Investigating Thai EFL Undergraduates' Oral Presentation Performances and Experiences, Using Teacher and Student Self-Assessments

Supornphan Konchiab

tu502@hotmail.com

Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna

Phatchara Munpanya

y.haleluya@gmail.com

Faculty of Business and Administration and Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna

_____

Abstract

This study aimed to 1) measure and identify students' strengths and weaknesses in oral presentation skills, 2) examine students' perceptions of rating their presentation performances, and 3) investigate students' attitudes towards their oral presentation experiences. The participants were 47 Thai third-year undergraduate students in the English for International Communication Program. Research instruments were the teacher assessment form and a student self-assessment questionnaire, including a scoring rubric and self-reflection questions. Means, standard deviations, and Paired Sample T-Test were used to analyze oral presentation performance levels from self- and teacher assessments. Coding and categorizing were also used to analyze responses from self-reflection questions. As a result, the overall level of oral presentation performance was at a high level. Based on the teacher assessment, students' most outstanding performance was expressing an in-depth understanding of the topics and creative and professional design of visual aids. Dealing with questions was the least outstanding performance but remained at the high level. Regarding the students' self-assessment, they appeared to be most confident in expressing an in-depth understanding of the topics that was ranked at a high level. However, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar were ranked at the medium level. In addition, students' reflection revealed students' positive attitudes towards their presentation experiences, showing their efforts to practice and prepare the presentation, solve problems related to setting and environment, affective factors, and working memory while delivering presentations. This study suggested that regular training and practice of self-assessment rubric and self-reflection would complement teacher assessments to improve students' oral presentation and continuously promote life-long learning.

Keywords: oral presentation performance, teacher assessment, self-assessment, EFL

Introduction

Communication is among the key skillsets for successful study and works in the twenty‑first century. Similarly, there have been significant demands for graduates who have outstanding communication skills in other countries worldwide. Consequently, Thai universities have increasingly focused more on developing speaking and communication skills to equip their students for future careers. Oral presentation, in particular, has become an integral part of the curriculum of both subject knowledge (Science, Engineering, Nursing, and Business) and language learning (English for Academic Purposes and English for Occupational Purposes). According to previous studies (Al-Issa & Al-Qubtan, 2010; Brooks & Wilson, 2014; and Živković, 2014), oral presentation skills are highly needed among the workforce market around the world. It is also a meaningful tool for speaking and listening skill development. In addition, it helps develop cognitive and social skills, share and obtain knowledge, as well as promote independent learning and active learning environments.

However, teaching and learning oral presentation in Thailand appears challenging for many reasons. Firstly, teaching and learning English in Thailand is conducted within the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. In this context, learning and using English is limited to the classroom where the language can be taught and learned, but seldom practiced (Cook, 2011). Consequently, Thai students may not be confident to speak English, specifically in public speaking and formal presentation (Khamkhien, 2010).

Secondly, an oral presentation requires many skills in addition to second language skills and, therefore, may be seen as challenging among students to give a good presentation. According to Duklim and Musigrungsi (2018), successful presenters are also required to use verbal and non‑verbal communication appropriately, understand the topic of the talk, and organize the content well. Guest (2018) included the design and effective use of visual aids, as well as the consistent interactions with the audience and visual aids. Besides, Liang and Kelsen (2018) also added clarity of content, appropriate language use, and responding to questions as criteria to evaluate students' oral presentation performance. Without a complete understanding of what constitutes a good presentation, students may not be aware of their strengths and weaknesses as a guideline to make a better oral presentation.

Thirdly, a traditional oral presentation assessment was based solely on the teacher's perspectives. Without students' voices, reflection, and feedback on their performance, teachers may miss some vital information to understand students' problems and needs to improve their presentation skills. Perhaps, incorporating students' reflections in an oral assessment may help achieve mutual agreement on what constitutes effective oral presentation. Unfortunately, there have been concerns that students may not be knowledgeable, mature, and confident enough to give accurate and reliable feedback on their oral performance. Many studies revealed that scores from students' self-assessments were unlikely to be consistent with the actual performance that was assessed by teachers (Alwi & Sidhu, 2013; Reitmeier &Vrchota, 2009; Rian et al., 2015). However, these studies also claimed that while

scores from teacher assessment are acceptable, they should be supported by students' descriptive reflections to elaborate and gain insights into their presentation experiences.

Many previous studies suggest including students' perspectives in assessing oral presentation. As Miles (2014) argues, students' self-reflection can be practical tools to encourage self-awareness, the learning process, and autonomous learning, leading to improved oral performances. This argument is supported by the study of Murakami et al. (2012). They found that the combination of self-, peer-, and teacher assessments helped increase the frequency of spoken English in the classroom and levels of learning engagement. Particularly, self- and teacher assessments also contributed to positive attitudes toward the course. Brooks and Wilson (2014) investigated oral presentation roles in improving second language skills of undergraduate students in Japan, using self-reflection and teacher evaluation. They found that students' self-reflection helped explore problems and identify areas of improvement. In Sucharitrak's (2018) study, self-assessments and VDO clips were used to assess and identify Thai EFL undergraduate students' presentation performances' strengths and weaknesses. While a combination of various assessment forms appeared to provide more reliable and valid data for monitoring and improving English oral presentation, little research into this area has been published, particularly in the Thai EFL context.

The research was conducted in the English for International Communication Program (EIC) in a public university in the north of Thailand. This four-year undergraduate program provides academic and practical courses to enable the students to develop their English language knowledge and skills. They were required to study a series of oral communication courses, including Listening and Speaking, Oral Communication, English Public Speaking, and Presentation and Discussion. These courses are commonly followed by more challenging courses that were mostly project-based and focused on oral presentation as part of learning and assessment (e.g., Seminar in English and Independent Studies). In delivering oral presentations, students are required to advance language proficiency and prepare the content and solve unforeseen problems while giving an oral presentation. Assessing these performances based solely on the teacher's perspective may not help shed light on the problems and deep needs to improve their oral presentation performance. It is also vital to examine students' thoughts, feelings, and reflections on their performance and experiences. Including students' perspectives in the assessment process would help personalize their specific needs to learn and improve their oral presentation performance. Therefore, this research examined the EIC students' oral presentation performances based on teacher's and student's perspectives. It aimed to identify the strengths and weaknesses of students' oral presentation skills and examine their perceptions towards rating their presentation skills. It also aimed to look into students' reflections on their experiences in pre-, while-, and post-oral presentations to gain insights into their preparation, problems, and needs to improve their oral presentation performance.

Research Questions

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses in students' oral presentation skills?

2. How do students perceive and assess their presentation performances?

3. What are students' attitudes towards their oral presentation experiences?

Literature Review

Research into EFL and ESL oral presentations has been conducted for many decades, focusing on many different aspects, including cognitive, affective, and social factors affecting oral presentation performance, as well as teaching interventions to improve oral presentations. Oral presentation assessments, in particular, have also been investigated as a tool to measure oral presentation ability as well as a learning tool to improve oral presentation performance. A conventional approach to assessing oral presentation is based mainly on the teacher's perspectives. More recently, students' self-assessment has become an increasingly important area in the research into EFL oral presentation.

Self-assessment of oral presentation involves students' observation, evaluation, and reflection on their presentation based on the desired performance. Self-assessment is underpinned by constructivism learning theory. Knowledge and learning are constructed when the learners link their new learning knowledge and experience to their knowledge and previous experience. Self-assessment enables learners to learn from their previous performance by monitoring and reflecting on their previous performance along with observing their progress. Self-assessment is also regarded as a vital metacognitive skill that helps improve the learner's goal orientation. Being responsible for their learning, learners can monitor their learning progress and plan to achieve the goal (McMillan & Hearn, 2008). The metacognitive skills, namely self-awareness, self-monitoring, planning, and learning management, are vital for developing life-long learning. In the EFL context of oral presentation assessment, self-assessments are relatively beneficial for learners and teachers (Chen, 2008; Grez et al., 2012; Reitmeier & Vrchota, 2009). For students, self-assessment helps raise their awareness of strength and weakness, encourage learning efforts and practice, gain self-confidence, and enhance self-directed learning. For teachers, self-assessment shares the assessment burden, enhances active learning engagement, and helps gain a mutual understanding of expected learning outcomes. The benefits of self-assessment are also evident in many previous studies in the international and Thai contexts.

Several previous studies compared the effectiveness of self-and teacher assessments using different research designs and yielded mixed results. Some studies showed consistency between oral presentation assessments based on teacher's and students' perspectives. For example, Najed and Mahfoodh (2019) conducted mixed-method research to examine the discrepancy of self-, peer-, and teacher assessments with 60 Iranian students in four English language classes. The assessment criteria were pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary/content, and communication skills/strategies. The finding revealed consistencies between peer- and teacher assessments but scores in self- and peer-

assessments and in self- and teacher assessments were not consistent. Based on the interviews, students' involvement in oral presentation assessment brought about a positive attitude and motivation to learn.

Many other studies tended to reveal the inconsistency of scores from teacher's and students' perspectives. Alwi and Sidhu (2013) compared EFL Malaysian tertiary students' self-perceived performances and their actual performances in an oral presentation. Self- and teacher assessments' criteria focused on organization, content, delivery, and language skills. They used a paired sample t-test analysis to compare the assessments and students' self-perceived performance was slightly higher than their actual performance. There was also a significant difference between the self- and teacher assessment' scores in the aspects of organization, content, and delivery, respectively. However, there was no significant difference between teacher- and student self-assessments on their language skills.

Similarly, Rian et al. (2015) conducted five cycles of action research and examined variation in self-, peer-, and teacher assessments in EFL presentation skills of 63 Japanese students. The comparison of these assessments in the last cycle revealed that self-and peer-assessments of five presentations appeared to be lower than teacher assessments. To maximize consistent scores, this study suggested that students should better understand the rubrics and criteria. In the same vein, Miles (2014) conducted qualitative research into how Japanese and Korean undergraduates with different English language proficiency reflected on their oral presentation performances. Many students tended to underrate their performance and reflected on their linguistic improvements positively. Interestingly, high proficient students appeared to reflect more on their language skills for improvement while the lower proficient group reflected more on body language and appearance. Perhaps, the lower proficient group did not understand the skills they needed to demonstrate or comment themselves appropriately and use functional language skills in their presentation, so they tended to avoid giving feedback on the language skills. Without experience, students may not be familiar with assessing themselves and confident to decide on scores for themselves and peers, but they were able to give detailed feedback on those performances (Miles, 2014).

Some other interesting research emphasized the advantages of self-assessment methods. For example, Reitmerier and Vrchota (2009) compared two forms of self-assessment: one group used a scoring rubric, and the other used descriptive self-reflection. They found that both groups shared similar average scores of self-, peer- and teacher assessments. Students were able to identify their strengths and limitations of their presentation precisely. This study suggested that the advantage of the scoring rubric was to guide students in preparing and delivering a presentation to meet learning expectations. At the same time, descriptive self-reflection helped personalize students' needs for improvement. Thus, students' perspectives would complement teachers' perspectives, increasing the reliability of oral presentation assessments and maximizing their learning process.

The value of combining teacher's and students' perspectives for oral presentation assessment was evident in Murakami et al.'s (2012) study. They compared the effects of peer-, self- and teacher assessments on EFL Japanese students' speaking and engagement in the task-based oral communication

classes. Ninety-nine Japanese students were divided into four classes: a control class focusing only on teacher assessment, a class with self- and teacher assessments, and two classes with self-, peer-, and teacher assessments. Based on the data from pre- and post-survey, the two classes with self-, peer-, and teacher assessments helped improve students' willingness to speak English and linguistic confidence. However, they did not promote a positive attitude to the class due to high task demands. On the other hand, a class with self- and teacher assessments, in particular, promoted a positive attitude in class and students' linguistic confidence. From these literature reviews, it can be said that with the balance of time and workload on assessment, a combination of teacher's and students' perspectives would be beneficial for the assessment and learning process of oral presentation.

As can be seen from the previous studies, self-assessment, in a form of scoring rubric, may not always be consistent with teacher assessment due to students' lack of understanding of criteria, confidence to judge their performance, and experience in self-assessments. In order to optimize the usefulness of self-assessment, descriptive reflection from rhetorical questions regarding students' feelings, problems and solving strategies should be included in self-assessment to gain insights into students' strengths and weaknesses. While the usefulness of self-assessments was widely discussed in previous research in the international context, little research in this area has been conducted and published in the Thai EFL context. Some research commonly included self-assessments in the teaching interventions as a reflection tool to improve the oral presentation and public speaking performance. For example, Sucharitrak (2018) used video clips as a self-assessment tool to improve the oral presentation performance of 30 English-major students and explored their reflection on its use. The research methods included two VDO clips of students' oral presentations, the self-assessment checklist, and semi-structured interviews. The findings showed that the video clip-based self-assessment helped students monitor their performance in presentation structure, content organization, presentation techniques, timing, pacing, facial expression, and body language. Students also reflected that they had lower anxiety and gained confidence when delivering the presentation.

Bunwirat et al. (2018) developed and implemented Inquiry-Based Mobile Learning (IBML) activities to enhance 30 Thai EFL undergraduates' questioning and public speaking skills. They included reflections as the final part of the IBML activity. Participating in self- and peer-reflections in IBML required students to take responsibility for their learning and to be more independent learners. Likewise, Dechted (2019) conducted action research to improve the English oral presentation performance of 42 Thai EFL undergraduate students using group process and brainstorming to reflect on their English oral presentation ability in the Seminar in Teaching English course. Oral presentation skills were assessed before and after the interventions. Based on a dependent sample t-test analysis, their scores on oral presentation skills were significantly improved. This study revealed that using a group process and brainstorming to reflect on their oral presentation performance helped students be more relaxed because they learned from being monitored and receiving feedback from their peers, which helped gain more

confidence. Brainstorming techniques also helped create accurate content, collaborative learning, shared learning from giving feedback and receiving feedback.

From previous studies, students' self-assessments were commonly regarded as an essential tool of assessment and learning to improve students' presentation skills. It helps raise students' awareness of their ability to deliver the presentation, encourages learning engagement, and enhances positive attitudes towards oral presentation experiences. In Thai EFL contexts, an oral presentation was an essential but challenging skill because of students' limited English language proficiency, lack of confidence in speaking in public, and speaking anxiety. Many studies suggested applying self-assessment to help students address their strengths and limitations, gain self-confidence, and reduced anxiety. Nevertheless, employing self-assessment may also be useless due to students' unfamiliarity and uncertainty of the rubric. Therefore, this research attempted to understand students' presentation performance, their perceptions of rating presentation performance, and overall experience in giving oral presentations.

Methodology

Research Approach

This research employed a mixed-method approach, focusing on the triangulation of data collection methods. According to Creswell (2013), collecting different data sources helps ensure the validity of the findings. In this research, students' levels of oral presentation performance were assessed by three evaluators and compared with student self-assessments. These data were supported by qualitative data from open-ended questions in student self-assessment. Collecting the data from different sources enabled researchers to gain insights into students' experiences, feelings, problems, and needs to improve oral presentation performances.

Research Participants

This study included 47 third-year students majoring in English for International Communication in a public university in Chiang Mai, Thailand. They enrolled in the Seminar in English course between November 2019 and March 2020. As part of this course, it was mandatory to work in groups, conducting a project, and giving a project presentation as a summative assessment. All 47 students voluntarily and willingly participated in this research. By obtaining informed consent, students were informed that their self-assessment scores would not be included in the course assessment. They had the right to withdraw anytime from the research without any effect on course assessment.

Course Background and Presentation Task

The project of the Seminar in English course involved the implementation of design thinking to improve the English language environment in the target communities. Students, working in groups,

were involved in three phases of design thinking. Firstly, in the Empathy phase, each group visited, observed, and interviewed the target community to gain insights into their needs and problems. Secondly, in the Ideation phase, they brainstormed, shared, and selected the best solutions to meet the needs and problems from the previous phase. Lastly, in the Prototype phase, they designed the prototype for the selected idea. They were asked to present the process and outcome after completing each phase throughout the course. At the end of this project, each group was required to display the exhibitions and presented the class project to the academic staff and students.

The oral presentation task was a 10 to 15 minute group presentation. Students in each group took turns presenting their parts. The structure of the presentation included a) introducing their project and team members; b) describing the Empathy process, illustrating data sets obtained from the observation and interviews, presenting a persona (that was a character representing the community members), and identifying their problems and needs to improve English language environment in the communities; c) describing the Ideation process, exemplifying ideas, and demonstrating ideas selection; d) describing the Prototyping process as well as features and functions of the prototype, and e) summarizing the presentation and opening floor for questions.

Research Instruments

Research instruments were developed and utilized to collect the data related to the research questions. The teacher assessment form, the student self-assessment form, and the student self-report questionnaire are described below:

The teacher assessment form was employed to measure and address students' strengths and weaknesses in their oral presentation skills. It consisted of 10 criteria with five levels for evaluating group and individual performances, adapted from Duklim and Musigrungsi (2018), Guest (2018), Liang and Kelsen (2018). To assess individual performance, six criteria comprised *1) effective pace and pause, 2) clear and correct pronunciation, 3) appropriate word choice, 4) complete and grammatical sentence, 5) appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids, and 6) in-depth understanding of the topic.* Four criteria were considered to assess group performance, including *1) delivery of clear, logical, and well-organized content, 2) delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking, 3) creative and professional design of visual aids, and 4) dealing with questions with good explanation.* Score 1 represents the least likely applicable to actual observed behaviors, and score 5 represents the most likely applicable to actual observed behaviors. The Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC) was used to validate these criteria by three experts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. The criteria were piloted with a group of seven former students whose oral presentation performances were recorded in 2018, and their VDO clips were replayed and evaluated. Based on Cronbach's alpha measure, the reliability of the criteria used in this study was acceptable ($\alpha=0.78$). In evaluating students' performance, each criterion was ranked by three evaluators. They rated each group member's performance who was in charge of different sections of the group presentation. After all students in the

group had presented, the evaluators rated the overall performance of the group. (See Appendix A for the teacher assessment form).

The student self-assessment questionnaire consisted of two parts: scoring rubric and self-reflection. Part 1 was the scoring rubric for examining students' perceived levels of their oral presentation performance. It consisted of 10 criteria with five levels for evaluating group and individual performances, aligned with the criteria in the teacher assessment. These criteria were introduced and explained to the students two weeks before the presentation to ensure their understanding of each criterion and help guide their practice to meet the desired performance. Part 2 was the self-reflection, used to investigate students' attitudes towards their oral presentation experiences. It contained five open-ended questions that allowed students to give more details, either in English or Thai, about their oral presentation experiences in pre-, while-, and post-oral presentations. The self-report questionnaire required students to give opinions about their preparation for the oral presentation. It also required students' reflection on the problems, the cause of the problems, and strategies to solve the problems while giving a presentation. In addition, it helped elicit students' reflection on self-improvement. (See Appendix B for the student self-assessment questionnaire).

Data Collection and Analysis

The teacher-assessment and students' self-assessment were employed to collect the data of oral presentation performances. Two weeks before the presentation, the task requirements and criteria were explained and discussed in class. On the day of the presentation, each of the eight groups presented their project. The presentations were recorded and evaluated individually and in a group by three evaluators who were Thai EFL teachers. After the presentation, the students were asked to replay their oral presentation recording, assessed their performance, and completed the self-reflection in the self-assessment questionnaire. The data were analyzed as follows:

Means and standard deviations (SD) were used to show the levels of each feature of the oral presentation performances, both individual and group. The levels of oral presentation performances were defined as Highest (4.51 – 5.00), High (3.51 – 4.50), Moderate (2.51 – 3.50), Low (1.51 – 2.50), and Lowest (1.00 – 1.50). Paired Sample T-Test analysis was used to test whether the self-assessment scores of 10 criteria differed from those in the teacher assessment.

Categorizing and coding were used to analyze students' responses to five open-ended questions in the self-assessment. First, all students' responses to each question were listed and reviewed to sort repeated responses into groups primarily. Then, responses in each group were reviewed and further categorized into themes and subthemes. These subthemes were checked against the responses to ensure they were sorted correctly. Finally, all themes and subthemes of responses to each question were counted and presented into three main categories. Those from Question 1 were included in the category of a) preparation before the oral presentation. Those from Questions 2, 3, and 4 were presented in the

category of b) problems, causes, solving strategies while giving a presentation. Those from Question 5 were presented in c) ways of improving their oral presentation performances.

Findings

Finding 1: Levels of Oral Presentation Performance from Teacher Assessment

Three Thai EFL teachers ranked students' oral presentation performances high overall ($\bar{x}$ = 4.20). As shown in Table 1, both group performances and individual performances were ranked at a high level ($\bar{x}$ = 4.25 and $\bar{x}$ = 4.17). Regarding group performances, the highest rank was the creative and professional design of visual aids, followed by delivery of clear, logical, and well-organized content and delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking ($\bar{x}$ = 4.49, $\bar{x}$ = 4.26, and $\bar{x}$ = 4.26, respectively). The lowest rank was dealing with questions with good explanation ($\bar{x}$ = 3.99). The level of individual performance was ranked slightly lower than group performance. The highest rank was an in-depth understanding of the topic, followed by the effective pace and pause, and appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids ($\bar{x}$ = 4.30, $\bar{x}$ = 4.22, and $\bar{x}$ = 4.20, respectively). The lowest rank was complete and grammatical sentences ($\bar{x}$ = 4.04).

Table 1

Levels of Students' Oral Presentation Performance from Teacher and Self-Assessments

Criteria	Teacher assessment		Self-assessment	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
1. Group performance	**4.25**	**0.44**	**4.04**	**0.57**
1.1 Clear, logical, and well-organized content	4.26	0.42	4.06	0.44
1.2 Delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking	4.26	0.29	4.11	0.60
1.3 Creative and professional design of visual aids	4.49	0.38	3.85	0.59
1.4 Dealing with questions with a good explanation	3.99	0.52	4.13	0.61
2. Individual performance	**4.17**	**0.32**	**3.63**	**0.72**
2.1 Effective pace and pause	4.22	0.43	3.60	0.61
2.2 Clear and correct pronunciation	4.14	0.34	3.47	0.72
2.3 Appropriate word choice	4.10	0.19	3.47	0.65
2.4 Complete and grammatical sentence	4.04	0.18	3.26	0.57
2.5 Appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids	4.20	0.28	3.89	0.76
2.6 In-depth understanding of the topic	4.30	0.38	4.13	0.65
Overall	**4.20**	**0.38**	**3.80**	**0.69**

Finding 2: Students' Perceived Levels of Oral Presentation Performance from Self-Assessment

Based on students' self-assessments, as shown in Table 1, the levels of group and individual performance appeared to be slightly lower than those assessed by teachers. However, they remained at a high level ($\bar{x}$ = 3.80). Based on the group performance, they appeared to be most confident in dealing with questions with good explanation and delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking ($\bar{x}$ = 4.13 and $\bar{x}$ = 4.11, respectively). Regarding individual performance, students tended to be confident that they understood the topic the most ($\bar{x}$ = 4.13). This is followed by appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids as well as effective pace and pause ($\bar{x}$ = 3.89 and $\bar{x}$ = 3.60, respectively). The lower level of oral presentation performance included clear and correct pronunciation, appropriate word choice, and complete and grammatical sentences. They were ranked at the moderate level ($\bar{x}$ = 3.47, $\bar{x}$ = 3.47, and $\bar{x}$ = 3.26, respectively).

Furthermore, based on the paired sample t-test analysis, as shown in Table 2, the self-assessment scores were significantly different from the teacher assessments. These criteria included the creative and professional design of visual aids, effective pace and pause, clear and correct pronunciation, appropriate word choice, and complete and grammatical sentences. However, there was no significant difference in the scores of other performances, namely dealing with questions with a good explanation, delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking, and in-depth understanding of the topic.

Table 2

Paired Sample T-Test Results for Teacher and Self-Assessments

Criteria	Mean difference	t	df	p-value
1. Group performance				
1.1 Clear, logical, and well-organized content	-0.20	-2.33	46	0.024*
1.2 Delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking	-0.15	-1.69	46	0.098
1.3 Creative and professional design of visual aids	-0.64	-7.05	46	0.000*
1.4 Dealing with questions with a good explanation	0.14	1.16	46	0.251
2. Individual performance				
2.1 Effective pace and pause	-0.63	-7.07	46	0.000*
2.2 Clear and correct pronunciation	-0.67	-6.20	46	0.000*
2.3 Appropriate word choice	-0.64	-6.51	46	0.000*
2.4 Complete and grammatical sentence	-0.79	-9.11	46	0.000*
2.5 Appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids	-0.30	-2.95	46	0.005*
2.6 In-depth understanding of the topic	-0.18	-1.73	46	0.090

Finding 3: Students' Attitudes towards Their Presentation Experience from Self-Reflection

Students' responses in the self-reflection were categorized, coded, and counted. These responses are presented in three main categories with examples as follows:

a) **Pre- presentation: Preparations for the oral presentation performance**

Questions referring to preparations for the oral presentation performance brought about 87 responses. Students were most likely to prepare the oral presentation by practicing alone and with the team, understanding topics, and writing and simplifying their script (24, 20, and 20 responses, respectively). Other responses were mentioned one to five times, including preparing an outline, searching for additional information to support their content, and recording their presentation to check pronunciation. Many students started to prepare the script by understanding the topic and wrote their script before practicing alone. Examples of these responses were as follows:

I prepared by creating a new script and tried to use my own word to understand the detail of the persona. (7BM)

I wrote the script according to my own understanding. I used simple vocabulary to ensure that I would not forget the script. (8BM)

I prepared my own content and tried to use language that was not too difficult and easy to remember and pronounce. (14BM)

Practicing was also the common activity for the preparation, as one student mentioned:

After I got the script, I practiced by reading the script 2-3 times. Then I practiced speech without a script in front of a mirror. (17BF)

b) **While- presentation: Problems, causes, problem-solving strategies**

Self-assessment questions referring to concerns during presentations yielded 209 responses, 74 responses related to problems while giving a presentation, 56 responses connected with causes of those problems, and 79 responses associated with strategies used to solve problems.

Major problems while giving a presentation

Of 74 responses, students reported that the most common problem was noise, followed by forgetting script (23 and 17 responses). Students were also likely to encounter problems related to excitement, anxiety, and nervousness (9, 6, and 4 responses, respectively). The examples of students' feedback on their significant problems were as follows:

The major problem was the noise around me. That day, we presented in a public area,

so everyone around me spoke very loudly, and it distracted me a lot. (16BM)

The problem that I had while I was presenting was forgetting some parts of my script. (7BM)

Causes of oral presentation problems

Of 56 responses, the most frequently mentioned causes of oral presentation problems were the venue of presentation which was in public, crowded, and noisy (21 responses). Some responses are:

Noise during the presentation was uncontrolled. People around me spoke very loudly, so the audience did not hear my presentation. (35BF)

The problem was the first time presenting outside the classroom, where many people were talking. I felt excited, nervous, and worried while presenting my project. (30BF)

The other causes of problems included students' personality, limited time for practice, anxiety, and limited presentation time (11, 8, 5, and 5 responses, respectively), as shown below.

I don't know. It may be my personality. I am usually shy and nervous when I have to speak or do something in front of many people. (19BF)

Problem-solving strategies

Of 79 responses, students tended to use effective strategies to solve their problems (21 responses). For example, one student tried to encourage herself while another student also encouraged his team. Examples are listed as follows:

I solved problems by taking a deep breath, concentrating on what to say, and trying not to put too much pressure on myself that could cause stress and bad feeling. (22BF)

While some friends were presenting, I made a gesture to let them know that I was there for them. (14BM)

Apart from this, many students kept focusing on their oral presentation, spoke loudly, and repeatedly practiced (11, 9, and 8 responses, respectively). These strategies were reported below.

I tried to concentrate on what I was speaking because I couldn't control the noise, so I had to have a concentration of my presentation. (5BF)

I tried to speak loudly to draw the attention of the audience. (3AF)

The other responses included trying to understand the content, write and revise the script, repeat the words, draw the audience's attention, pronounce words clearly and slowly, as well as use keywords to memorize the script, each of which had 2-3 responses.

c) Post presentation: Satisfaction on oral presentation performance and ways for improvement

The majority of students appeared to be satisfied with their oral presentation performance, while only two students were not likely to be satisfied with their performance. One student shared her positive view below.

> *I got the impression with my presentation because I had prepared well. I didn't read my script at all. (10BF)*

In terms of ways of improvement in their oral presentation performance, of 73 responses, students were most likely to improve their pronunciation, followed by developing better visual aids (15 and 10, respectively), as one student reported:

> *I thought it was almost perfect except for the incorrect pronunciation that I wanted to make it better next time. (18BF)*

Some students also reported that they wanted to gain more confidence, improve the content, preparation, and practice (7, 6, 5, and 4 responses). A few other responses involved word choice, grammar, body language, dealing with questions. An example is shown below.

> *I wanted to add more details to describe the personal story. (21BF)*

Discussion

RQ 1: What Are the Strengths and Weaknesses in Students' Oral Presentation Skills?

The results from the teacher assessment revealed students' strengths and weaknesses. Firstly, it was likely that students' outstanding performances were creatively and professionally designed visual aids. Designing visual aids was probably an easier and more pleasant task for them than other academic tasks. Working in groups allowed students to share responsibilities, allocate tasks, and manage time on tasks. Also, practicing presentation with visual aids and adjusted them time after time could lead to well-designed and professional visual aids that help enhance the comprehensibility of the content. According to Guest (2018), good visual aids help presenters follow and remember the script and increase the audience's comprehensibility. Besides, students also appeared to interact with audiences and visual aids that may also link to their practice before the day of presentation. According to students' responses on self-assessment, they reported that they practice frequently, both individually and with the team, for preparation. Through practice, students learned to interact with their audience confidently,

draw the audience's attention to visual aids, and maintain such attention throughout the presentation. In doing so, Guest (2018) suggested using narrative signals including phrases (e.g., "Now, I'd like to show you…" and "As you can see here") and gestures (e.g., hand gesture to introduce visual aids and eye contact with audience) would enable the presenter to make a connection between the audiences and visual aids.

Delivery with an in-depth understanding of the topics were also outstanding performances. This is consistent with students' self-assessment and supported by responses from self-reflection showing their attempts to understand topics and preparing scripts based on their understandings, leading to a high score on giving the presentation with an in-depth understanding of topics. This finding supports Duklim and Musigrungsi's (2018) view that content is an essential element of delivering an oral presentation. According to Leong and Ahmadi (2017), knowledge of topics reflects the speaker's ability to apply language in the real world and impact students' oral presentation. Managing and sharing knowledge with a complete understanding of the topic also helps both presenters and audiences acquire world knowledge, in addition to language knowledge (Al-Issa & Al-Qubtan, 2010).

Another outstanding performance that reflected students' effort and practice was effective pace and pauses. Like other performances, it was evident from students' common responses that practice time after time would contribute to effective pace and pause. Such performance helped enhance overall intelligibility, enabling audiences to follow and understand the content of the delivery. According to Khamkhien (2010), reading and pronouncing words, phrases, and sentences without pauses may cause misunderstanding of the message. Besides, as Guest (2018) noted, presenters need to alter the pace and adjust the dynamics to minimize their speech's flatness. As can be seen, it is vital to provide time to prepare and practice oral presentations. As suggested in Tuan and Neomy's (2007) study, planning for oral presentation is essential to develop students' confidence and interaction. Hence, students should prepare an oral presentation in advance. This is in line with Duklim and Musigrungsi (2018). They pointed out that, to achieve successful oral presentation, presenters require sufficient time to prepare the content and practice several times to improve their performance.

Interestingly, although students delivered the presentation with an in-depth understanding of the topic, they were less likely to deal with questions with good explanations. This can be explained that in-depth understandings of topics and other outstanding performances (e.g., design of visual aids, interaction with the audience and visual aids, and effective pace and pause) were the results from their preparation and practice. However, dealing with questions was more challenging because it required students to answer promptly. With time constraints, they may not be able to give a good explanation. As Guest (2018) noted, the question-and-answer sessions (Q & A) are commonly unpredictable and open-ended, which may cause anxiety for many presenters. The students in this study might not prepare to answer the questions. To help students improve their performances in dealing with questions, they should be trained to use communication strategies, particularly asking for clarification, asking for an explanation, thanking and appeasement (Guest, 2018).

RQ 2: What Are Students' Perceptions of Rating Their Presentation Performance?

Based on the students' self-assessment scoring rubric, students appeared to be confident in their in-depth understanding of the topics and deliver a comprehensive design thinking process. This is supported by the data from students' reflections on their efforts to prepare, write their script, and frequent practice, contributing to an in-depth understanding of the topic and design thinking process, and dealing with questions with good explanations. As discussed in the previous section, adequate preparation and practice could give the presentation a complete understanding of the topic and a comprehensive design thinking process. By preparing their scripts, students were fully aware that they understood the content and delivered the content confidently. Scores from these criteria were also consistent with those in the teacher assessment. These criteria might have been easier to understand and rated because these performances were observable from the presentation's content. As Rian et al. (2015) pointed out, rubrics that are more concrete, easier to describe, and more specific help eliminate overscoring and underscoring students' self-assessments.

However, students were less likely confident in language features, including clear and correct pronunciation, appropriate word choice, and complete and grammatical sentences. Comparing with the teacher assessment, students tended to underscore these performances. This could be explained that these English-major students had learned many courses related to language knowledge (e.g., grammar, phonetics and phonology, and vocabulary). They were more aware of every single unit's language accuracy of utterance and required to use more sophisticated English patterns. Their language used in the presentation did not seem to meet their expectation of using more, so they ranked their performance at a medium level. On the other hand, when rating students' performance, teachers focused more on the overall intelligibility of the message delivered. They may not capture all pronunciation mistakes in every single word and grammatical errors in every sentence. Similarly, Rian et al. (2015) also found Japanese students rated their stress and intonation lower than teachers due to students' lack of language confidence. Likewise, Alwi and Sidhu (2013) found Malaysian students rated vocabulary and grammar in the presentation lower than average, reflecting their needs for improving language proficiency. Duklim and Musigrungsi (2018) revealed that the presenter's language proficiency significantly affected success in an oral presentation. It can be said that students in this research needed to continue practicing and improving their use of language. According to students' responses in the self-assessments, pronunciation was the main area they wanted to improve. Combining regular practice with videotaping and self-reflection, in and outside the classroom, could be one of the best approaches to improve pronunciation and other essential features of oral presentation performances (Lima, 2016; Murakami et al., 2012; Sucharitrak, 2018).

It was noticeable that unclear description of desired performance and students' lack of understanding of the criteria led to underscoring and overscoring in the self-assessment. The criteria in this research context were a five-point rating scale. Without detailed descriptions of each scale, students may find scoring their performance challenging. Similarly, Miles' (2014) also found that self-

assessment scores were lower than teacher assessment scores due to students' lack of complete understanding of the criteria and confidence in making a decision. Therefore, providing an analytic rubric with practical and comprehensible descriptions of expected performance for each criterion would enable students to confidently decide the more accurate scores. Miles (2014, p. 339) also suggested training students to notice the difference between "*what they want to say and what they can do*" to raise students' awareness of language features. In addition, in the Thai EFL context, students usually perceive that grading and scoring are the teacher's responsibility. They hardly have opportunities to monitor their performance, so they may not be familiar with self-rating and confident to make a decision. Thus, it is essential to include student self-assessment in the EFL classroom with a consistent practice for the accuracy of self-assessment (Chen, 2008).

RQ 3: What Are Students' Attitudes towards Their Oral Presentation Experiences?

Based on students' responses in the self-assessment questionnaire Part 2 self-reflection, attitudes towards their overall presentation experiences were mainly positive. However, they somewhat encountered problems related to setting and environment, affective factors, and working memory. Firstly, the presentation setting took place in an exhibition area, shared with other academic programs. Seven groups of students exhibited and presented their projects to the public as well as evaluators. Such an environment greatly affected students' concentration, working memory, and negative feelings. This is because these students were more familiar with the quiet and friendly classroom environment. When they had to present in public outside the classroom, it was challenging to control the situations, particularly noise. Some also felt nervous and anxious when presenting their public project, while others were distracted and finally forgot the scripts. Affective related problems seemed to be the most common among Thai EFL speakers (Yaikhong & Usaha, 2012).

However, students seemed to cope with these problems well, using affective strategies such as encouraging themselves, taking deep breaths, and staying focused to continue the presentation. According to Guest (2018), taking deep, full breaths could help reduce anxiety and allowed speakers to project their voice without showing their nerves. Also, as Nakatani (2010) pointed out, controlling and managing their feelings helps reduce anxiety and enhance pleasantness while giving a presentation, leading to better oral performance. In addition, Phuthong (2017) suggested mindfulness practice to maintain learning focus, enhance concentration, calmness, and control emotion. As can be seen, these strategies would enable students to cope with affective problems caused by uncontrolled and unforeseen situations in the real world that is sometimes difficult to avoid. Perhaps, it may be a good challenge for students to step out of their comfort zone, practice presentation in a real-world setting, and learn to use effective strategies to improve students' oral presentation performances.

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study revealed students' needs and suggested ways to improve their language proficiency and confidence along with learning to use self-assessment accurately and confidently as a pathway of success in giving oral presentations. First, to improve language proficiency and confidence, language features (e.g., pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar) should be prioritized. Practicing communication strategies to cope with negative feelings and unforeseen problems during oral presentations should also be worthwhile. Extensive presentation practice in different learning contexts would promote authentic use of the language and their flexibility and adaptability of using strategies. Students also need to learn to use self-assessment as learning tools, either rubric or self-reflection. They should be trained to understand the criteria or encouraged to co-create the mutual criteria with the teachers. They should also be introduced to some assessment skills to raise their awareness of their performance, including noticing the gap between their current performance and desired performance (Miles, 2014).

This study focused mainly on final presentations as summative assessments, whereas self-assessment has commonly used in the EFL classroom as a formative assessment. Therefore, there should be some future research looking into self-assessment as learning and reflection tools to improve students' performance in and outside the classroom. Also, as this study revealed the benefits of students' perspectives in oral presentation assessment, it is recommended to investigate an oral presentation's developmental process using a combination of different forms of assessment and self-reflection.

References

Al-Issa, A. S., & Al-Qubtan, R. (2010). Taking the floor: Oral presentations in EFL classrooms. *TESOL Journal*, *1*, 227-246.

Alwi, F. N., & Sidhu, G. (2013). Oral presentation: Self-perceived competence and actual performanc*e among UiTM Business Faculty students. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 90*, 98-106.

Bunwirat, N., Chuaychoowong, M., & Boonsathorn, S. (2018). Effects of Inquiry-Based Mobile Learning (IBML) on university students' questioning and public speaking skills. *FEU Academic Review Journal, 12*(1), 283-303.

Brooks, G., & Wilson, J. (2014). Using oral presentations to improve students' English language skills. *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review*, *19*, 199-210.

Chen, Y. M. (2008). Learning to self-assess oral performance in English: A longitudinal case study. Language *Teaching Research, 12*(2), 235-262.

Cook, V. (2011). Teaching English as a foreign language in Europe. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 140-154). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dechted, P. (2019). The result of using group process and brainstorming on English oral presentation ability of undergraduate students. *Journal of Faculty of Education Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University, 6*(2), 185-194.

Duklim, B., & Musigrungsi, S. (2018). Oral presentation performance and strategies employed by students in an international classroom context. *Songklanakarin Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 24*(1), 39-74.

Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2012). How effective are self- and peer- assessment of oral presentation skills compared with teachers' assessments? *Active Learning in Higher Education, 13*(2), 129-142.

Guest, M. (2018). *Conferencing and Presentation English for Young Academics*. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Teaching English speaking and English speaking tests in the Thai context: A reflection from Thai perspective. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 184-190.

Leong, L., & Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An analysis of factors influencing learners' English speaking skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education (IJREE), 2*(1), 34-41.

Liang, H. Y., & Kelsen, B. (2018). Influence of personality and motivation on oral presentation performance. *J Psycholinguist Res, 44*, 755-766.

Lima, F. E. (2016). Comprehensibility and liveliness in nonnative student oral presentations before and after training: A mixed-methods study. *System, 63*, 121-133.

McMillan, J. H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement. *Educational Horizons, 87*(1), 40-49.

Miles, R. (2014). The learner's perspective on assessing and evaluating their oral presentations, *Proceedings of the Sixth CLS International Conference (CLaSIC)*, Singapore, 337-352.

Murakami, C., Valvona, C., & Broudy, D. (2012). Turning apathy into activeness in oral communication classes: regular self- and peer- assessment in a TBLT programme. *System, 40*, 407-420.

Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 116-136. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00987

Nejad, A. M., & Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2019). Assessment of oral presentations: Effectiveness of self-, peer-, and teacher assessments. *International Journal of Instruction, 12*(3), 615-632. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12337a

Phuthong, L. (2017). The effects of mindfulness practice of English major students at Maejo University. *Journal of Liberal Arts, Maejo University, 5*(2), 85-98.

Reitmeier, C. A. & Vrchota, D. A. (2009). Self-assessment of oral communication presentations in Food Science and Nutrition. *Journal of Food Science Education, 8*(4), 88-92.

Rian, J. P., Hinkelman, D., & Cotter, M. (2015). Self-, peer, and teacher assessments of student presentation videos. *JALT 2014 Conference Proceedings,* 688-697.

Sucharitrak, S. (2018). Using video self-assessment to improve students English oral presentation skills. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University, 11*(5). 94-104.

Tuan, T., & Neomy, S., (2007). Investigating group planning in preparation for oral presentations in an EFL class in Vietnam. *RELC Journal, 38*(1), 104-124.

Yaikhong, K. & Usaha, S. (2012). A measure of EFL public speaking class anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation and reliability. *English Language Teaching, 5*(12), 23-35.

Živković, S. (2014). The importance of oral presentations for university students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 5*(19), 468-474.

Appendix A: Teacher Assessment Form

Evaluator:		Group:			
Instruction: *Please rate each presenter with the following criteria: From 5 (the most likely applicable to actual observed behaviors) to 1 (the least likely applicable to actual observed behaviors)*					
Criteria for individual performance	Rating scores				
	Presenter 1	Presenter 2	Presenter 3	Presenter 4	Presenter 5
1) effective pace and pause					
2) clear and correct pronunciation					
3) appropriate word choice					
4) complete and grammatical sentence					
5) appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids					
6) in-depth understanding of the topic					
Total (30 scores)					
Criteria for group performance	Rating scores				
1) delivery of clear, logical, and well-organized content					
2) delivery of comprehensive process of design thinking					
3) creative and professional design of visual aids					
4) dealing with questions with good explanations					
Total (20 scores)					

Appendix B: Student Self-Assessment Questionnaire

Part 1: Scoring Rubric for Student Self-Assessment

Presenter:		Group:				
Instruction: *How much do you agree with the following statement regarding your presentation performance? Rate 5 for the statement you are most likely to agree and 1 for the statement you are least likely to agree.*						
Criteria for individual performance			Rating scores			
		5	4	3	2	1
1) I used pace and pause effectively.						
2) I gave a presentation with the clear and correct pronunciation.						
3) I used appropriate word choice.						
4) I used complete and grammatical sentences.						
5) I had appropriate interaction with the audience and visual aids.						
6) I showed an in-depth understanding of the topic.						
Criteria for group performance						
1) The content of our presentation was clear, logical, and well-organized.						
2) Our presentation showed a comprehensive process of design thinking.						
3) We presented with the creative and professional design of visual aids.						
4) We dealt with questions with good explanations.						

Part 2: Student Self- Reflection

Answer the following questions and provide explanations and examples related to the VDO clip of your presentation.

Question 1: How did you prepare for the presentation?

Question 2: What were the major problems you had encountered while presenting your project?

Question 3: What were the causes of those problems?

Question 4: How did you solve those problems?

Question 5: How much were you satisfied with your presentation? Why/why not?

If you had the second chance to present your project, what would you improve for a better presentation?

About the Authors

Supornphan Konchiab, as the first author for this paper, holds an M.A. in TEFL and a Ph.D. in Educational Studies. She is a lecturer of the English for International Communication Program, Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Chiang Mai. Her research interests include oral communication development, ESP, Action research, and Design Thinking in education.

Phatchara Munpanya, as the corresponding author. She is a lecturer of English, Language and Communication Department, Faculty of Business and Administration and Liberal Arts, Rajamangala University of Technology Lanna, Thailand. Her research interests are EFL, English communication, and Design Thinking in education.