A Thematic Analysis on Open-Ended and Criteria-Based Peer Feedback Approaches to Peer Assessment

Liu, Yueh-Hua

Assistant Professor, Department of Applied English,

Chihlee University of Technology

Kao, Shu-Hua

Associate Professor, Department of Applied English,

Chihlee University of Technology

Abstract

Effective communication skills hold paramount importance in today's ever-evolving globalized business domain, with a special emphasis on presentation skills. The study was conducted in a sophomore Business English course, where students were required to adhere to specific evaluative criteria in preparing their team presentations, which were crucial for their midterm evaluations. While existing literature underscores iterative feedback's value in enhancing skills, our research, constrained by practicalities, investigates feedback from a one-off presentation without subsequent reflective iterations. Two approaches were employed across three classes: open-ended and criteria-based approaches. An in-depth analysis revealed that feedback not only covered pre-established evaluation criteria but also unveiled emergent themes. Notably, while feedback length did not differ significantly between these two approaches, the content showed subtle variations, with some aspects highlighted more in one approach over another. This research provides insights into the subtleties and importance of initial feedback in educational contexts with limited feedback opportunities, offering valuable implications for educators' pedagogical decisions.

Keywords: Peer Feedback, Peer Assessment, Sustainable Assessment

Introduction

Effective communication skills are critical in today's globalized business contexts, with a special emphasis on presentation skills. Especially in Business English courses, sharpening these skills is a key aspect of preparing students for future professional endeavors. The journey towards proficiency in presentation skills often involves collaborative efforts and constructive feedback, even when multiple presentations are not feasible within the course structure.

Background

In light of today's educational settings, collaborative teamwork and presentations are essential for students' holistic development. Team presentations provide an opportunity for students to hone their presentation skills while navigating the complexities of group dynamics and communication challenges, mirroring real-world scenarios. In many instances, incorporating peer feedback in forms such as peer reviews, peer critiques, or peer reflections becomes an integral part of this educational process, enabling students to critically assess their peers' work and engage in peer-to-peer learning.

Current literature accentuates the value of feedback in learning processes, with many studies emphasizing the iterative feedback loops and their impact on skill improvement (Chekol, 2020; Cui, Schunn, & Gai, 2021). Our research situates itself within this conversation. However, it offers a unique perspective—each team presentation is evaluated by feedback from all other classmates, highlighting the collective insights from a single presentation instance. Due to practical constraints, there is no opportunity for students to engage in multiple team presentations, nor is there time for them to reflect on and apply feedback in a subsequent presentation so as to see the effectiveness of peer feedback on improvement. Thus, the study solely relies on the peer-written feedback provided after a single team presentation, group after group. This singular data point offers an intriguing opportunity to explore the initial impressions and perceptions of students regarding presentation skills, despite the absence of a direct measure of improvement.

This study is set within the context of a one-time peer feedback exercise in a sophomore Business English course, in which students engaged in team presentations that were integral to their midterm evaluations. These presentations, pivotal in determining the students' midterm grades, were coupled with several components. One of which is peer feedback. Notably, the grades students received for their presentations were not influenced by the peer assessments they received. Instead, the act of providing peer feedback was incentivized, contributing to the grade of the feedback provider, thus encouraging thoughtful participation in the process.

Operating within this framework, the students in two classes were instructed by an instructor to offer open-ended, observational feedback on their peers' presentations. Although evaluation criteria were offered for them to prepare for their presentation, they did not have these criteria components printed out at time of peer evaluation. Concurrently, another instructor guided a separate class through a more structured form of peer assessment, requiring students not only to provide feedback but also to rate their peers' performances. On the feedback form, each evaluation component is clearly outlined and accessible for review.

Purpose of the Study

The study focuses on a dual investigative approach: Firstly, it encompasses a comprehensive analysis of all written feedback, concentrating exclusively on the text without considering the additional rating layer from one class. This approach is designed to delve into all the themes gathered across three classes. Secondly, the study embarks on a comparative analysis between the open-ended feedback and the more structured feedback-and-rating approach. This comparison remains confined to the qualitative feedback, deliberately excluding the ratings to maintain uniformity in the investigation parameters. The objective is to unearth what extent the use of open-ended and structured forms of peer feedback differs in terms of themes gathered.

While traditional research designs often involve multiple iterations of presentations and assessments, our constrained data scenario offers an opportunity to explore the significance of initial impressions and the potential impact of peer feedback in the learning process. It is the hope of this study that the outcomes may inform educators on how to adapt pedagogical approaches and enhance learning strategies in situations where only one-time peer feedback is available.

Literature Review

Peer Feedback

In academic discourse, the term "peer feedback" often overlaps with terms like peer review, peer response, and others (Sun, Chen, & Yin, 2023). According to Huisman, Saab, Van

Driel, and Van Den Broek (2020), peer feedback is "all task-related information that a learner communicates to a peer of similar status, which can be used to modify his or her thinking or behavior for the purpose of learning" (p. 328). This feedback mechanism, where students reciprocally both give and receive feedback from their peers, has recently been emphasized for potentially being more effective than feedback provided solely by teachers (Cui et al., 2021; Grion & Tino, 2018).

While peer feedback actively involves students in their learning by letting them act as both examiner and examinee, peer assessment has students grade peers' work based on set criteria (Simonsmeier, Peiffer, Flaig, & et al, 2020). That is, peer feedback focuses on the communication process, including direct error corrections or comments without a formal score, peer assessment might encompass both feedback and a final grade (Sun et al., 2023).

Peer Feedback Effectiveness

The effectiveness of peer feedback across various skill sets, disciplines, and educational settings has been widely investigated. Research designs tapping into this topic can vary significantly in terms of educational levels, contexts, and approaches; consequently, while some studies support the effectiveness of peer feedback (Cui et al., 2021), others suggest the contrary (Erbilgin, Robinson, Jarrah, Johnson, & Gningue, 2023). Chekol (2020) delved into the effects of peer feedback on EFL students' speaking capabilities in an Ethiopian secondary school and revealed that the use of peer feedback significantly enhanced students' speaking achievements, especially in areas like grammar, fluency, and vocabulary, although pronunciation remained unaffected. Studies of such suggest peer feedback became evident that a collaborative learning environment that incorporates peer feedback is pivotal for academic achievement. Drawing from prior research, Iriarte and Alastuey (2017) highlight the findings of Bitchener (2005) and Sheen (2006), who evidenced that students who benefited from corrective feedback (CF) demonstrated superior performance than their counterparts who did not receive any. In a similar vein, Bitchener and Knoch (2008), also cited by Iriarte and Alastuey (2017), conducted a study with university students, revealing a marked improvement in grammatical accuracy for those who received CF. In contrast, the control group, who weren't privy to any CF, manifested no significant progression.

Taghizadeh Kerman, Banihashem, & Noroozi (2022) shifted the focus to online higher education settings, particularly examining the feedback received by varying levels of successful students during argumentative essay writing exercises. The data suggested that peer feedback could influence the quality of essays, with unsuccessful students receiving more descriptive feedback. Such insights underscore the need for tailored peer feedback strategies in online learning settings to bolster the quality of students' work.

The comparative effectiveness of peer and teacher feedback has long been a topic of debate. There are studies favoring teacher-led feedback (Yang, Badger, Yu, 2006), spotlighting the value of peer feedback (Sato, 2013), or highlighting peer feedback under teacher intervention (Chen, 2021). A comprehensive review by Iriarte and Alastuey (2017) suggests that neither method is universally superior, with various factors, such as student characteristics, influencing the efficacy of the feedback. Their investigation particularly highlighted peer feedback's potential for enhancing grammatical accuracy in low-proficiency students, indicating its promise as a significant tool in language education. The study by Chekol (2020) investigated the influence of using peer feedback on EFL students' speaking achievement and their perceptions towards peer feedback. The study used a quasi-experimental design with one section of 39 grade eleven students from Injibara secondary school in Ethiopia as participants. The study found that peer feedback significantly improved the students' speaking achievement and perception, especially on grammar, fluency and vocabulary, but not on pronunciation. The study concluded that peer feedback is a beneficial technique that can support students' speaking achievement and perception, and recommended that teachers and learners should accept the idea of active participation and negotiation in learning. Studies of such suggest peer feedback became evident that a collaborative learning environment that incorporates peer feedback is pivotal for academic achievement. To understand if peer feedback under teacher intervention can enhance students' writing abilities more effectively than teacher feedback and peer feedback, Chen (2021) compared the three strategies and found that peer feedback under teacher intervention has a more balanced and positive impact on students' writing ability, interest, anxiety, and acceptance than teacher feedback or peer feedback alone. This synergy not only amplifies the unique strengths of each individual method but also fosters an elevated level of student engagement and enthusiasm toward honing their writing.

Sustainable Assessment and Evaluative Judgment

Educational assessments are pivotal in upholding academic standards but are not without their difficulties. McConlogue (2020) brings attention to a significant shift in these practices, from merely gauging current knowledge to fostering skills that support lifelong learning and adaptability. This new paradigm champions active student participation in the feedback process and the development of self-assessment skills. The crux of the argument lies in the effectiveness of feedback: if students can't internalize and implement it, its value diminishes. Furthermore, McConlogue (2020) highlighted the innovative concept of evaluative judgment in education, transforming students from mere observers to active contributors in the assessment process.

Expanding on this, McConlogue (2020) identifies a prevalent issue: traditional assessment strategies, despite their role in ensuring quality and responsibility, often fall short in nurturing profound, enduring learning experiences. The author argued that since traditional practices tend to emphasize students' demonstration of existing knowledge rather than the cultivation of a continuous learning journey beyond formal education, a shift is needed towards not just evaluating existing knowledge but also promoting skills vital for ongoing learning and adaptability. This involves students' active participation in feedback mechanisms, enhancement of their self-assessment abilities, and engagement in productive educational dialogues, all aimed at shaping them into autonomous, efficient learners.

Methodology

This study employs thematic analysis to scrutinize the peer feedback given by sophomore Business English students across three classes. These students engaged in team presentations as part of their midterm evaluation and were introduced to a common rubric in advance of their presentations. Feedback was captured in written form, post-presentation, with students documenting their observations and evaluations of their peers' performance.

Two instructors presided over the course, one adopting the criteria-based method, and the other the open-ended approach. The structure of the feedback forms varied according to the method adopted by the instructor. In two classes (Class B and Class C), the form was designed to be open-ended, providing students the liberty to note any aspect of the presentations they found noteworthy. Meanwhile, Class A was provided with a structured form that prompted students to provide ratings and specific comments aligned with predetermined evaluation criteria.

Below is the presentation rubric, which broke down the assessment into four main domains: Content and Structure, Speech, Performance, and Clothing and Appearance. Each domain was further divided into specific sub-criteria, complete with designated weights, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation framework for the students' presentations.

Evaluation Criteria	Assessment Weight	
Content and Structure	40%	Content 10%, Organization 20%, Relevance 10%
Speech	30%	Pronunciation 15%, Fluency 15%
Performance	20%	Creativity 10%, Team Work 10%
Clothing and Appearance	10%	Clothing 5%, Appearance 5%

The data analysis involved two steps: firstly, a thematic analysis of all written feedback, regardless of the form design, was conducted to identify the common themes and patterns that emerged across the three classes. The themes were coded and categorized based on the evaluation components in the rubric, as well as additional themes that were not explicitly specified but were deemed relevant for the analysis. Secondly, a comparative analysis between the open-ended and criteria-based feedback forms was performed to examine the differences and similarities in the themes and comments generated by each form design. The comparison focused on the qualitative feedback only, excluding the ratings from the criteria-based forms, to maintain consistency in the analysis parameters. The objective of the analysis was to explore the extent and nature of peer feedback derived from a single instance of team presentations, and to investigate how the form design influenced the feedback content.

Results and Discussion

Results

Through a systematic process of categorization and coding, informed by prescribed evaluation criteria and components, the data was meticulously broken down into themes that are not only purposeful and meaningful for the analysis but also sufficiently flexible to accommodate additional themes that emerged as pertinent during the review process. Four categories were found suitable for analysis, each with its corresponding themes. Specific themes were identified to match the prescribed

evaluation criteria; themes denoted with an asterisk were not originally specified but emerged as essential themes during the coding process. The following table (Table 1) summarizes the categories in relation to their specific themes:

Table 1 Five Categories in relation to Themes

Category	Themes
Content and Structure	• Content • Organization • Relevance • Time Management *
Speech	• Pronunciation • Fluency • Volume* • Speech Clarity & Articulation*
Performance	• Creativity • Team Work • Audience Engagement * • Confidence & Composure * • Preparedness*
Clothing and Appearance	• Clothing • Appearance

Discussion

Criteria-based and open-ended peer feedback approaches in this study primarily differ in the feedback question design. For the criteria-based group, all the evaluation criteria with components were clearly and literally listed on the form so it guaranteed no students could miss or leave blank but to provide a rating, along with the feedback on each criterion. On the other hand, the open-ended group only gave feedback to whichever components stood out for them, as instructed. While students from both groups were all instructed and given the evaluation criteria to prepare their team presentations, one group has the criteria visually available and one without when giving feedback.

When comparing and contrasting the data from these two approaches at a superficial level, the length of feedback responses from both groups doesn't generally differ significantly, ranging from as few as two words to as many as the feedback provider deems appropriate or feels necessary to address. Notably, single-word responses like "none" are exclusively found in the criteria-based feedback, suggesting a formality that may correspond to the open-ended group's selective commentary on a few notable points. In instances where certain aspects of a presentation do not resonate or are deemed less relevant, students from the open-ended group may choose to offer superficial comments or opt to omit feedback entirely, rather than explicitly stating "none." This omission is perhaps indicative of the inherent flexibility and subjective nature of the open-ended approach, which does not obligate students to address each criterion unless it is significantly impactful from their perspective.

When conducting a more thorough examination of the data, the data shows that in general peer feedback responses have not only covered all the criteria components but also delved into underlying layers and aspects, making them suitable for coding thematic elements. Certain themes were more emphasized or exclusively mentioned in one approach compared to another, or vice versa. The following discussion addresses each category and its corresponding themes.

Category One: Content and Structure

Within the "Content and Structure" category, the prescribed evaluation criteria encompass "Content," "Organization," and "Relevance." Even though "Time Management" is not explicitly listed in the evaluation rubric, it drew significant feedback and is therefore pertinent for further discussion.

A. Content, Organization, and Relevance

Feedback on presentations often revolves around the "Content and Structure," with "Content" and "organization" emerging as the top two elements frequently addressed. Content-related feedback typically falls into two aspects. The majority consist of brief, non-substantial comments such as "rich content", "interesting topic", or "good content". Somewhat more elaborate feedback might resemble: "It's a novel subject because I've never heard anyone present on this topic before, and it's very comprehensive." On the other hand, organization-related feedback predominantly refers to the arrangement of PowerPoint slides, layouts, and the amount of text, exemplified by remarks such as "The layout is clear, making it easy to read and leaving a memorable impression, aiding in comprehension," or "The visuals are lively and well-designed, but there's too much text." The third commonly addressed is relevance-related comments, such as "The content is consistent with the theme," or "The presentation content is on point" Interestingly, under this category, the criteria-based group offers comments far more frequently than the open-ended group.

B. Time Management

The theme, "Time Management," can be placed under "Content and Structure" or "Performance," since both make sense. For this study, Time Management is categorized under "Content and Structure" considering presenters could have taken the five-minute presentation into consideration of their content and slides organization. Although not outlined in the primary criteria, "Time Management" receives more attention from the open-ended group. This could be because the criteria-based group follows

the provided rubric closely, while the open-ended group offers feedback based on their immediate observations and what genuinely stood out to them. Feedback example include: "Reducing the animations can save some time."; "It may be due to too much script leading to poor time management."; or "The presentation content was rich, but it was slightly over time. Time management could be a bit tighter."

Category Two: Speech

Within the "Speech" category, the prescribed evaluation criteria include "Pronunciation" and "Fluency." Although "Volume," and "Clarity and Articulation," were not specified in the evaluation rubric, they garnered significant attention and are thus relevant for analysis.

A. Pronunciation and Fluency

Both groups frequently addressed the "Speech" evaluation category, which encompasses "Pronunciation" and "Fluency" as per the rubric. There is not significant difference between the groups regarding mentions of "pronunciation," such as "Pronunciation on some words could use more practice to master them." or "You might want to pay a bit of attention to some words that are mispronounced." Similar to the above pre-listed evaluation components, "fluency," received far more mentions from the criteria-based group than from the open-ended group. Fluency-related comments include: "Some team members spoke very fluently and expressed themselves smoothly.", or "The content is thorough and explained very fluently."

B. Volume

From the data, it's evident that aspects such as "Volume" and "Clarity and Articulation," although not specified in the rubric, garnered a substantial number of comments, highlighting the importance of including them in the data analysis. Both groups frequently commented on the speakers' volume with remarks like "volume is appropriate," "It would be better if the volume were a bit louder," and "The volume is too low." The criteria-based group and one class (Class A) from the open-ended group had similar mentions regarding volume. However, another class (Class B) from the open-ended group mentioned it less often than the other two.

C. Clarity and Articulation

Although "Clarity" and "Articulation" could fall under the broader category of "pronunciation," given pronunciation being a critical aspect of clear communication, articulation and clarity further suggest one's ability to communicate effectively. In this study, they are treated as separate concepts. The emphasis on clarity and articulation is evident from the feedback from both criteria-based and open-ended groups, with comments such as "I feel that this group could speak a little clearer.", "The verbal expression is very clear.", "The pronunciation is very clear.", "The first presenter's pronunciation could be a bit clearer.", and simply "They speak clearly." Notably, Class B from the open-ended group once again mentioned it less often than the other two groups.

Category Three: Performance

Within the "Performance" category, the prescribed evaluation criteria include "Creativity" and "Team Work" as per the rubric. Although "Audience Engagement", "Preparedness", and "Confidence and Composure" were not initially included in the assessment criteria, their substantial influence warrants consideration and thus they are pertinent to the analysis.

A. Creativity

Unsurprisingly, the criteria-based group mentioned words, such as "creative" or "innovation" significantly more than the open-ended group. However, while "Eye Contact with Audience", "Interaction & Engagement", "Confidence & Composure", "Preparedness & Mastery of Material", "Professional Manners & Etiquette", and "Spontaneity & Adaptability" were not explicitly listed in the evaluation rubric, they garnered a significant volume of feedback, especially from the open-ended group. This volume suggests they should be included in further analysis. Under the "Performance" category, "Creativity" was anticipated to elicit comments on the team's performance rather than "Content" from the "Content and Structure" category. For the criteria-based group, feedback on "creativity" was mostly related to content, with comments like "The PowerPoint slides are creative", "It's quite a creative topic", and "They used anime images, and the creativity is average". There were some comments related to performance, such as "The back-and-forth dialogue was creative", "Conducting it in the form of an interview was very creative", and "They presented in the style of a news broadcast, which was quite creative". In contrast, the open-ended group commented somewhat less on performance creativity with remarks like "The beginning part was quite creative", "They started with a brief play, which was quite innovative", and "A very novel presentation style! A bit like a mini-play?"

B. Team Work

As expected, the criteria-based group frequently commented on the prescribed evaluation component related to team work,

"They demonstrated a strong team spirit," "The team interaction was good, and everyone spoke about the same amount", and "It would be better if the content of the speech was distributed more evenly. Otherwise, one person dominates the majority. There's less interaction among the team members." While the open-ended group also commented, "The team members interacted on stage, which enhanced the overall presentation.", or "While waiting on stage for your turn, avoid talking too loudly as it can disturb the member who is presenting.", the open-ended group seemed to comment far less on team work.

C. Audience Engagement

That said, open-ended group tend to comment aspects specific to non-prescribed under the rubric, such as "Audience Engagement," "Confidence & Composure," and "Preparedness" The open-ended group paid more attention to whether the presenters maintained eye contact and actively interacted or engaged with the audience, although with Class A having more mentions than Class B. The criteria-based group, however, commented far less than its counterpart. Audience engagement-related comments include: "The second presenter did not make eye contact with the audience."; "Try to face forward and maintain eye contact with the audience."; and "The opening hook was quite good, providing a refreshing feel and perfectly capturing the audience's attention with a question," etc.

D. Preparedness

While both groups remarked on the presenters' familiarity with the content and instances of apparent unpreparedness with the script, the open-ended group provided considerably more feedback on these aspects compared to the criteria-based group. The preparedness-related comments, noting whether the presenters were well-prepared or ill-prepared, included: "All three of them stumbled over their words. They need to be better prepared."; and "It's evident that they made an effort to memorize their script. I've seen their reports before and know that their skills aren't that strong. However, it's clear they prepared with dedication, and I think that's commendable."

E. Confidence and Composure

Both groups also took notice on the presenters' confidence and composure, with open-ended groups slightly weighing more. It is interesting to note that criteria-based group mostly mentioned this concept under the category of "Speech," instead of "Performance." It could make sense since one's confidence can be illustrated by his or her speech, such as "Articulation is clear, volume is sufficient, but

sounds somewhat unconfident," or "The speaking voice is a bit soft, sounding somewhat unconfident." With the open-ended group, while they also have confidence-related comments on speech, their wording has frequent tendency towards the overall outlooks, such as "The second presenter appeared very unconfident, glancing around, possibly looking at the script.", or "The demeanor was also very confident.", or "The first speaker had gestures, but you could see that he was swaying from nervousness. If he could be a little more confident, I think he would be a great presenter."

Category Four: Clothing and Appearance

The explicitly defined category of "Clothing and Appearance" ensures that students in the criteria-based group provide comprehensive feedback in this area, with the majority of comments focusing on attire rather than grooming or physical appearance. In contrast, not every participant in the open-ended group addresses this specific category, yet the quantity of feedback that does touch on it is noteworthy. It's particularly intriguing to observe that students in the open-ended group are inclined to provide remarks on the presenter's general performance. The use of the term "overall" is markedly more prevalent among the open-ended feedback, suggesting a broader, more holistic view of the presentation, as opposed to the more segmented approach seen in the criteria-based group.

By comparing open-ended feedback with a more structured, criteria-based assessment, the study finds that, with the criteria clearly listed, the criteria-based group was more likely to respond accordingly, either with brief one-word or with more elaborated feedback. The criteria-based group would also frequently include comments on "Volume," and "Clarity and Articulation" in their feedback, suggesting the inevitability of referring related aspects of "Speech," in addition to "Pronunciation" and "Fluency." On the other hand, since the open-ended group was to comment on whichever aspects that stood out to them, their feedback were inclined to respond to more diverse presentation elements and personal impressions, which could range from the content and organization of the presentation to the presenters' engagement with the audience or visual aids used, reflecting a wider but potentially less focused array of feedback points compared to the criteria-based group.

While coding and categorizing, the study discovers that the language in the evaluation criteria is subject to individual interpretation, which may lead to variations in the focus of comments across different groups and individuals.

For instance, under the "Performance" category, with the prescribed evaluation components of "Creativity" and "Team work," reviewers might inadvertently address content "Creativity" in content instead of "Creativity" in performance if they do not closely adhere to the specified criteria. Additionally, while the term "Team Work" is explicitly available to the criteria-based group, leading to consistent mentions in their feedback, the open-ended group, despite being aware of and having prepared their presentations with the same rubric, might not readily think of "Team Work" during their reviews, as it was not immediately present in the feedback context.

The study also finds that students are quite receptive to guidance. Notably, within the "Content and Structure" category, "Time Management" was significantly emphasized by the open-ended group, in contrast to the criteria-based group. This discrepancy may stem from the possibility that the instructor of the open-ended group highlighted the critical nature of managing time effectively, while the instructor of the criteria-based group may have directed students to defer the management of presentation timing to her. Furthermore, with the criteria clearly listed, students tend to stay more on topic in their responses; whereas students in the open-ended group, being asked to comment on aspects that stood out to them, naturally tend to provide feedback that is more varied and subjective.

Conclusion

The insights from this study reveal the nuances and importance of initial feedback in educational settings where opportunities for feedback are limited. Despite the inability to iteratively apply feedback, the study shows that even a single instance of peer assessment can offer valuable insights into students' presentation skills. A key takeaway is that structured criteria can guide students to provide more targeted and relevant feedback, while open-ended feedback tends to be broader and more subjective, touching upon a variety of presentation elements.

For educators, these findings suggest that the way feedback is structured has a significant impact on the focus and content of students' assessments. When feedback opportunities are limited, it becomes crucial to instruct students clearly on how to give feedback that is both useful and relevant. The study highlights the potential for varying interpretations of criteria language, which suggests that educators should provide clear, unambiguous guidelines for evaluation.

Moreover, the fact that students incorporated feedback themes that were not explicitly listed in

the rubric, such as "Volume" and "Clarity and Articulation," underlines the students' intuitive understanding of relevant evaluation categories. This demonstrates that students can transcend the provided criteria, offering more comprehensive feedback when they understand the broader objectives of the presentation skills being assessed.

The differences in feedback between the two groups - with one focusing on specific elements highlighted by the instructor and the other offering a more holistic view - underscore the importance of instructor influence. The feedback from both groups showed an overlap in themes, yet there were also notable variations. This not only reflects the impact of feedback format but also the adaptability and discernment of students in their evaluative capacities.

Educators can thus leverage this influence to highlight aspects of presentations that might otherwise be overlooked. In pedagogical decisions, educators may consider these insights to balance the provision of structured guidance with the encouragement of individual student perceptions. This balance can help ensure that peer feedback is constructive and comprehensive, even when the presentation and feedback process cannot be repeated. The study ultimately supports the value of peer feedback as a learning tool, advocating for thoughtful integration of feedback mechanisms in course design to enhance learning outcomes even in constrained educational scenarios.

References

Chen, J. (2021). Research on the effect of peer feedback training in English writing teaching: A case study of students in business English major. *English Language Teaching*, *14*(6), 12-24. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n6p12

Cui, Y., Schunn, C. D., & Gai, X. (2021). Peer feedback and teacher feedback: a comparative study of revision effectiveness in writing instruction for EFL learners. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *41*(6), 1838–1854. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.196 9541

Dagnew Chekol, A. (2020). Investigating the Influence of Using Peer Feedback on EFL Students' Speaking Achievement and Their Perceptions Towards Peer Feedback. *Arabic Language, Literature & Culture*, *5*(3), 23. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.allc.20200503.11

Erbilgin, E., Robinson, J. M., Jarrah, A. M., Johnson, J. D., & Gningue, S. M. (2023).

Exploring the type and quality of peer feedback in a graduate-level blended course. *Education Sciences*, *13*(6), 548. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060548

Grion, V., & Tino, C. (2018). Verso una "valutazione sostenibile" all'università: percezioni di efficacia dei processi di dare e ricevere feedback fra pari. *Lifelong Lifewide Learning*, *14*(31), 38–55.

Huisman, B., Saab, N., Van Driel, J., & Van Den Broek, P. (2019). A questionnaire to assess students' beliefs about peer-feedback. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *57*(3), 328–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1630294

Iriarte, M. G., & Alastuey, C. B. (2017). Peer vs. Teacher corrective feedback and its effect on grammar MÁSTER EN FORMACIÓN DEL PROFESORADO DE EDUCACIÓN SECUNDARIA. Universidad Publica de Navarra.

McConlogue, T. (2020). Peer and Collaborative Assessment. *In Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education: A Guide for Teachers* (pp. 99–117). UCL Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv13xprqb.12

Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs About Peer Interaction and Peer Corrective Feedback: Efficacy of Classroom Intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, *97*(3), 611–633. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43651696

Simonsmeier, B. A., Peiffer, H., Flaig, M., & et al. (2020). Peer feedback improves students' academic self-concept in higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, *61*(8), 706-724. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-020-09591-y

Sun, Q., Chen, F., & Yin, S. (2023). The role and features of peer assessment feedback in college English writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1070618

Taghizadeh Kerman, N., Banihashem, S. K., & Noroozi, O. (2022). Exploring the Role of Received Peer Feedback for Students' Learning Outcomes in Online Higher Education. In A. Ben Attou, L. Ciddi, & M. Unal (Eds.), *Proceedings of International Conference on Studies in Education and Social Sciences 2022* (Vol. 1, pp. 389-397). The International Society for Technology, Education and Science (ISTES).

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *15*(3), 179–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004

🌱 作者簡歷

姓　名：	劉月華 / Liu, Yueh-Hua	
現　職：	致理科技大學應用英語系助理教授	
學　歷：	休士頓大學課程與教學研究所-雙語教育學博士	
經　驗：	致理科技大學應用英語系 助理教授	
研究專長：	Teaching English to Speaker of Other Languages, Bilingual Education	

姓　名：	高淑華 / Kao, Shu-Hua	
現　職：	致理科技大學應用英語系副教授	
學　歷：	英國諾丁翰大學教育學院哲學博士	
經　驗：	致理科技大學應用英語系 助理教授	
研究專長：	English Language Teaching, English for Specific Purposes, Learner Autonomy	