (Student 4, Group 3 – Moderate Achiever)

Theme 3: Unsatisfactory feedback

Some students in Groups 2 and 3 reported that they were not satisfied with the quality of the feedback they received. They described how they felt:

"I felt uncomfortable when receiving peer feedback, as the comments were sometimes too broad or not honest enough. And I wasn't sure of their ability to give me good comments." (Student 1, Group 2 – High Achiever)

"The written comments were so direct that they sometimes hurt my feelings and lowered my self-confidence. But I knew that what they wrote was the truth." (Student 5, Group 3 – Low Achiever)

Some of the interviewees from Group 1 would have liked to hear comments from their classmates, as exemplified in the excerpt below.

"Although I liked the teacher's feedback, I also wanted to hear more comments from my classmates because I think the more comments, the better it is for my next presentation." (Student 3, Group 1 – Moderate Achiever)

4.2.2 Perceptions of "feedback givers"

When considering the perceived benefits of giving peer feedback, Group 2 exhibited a mean score of 4.13 ($SD = 0.81$), categorized as "agree." At the same

time, Group 3 reported a higher mean score of 4.46 ($SD = 0.68$), falling within the "strongly agree" range. These results indicated that students generally perceived benefits in providing peer feedback, with Group 3 expressing a more positive perception than Group 2.

However, when considering the perceived problems of giving peer feedback, Group 2 reported a mean score of 2.54 ($SD = 1.11$), categorized as "disagree." At the same time, Group 3 had a lower mean score of 1.91 ($SD = 0.68$), also within the "disagree" range. These findings suggested that students in both groups encountered few challenges when providing peer feedback, with Group 3 experiencing fewer perceived problems than Group 2. This may be attributed to the anonymity and distance afforded by online written peer feedback, potentially making students more receptive to providing peer feedback without self-consciousness or social pressure, and thereby contributing to higher agreement on benefits and lower disagreement on problems.

Qualitative data from the interviews revealed that most students held one theme of positive perceptions of the feedback they received. However, two negative themes were also revealed through the interviews.

Theme 1: Improvement of critical thinking skills

Most students said their critical thinking skills were greatly improved because they had to evaluate their friends' presentation performance based on the given presentation rubrics, which were divided into different aspects. This peer feedback activity occurred every other week. The following are excerpts from the interviewees from Group 2 and Group 3:

> "To give effective feedback to presenters, I had to discuss every aspect of the presentation with my teammates. Each aspect had sub-categories that my team needed to think critically about whether the presenters had performed well enough. I also

needed to prepare concrete suggestions for improving their presentations. I felt that this activity helped me improve my critical thinking skills." (Student 2, Group 2 – High Achiever)

"I think my critical thinking skills have been improved because my team and I had to participate in the peer feedback activity every other week. This activity required my team to think critically to evaluate the presenters' performance, such as organization, visual slides, and deliveries." (Student 3, Group 3 – Moderate Achiever)

These positive perceptions of peer feedback observed in the oral peer feedback and online written peer feedback groups were consistent with previous studies (e.g., Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Gielen et al., 2010). These findings suggested that peer feedback could be a valuable learning tool, fostering active learning, critical thinking, and self-regulation (Nicol et al., 2013; Topping, 2009). Furthermore, peer feedback activities contributed to a multifaceted engagement experience, impacting learners' emotions, cognitive processes, and task-related behaviors.

Additionally, the interview data revealed that students across all English achievement levels indicated that participating in the peer feedback process helped them identify their mistakes and evaluate their abilities. This contributed to increased confidence in EOP skills, especially among high achievers. Students providing feedback through both modes seemed willing to offer feedback to their peers. Specifically, those providing online written feedback reported feeling more comfortable and engaged.

Theme 2: Uncomfortable feelings

This theme was only found in Group 2. Some students in Group 2 said they felt uncomfortable giving feedback to their classmates orally. The following are two excerpts from the interviews:

"Sometimes, I felt uncomfortable giving direct feedback to my friends because I was afraid it might upset my friends and damage our good relationships." (Student 1, Group 2 – High Achiever)

"I felt pressured and stressed that I had to criticize my friends' performance as I was not sure I was good enough to give effective feedback. The English ability of some presenters was even better than mine." (Student 6, Group 2 – Low Achiever)

Theme 3: Time-consuming activity

This theme was revealed in Group 2 only. Some high-achieving students found the oral peer feedback activities time-consuming and tedious. The following are two excerpts from the interview:

"Although the peer feedback activity was beneficial to students, I sometimes think that the activity took too long, and some comments were not necessary." (Student 1, Group 2 – High Achiever)

"I felt that the peer feedback activity sometimes took longer than the presentation. It was boring to listen to similar comments from classmates. I think the teacher needed to control the time better." (Student 2, Group 2 – High Achiever)

Students across achievement levels expressed hesitation in their abilities to provide effective feedback, encompassing both English and oral presentation skills. Some high-achieving students who provided oral peer feedback expressed concerns about potentially making their peers lose face or feel humiliated if they pointed out their peers' errors in front of the class. A few students elaborated that, due to Thai cultural norms, they were conditioned to avoid providing negative

feedback, even when warranted. Additionally, most interviewees reported feeling embarrassed when providing peer feedback, particularly in the oral mode. Some students questioned their classmates' abilities to judge, comment, and grade their work objectively. The moderate perceived problems associated with peer feedback as givers, particularly in the oral peer feedback group, align with the challenges reported in previous research (e.g., Kaufman & Schunn, 2011; Strijbos & Sluijsmans, 2010). These challenges may stem from students' limited expertise, language proficiency, or lack of training in providing effective feedback (Yu & Lee, 2016).

The questionnaire and interview results revealed that students exhibited highly positive perceptions of all three feedback modalities explored in this study, particularly in their roles as receivers of feedback. Notably, online written peer feedback emerged as the most favorably perceived modality, followed by oral and teacher feedback. Conversely, oral peer feedback had the most significant number of problematic aspects, while oral teacher feedback was considered the least problematic. However, some challenges were identified concerning the perceived problems associated with peer feedback, especially when students assumed the role of givers. These findings have underscored the significance of proactively addressing potential issues and implementing adequate support mechanisms to enhance the efficacy of peer feedback activities within the context of EOP courses. Despite the positive perceptions, recognizing challenges related to peer feedback, primarily in the role of giver, highlights the need for thoughtful implementation strategies, such as targeted training, clear guidelines, and ongoing facilitation, to mitigate perceived problems and maximize the benefits of peer feedback engagement.

5. Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

The present study investigated the effects of different feedback types (oral teacher feedback, oral peer feedback, and online written peer feedback) and

English achievement levels on students' oral presentation performance in an EFL context The results revealed statistically significant main effects of feedback types and English achievement levels on students' EOP performance, albeit with modest and large effect sizes. However, no significant interaction effect was observed between the feedback types and the achievement levels. The study also explored students' attitudes toward the different feedback types, revealing highly positive perceptions of the three feedback types. However, some challenges were noted regarding the perceived problems associated with peer feedback, mainly when acting as givers.

It is important to note that this study also had some limitations that should be considered. First, the second questionnaire used with the two experimental groups was lengthy (70 items), affecting the data quality because the student participants might have felt fatigued and rushed through answers. Second, the fact that this study was conducted only with engineering students from a single university limits the generalization of the results to other populations.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study have yielded several implications for EFL pedagogy and the implementation of feedback strategies in oral presentation courses as follows:

5.2.1 Incorporating peer and teacher feedback can enhance students' oral presentation skills and language development. This study has demonstrated the potential benefits of both oral and online written peer feedback modalities.

5.2.2 Instructors should consider students' English achievement levels when designing feedback activities and providing appropriate support. Higher-achieving students may require more advanced feedback, while lower-achieving students may benefit from additional scaffolding and targeted language support.

5.2.3 Students should be provided with training and guidance on effectively giving and receiving constructive feedback. This can mitigate potential problems

caused by language proficiency, expertise, and challenges with interpersonal dynamics.

5.2.4 Incorporating technology-mediated feedback platforms, such as online written peer feedback, can offer advantages such as anonymity and increased comfort levels, potentially enhancing the quality and honesty of feedback.

5.3 Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the findings and implications of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for future research and practice:

5.3.1 Studies should be conducted to explore potential benefits of multimodal feedback (e.g., video annotations or audio comments) to provide more comprehensive and nuanced feedback.

5.3.2 Studies should investigate the long-term effects of peer feedback on students' oral presentation skills and overall language development and the potential transfer of these skills to academic and professional contexts.

5.3.3 Additional research should also be carried out in diverse EFL contexts, considering variables such as institution types, class sizes, and curriculum structures to enhance the generalizability of the findings.

By addressing these recommendations, researchers and educators can contribute to a deeper understanding of effective feedback practices in EFL oral presentation courses, ultimately fostering students' communicative competence and preparing them for academic and professional success in an increasingly globalized context.

6. About the Authors

Assistant Professor Raveewan Wanchid, Ph.D. is an English language lecturer at the Faculty of Applied Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok (KMUTNB), Thailand. Her research expertise is in writing instruction and alternative assessment in English language teaching.

Valaikorn Charoensuk, Ph.D., is an English language lecturer at the Faculty of Applied Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok (KMUTNB), Thailand. Her areas of interest include alternative assessment in language learning, oral presentation coaching, and multimodal translation.

7. References

Ahangari, S., Rassekh-Alqol, B., & Ali Akbari Hamed, L. (2013). The effect of peer assessment on oral presentation in an EFL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2*(3), 45–53. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.2n.3p.45

Akbari, E. (2021). Examining the effectiveness of peer feedback in the context of learning English in a Web 2.0 environment (peer feedback 2.0). *Journal of Foreign Language Research, 11*(3), 556–569. https://doi:10.22059/jflr.2021.330903.895

Al Abri, A., Al Baimani, S., & Al Bahlani, S. (2021). The role of web-based peer feedback in advancing EFL essay writing. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal, 22*(1), 374–390.

Becker, L. A. (2000). Effect size calculators. Retrieved from http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/EffectSizeBecker.pdf

Boud, D. (2007). Reframing assessment as if learning were important. In D. Boud & N. Falchikov (Eds.), *Rethinking assessment in higher education* (pp. 14–25). Routledge.

Brooks, G., & Wilson, J. (2014). Using oral presentations to improve students' English language skills. *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review, 19*, 199–212.

Brown, S., Race, P., & Smith, B. (2005). 500 tips on assessment (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203307359

Browne, C. M., & Wada, M. (1998). Current issues in high school English teaching in Japan: An exploratory survey. *Language Culture and Curriculum, 11*(1), 97–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908319808666543

Bunch, G. C. (2009). "Going up there": Challenges and opportunities for language minority students during a mainstream classroom speech event. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(2), 81–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2009.04.001

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 219–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572132

Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (1997). Having second thoughts: Student perceptions before and after a peer assessment exercise. *Studies in Higher Education, 22*(2), 233–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381064

Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing, 22*(1), 93–121. https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt298oa

Chiu, A. S. (2004). The festival presentation: Making classroom presentations interactive and fun. *The Language Teacher, 28*(8), 32.

Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 328–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.006

Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Berings, D. (2010). Peer assessment of oral presentation skills. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 1776–1780. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.983

Demirbilek, M. (2015). Social media and peer feedback: What do students really think about using Wiki and Facebook as platforms for peer feedback? *Active Learning in Higher Education, 16*(3), 211–224. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787415589530

Falchikov, N. (1995). Peer feedback marking: Developing peer assessment. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 32*(2), 175–187. https://doi.org/10.1080/1355800950320212

Ferris, D., & Kurzer, K. (2019). Does error feedback help L2 writers? Latest evidence on the efficacy of written corrective feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 106–124). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547.007

Freeman, M. (1995). Peer assessment by groups of group work. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 20*(3), 289–300. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293950200305

Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1*, 3–31.

Gielen, S., Peeters, E., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Struyven, K. (2010). Improving the effectiveness of peer feedback for learning. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 304–315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.007

Girard, T., Pinar, M., & Trapp, P. S. (2011). An exploratory study of class presentations and peer evaluations: Do students perceive the benefits? *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 15*(1), 77–94.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hsu, K. C., & Wang, Y. (2022). A review on the training effects and learners' perceptions towards asynchronous computer-mediated peer feedback for L2 writing revision. In L. Uden & D. Liberona (Eds.), *Learning technology for education challenges* (Vol. 1595, pp. 153–162). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-08890-2_11

Huxham, M., Campbell, F., & Westwood, J. (2010). Oral versus written assessments: A test of student performance and attitudes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 37*(1), 125–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.515012

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444806003399

Jafarpur, A. (1991). Can naive EFL learners estimate their own proficiency? *Evaluation & Research in Education, 5*(3), 145–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500799109533306

Jones, L. (2007). The student-centered classroom. Cambridge University Press.

Joughin, G. (2007). Student conceptions of oral presentations. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(3), 323–336. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701346873

Kaufman, J. H., & Schunn, C. D. (2011). Students' perceptions about peer assessment for writing: Their origin and impact on revision work. *Instructional Science, 39*(3), 387–406. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-010-9133-6

King, J. (2002). Preparing EFL learners for oral presentations. *Dong Hwa Journal of Humanistic Studies, 4*, 401–418.

King, N., Horrocks, C., & Brooks, J. (2019). Interviews in qualitative research (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Kovac, M., & Sirkovic, N. (2012). Peer evaluation of oral presentations in Croatia. *English Language Teaching, 5*(7), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n7p8

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308

Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., & Talaee, E. (2021). Peer feedback or peer feedforward? Enhancing students' argumentative peer learning processes and outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 52*(2), 768–784. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13054

Li, J., Huang, J., & Cheng, S. (2022). The reliability, effectiveness, and benefits of peer assessment in college EFL speaking classrooms: Student and teacher perspectives. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 72*, Article 101120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.101120

Lim, L.-A., Gentili, S., Pardo, A., Kovanović, V., Whitelock-Wainwright, A., Gašević, D., & Dawson, S. (2021). What changes, and for whom? A study of the impact of learning analytics-based process feedback in a large

course. *Learning and Instruction, 72*, Article 101202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2019.04.003

Lin, H.-C., Bruning, P. F., & Swarna, H. (2018). Using online opinion leaders to promote the hedonic and utilitarian value of products and services. *Business Horizons, 61*(3), 431–442. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.01.010

Lydia Wen, M., Tsai, C., & Chang, C. (2006). Attitudes towards peer assessment: A comparison of the perspectives of pre - service and in - service teachers. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *43*(1), 83–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290500467640

McDonald, A., McGowan, H., Dollinger, M., Naylor, R., & Khosravi, H. (2021). Repositioning students as co-creators of curriculum for online learning resources. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 37*(6), 102–118. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6735

Meloni, C. F., & Thompson, S. E. (1980). Oral reports in the intermediate ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(4), 503–510. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586238

Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane - Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self - regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2013). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(1), 102–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518

Nida, F. (2017). *The use of peer assessment to improve oral presentation skills* [Skripsi thesis, UIN Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh]. UIN Ar-Raniry Repository. https://repository.ar-raniry.ac.id/id/eprint/1914

Nishino, T., & Watanabe, M. (2008). Communication-oriented policies versus classroom realities in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 42*(1), 133–138. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00214.x

Nita, F. R., & Anam, S. (2021). Secondary EFL teachers' views towards the implementation of peer assessment: Between opportunities and challenges. *ELT Worldwide: Journal of English Language Teaching, 8*(2), 352–364.

Noonan, B., & Duncan, C. R. (2005). Peer and self-assessment in high schools. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 10*(1), 17. https://doi.org/10.7275/a166-vm41

Pâquet, M., & Des Marchais, J. (1998). Students' acceptance of peer assessment. *Education for Health, 11*(1), 25–35.

Pham, T. N., Lin, M., Trinh, V. Q., & Bui, L. T. P. (2020). Electronic peer feedback, EFL academic writing, and reflective thinking: Evidence from a Confucian context. *Sage Open, 10*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914554

Pojslová, B. (2023, February). *Scaffolding presentation skills with peer feedback and assessment*. Humanising Language Teaching. Retrieved from https://www.hltmag.co.uk/feb23/scaffolding-presentation-skills

Purchase, H. C. (2000). Learning about interface design through peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 25*(4), 341–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/026029300449245

Rajoo, A. (2010). Facilitating the development of students' oral presentation skills. *Voice of Academia, 5*(1), 43–50.

Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). Improving students' learning by developing their understanding of assessment criteria and processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 28*(2), 147–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301671

Sluijsmans, D. M. A., Brand-Gruwel, S., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Bastiaens, T. J. (2003). The training of peer assessment skills to promote the development of reflection skills in teacher education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 29*(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X(03)90003-4

Smith, H., Cooper, A., & Lancaster, L. (2002). Improving the quality of undergraduate peer assessment: A case for student and staff development. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *39*(1), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/13558000110102904

Smyth, K. (2004). The benefits of students learning about critical evaluation rather than being summatively judged. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 29*(3), 370–378. https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000197609

Strijbos, J.-W., & Sluijsmans, D. (2010). Unraveling peer assessment: Methodological, functional, and conceptual developments. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 265–269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.002

Swatevacharkul, R. (2006). *The effects of degrees of support for learner independence through web-based instruction and levels of general English proficiency on English reading comprehension ability of second-year undergraduate learners* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok.

Taguchi, N. (2002). Implementing oral communication classes in upper secondary schools: A case study. *The Language Teacher, 26*(12), 3-8.

Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice, 48*(1), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569

Tsou, W.-L., & Huang, Y.-H. (2012). The effect of explicit instruction in formulaic sequences on academic speech fluency. *Taiwan International ESP Journal, 4*(2), 57–80. https://doi.org/10.6706/TIESPJ.2012.4.2.3

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Waluyo, B, & Panmei, B. (2024). Students' peer feedback engagements in online English courses facilitated by a social network in Thailand. *Journal of Technology and Science Education, 14*(2), 306-323. https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.2305

Wanchid, R. (2007). *The effects of types of peer feedback and levels of general English proficiency on writing achievement of KMITNB students* [Doctoral dissertation, Chulalongkorn University].

Weissberg, B. (1993). The graduate seminar: Another research-process genre. *English for Specific Purposes, 12*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(93)90025-J

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*(2), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

Yeh, H.-C., Tseng, S.-S., & Chen, Y.-S. (2019). Using online peer feedback through blogs to promote speaking performance. *Educational Technology & Society, 22*(1), 1–14.

Yoshikawa, E. (2014). One-minute speeches: Students developing speech and presentation skills. *Hokkaido Language and Culture Research, 12*, 61–72.

Yu, F.-Y., & Wu, C.-P. (2013). Predictive effects of online peer feedback types on performance quality. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 16*(1), 332–341. https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.16.1.332

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Understanding the role of learners with low English language proficiency in peer feedback of second language writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(2), 483–494. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.301

Zhang, J., Kuusisto, E., Nokelainen, P., & Tirri, K. (2020). Peer feedback reflects the mindset and academic motivation of learners. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 1701, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01701

Zhang, M., He, Q., Du, J., Liu, F., & Huang, B. (2022). Learners' perceived advantages and social-affective dispositions toward online peer feedback in academic writing. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 973478. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.973478

Zhao, H. (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. *ELT Journal, 68*(2), 155–168. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct068

Zhao, H. (2018). Exploring tertiary English as a Foreign Language writing tutors' perceptions of the appropriateness of peer assessment for

writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(7), 1133–1145. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1434610