

Wanchid & Charoensuk, 2023

Volume 9 Issue 1, pp. 01-22

Received: 1st December 2022

Revised: 31st January 2023, 2nd March 2023

Accepted: 4th March 2023

Date of Publication: 15th March 2023

DOI- <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2023.91.0122>

This paper can be cited as: Wanchid, R. & Charoensuk, V. (2023). Thai And Non-Thai Instructors' Perspectives on Peer Feedback Activities in English Oral Presentations. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(1),01-22.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

THAI AND NON-THAI INSTRUCTORS' PERSPECTIVES ON PEER FEEDBACK ACTIVITIES IN ENGLISH ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Raveewan Wanchid

Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Department of Languages, Faculty of Applied Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand
raveewan.w@arts.kmutnb.ac.th

Valaikorn Charoensuk

Ph.D., Department of Languages, Faculty of Applied Arts, King Mongkut's University of Technology North Bangkok, Bangkok, Thailand
valaikorn.c@arts.kmutnb.ac.th

Abstract

The purposes of this research were 1) to investigate Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives on peer feedback activities in English oral presentations; 2) to compare the perspectives on peer feedback activities of Thai and non-Thai teachers, and 3) to explore possible reasons affecting the Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives on peer feedback activities in their real classroom practices. The study was conducted with 5 Thai and 5 foreign instructors. Questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations were used to collect the data. Descriptive statistics and

content analysis were employed in the data analysis. The results revealed that 1) in general both Thai and non-Thai instructors moderately agreed that peer feedback was beneficial for students, 2) the perspectives of Thai and non-Thai teachers in most items were not significantly different, and 3) there were six possible reasons why Thai and non-Thai teachers have different perspectives on some issues towards the use of peer feedback activities.

Keywords

English Oral Presentations, Peer Feedback Activities, Thai, Non-Thai

1. Introduction

Nowadays, alternative assessment has a major role to play in English as a foreign language (EFL) instruction, especially peer assessment. Topping (2009) stated that peer assessment is “an arrangement for learners to consider and specify the level, value, or quality of a product or performance by other equal-status learners” (p.20-21). Considerable advantages of peer assessment are shown in a great deal of research. For example, peer assessment can promote students’ critical skills and their learning, and allow them to be more active, responsible, and autonomous learners (Cheng & Warren, 2005). However, most of the studies yielding positive results of peer assessment were conducted with L1 and L2 learning contexts. When this pedagogical activity has been used by EFL practitioners, many problems have unexpectedly emerged such as the lack of confidence and ability to give quality peer feedback, unfair assessment, and being afraid of creating bad relationships. As a result, the calls for research in an EFL context are required.

English Presentations is a new elective English course at the researchers’ workplace that first allowed students to enroll in the first semester of the academic year 2018. Undoubtedly, no research has been conducted on this subject.

Peer assessment is introduced to the course as one of the course assessments in Oral Presentations due to the advantages of this pedagogy and the constraints of teaching and learning contexts. Normally, the course instructors have to deal with a large class size of 45-50 students with mixed English abilities; it is impossible to allow an individual student to give a presentation each week and receive quality teacher feedback; and for a teacher to give instruction within class time of 3 hours per week. As the aforementioned constraints of teaching and learning context, this study is, therefore, trying to fill the gap by designing oral peer feedback activity model in the English Oral Presentations course, where students collaboratively work in a small group to prepare

their group presentations, give oral comments to other groups' presentations, analyze peer comments and suggestions from other groups, and use them to improve their practice before presenting in front of the class. Therefore, collaborative learning in which students work in a small group, and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development believing students' ability will be boosted through peer teaching or guidance, is applied as the theoretical framework of this study.

As peer assessment is first used in an English oral presentation course, most of the instructors have not experienced this type of assessment before. Some of them are not familiar with it or may feel awkward using it in their class as they may have different backgrounds, teaching experiences, and perspectives in English language instruction. Previous research found a relationship between teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors (Borg, 2006). A number of studies explored teachers' beliefs about feedback on students' writing; few have been done with teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards peer feedback on oral presentations (Wang et. al., 2018). Therefore, it is worth studying what beliefs the teachers hold in oral presentation instruction and what they perceive about the use of peer feedback activities implemented in their class. The principal objectives of the study were as follows.

- 1.1.** To investigate Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities.
- 1.2.** To compare the perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities of Thai and non-Thai teachers.
- 1.3.** To explore possible reasons affecting the Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities in their real classroom practices.

2. Review of Literature

Assessment is believed to be very influential for learning, especially in higher education (Boud et. al., 1999). To utilize the learning outcome, assessment should also provide feedback for the learners in order that they will know what they have done well and what they should improve (Price et. al., 2011). Normally, assessors are teachers or experts in the field. However, the engagement of learners in the assessment task or peer assessment has been proved to be beneficial for learners; therefore, it has been increasingly used as one of the learning methods in tertiary education (Falchikov, 1995; Rust, Price, & O'Donovan, 2003; Smyth, 2004; Sluijsmans et. al., 2003; and Race et. al., 2005). Black and Wiliam (2006) explain that, with peer assessment, learners

are able to understand and make sense of assessment criteria better from their own work and their peers' as they also have to take role of examiner.

However, within EFL context, a lot of drawbacks have been found from the use of this practice. Since effective oral presentation and the assessment from peer feedback require all four skills, low proficiency EFL learners seem to confront some problems. Huxham, Campbell, and Westwood (2010) and Joughin (2007) state that oral presentation brings about high level of anxiety in learners. They explain that learners' anxiety arises when they have insufficient knowledge, skills, experience, and understandings about the topic and how to assess the works of their peers; moreover, as a consequence they sometimes feel that they may look foolish, even more foolish if there are any questions they fail to answer. Findings regarding signs of anxiety revealed that over-use of gestures, speaking fast, or speaking in a very low voice when participating or interacting in class (Mouhoubi-Messadh, 2017). According to Cheng and Warren, (1997), Smith, Cooper, and Lancaster (2002), and Wen, Tsai, and Chang (2006), in general, students feel satisfied with peer assessment; but criticisms from their peers are what they do not want to face. However, Boston (2002) indicated that peer feedback is quite beneficial with low achieving learners.

According to Ajzen (2005), one's intention and behavior are influenced by his/her belief, attitude, awareness of social norms, as well as levels of control he/she perceives. In classroom, it is the teacher who take the main responsibility to facilitate classroom activities. Teachers' beliefs direct themselves on understanding educational policies, choosing what is important for students, and determining what should be included in classroom (Fives & Buehl, 2012). In fact, the relationship between teachers' beliefs and classroom behaviors has been paid much interest since the 1990s and there are increasing numbers of studies on this issue (Borg, 2006).

As playing a major role in classroom practices, the teachers are the one who decide whether peer assessment (PA) should be implemented in the settings (Panadero & Brown, 2017). Panadero and Brown (2017) and Rubie-Davies et. al., (2012) also agree that classroom practices can be predicted from teachers' conceptions. Considering the aspect of peer feedback/peer assessment, suitable conception on assessment is very important that they navigate teacher's belief system to employ this practice to classroom and provide cognitive and affective responses to novice assessors (Boud, 2016 and Xu & Brown, 2016). Similar ideas have been suggested by Cowie and Harrison (2016) and Harris and Brown (2013). They point out that teacher's beliefs

and actions are crucial to be the first step of embedding peer assessment as classroom culture to enhance students' skills from their differences. Xu and Brown (2016) assert that teachers' conception of PA should rather be focused than the PA literacy training. Ultimately, some experts conclude that whether the implementation of peer assessment will be successful depends on teachers' motivation and their abilities to train the students to be ready for peer assessment (Harris & Brown, 2013 and Panadero & Brown, 2017).

Nevertheless, realizing and experiencing many problems, the majority of teachers still apply PA to their classes and reflect the difficulties they have confronted in order to improve the practicality of this process. The reflections include the issues on the focus of feedback, individual students, the classroom, as well as the teachers themselves. This research aims at discovering the perspectives of teachers who are from different teaching and learning cultures.

3. Research Methodology

The participants of this study were 10 English language instructors (five Thai and five non-Thai teachers) who were teaching the English Oral Presentations course in the first semester of the 2019 academic year. The teachers were from the Department of Languages, in a Thai public university.

Four of Thai instructors were female, and one was male. Their age range was between 34 to 65 years old. Three of them had master's degree, and two instructors received a doctoral degree. Three of them were full-time instructors. Their English language teaching experience varied from 2.5 years to 30 years.

Among the non-Thai instructors, they were male, their age range was between 33-63 years old. Three received a master's degree, one held a doctoral degree, and one held a bachelor's degree. Four were full-time, and one was a part-time lecturer. The range of teaching experience was 9-35 years.

Normally, 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 this subject, divided into 15-20 sections each semester.

English Presentations is an elective English course for undergraduate students who are required to first pass fundamental English I and II before taking this course. The class duration is

3 hours, once a week over a period of 15 weeks. The commercial English textbook, *Speaking of Speech (new edition)*, 2009, by David Harrington and Charles LeBeau, is used due to its relevance with the course objectives. The textbook focuses on three main components of oral presentation skills – the physical message, the visual message, and the story message. All sections are required to follow the same syllabus. It means that students experience the same textbook, classroom activities, assessment criteria, and course evaluation. Regarding the course evaluation, throughout a semester, students have to get into groups of 4-5 to prepare and perform seven mini-presentations (46%), one final presentation (21%), seven peer feedback activities (21%), class attendance (6%), and end of class quizzes (6%).

For the peer feedback activities, on the weeks of seven mini-presentations, each group was required to assess the performance of another group based on the provided peer assessment guideline, and they need to present their peer feedback orally in class. A teacher had a role to play as a facilitator to make the classroom activity flow and to reach the course objectives. A teacher gave teacher feedback on each group's presentations and commented on the quality of feedback the students provide to their classmate presenters. It is noted that all the instructors were required to follow the syllabus, so it means that they were teaching the same way in all sections.

3.1. Data Collection

For quantitative data, a teacher questionnaire was sent to the 10 participants after the course had ended. The questionnaire was designed to elicit the teachers' responses regarding their perspectives toward peer feedback activities by using five-point Likert scales ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The instruments were validated by 3 experts, and the overall Index of Item Objective Congruence of the qualitative instruments (IOC) was 1. The reliability of the questionnaire was calculated by the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha, SPSS, which was 0.79. The questionnaire was distributed to the teachers at the end of the course (Week 16).

Besides, classroom observations were allowed by one Thai and one non-Thai instructors: one before the midterm exam week and one before the final exam week. The role of the researcher was to observe what happened in the classes, and the details of how the instructors organized the peer feedback activities. The observer sat in the back of the classroom quietly while she was writing down the information.

After receiving the questionnaire results, one Thai and one non-Thai instructors were privately interviewed after the course ended to gain more in-depth data about the teachers'

perspectives - the nature of oral presentations, feedback strategies, assessment methods, teachers' presentation focus, and their classroom behaviors. Besides, the problems and possible limitations that might downgrade the effectiveness of the peer feedback activity model used in the presentation course were also discussed. The interview took 30 minutes each.

3.2. Data Analysis

To answer the research questions, the data from the questionnaire were analyzed using a statistical analysis software program, and the data of Thai and non-Thai respondents were presented by means and standard deviation. The independent t-test was used to compare whether their responses are significantly different. The interview and observation data were transcribed, qualitatively analyzed, and then categorized for the result presentation. Both quantitative and qualitative results were used to analyze the possible reasons that may have affected the teachers' attitudes and real classroom practices.

4. Results of the Study

After the online questionnaire had been returned, the data were analyzed. A five-point Likert scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5), was used. To make the data clearer, the teachers' perspectives were interpreted by using the evaluation criteria described below:

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 1.00-1.80 | means that the teachers strongly disagree with the statement. (SD) |
| 1.81-2.60 | means that the teachers disagree with the statement. (D) |
| 2.61-3.40 | means that the teachers moderately agree with the statement. (M) |
| 3.41-4.20 | means that the teachers agree with the statement. (A) |
| 4.21-5.00 | means that the teachers strongly agree with the statement. (SA) |

There are two main parts of the questionnaire. Each part will be reported respectively.

4.1. Thai and non-Thai Teachers' Perspectives in the Instruction of Oral English Presentations and the Comparison between Thai and Non-Thai Teachers

Table 1: Perspectives in the Instruction of Oral English Presentations

Statements Related to Perspectives in the Instruction of Oral English Presentations	Thai		Non-Thai		Differences	
	Mean (\bar{x})	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t -test	Sig
1. Speech comprehensibility such as speaking speed and pronunciation is one of the key factors for successful presentations.	4.00 (A)	0.71	4.20 (A)	0.45	-.54	.608
2. Knowledge on a presentation topic is one of the key factors for successful presentations.	4.40 (SA)	0.55	3.40 (M)	0.55	2.89	.020
3. Organization such as signposting and speech structure (Story Message) is one of the key factors for successful presentations.	3.80 (A)	0.45	4.00 (A)	0.00	-1.00	.347
4. PowerPoint design (Visual Message) is one of the key factors for successful presentations.	4.00 (A)	0.00	3.80 (A)	0.45	1.00	.347
5. Presence such as posture and eye contact (Physical Message) is one of the key factors for successful presentations.	3.60 (A)	0.89	4.20 (A)	0.45	-1.34	.217
6. Only teacher feedback is sufficient for students to improve their presentation performance.	2.60 (D)	0.89	2.60 (D)	0.89	0.00	1.00
7. To help students improve their presentation performance, praise is necessary in teacher feedback.	3.60 (A)	0.89	3.40 (M)	0.55	.43	.681
8. To help students improve their presentation performance, suggestions are necessary in teacher feedback.	3.80 (A)	1.10	4.60 (SA)	0.55	-1.46	.182
9. To help students improve their presentation performance, criticism is necessary in teacher feedback.	3.40 (M)	0.89	3.40 (M)	0.55	0.00	1.00

Statements Related to Perspectives in the Instruction of Oral English Presentations	Thai		Non-Thai		Differences	
	Mean (\bar{x})	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig
10. Oral feedback is more effective than written feedback.	3.60 (A)	0.55	3.60 (A)	0.89	0.00	1.00
11. Immediate feedback is better than delayed feedback.	4.40 (SA)	0.55	4.80 (SA)	0.45	-1.27	.242
12. Giving feedback in private is better than giving feedback in public.	3.40 (M)	0.55	2.80 (M)	0.45	1.90	.094
13. Teachers should provide specific feedback to each individual student in a group presentation.	4.00 (A)	0.00	4.00 (A)	0.00	-.89	.397
14. Teacher feedback should be selective rather than comprehensive.	3.40 (M)	0.89	3.80 (A)	0.45	.447	.667
15. I think teacher feedback is more effective than peer feedback.	3.80 (A)	0.45	3.60 (A)	0.89	0.00	1.00
16. Students only need feedback from the teacher on their presentation performance.	3.00 (M)	1.00	3.00 (M)	0.71	-1.63	.141
17. I think peer feedback is as helpful as teacher feedback.	3.20 (M)	0.84	4.00 (A)	0.71	.949	.371
18. Students have an adequate ability to assess their own presentation performance.	2.40 (D)	1.34	1.80 (SD)	0.45	- 1.109	.299

(Source: Self)

Table 1 illustrates Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives towards the instruction of English oral presentations. On the whole, the perspectives of both groups were quite similar. Considering the factors for successful presentation, speech comprehensibility, organization, PowerPoint design, and presence were believed to be the key factors. Interestingly, one factor which was viewed a bit differently is knowledge. That is, while Thai teachers strongly agreed that it was one of the key factors ($\bar{x} = 4.40$, S.D. = 0.55), non-Thai teachers agreed just only at a moderate level ($\bar{x} = 3.40$, S.D. = 0.55).

For the assessment in form of feedback, teachers' feedback to each individual student was agreed to be essential; however, they denied that only teacher feedback was enough ($\bar{x} = 2.60$, S.D. = 0.89). Moreover, they both admitted that oral feedback was better than written one ($\bar{x} = 3.60$, S.D. = 0.55) and immediate feedback was rather needed than the delayed one (item 11), emphasized by non-Thai teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.80$, S.D. = 0.45). In order to help students to improve their skills, praise, suggestion, and criticism were agreed upon both groups to be necessary (items 7-9). To be more specific, suggestion was highly recommended by non-Thai teachers ($\bar{x} = 4.6$, S.D. = 0.55).

According to Table 2, the perspectives of the teachers towards the use of peer feedback activities on student oral presentations in English presentations course were revealed. Even though, both Thai and non-Thai teachers moderately agreed that peer feedback was beneficial for teachers of presentations in higher education ($\bar{x} = 3.40$, $\bar{x} = 3.00$) and believed that students could gain benefits from both teacher and peer feedback ($\bar{x} = 3.80$, $\bar{x} = 4.00$), there were some different opinions among the two groups of teachers. Focusing on the students, Thai teachers reflected their disagreement that students had an adequate ability to assess their friends' presentation performance ($\bar{x} = 2.60$, S.D. = 1.34), while groups of non-Thai teachers moderately agreed with this point ($\bar{x} = 3.40$, S.D. = 0.89). Moreover, it was disagreed by Thai teachers that students could provide honest feedback ($\bar{x} = 2.60$, S.D. = 1.14). Non-Thai teachers agreed that their students had fun when they gave feedback to their friends ($\bar{x} = 3.60$, S.D. = 0.55). On the other hand, this point was disagreed by Thai teachers ($\bar{x} = 2.40$, S.D. = 1.52). As a consequence, students were moderately agreed by non-Thai teachers to like peer feedback activities ($\bar{x} = 3.4$, S.D. = 0.89). In contrast, Thai teachers disagreed that students liked this kind of activity ($\bar{x} = 2.60$, S.D. = 1.34).

Table 2: *Perspectives of the Teachers towards the Use of Peer Feedback Activities on Student Oral Presentations in English Presentations Course and the Comparison between Thai and Non-Thai Teachers*

Statements Related to Perspectives towards the Use of Peer Feedback Activities	Thai		Non-Thai		Differences	
	Mean (\bar{x})	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig
1. Students have an adequate ability to assess their friends' presentation performance.	2.60 (D)	1.34	3.40 (M)	0.89	-2.058	.074

Statements Related to Perspectives towards the Use of Peer Feedback Activities	Thai		Non-Thai		Differences	
	Mean (\bar{x})	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig
2. I believe the use of peer feedback in English presentations course is useful for students.	2.80 (M)	1.10	4.00 (A)	0.71	-.802	.446
3. Teaching English presentation is more interesting when peer feedback activities are used.	3.00 (M)	1.41	3.60 (A)	0.89	.667	.524
4. Peer feedback is beneficial for teachers of presentations in higher education.	3.40 (M)	1.34	3.00 (M)	0.00	-2.530	.062
5. I think peer feedback is fair.	2.80 (M)	1.10	4.40 (SA)	0.89	-1.206	.035
6. I think peer feedback is reasonable.	3.00 (M)	1.41	3.80 (A)	0.45	-.343	0.05
7. I believe students can gain benefits from both teacher feedback and peer feedback.	3.80 (A)	1.10	4.00 (A)	0.71	-2.746	.740
8. Students can provide honest feedback to their friends.	2.60 (D)	1.14	4.00 (A)	0.00	-2.271	.050
9. Students can provide useful feedback or suggestions to their friends.	2.80 (M)	1.30	4.20 (A)	0.45	-.730	.486
10. Students put their full efforts into peer feedback activities.	2.20 (D)	1.10	2.60 (D)	0.55	-1.109	.299
11. Students like peer feedback activities.	2.60 (D)	1.34	3.40 (M)	0.89	-1.664	.135
12. Students have fun when they give feedback to their friends.	2.40 (D)	1.52	3.60 (A)	0.55	-.343	.050
13. Students appreciate the feedback they received from their friends.	3.00 (M)	1.22	3.20 (M)	0.45	-.632	.545

Statements Related to Perspectives towards the Use of Peer Feedback Activities	Thai		Non-Thai		Differences	
	Mean (\bar{x})	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig
14. I enjoy using peer feedback activities in my oral presentation class.	3.60 (A)	0.55	3.80 (A)	0.45	-1.177	.273
15. I recommend using peer feedback in the English presentations course for the next semester.	3.40 (M)	0.89	4.00 (A)	0.71	-1.414	.195

(Source: Self)

To compare the beliefs and attitudes towards the use of peer assessment of Thai and non-Thai teachers, it could be said that both Thai and non-Thai teachers carried numerous similar perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities which are shown from the questionnaire results. They both perceived that the use of peer feedback activities could benefit students in terms of presentation skills; but it could not help in terms of language accuracy and English pronunciation. Praise, suggestion, and criticism were agreed upon both groups to be necessary in this practice. Apart from peer feedback, teacher feedback and feedback for individual student were believed to still be necessary for students. They both believed that teacher feedback was more effective than that of peers.

In addition, Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives revealed that peer feedback activities could enhance student engagement in their peers' presentation. Both groups insisted that this activity would not make the learning atmosphere stressful or would be too harsh for students.

On the contrary, big different perspectives among the two groups of teachers were learners' abilities and readiness in participating in peer feedback activities. To illustrate, non-Thai teachers seemed to be more confident than the other group of teachers that their students could achieve the goals in this practice. In contrast, Thai teachers reflected higher levels of worry on students' readiness. Due to different levels of students' English proficiency, especially the ones with low abilities, the idea that peer feedback might be unclear and unreliable were reflected more by Thai teachers. On the other, non-Thai teachers seemed to not consider this issue a big matter. Moreover, it was found that Thai teachers seemed to perceive some students' discomfort when giving feedback to their friends.

According to the questionnaire, the results revealed that the perspectives of Thai and non-Thai teachers were quite similar in all the four aspects. Only a few items were significantly different, so the differences of the Thai and non-Thai perspectives were not clearly shown.

To answer the third research question investigating the possible reasons that affect the Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities in their real classroom practices, the interview was conducted with one female Thai and one male non-Thai instructors because these two instructors were willing to join the interview, and both of them allowed the researcher to observe their oral presentation classes twice: before the midterm and final examination weeks.

Therefore, the interview was conducted in order to gain more in-depth viewpoints of the Thai and non-Thai instructors. For the Thai instructor, she was female at the age of 38. For the non-Thai instructor, he was male at the age of 35. Both received master's degree in Languages, and they have been teaching English for 7 and 10 years respectively. Thai teacher has never used peer feedback in her class before, while the non-Thai teacher has had some experienced in using peer feedback in a writing class. It could be said that they have never applied the peer feedback activities in an oral presentation course. They were quite similar in terms of age range, level of education, EFL teaching experience. They were asked the same questions about what and how they conducted the peer feedback activities in their oral presentation classes.

Although the Thai and non-Thai instructors' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities were not significantly shown in the questionnaire results, the open-ended questions, class observations, and the interview results possibly showed some of the possible reasons that affect the Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities in their real classroom practices, which are 1) students' low English proficiency, 2) students' unfamiliarity to peer feedback activities, 3) experience of teaching oral presentation, 4) experience of using peer feedback activities, 5) teaching styles, and 6) teacher's gender.

4.3. Students' Low English Proficiency

Since the use of peer feedback activities in classroom required a great deal of English proficiency of students, lacks of this ability or low ability in English could result in the failure of peer feedback process. Most of the teachers believed that students' low English proficiency was one main reason to obstruct peer feedback process. There were various fields of English proficiency that seemed to be the problem. Firstly, no matter what content on feedback about the

presentation were, if the feedback could not be conveyed, it was useless. Therefore, students needed, at least, to be able to communicate in English in order to give comments to their peers. That is, the students required listening and speaking skills in this process. They had to listen to what the presenters said and spoke out to give feedback to what were good points or weak points the presenters had done. Secondly, pronunciation seemed to be another problem for Thai students. One of the teachers emphasized that their students could give feedbacks on superficial issues about the articulation; for example, the loudness or the clarity of presenters' speech. For the pronunciation, there was little peer feedback on this issue since the teachers believed that their students lacked knowledge on English pronunciation. Lastly, the majority of teachers stated that low proficiency of English word choice played role in the success of 'constructive' peer feedback. With a limited number of word choice, the students seemed unable to explain and give suggestions to their peers effectively and constructively. One teacher pointed out their students could only say that the presentation was good. However, when she asked them to clarify what was 'good', they couldn't explain anything more. From these reasons, in the view of one of the teachers, peer feedback was believed to be effective only with students with high English proficiency.

4.4. The Unfamiliarity to Peer Feedback of Thai EFL Learners

The unfamiliarity to peer feedback of Thai EFL learners was believed by the majority of non-native teachers to be one of the reasons that might obstruct peer feedback. To illustrate, normally, Thai students are shy, reserved, and humble. These characters make them avoid giving direct feedback or critiques which may lead to some problems on their relationship. Moreover, with the folk that Thai students are trained to respect the seniors or the older, most of them tend to stay silent in class. This results in their less opportunity to speak up in class with both their classmates and their teachers. Due to their characters and this passive learning style, Thai students were not familiar with peer feedback which they had to directly comment their friends. This might affect their relationship. All Thai and non-Thai teachers agreed that this was something very new to their students. In addition, some teachers reflected that there were also some students who were lazy and reluctant to participate in class activities. However, most of the teachers reported that their students were more attentive. This might due to that there are some assessment and points gained from peer feedback activities.

4.5. Experience of Teaching Oral Presentation

The experience of teaching oral presentation of the participants seemed to be one of the factors affecting Thai and non-Thai teachers' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities in their class. With not enough of this kind of experience, one of the teachers reported that she did not master to train her students what the features of good oral presentation were and found it difficult to demonstrate the presentation. She also stated that she was quite worried that she could not provide effective feedback on oral presentation to her students. Some teachers believed that it might be better if there were more details for each of the topic in oral presentation skills.

4.6. Experience of Using Peer Feedback

Giving peer feedback is not only new to the students, but it is also to the teachers. A few teachers have used peer feedback in their teaching before; for example, one teacher said that she employed peer feedback in her English writing class. Some teachers used it just to check the students' understandings and it was also group feedback, not an individual one. None of them had ever used it in speaking class, especially in oral presentation class. One teacher reflected that, with lack of experience in using this process, she was afraid that she did not master in facilitating this kind of classroom. So, it was quite time-consuming. Another native teacher believed that in order that using peer feedback would be effective, teachers and students required a clear understanding of the concepts on commenting the others.

4.7. Teaching Styles

From the class observation, it was found that teaching styles seem to affect the use of peer feedback activities. The Thai teacher seemed to have an activity style while the non-Thai teacher tended to have a lecture style. In the peer feedback activity, teachers have to play a role as a facilitator, so teachers who have an activity style seem to fit well with the assigned peer feedback activity model.

4.8. Teacher's Gender

Besides, gender seemed to have some influence on the class atmosphere. From the class observation and open-ended questions, a teacher's gender seemed to have some role to play in this study. The reflection from Thai female teachers seemed to show more understandings in their students' feelings with peer feedback process. On the contrary, most of male teachers did not talk or give much details about this. The majority of female teachers agreed that they could feel that

most of their students felt uncomfortable to give comments to their friends. They reported that they noticed that some of these students were insecure and stressed when giving feedback. This might be due to that, when the students gave peer feedback or direct comments, it was quite difficult for them to give constructive feedback and most of the time negative feedback could not be avoided. This might weaken their good relationship. Moreover, it was reported by one of these female teachers that she could see that her students felt uncomfortable to give feedback to their peers since they felt that they were not capable enough to do so. One female teacher also suggested that it could be better if they could give feedback in closed group or in a team. It could make the students feel more personal and relaxed.

5. Discussions

Due to the fact that there are still limited research studies on the teachers' perspectives towards the use of peer feedback in English oral presentation course, especially in the EFL context, this present study enlightens more insight on this issue. As the major role of classroom conductor to achieve each period's set goal, teachers take large responsibility in the success of peer assessment in classroom (Harris & Brown, 2013; Panadero & Brown, 2017; and Adachi et. al., 2017). With this reason, experts emphasized the importance of the beliefs and attitudes held by the teachers (Fives & Buehl, 2012; Rubie-Davies et. al., 2012; Harris & Brown, 2013; Boud, 2016; Xu & Brown, 2016; Cowie & Harrison, 2016; and Panadero & Brown, 2017).

There are a large number of research studies confirming that the implementation of peer assessment and feedback practice in classrooms is useful for learners in terms of learning and performance, problem-solving skills, self-regulated learning, as well as metacognition (Lynch & Golen, 1992; Zevenbergen, 2001; Chang & Warren, 2005; Hwang, Hung & Chen, 2014; Bryant & Carless, 2009; Nicol, 2010; Kim & Ryu, 2013; Spandorfer et. al., 2014; Panadero et. al., 2016; and Panadero & Brown, 2017).

The beliefs in this idea of using peer feedback in English oral presentation course are reflected by both Thai and non -Thai teacher participants in this study. It is found that this process is acknowledged to be able to improve communicative competence rather than other specific language skills. This finding corresponds to Brooks and Wilson's idea (2014).

There are still some concerns on role of learners as novice assessors and presenters reflected by both groups of teachers. Moreover, Thai teachers are found to reflect higher level of

worry, especially in the aspects of uncertainty on learners' abilities and readiness for this method. The issue of learners' inadequate ability is also echoed in the studies of Chaqmaqchee (2015) and Boston (2002). Also, the unfamiliarity to peer feedback of Thai EFL learners is admitted to have effects on the process. The idea of getting used to their passive traditional learning method are also concerned in many studies (Liu & Carless, 2006; Harris & Brown, 2013; Adachi et. al., 2017; Zhao, 2018).

From this finding, it can be concluded that Thai teachers, experiencing and being more familiar with Thai norms, seemed to clearly express caring and interest in learners which corresponds to what Brookhart (2008) has mentioned. Besides, this study also discovers both groups of teachers' voices on problems on learners' emotional responses and their relationship with other partakers. The problems include willingness to criticize, face value, self-confidence, pressure, trust, honesty, anonymity which is similar to the findings of many studies (Lynch & Golen, 1992; Noonan & Duncan, 2005; Joughin, 2007; Harris & Brown, 2008; Huxham et. al., 2010; Harris & Brown, 2013; Vanderhoven et. al., 2015; Wang et. al., 2018; Rotsaert et. al., 2018).

In addition to the practices and learners, according to the views of the participants, the influencing factors also include the teachers and the policies of their educational institutions. It was found that some teacher reflected their hesitation in carrying expertise on this practice. Furthermore, some of them seemed to be not sure that they were capable to effectively conduct classroom with peer assessment due to the influence of their educational organization's policies. These reflections correspond to the studies of many experts (Muijs & Reynolds, 2005; Harris & Brown, 2013; Brown, 2008; Brown et. al., 2009; Harris & Brown, 2013; Zhao, 2018). Considering the gender of teachers, from the participants, all non-Thai teachers were male and they were found to have more positive attitudes. The similar findings echoed in Wen et. al. (2006) and Fitzpatrick (1999). This seems to be because female teachers tend to illustrate more on how they felt. Therefore, they seem to have more understandings and reflection on worries than their male counterpart.

All in all, Thai and non-Thai teachers have reflected perspectives towards the use of peer feedback activities in English oral presentation course. These perspectives have been influenced by divergent partakers in the process. They include the idea of peer feedback and oral presentation, the role of learners, the role of teachers, the classroom relationship, and the educational institution. The findings from this study will be very useful for the implementation of

peer feedback in English oral presentation in EFL classroom. The related partakers in the process will realize what enhance and hinder the success of using this practice, especially from the view of the most influencing party in the classroom. As a result, students will gain the highest learning benefits from use of peer feedback and the authentic practice of communication by using oral presentation.

6. Conclusion

The use of peer feedback in the EFL presentation class yields undeniable benefits which are reflected by both Thai and non-Thai language instructors. However, some possible reasons that might influence the differences of these two groups' perspectives are varied from their learners' English proficiency, teaching experiences, beliefs, cultures, teaching styles, and gender. The limitation of this research is the number of participants, so the results of this study cannot be generalized to other teaching and learning contexts. To make the comparison between Thai and Non-Thai teachers' perspectives on the use of peer feedback more crystal clear, a larger number of language instructors are highly recommended.

REFERENCES

- Adachi, C., Tai, J. H. M., & P. Dawson. (2017). Academics' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of self and peer assessment in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*: 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1339775>
- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, personality and behavior* (2nd ed.). New York: Open University Press.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2006). *Developing a theory of formative assessment*.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and Practice* London: Continuum.
- Boston, C. (2002). The Concept of Formative Assessment, *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 8(1), 1-6. doi: 10.7275/kmcq-dj31
- Boud, D. (2016). Current influences on changing assessment: Implications for research to make a difference. Invited keynote address at EARLI SIG 1 Assessment & Evaluation Conference. Munich, Germany.

- Boud, D., Cohen, R., & Sampson, J. (1999). Peer learning and assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 24(4), 413 – 426.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293990240405>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brooks, G., & Wilson, J. (2014). Using Oral Presentations to Improve Students' English Language Skill. *Japan: Kwansei Gakuin University – Humanities Review*, 19: 199-212.
- Brown, G. T. L. (2008). *Conceptions of assessment: Understanding what assessment means to teachers and students*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/t01348-000>
- Brown, G. T. L., Kennedy, K. J., Fok, P. K., Chan, J. K. S., & Yu, W. M. (2009). Assessment for student improvement: understanding Hong Kong teachers' conceptions and practices of assessment, *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 16:3, 347-363.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09695940903319737>
- Bryant, D. A., & Carless, D. R. (2009). 'Peer assessment in a test-dominated setting: Empowering, boring or facilitating examination preparation?', *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 9(1), 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-009-9077-2>
- Chaqmaqchee, Z. A. (2015). Empowering learning: students and teachers outlook on peer assessment for oral presentation. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6, 75-81.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (1997). Having second thoughts: student perceptions before and after a peer assessment exercise. *Studies in Higher Education*, 22, 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>
- Cowie, B., & Harrison, C. (2016). Classroom processes that support effective assessment.
- Falchikov, N. (1995). Peer feedback marking: Developing peer assessment. *Innovations in Education & Training International*, 32(2), 175–187.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1355800950320212>

- Fitzpatrick, C. (1999) Students as evaluators in practicum: examining peer/self-assessment and self-efficacy, paper presented at the National Conference of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, New Orleans, LA, 27–31 October.
- Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2012). Spring cleaning for the “messy” construct of teachers' beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined? What can they tell us?
<https://doi.org/10.1037/13274-019>
- Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T. L. (2013). Opportunities and obstacles to consider when using peer- and self-assessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 36(0), 101–111.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.008>
- Huxham, M., Campbell, F., & Westwood, J. (2010). Oral versus written assessment: a test of student performance and attitudes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.515012>
- Hwang, G. J., Hung, C. M., & Chen, N. S. (2014). Improving learning achievements, motivations and problem-solving skills through a peer assessment-based game development approach. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 62(2), 129-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-013-9320-7>
- Kim, M., & Ryu, J. (2013). The development and implementation of a web-based formative peer assessment system for enhancing students' metacognitive awareness and performance in ill-structured tasks. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 61(4), 549-561. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-012-9266-1>
- Liu, N. F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 279-290.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- Lynch, D. H., & Golen, S. (1992). Peer evaluation of writing in business communication classes. *Journal of Education for Business*, 68(1), 44–48.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.1992.10117585>
- Mouhoubi-Messadh, C. (2017). Reflections on Hidden Voices in the EFL Classroom: The “Anxious” Learner and the “Caring” Teacher. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 14-25. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.32.1425>

- Nicol, D. (2010). From monologue to dialogue: Improving written feedback processes in mass higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(5), 501–517.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602931003786559>
- Noonan, B., & Duncan, C. R. (2005). Peer and self-assessment in high schools. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(17).
- Panadero, E. & Brown, G.T.L. (2017). Teachers' reasons for using peer assessment: positive experience predicts use. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 32(1): 133-56.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-015-0282-5>
- Panadero, E., Jonsson, A., & Strijbos, J. W. (2016). Scaffolding self-regulated learning through self-assessment and peer assessment: Guidelines for classroom implementation.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-39211-0_18
- Price, M., Carroll, J., O'Donovan, B., & Rust, C. (2011). If I was going there, I wouldn't start from here: a critical commentary on current assessment practice. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 36(2), 479 – 492.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903512883>
- Race, P., Brown, S., & Smith, B. (2005). *500 Tips on assessment*. London: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203307359>
- Rotsaert, T., Panadero, E., & Schellens, T. (2018). Peer assessment use, its social nature challenges and perceived educational value: A teachers' survey study. *Studies In Educational Evaluation*, 59, 124-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2018.07.001>
- Rubie-Davies, C., Flint, A., & McDonald, L. (2012). Teacher beliefs, teacher characteristics, and school contextual factors: what are the relationships? *The British journal of educational psychology*, 82, 270-88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2011.02025.x>
- Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). Improving students' learning by developing their understanding of assessment criteria and processes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28, 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301671>
- Sluijsmans, D. M. A., Brand-Gruwel, S., Van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Bastiens, T. J. (2003). The training of peer assessment skills to promote the development of reflection skills in teacher education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 29, 23-42.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-491X\(03\)90003-4](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, 369-378. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0260293042000197609>
- Spandorfer, J., Puklus, T., Rose, V., Vahedi, M., Collins, L., Giordano, C., & Braster, C. (2014). Peer assessment among first year medical students in anatomy. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 7(2), 144–152. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.1394>
- Topping, K. J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48, 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569>
- Vanderhoven, E., Raes, A., Montrieux, H., Rotsaert, T., & Schellens, T. (2015). What if pupils can assess their peers anonymously? A quasi-experimental study. *Computers & Education*, 81, 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.10.001>
- Wang, B., Yu, S., & Teo, T. (2018). Experienced EFL teachers' beliefs about feedback on student oral presentations. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-018-0053-3>
- Wen, M. L., Tsai, C. C., & Chang, C. Y. (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>
- Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2016). Teacher assessment literacy in practice: A reconceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 58, 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.05.010>
- Zevenbergen, R. (2001). Peer assessment of student constructed posters: assessment alternatives in pre-service mathematics education, *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 4, 95–113. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011401532410>
- 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>