

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

This chapter addresses the explanation related to EFL students' experiences in developing presentational communicative during virtual exchange program. It consists of the theoretical framework and several relevant studies.

#### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

##### **2.1.1 Virtual Exchange**

###### **2.1.1.1 Key Scholars in VE Research**

A significant amount of material on the subject of Virtual Exchange (VE) has been published by four scholars whose names are worth highlighting. O'Dowd is a leader in this field, author and co-author of the vast majority of articles on VE and telecollaboration (a model of VE). As a result, O'Dowd's research is widely cited in VE scholarships (Zak, 2021). Rubin, who has published extensively on VE and in particular on the Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) is another worth noting contributor to both scholarly and practitioner resources. Rubin spent years as the director of COIL center at the State University of New York (SUNY), where he developed a VE model. He provides guidance on implementation and program design for those interested in teaching a COIL course (Guth & Rubin, 2015; Rubin, 2016, 2017). Another important scholar in this field is Helm, with research that focuses on language learning in VE setting as well as program design. Helm's most recent

study is a significant critique of language learning assumptions in the VE setting (Helm, 2018). Finally, Guth's (2019) scholarship, which focuses on language learning, teacher preparation, and practitioner advice concerning VE.

### **2.1.1.2 Definition of Virtual Exchange**

Virtual Exchange has many forms and is used in many fields. VE programs are most often utilized for language learning (e.g. Barbier & Benjamin, 2019; Guadamillas Gomez, 2017; Hagley, 2016; Helm, 2017; Helm & Guth, 2012), peacebuilding (e.g. Elliot-Gower & Hill, 2015), and the development of international cultural competencies (e.g. Abrahamse, Johnson, Levinson, Medsker, Pearce, Quiroga, & Scipione, 2014; Akbaba & Baskan, 2017). VE has increased in popularity in higher education over the last two decades (O'Dowd, 2018). Rubin (2017) highlighted that a wider involvement of universities in online technology, the widespread use of social networks, and the increasingly pervasive fear of terrorism are the factors contributing to the popularity and the need of VE in higher education.

Due to its pervasiveness in foreign language education research and practice field, the term VE has been used in recent years as an generic term to facilitate understanding across different educational contexts (O'Dowd & O'Rourke, 2019; Hagley, 2020). Foreign language virtual exchange or telecollaboration refers to virtual intercultural interaction and exchange projects between classes of foreign language learners in geographically distant locations (O'Dowd, 2011). In a later study by O'Dowd (2018), the term VE is used to describe a variety of programs

that promote online interpersonal communication among learners in different parts of the world to learn a language or other subjects. The VE programs provide a global online experience eased via the Internet as an affordable and secure alternative to studying abroad (O'Dowd, 2018; Ruiz-Corbella, 2014, Rubin, 2016, 2017).

### **2.1.1.3 Types of Virtual Exchange**

Concerning the type of VE, no model has dominated due to the development of a massive variety of projects, which has provided educators the freedom to creatively respond the diverse needs of their learners (O'Dowd, 2017). Educators around the world, in different educational setting and with different educational goals, have engaged in very diverse approaches to VE. Several VE models have been developed. O'Dowd (2018) divides the VE model into three approaches: subject-specific, shared syllabus, and service-provider.

The subject-specific approach can be further divided into exchanges that are grounded in foreign language learning and those that are from business studies. One of the earliest example of this subject-specific approach in VE is the eTandem model. Much of the research in eTandem focuses on second language acquisition and examines language development, as eTandem learning is often focused on the development of language skills (O'Rourke, 2007). Another model that is classified under subject-specific is the Cultura model. This model focus on the intercultural aspects of VE. The two main goals of this model are improving both students' intercultural competence and linguistic ability. Students are

frequently required to compare and contrast different aspects of culture from students' respective countries in projects based on the Cultura model.

The second approach is shared syllabus. This approach allowed teachers from a different educational institutions to collaborate to provide their students with opportunities to work on share content. This model enables students to learn about their subject area from a different cultural perspective while also developing their intercultural communication skills and language skills at the same time (Starke-Meyerring & Wilson, 2008). Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), which was developed at the State University of New York (SUNY) network of universities, is one of the most well-known models of the shared syllabus (Rubin, 2016). In this model, students studying similar subjects are connected and collaborate on materials that both universities' instructors have developed. The difference between this approach and others is the emphasis on content and different cultural interpretations that students from different countries bring to the exchange.

The third approach described by O'Dowd (2018) is a service-provider approach which refers to the projects created by organizations rather than individual teachers. A well-known example of the service-provider can be seen in the Erasmus+VE project that was conducted in 2018. It became an endeavor to connect students from the US and Europe and the Arab and/or Muslim worlds to help them develop friendships and deepen their understanding of each other.

#### 2.1.1.4 Utilization of Online Technology in VE

Recently, virtual exchange have used video conferencing (Hartwiger & Moore, 2015) through tools such as Skype (Turhune, 2015) and Zoom (Bohinski & Mule, 2016; Lengkaitis, 2019; Lengkaitis, Calo, & Escobar, 2019). As Mackey, Oliver, and Leeman (2003) points out that participating communicative interaction, especially in the forms of computer-mediated communication (CMC) used in VE, can provide students with more opportunities to produce modified output than traditional classroom interaction. Supporting this view, DeyKeyser (1998) stated that the ability to modify output is believed to encourage fluency, automatization of retrieval process, and syntactic processing which is very important for language learner. Similarly, Yanguas (2010, 2012) and Ziegler (2016) found that interaction in online setting such as VE has highlighted their ability to encourage more occasions for the production of modified output. Additionally, Ziegler (2016) concluded that interaction in synchronous CMC that utilizing in VE improves overall L2 learning outcomes more than traditional interaction, particularly for the development of productive abilities such as oral or presentational skill.

Similarly, The EVALUATE Group (2019) reported that VE allows learners to communicate with one another using online communication technologies or computer-mediated communication (CMC) and engage in collaborative projects. This view is supported by Cohen and Wigham (2019) who argue that the contributions of webcams in VE and how the image of the interlocutors provides more access to communicative resources such as facial expressions, gestures,

body movement, and gaze, which lead to more active communication and greater understanding.

## **2.1.2 Presentational Communicative Competence**

### **2.1.2.1 Definition**

Learning a language necessitates students' active involvement and participation in the learning process (Lee, 2007) by utilizing or being exposed to the language outside the classroom to see a real improvement. Students need to watch movies or news or listen to podcasts or music in the target language. However, the learners also need to be introduced to authentic communication activity (Zwaard & Bannink, 2016) with other learners or native speakers. One of the most desirable results of foreign language learning for learners is able to communicate orally in the target language. However, for many non-native speakers of English in particular, developing oral communication skills is the biggest challenge (Gani, Fajrina & Hanifa, 2015).

Developing oral presentation skills is a crucial concern in higher education (Ginkel, Gulikers, Biemans & Mulder, 2015). It is the part of communication competence (Mulder, 2014) that becomes one of the core competencies for higher education (Cambell, Mothersbaugh, Brammer & Taylor, 2001; Hinton & Kramer, 1998; Smith & Sodano, 2011). Therefore, the acquisition of oral presentation ability has grown increasingly crucial within a variety of academic fields.

Based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for languages, communicative language activities are presented under four models of

communication, i.e. reception, production, interaction, and mediation. These categories were considerably influenced by the distinction between transaction and interpersonal language use, and between interpersonal and ideational language use (development of ideas) (Council of Europe, 2020). Referring to the framework, presentational communicative skill includes production activities in the transactional language use field.

Oral presentation are organized and practiced the speeches by which a speaker present a topic to audiences (Levin & Topping, 2006). Audiences could be more active or passive depending on the type and function of oral presentation, which places varying levels of stress on speakers (Joughin, 2007). Oral presentation is considered useful for language learners because it requires students to use all four language skills which are caused by implementing authentic tasks and being learner-oriented, and also provide the students the necessary exposure to the target language in natural and lifelike interactions (Al-Issa & Al-Qubtan, 2010; Brooks & Wilson, 2014; Girard, Pinar & Trapp, 2011; King, 2002). With regards to the benefits, oral presentation can be an effective innovative strategy for promoting the development of skill in the higher education (Sundrarajun & Kiely, 2010).

Equally impotant to the benefits, the issues related to oral presentations have been a topic of debate among researchers. Some of these issues derive from the way oral presentations are implemented in the classroom, which include flawed scaffolding (Brooks & Wilson, 2014), inadequate teacher or audience feedback (Chuang, 2011), negligence of preliminary instruction (Leichsenring, 2010), and

choosing inappropriate or unrelated topics (Meloni & Thompson, 1980). Regarding to the importance of preliminary instruction, Gurbuz and Cabaroglu (2021) in their findings found that the success of oral presentation depends highly on preliminary instruction because it helps learners prepared in their deliveries, minimize anxiety, and nervousness. Developing oral presentation competences, learners learn it by trial and error, which takes time and multiple attempts. In addition, the greater focus of the students when preparing the presentation is often placed on content over delivery, resulting in students producing presentation that is information-heavy with insufficient attention afforded to impact on an audience.

In the National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project handout (2006), presentational communicative competence is defined as the ability of learners to present information, concepts, and ideas to inform, explain, persuade, and narrate on a variety of topics using appropriate media and able to adapt to various audiences. Learners are able to plan, practice, review, and revise what and how they are going to communicate. In EFL, many of the skills required for this presentational communicative competence are the same which will help the learners to effectively communicate their ideas.

In the last few decades, a considerable literature has grown up around the theme of communication in language learning. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) through The National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (NSFL) offers a new “Communicative Competence Framework” consisting of three modes which place primary emphasis on the

context and purpose of the communications. Those are interpersonal, interpretative, and presentational. The three modes of communication provide the organizing principle for describing language performance across ranges: Novice, Intermediate, Advanced, Superior, and Distinguished. In the NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements Proficiency Benchmarks in presentational mode of communication (2017), the learners of each level are able to:

**Table 2.1: Can-Do Statements Proficiency Benchmarks – Presentational**

| Range         | Proficiency Benchmarks   |
|---------------|--|
| Novice        | present information on both very familiar and everyday topics using a variety of practiced or memorized words, phrases, and simple sentences through spoken, written, or signed language   |
| Intermediate  | communicate information, make presentations, and express my thoughts about familiar topics, using sentences and series of connected sentences through spoken, written, or signed language  |
| Advanced      | deliver detailed and organized presentations on familiar as well as unfamiliar concrete topics, in paragraphs and using various time frames through spoken, written, or signed language  |
| Superior      | deliver extended presentations on abstract or hypothetical issues and ideas ranging from broad general interests to my areas of specialized expertise, with precision of expression and to a wide variety of audiences, using spoken, written, or signed language. |
| Distinguished | deliver sophisticated and articulate presentations on a wide range of global issues and highly abstract concepts, fully adapting to the cultural context of the audience, using spoken, written, or signed language  |

Additionally, based on the World-Readiness Standards for Learning Language by ACTFL, in presentational communication, learners present information, concepts, and ideas to inform, explain, persuade, and narrate on a variety of topics using appropriate media and adapting to various audiences of listeners, readers, or viewers.

According to ACTFL performance descriptors for language learners (2012), in presentational mode, there are seven domains that describe what language features that construct this competence that refers to the ability of learners to use the language that has been learned and practiced. Those are functions, content/context, text type, language control, vocabulary, communication strategies, and cultural awareness.

**Table 2.2 : ACTFL Performance Descriptors for Language Learners – Presentational (2012)**

| <b>Domains</b>  | <b>Novice Range</b>   | <b>Intermediate Range</b>  | <b>Advanced Range</b>   |
|---|---|--|---|
|   | Communicates information on very familiar topics using a variety of words, phrases, and sentences that have been practiced and memorized. | Communicates information and expresses own thoughts about familiar topics using sentences and series of sentences. | Communicates information and expresses self with detail and organization on familiar and some new concrete topics using paragraphs. |
| <b>Functions</b> ( <i>the global task the learner can</i> | Presents simple, basic information on very familiar topics by   | Expresses own thoughts and present information and   | Produces narrations and description in all major time frames on   |

| <b>Domains</b>  | <b>Novice Range</b>   | <b>Intermediate Range</b>  | <b>Advanced Range</b>   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <i>perform in the language)</i>   | <p>producing words, lists, notes and formulaic language using highly practiced language.</p> <p>May show emerging evidence of the ability to express own thoughts and preferences.</p>  | <p>personal preferences on familiar topics by creating with language primarily in present time.</p> <p>May show emerging evidence of the ability to tell or retell and provide additional description.</p>           | <p>familiar and some unfamiliar topics.</p> <p>May show emerging evidence of the ability to provide a well-supported argument, including detailed evidence in support of a point of view.</p>   |
| <p><b>Context</b> (<i>situations within which the learner can function</i>) / <b>Content</b> (<i>the topics which the learner can understand and discuss</i>)</p> | <p>Creates messages in some personally relevant context on topics that relate to basic biographical information.</p> <p>May show emerging evidence of the ability to create messages in highly practiced contexts related to oneself and immediate environment.</p> | <p>Creates messages in context relevant to oneself and others, and one's immediate environment.</p> <p>May show emerging evidence of the ability to create messages on general interest and work-related topics.</p> | <p>Creates messages fully and effectively in contexts both personal and general.</p> <p>Content areas include topics of personal and general interest (community, national, and international events) as well work-related topics and areas of special competence.</p> <p>May show emerging evidence of the ability to create messages in</p> |

| <b>Domains</b>   | <b>Novice Range</b>   | <b>Intermediate Range</b>  | <b>Advanced Range</b>   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  |   |  | more abstract content areas.  |
| <b>Text type</b><br><i>(controlled by the learner is that which the learners is able to understand and produce in order to perform the functions of the level)</i> | Produces words and phrases and highly practiced sentences or formulaic questions.   | Produces sentences, series of sentences, and some connected sentences.   | Produces full paragraph that are organized and detailed.  |
| <b>Language Control</b><br><i>(describe the level of control the learner has over certain language features or strategies to produces or understand language)</i>  | Produces memorized language that is appropriate to the context; limited language control may require a sympathetic audience to be understood.<br>With practiced, polish, or editing, may show emerging evidence of intermediate-level language control. | Control of language is sufficient to be understood by audiences accustomed to the language produced by language learners.<br>With practice, polish, or editing, may show emerging evidence of Advanced-level language control. | Control of high-frequency structure is sufficient to be understood by audiences not accustomed to the language of language learners.<br>With practice, polish, or editing, show evidence of Advanced-level control of grammar and syntax. |
| <b>Vocabulary</b>  | Produces a number of  | Produces vocabulary  | Produces a broad range  |

| <b>Domains</b>   | <b>Novice Range</b>  | <b>Intermediate Range</b>   | <b>Advanced Range</b>  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <i>(describe how extensive and applicable is the language learners' vocabulary)</i>  | high frequency words and formulaic expressions; able to use a limited variety of vocabulary on familiar topics.  | on variety of everyday topics of personal interest, and topics that have been studied.  | of vocabulary related to topics of personal, public, and community interest, and some specific vocabulary related to areas of study or expertise.  |
| <b>Communication strategies</b><br><i>(strategies used to maintain communication, negotiate meaning, and to express oneself)</i> | <p>May use some or all the following strategies to communicate, able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rely on practiced format</li> <li>- Use facial expressions and gestures</li> <li>- Repeat words</li> <li>- Resort to first language</li> <li>- Use graphic organizers to present information</li> <li>- Rely on multiple drafts and practice sessions with feedback</li> </ul> | <p>May use some or all the following strategies to communicate and maintain audience interest, able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Show an increasing awareness of errors and able to self-correct or edit</li> <li>- Use phrases, imagery, or content</li> <li>- Simplify</li> <li>- Use known language to compensate for missing vocabulary</li> <li>- Use graphic organizer</li> <li>- Use reference resources as</li> </ul> | <p>May use some or all of the following strategies to communicate and maintain audience interests, able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrate conscious efforts at self-editing and correction</li> <li>- Elaborate and clarify</li> <li>- Provide examples, synonyms, or antonyms</li> <li>- Use cohesion, chronology and details to explain or narrate fully</li> <li>- Circumlocute</li> </ul> |

| Domains   | Novice Range  | Intermediate Range   | Advanced Range  |
|---|---|--|---|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support presentational speaking with visuals and notes</li> <li>- Support presentational writing with visual or prompts</li> </ul> | appropriate  |   |
| <b>Cultural Awareness</b><br><i>(cultural products, practices, or perspectives the language learners may employ to communicate more successfully in the cultural setting)</i> | May use some memorized culturally appropriate gestures, formulaic expressions, and basic writing conventions.   | Uses some culturally appropriate vocabulary, expressions, and gestures. Reflects some knowledge of cultural differences related to written and spoken communication. | Uses cultural knowledge appropriate to the presentational context and increasingly reflective of authentic cultural practices and perspectives. |

### 2.1.2.2 Designing Presentation

In the study of Zivkovic (2014), there are several things that need close attention of the students in designing their presentation.

First, students need to identify the audience accurately (experts, technicians, students, etc). Different audiences require and are prepared for different amounts and depths of information. The success of the presentation depends on knowing those in advance.

Second, students need to determine the aims of the presentation. The presentation can have one of these aims: to inform, to persuade, or to teach. The structure and the shape of the presentation will vary significantly depending on the aims of the presentation.

Third, students need to consider the shape or body of the presentation. Students should gain the mastery of organizing and selecting their arguments or pieces of information to respect the time allocated. Additionally, it can familiarise the audience with the aim, content, and structure of the presentation.

Fourth, students need to consider the use of appropriate material and visual aids. When designing a visual, students should consider its effect on the audience. To help the audiences follow and understand the presentation, it is a good idea to use some visual aids such as slides, video, multimedia, and so on. Walters and Walters (2002) stated that using visual aids during a presentation can be a concrete reminder of the message being delivered and good for audience participation.

Fifth, students need to think about how to gain the audiences' attention during their presentation through the delivery. The students may start by creating an introduction that grabs the audiences' attention, identifies the topic, and create the audiences' expectations that the material of the presentation is fascinating for

them. Connecting the presentation to audiences' needs/values/knowledge is another alternative to gain the attention of the audience. The use of appropriate body language and looking presentable could become supported tactics in grasping the audiences' attention.

### **2.1.2.3 Communication Strategy Use in Oral Communication**

In accomplishing the particular task, the learners seek to employ efficient communication strategies to fulfill the demand of the task successfully depending on their intended communicative purpose. They may involve, for example: reading a written text aloud; speaking from notes, or from a written text or visual aids (diagrams, pictures, charts, etc.); acting out a rehearsed role; speaking spontaneously; singing. This strategy provides a crucial correlation between the different competencies that the learner has (innate or acquired) and successful task completion. Communication strategies should not be viewed simply with a disability model - as a way of making up for a language deficit or a miscommunication. Whereas, it is the adoption of a particular line of action to maximize the effectiveness of communication.

There are two perspectives regarding the classification of communication strategies; interactional and psycholinguistic views. In the interactional view, communication strategy is regarded not only as a problem-solving phenomenon to compensate for communication disruptions but also as a device with pragmatic discourse functions for message enhancement (Nakatani & Gho, 2007). While the psycholinguistics view examines communication strategy as a learners' problem-

solving behaviors arising from gaps in their lexical knowledge (Nakatani & Gho, 2007).

Nakatani (2006) developed Oral Communication Strategy Inventory (OCSI) considering the communication problems encountered by the people learning EFL. Nakatani (2006) classified speaking strategies as (1) social-affective, (2) fluency-oriented, (3) negotiation for meaning, (4) accuracy-oriented, (5) message reduction and alteration, (6) nonverbal strategies while speaking, (7) message abandonment, and (8) attempt to think in English strategies.

In general, the results of several studies indicated that high proficiency learners were more likely to make effective use of achievement strategies to enhance communication such as social-affective, fluency-oriented, negotiation for meaning, and accuracy-oriented (Nakatani, 2006; Chuanchaisit & Prapphal, 2009). In contrast, low proficiency learners were more likely to use reduction strategies such as message abandonment, reduction, and alteration (Mei & Nathalang, 2010; Nakatani, 2006; Wannaruk, 2003).

#### **2.1.2.4 Design Principles of Learning Environment for Developing Oral Presentation in Higher Education**

The synthesis study conducted by Ginkel, Gulikers, Biemans dan Mulder (2015) generated seven design principles for developing oral presentation competence in higher education deduced from the literatures. This paper argues that the design of learning environments for developing oral presentation competence requires a systematic approach that takes the instruction, learning and

assessment sides of the learning environment coin into account (Biggs, 1996). Based on both theoretical and empirical findings, a set of seven design principles was formulated, showing the effects of characteristics of learning environments for developing oral presentation competence on students' performances. They categorize the principle into three broader themes: addressing instruction, learning activity, and assessment strategy.

### Addressing Instruction

Addressing instruction theme consist of sub-themes, namely learning objective and task. First, the learning objective emphasizes ensuring that objectives are communicated explicitly to students and are specifically formulated concerning the criteria of an oral presentation to enhance self-efficacy belief and oral presentation competence. In study of Gurbuz and Cabaroglu (2021) argued that the success of oral presentations rely highly on preliminary instruction, not only because it prepares learners for their deliveries, but because it minimizes anxiety and nervousness. In the aspect of content, the form of presentation, the presentation delivery, and interaction with the audience gained more concern in the oral presentation (Bower, Cavanagh, Moloney & Dao, 2011; Carroll, 2006; De Grez, Valcke & Roozen, 2009a). However, in practice, paying attention to all of these aspects of oral presentation competence at the same time is impossible (De Grez et al, 2009a). Therefore, the formulation of the learning objective in developing it should focus on different aspects of this competence accordingly to the perspective of the students.

Considering the goal formulation, there is controversy about to who is expected to set the goals for developing oral presentation competence. The study conducted by De Grez et al. (2009a) showed that students who defined specific goals by the self significantly outperformed the students where the general goal was set by other the instructor. Although other researchers argued that when people accept and commit themselves to assigned goals, these goals can be equally as well motivating as self-set goals (De Grez, 2009; Schunk, 2001).

Second, this learning task principle discusses the specific characteristic of the learning task for encouraging PCC, self-efficacy, or reducing communication apprehension. The first characteristic is associated with the content of the task (Bayless, 2014; De Grez et al, 2009a; Mossa, 1995). In the study of Mazaheri and Yazdani (2016) showed that increasing self-efficacy affected in the improvement of oral presentation competence of students. The presentation topics that are relevant and more closely matched students' interests, encourage students to develop a higher level of PCC than a topic that less closely matched students' interests.

De Grez et al. (2009a) was the only one who studied the effect of learning task content on PCC in isolation and found that students that received higher scores on PCC presented relevant and matched with their interests. Conversely, students with lower scores on PCC have considered the given topic less challenging and interesting to them. Less relevant topics invoked a lower level of enthusiasm resulting in lower PCC scores. In addition, students who presented the less challenging topic first and adopted the more challenging topic in their next

presentation showed significant progress in competence. In the same vein, Econopouly, Byrne and Johnson (2010) and Korlber (2011) revealed that an authentic task in case-based or problem-based learning, improved students' oral presentation competence, confidence level, and high appreciation of learning.

Secondly, concerning task complexity, such as the length of the presentation (Grace & Gilsdorf, 2004; Kerby & Romine, 2009), several studies revealed positive effects on various aspects of PCC when the course contained the number of presentations tasks ordered from simple to more complex in decreasing communication apprehension (Leeds & Maurer, 2009). Thirdly, presenting for a real audience was found to positively influence confidence levels, self-efficacy, and oral presentation (Chan, 2011; Houde, 2000; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001). The oral presentation task has a facilitating effect on students' overall language ability and motivation (Girard, Pinar & Trapp, 2011). Low self-efficacy can make students fail to develop their abilities which are stated in the study of Muyan and Tunaz (2017) because students unconsciously restrict themselves to the language learning opportunities. Thus, the variety of concepts supporting arguments for this principle encompass the social cognitive perspective, communication apprehension as a crucial intermediate variable, and case-based and problem-based learning.

### Learning Activity

First, behavior modeling is a sub-theme discussion in the learning activity principle. It is concerning providing opportunities to observe models of peers or experts to increase self-efficacy beliefs and oral presentation competence.

Observing peer or expert models is highlighted as one of the key strategies for increasing self-efficacy beliefs or developing oral presenting competence. Observation through modeling is used to develop complex skills such as oral presentation competence (Brown & Morrissey, 2004; De Grez, Valcke, & Roozen, 2012; Smith & Sodano, 2011; Taylor, 1992; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001). It also is acknowledged as a first step in the oral presentation learning process prior to the next step of repeated performances (De Grez et al., 2009b). The researchers use the social-cognitive perspective by Bandura (1997) to emphasize the relationship between modeling as a characteristic of the learning environment and students' self-efficacy belief. It is stated that self-efficacy exerts a positive influence on learning in general, both directly and through its mediating effect on other attributes such as motivation and persistence (Bandura, 1986; Zimmerman, 1995).

In several pieces of literature, researchers examined the impacts of adopting non-expert models – such as peers – and expert models – such as teachers or other professionals (Adams, 2004; Taylor, 1992; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001; Econopouly et al., 2010; Swanson, Spooner, Reeder, Haight & Van Senthysel, 1992). A study conducted by Adam (2004) revealed that adopting a non-expert model – such as peers – contributed positively to a change in self-efficacy after viewing the peer model performance regarding students' own presentation. However, another researcher who applied the expert model showed that students' oral presentation competence improved significantly (Econopouly et al., 2010). It

concludes that both expert and peer models could positively affect students' PCC and self-efficacy.

Another sub-theme of the learning activity principle is providing the opportunity for students to practice their oral presentations to develop their PCC and decrease their communication apprehension.

Practicing is a crucial strategy to decrease communication apprehension (Bower et al., 2011) and the notion that performances develop as the number of repetitions of the activity increase (Calcich & Weilbaker, 1992). Empirical studies found a link between practicing presentations and enhancing oral presentation competence (Smith & Sodano, 2011; Swanson et al., 1992), decrease communication apprehension (Leeds & Maurer, 2009; Rubin, Rubin & Jordan, 1997), improving self-efficacy, and improve confidence (Rubin et al., 1997; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001). The frequency of opportunities for practicing presentations varied considerably between the studies. Findings from De Grez et al. (2009b) showed that significant improvements were found in the oral presentation performance between the first and second presentations. Without discarding the importance of practicing in itself, some studies explicitly stated that it must be accompanied by other learning environment characteristics to foster students' performance (Swanson et al., 1992), such as having an attentive audience (e.g. Shaw, 2001; Tucker & McCarthy, 2001).

### Assessment Strategy

The assessment strategy is divided into three sub-themes: intensity and timing feedback, peer assessment, and self-assessment.

First, feedback and assessment are critical in the learning cycle of acquiring complex behavior, such as oral presentation competence (Grez, Valcke & Berings, 2010; Hattie, 2009). Regarding the characteristics of the type of feedback, explicit feedback is considered crucial in developing presentation performance (Bower et al., 2011; Carroll, 2006). Similarly, Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen's (2009) result found that explicit correction in feedback sessions was significantly more effective than the implicit because it stated clearly to students what was wrong with their performances. In addition, students perceived the explicit correction more acquired them to correct their mistakes than other feedback. Although empirical evidence reported the positive relationships between types of feedback and the enhancement of oral presentation performances, it is also affected by other factors such as the characteristic of the learning environment.

As regards the timing of feedback, the provision of feedback could be immediate or even delayed considering the influence on the development of oral presentation competence because specific aspects are associated with presentations requiring conscious deliberation, while others are executed automatically (King, Young & Behnke, 2000). For improving aspects of oral presentation competence that demand deliberative and effortful processing (e.g., changing/expanding the length of an introduction of a presentation), delayed feedback was found superior (King et al., 2000).

Another important aspect is the intensity of feedback. It impacts students' interpretation of feedback which is an important intermediate variable for enhancing oral presentation competence (Smith & King, 2004). The feedback

must be related to the presentation level, motivation, and learning to improve performances (King et al., 2000). The study reported that students who received feedback on any intensity level showed a better oral presentation competence. However, students' reactions to high or low-intensity feedback differed depending on students' feedback sensitivity. Generally, being sensitive to feedback is correlated with the proclivity of students to attend to feedback, regard the feedback as important, or react/respond to the threats implied by feedback (King, 2015). The study reported that students with high sensitivity developed more desired public speaking behaviors (considering eye contact and introduction length of the presentation) in a condition where they received tactful and non-confrontational feedback (i.e. low intensity).

Second, adopted peers in the formative assessment process can encourage oral presentation performances (Baker & Thompson, 2004; Hill & Storey, 2003; Lane, 2007; Shaw, 2001). Formative assessment help students to recognize their strengths and weakness that need to be improved in their oral presentation competence. In addition, peers assessing other students' presentations encourage students' self-performance by paying attention to required performance criteria in PCC (Cheng & Warren, 2005; De Grez et al., 2012). Moreover, increased responsibility in giving and receiving feedback enhances the willingness to speak which might lead to increase oral presentation competence (Mitchell & Bakewell, 1995).

The combination of multiple feedback mechanisms, such as feedback from the teacher, the self, and the peer, allows greater reflective learning which leads to

positive presentation performance improvement (Carroll, 2006; Mitchell & Bakewell, 1995; Kolber, 2011). It remains unclear to what extent feedback quality differs between commonly used feedback sources such as teachers and peers (Price et al. 2010; Boud and Molloy 2013; Van Ginkel et al. 2015). However, Van Ginkel, Gulikers, Biemans, and Mulder (2017) in their study found that teacher feedback corresponded to highest extent of feedback quality criteria than others. Due to the superiority of teacher feedback in this study, it might also result from teachers being better able to adapt their feedback to individual student preferences and characteristics, as well as the context in which the feedback is given.

Despite that, not all students prefer peer evaluation, especially when students do not feel competent about specific assessment criteria for developing oral presentation competence (Baker & Thompson, 2004; Cheng & Warren, 2005). Therefore, to apply this principle in educational practice, the study suggested training peers in the assessment process before formative assessment processes in the classroom (Cheng & Warren, 2005; De Grez et al., 2010; 2012). Unfortunately, it is still questionable whether the variations in presentation performances between the conditions were caused by differences in the quantity of feedback or by the specific source of feedback (e.g. the teacher or the peer).

Third, self-assessment is defined as a process in which students monitor and evaluate their self-presentation performance, utilizing videotaping or written portfolios, to provide useful self-feedback and find appropriate strategies for improving their future performances. Some the researchers consider self-assessment as an essential step in reflection and learning cycles for developing

students' presentation competence (Bower et al., 2011; De Grez et al., 2009a; Lane, 2007; Qurban & Austria, 2009; Reitmeier & Vrchota, 2009) in addition to other essential stages within these cycles, such as 'practicing presentation' and 'reflection on presentation of others'.

According to researchers, self-directed viewing of successful speeches coupled with an explicit focus on specific presentation competence aspects might result in students reporting more positive perceptions of themselves. That positive perception can encourage students to the lower levels of apprehension and more practice. Similarly, other researchers argued that self-assessment by watching oneself presenting, can decrease communication apprehension (Dupagne, Stacks & Giroux, 2007) and enhances self-efficacy levels (Brown & Morrissey, 2004). However, some empirical studies examined the impact of the self-assessment on oral presentation performance after the students had already attained the most progression in presentation. While the evidence-based (quasi-) experimental studies, conducted in the phase during which most progression in students' performances can be achieved, are still lacking so far (De Grez et al., 2009b; Van Ginkel et al., 2015).

## **2.2 Relevant Studies**

Up to now, a number of studies have attempted to investigate the contributions of VE in developing learners' intercultural communicative competence which become the trends research in VE setting. A previous study conducted by Cunningham (2019) focused on a genre-based telecollaboration for

content and language learning. The project was implemented at a university level to develop students' knowledge of German business culture. The finding of the study indicates that genre-based pedagogy can foster integrated content and language learning in telecollaboration by helping learners demonstrate attention and link existing knowledge to new knowledge.

Some researches has highlighted the self-reported benefits of VE (Tian & Wang, 2010; Walker, 2018), which point to improvements in learners' linguistics and intercultural competences. Other study has indicated discrepancies between the self-reported benefits among two groups. Less proficient learners reported the exchange as less beneficial to them as opposed to more proficient learners who deemed the exchange as satisfactory (Tiang & Wang, 2010). Additionally, Bueno-Alastuey (2011) reported that the group of participants who consist of English learner with aim – developing linguistics skills, obtained more benefits that the other group on VE. Likewise, Lee (2007) in her research showed that learner-to-learner interaction utilizing videoconferencing in VE setting were effective in fostering 12 oral communication.

Meanwhile, another study conducted by Lindner (2016) investigated an exchange between students at the University of Paderborn in Germany and Masryk University which was implemented within English for Specific Academic Purposes (ESAP) courses for business and economics in order to develop intercultural competence and workplace skills. Lindner's (2016) study found that the VE projects provided students with valuable situated practice for a workplace

scenario that they likely will encounter in the future, and improved their intercultural competence through those practice.

In the same vein, Sevilla-Pavon and Nicolaou's study (2020) focused on investigating how VE contributes to students of two universities perceived development of 21st-century competencies and social entrepreneurial mindset within English for specific purposes contexts. The data of the study was gathered from written reflection, pre-and post-intervention questionnaires, focus group interviews, and analysis artefact produced by the participants. The findings indicated that VE has positively contributed to their motivation and the development of 21st-century competencies, especially linguistic as well intercultural competencies and social entrepreneurial mindset.

Two more studies that were conducted in developing learners' intercultural communicative competencies through VE were reported by Canals (2020) and Varo (2021). Canals' study (2020) tried to assess the benefit of participating in a VE for practicing students' oral skills with English native speakers at a Spanish university. The study compared the students participating in the VE with the students from the same class who did not participate the program . The study were measure the learners' motivation to learn the language, communicate and collaborate. Data of the study were gathered from the learners' oral grades and two report questionnaires. Canals' (2020) study revealed that VE contributed positively to develop the students' oral skill and increased their motivation. The result also showed that there is a noticeable improvement in oral skills among lower-proficiency learners who participated in the VE.

In a later study, Varo (2021) evaluated the effectiveness of the use of an EP as an alternative approach to telecollaboration and the effect of videoconference on the students' intercultural competence on US college students studying Spanish with trained Colombian university students. The analysis result focusing on the development of intercultural competence also reported that the US students perceived a significant effect on their language proficiency, skills, knowledge, and awareness of how their Colombian exchange partners see them and the differences within South American/Columbian culture. Overall, the studies show how VE contributes positively to develop learners' skill, knowledge, motivation, willingness to speak, communicative and intercultural competencies.

Overall, these previous studies consistently indicate the beneficial effects of the implementation VE program in developing competencies, especially in intercultural competence and learners' linguistics which is in line with the purpose of this study to investigate how the VE program in developing students' PCC. However, very few studies have been undertaken on focusing the development of oral presentation communication competence in VE settings. Therefore, this present study will enhance our understanding of the learners' experiences in developing their PCC in VE settings.

