

The Portrait of Lecturer's Feedback on Students' Oral Presentation Experience from Indonesian and Nepal University

Yorina An'guna Bansa¹

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Jambi, Jambi, Indonesia

Corresponding author e-mail: yorinabansa@gmail.com

Abstract: Although much research has been conducted on teacher feedback, little is discussed about how teacher educators give feedback on student teachers' oral presentations to improve students' communicative competence in foreign-language (FL) education. Semi-structured interviews have been carried out to get the data and this case study analyzed the methods used by an experienced Indonesian teacher educator of English as a foreign language to provide feedback on student teachers' oral presentation tasks. This study revealed that the teacher gave feedback mainly focused on content, oral skill development, and analytical thinking. The analysis also revealed that the teacher used the pattern of 'praise and suggestion' when giving feedback on student teachers' oral presentations. This paper also discusses relevant pedagogical implications for student teacher's feedback practices in the EFL context.

Keywords: Indonesian and Nepal University, Lecturers' Feedback, Oral Presentation

A. Introduction

Research on teachers' feedback in second language education has been done in the last twenty years (Wang et al, 2016). Teacher feedback is a genuine part of the teaching and learning process. This feedback can be focused on writing instruction and on communicative spoken feedback, such as oral presentation in an EFL classroom. Particularly teacher feedback on students' oral presentations. Very limited research has been undertaken on this key issue. The first goal of feedback is to give presenters information about their performance and about the future actions taken to improve their oral presentation skills (Nicol & Milligan, 2006). The second goal is to enable assessors to compare the way they assess with the approach of others and to become better assessors. The third goal of feedback is to get educators information about the learning process of presenters and assessors and to help them become better educators. It is obvious that the attainment of all these goals can cause cognitive overload in both students and educators. Oral presentations are essentially student-centered language tasks. Another benefit of oral presentations is that students can use four basic English skills namely listening, speaking, reading, and

writing in an integrated way (King, 2002). In a nutshell, the use of oral presentations helps bridge “the gap between language study and language use” (King, 2002). Oral presentations serve as an effective means of teaching lifelong skills that can extend beyond the educational setting into a professional context after graduation since many future employers attach great importance to communication skills and the ability to give formal presentations (Pittinger et al. 2004). Therefore, it will be interesting to know how teachers give feedback on student oral presentations and the reasons underlying their feedback practice, especially in non-western societies like Asia.

This paper aims to provide a portrait of the lecturer’s feedback on students’ oral presentations from Indonesian and Malaysian University contexts. It is expected that this contextualized case study will provide multifaceted insights into teacher-feedback practices in the university context. The study also highlights the potential contribution of experienced teachers to student teachers to explore reading, to explain their comprehension, and to train how to speak in front of audiences and how to respond to it. This provides students with a developmental progression of skills in making oral presentations.

The theoretical framework of this paper will adopt the feedback theory proposed by by Lipnevich & Panadero (2021) which concentrates on the three most important aspects, namely: (1). The definition of feedback. He simply defines feedback as the information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way. From this definition, there are three important things to emphasize. The first one deals with the focus of feedback based on the prior criteria previously stated. The second is related to the necessary conditions when the feedback is given which is in line with what kind of mistakes done by the students when they deliver oral presentations. The third is information on the gap between the actual level and the reference level is considered to be feedback only when it is used to alter the gap.

In addition, Narciss (2008) defines feedback as “all post-response information that is provided to a learner to inform the learner on his or her actual state of learning or performance”. However, Feedback is considered a difficult issue in the higher education arena. Although it is acknowledged as an essential element of improving the learning process of the students (Al-Bashir et al., 2016). Empirical evidence suggests that feedback is complex, and the interrelationship between the learner, the educator, the environment, the practice/knowledge culture, and the specific task means that a one-size-fits-all model on ‘how to do feedback’ is likely to fall down on many levels in the application (Molloy, 2013).

Thurlings et al. (2013) stated that “effective feedback to (student) teachers are 1). immediate, specific, and corrective, 2). elaborative, actively engages learners in correcting their errors, and 3). timely, specific, formative, accurate, concrete, specific, focused on the task and/or goal, descriptive, frequent, and creating, cognitive dissonance, 4) provided in the context of coaching and/or peer coaching, constructive, not only positive.”

B. Methods

A single-case design with purposive sampling was selected for the research. The focal participant, Zalina (female; pseudonym), was the associate professor of the English language teaching department at a state Jambi University in Sumatra, Indonesia. He had 14 years of teaching experience and held a doctoral degree in the School of Education and Applied Linguistics at an Australian University. At the time of the study, Zalina was teaching third-year undergraduates enrolled in a course entitled Oracy in Academic Context, and she was teaching postgraduate students enrolled in a course entitled Critical Digital Literacy. During a semi-structured in-depth interview, Zalina recalled her experiences of commenting on student oral presentations and shared her views on language teaching and teacher feedback in general. The interview was audio-recorded, transcribed, and taken notes and then, it was analyzed using a method of qualitative content analysis. The interview transcript was read recursively and closely to be able to identify and code emergent themes in relation to the two research questions.

The second focal participant was Vijay (male; pseudonym), a professor at Tribhuvan University Nepal. He obtained his doctoral degree from Airlangga University, Indonesia. He has five years of teaching experience both in English and Indonesian language. Based on the information obtained from the second participant, Vijay, he taught financial management students which are in the fourth semester and the next semester, he would teach postgraduate students. Furthermore, when it comes to talking about his main foci of giving feedback on students’ oral presentations, he said that he paid more attention to the way students carried out the presentation and he also paid more attention to the quality of material given by the students. In other words, he tends to give feedback on the area of how his students present their materials in front of the class and the materials given by his students during presentation sessions. Among the foci, he paid more attention to the student’s presentation skills because Vijay thinks that doing something needs skill even the simplest job.

In relation to the students’ content on the materials and the students’ presentation skills, he gave the students suggestions and encouragement so that they students conduct their oral presentation better for the next occasions and he also addressed

encouraging words when giving comments on the materials delivered by the students during oral presentation session. In conclusion, the purpose of giving comments on the students' material and their presentation skills is to improve the quality of the materials presented and for the betterment of the students' presentation skills. Since it was an oral presentation, he gave comments on the students' presentation directly meaning that he commented on the students' presentation orally but sometimes he also gave written feedback depending on the situations and conditions.

C. Results and Discussion

From the data obtained from the first respondent, Zalina's feedback to the student teacher's oral presentation focused on content, oral skill development, and analytical thinking. She always gives feedback orally and never conducts her written commentary. For those three main points, mostly she paid attention to content. To explain the definition, students should be guided to get the right content. The teacher also gives feedback on oral skill development, especially in movement, body language, and facial expression. The teacher reported that students are still textbook-oriented, they cannot relate to the real situation that they face in everyday life. Therefore, they cannot give examples based on previous experience and they cannot make a counter argument. The teacher gave little attention to grammatical errors, phonological errors, and inaccurate stress placement. She tends to ignore incorrect verb tenses and inaccurate stress placement; those are not her main concerns. She commented on mispronunciation and intonation if it often happened during oral presentations because she thinks it disturbed the oral presentation performance. She suggested that students should be aware of voice production when doing oral presentations; it is important to set up an interesting performance.

In giving feedback, Zalina had forms like praise and suggestion, she didn't like to critique their students' performance, but she tended to give appreciation and suggestions. She appreciated and suggested it after the students finished their oral presentation and questions and answers session. She appreciated students who knew what they were talking about and their comprehension, it was like she was concerned with the implications, theories, and practice. She was concerned to what extent students understand their reading and their analytical thinking. She also appreciates how students can collect the data and coordinate with their peers to prepare presentations, and she appreciates how students construct interesting PPT slides. She gave compliments to specific strengths and learning achievements. She always gives concrete guidelines for future improvement.

She thinks that oral presentation is recommended to be conducted for student teachers. She believes that oral presentation has a positive contribution toward

pedagogical implications. Student teachers can explore reading, understand the topic they have read, and explain it to the audience. Oral presentations can train them to speak in front of people and respond to others' feedback and questions. How they deliver messages from what they read and how they respond to what others think about their presentation are essentially important to be practiced in the classroom. The student teacher should have these skills namely communicative competence and discourse analysis. This study argued that oral presentation enables novice and pre-service teachers to engage in real-life classrooms.

In addition, the data that has been gotten from Vijay will be described in the following. He gave attention to students' grammatical mistakes, phonological errors, and inaccurate stress placement in giving feedback to students' oral presentations. He gave attention to students' oral presentation performance, for example to their pronunciation, voice production, and intonation. In giving feedback on students' oral presentations, he usually gave critiques, suggestions, or even praise. If he thought that the students made a serious mistake, he gave critiques and helped to solve the problem. He usually gives critiques about the matter of presentation and the data. On the other hand, if the students were not confident in delivering the oral presentation, he would give praise. He appreciated when students could accomplish their presentations excitedly. He praised the way they presented their own way and that they could develop the oral presentation very well.

Moreover, he gave feedback more in written commentary and gave students a note about the points that the students should pay attention to. He stated that it was common in Nepal University. He also said that Nepal university students were very active in asking when their classmates presented the paper. They could directly raise their hand and ask. On the other hand, in Indonesia, the writer observed that most of the students were quiet, shy, and not confident in giving questions or feedback to their classmates' oral presentations. Those different characteristics of the students in the presentation atmosphere between Indonesia and Nepal may bring different ways of Indonesian lecturer and Nepal lecturer when they gave feedback towards students' oral presentation.

He also reported that their students in Nepal were not good at designing PowerPoint. The students sometimes present their oral presentation on a board while writing the points. The Nepal classroom did not use high technology compared to the Indonesian classroom, especially in the university in the big city. In line with the lecturers' feedback on students' oral presentations, he thought that students' oral presentations made a positive contribution to the pedagogical implication. He argued that by doing oral presentations, students sharpen their skills, they learn something new, they get experience in delivering their ideas, they can learn much more, and they can present very nicely in the future.

Feedback research not only addresses whether feedback improves learning, but also how feedback improves learning. Mory (2003) discusses four perspectives on how feedback supports learning. First, feedback can be considered as an incentive for increasing response rate and/or accuracy. Second, feedback can be regarded as a reinforcer that automatically connects responses to prior stimuli (focused on correct responses). Third, feedback can be considered as information that learners can use to validate or change a previous response (focused on erroneous responses). Finally, feedback can be regarded as the provision of scaffolds to help students construct internal schemata and analyze their learning processes.

From the findings, either Zalina from Indonesia or Vijay from Nepal, have done their jobs to give feedback on students' oral presentations. It can be noted that Zalina from Indonesia University tends to give spoken feedback, but Vijay from Nepal University tends to give written feedback. Even Though they had different ways of addressing feedback, they did respond to students' works to value and appreciate them. Moreover, Molloy (2013) clearly stated that feedback is viewed as a tool to help the learner.

Lipnevich & Panadero (2021) did acknowledge alternative interpretations of positive and negative feedback, with the valence being determined by the emotions triggered in the feedback receiver (e.g., positive for enjoyment and pride, negative for disappointment and anxiety), as well as within the parameters of positive and negative reinforcement from Skinner. In the context of education, we usually describe feedback as being positive or negative depending on the emotions it elicits. In doing so, it can be seen that Zalina and Vijay had structure giving the feedback. Zalina tended to give positive feedback only. She tended to give praise and suggestions. She clearly stated that she did not like giving criticism. On the opposite side, Vijay tended to give both positive and negative feedback. Through written commentaries, he wrote all the things that concerned the students' presentation.

D. Conclusion

From the results and discussions above, it can be concluded that there are some differences between the two lecturers from two different countries in giving feedback one of the biggest differences deals with the way each of them gives feedback where Zalina in this case prefers to give direct feedback whereas Vijay prefers to give indirect feedback. Regardless of the difference, the two lecturers have actually carried out their roles both as a lecturer and as an educator. Both of the lecturers give positive and negative feedback depending on the situations and conditions. For further study, it can be suggested to explore more on the effect of positive and negative feedback on students' learning performance not only in the scope of speaking, but also in the scope of writing since writing skill is also

important for them as it deals with the way of how to deliver ideas, opinions, and arguments so that it can be read by both local readers and international readers.

References

- Al-Bashir, Md. Mamoon, Kabir, Md. Rezaul, & Rahman, I. (2016) The Value and Effectiveness of Feedback in Improving Students' Learning and Professionalizing Teaching in Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*. Vol 7, (16), 38-41.
- Wang, B., Yu, S., Zheng, Y., & Teo, T. (2022). Student engagement with teacher oral feedback in EFL university classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688221105772.
- King, J. (2002). "Preparing EFL Learners for Oral Presentations". *Journal of Humanistic Studies*: 401-418.
- Lipnevich & Panadero. (2021). A Review of Feedback Models and Theories: Descriptions, Definitions, and Conclusions. *Frontiers in Education*. Vol (6), 1-29.
- Molloy, E. and Boud, D. (2013). Feedback Models for Learning, Teaching, and Performance. In Spector, J. M., Merrill, D., Elen, J. and Bishop, M.J. (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*. Fourth Edition. Springer: New York, 413-424. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5_33
- Mory, E. H. (2003). Feedback Research Revisited. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of Research for Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 745e783). New York: Macmillan.
- Narciss, S. (2008). Feedback Strategies for Interactive Learning Tasks. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Van Merriënboer, & M. P. Driscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology* (3rd ed.). (pp. 125e143) New York: Erlbaum.
- Nicol & Milligan. (2006). "Rethinking Technology-Supported Assessment Practices in Relation to the Seven Principles of Good Feedback Practice". *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*.
- Pittenger, et al. (2004). "Using Real-World Standards to Enhance Students' Presentation Skills". *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67 (3), 327-336.
- Thurlings, Marieke. Vermeulen, Marjan., Bastiaens, Theo & Stijnen, Sjef. (2013). Understanding Feedback: A Learning Theory Perspective. *Educational Research Review* 9 (2013) 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2012.11.004>