THE IMPACT OF PEER FEEDBACK IN IMPROVING ACCURACY IN SPEAKING SKILLS

Kiranova Khafiza Uramish kizi

2nd year student of the MA Department of Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Abstract. *In speaking English, students still find many difficulties especially when students make speeches, and unfortunately in giving speeches students are rarely given feedback so they don't know where their mistakes are. In this paper, the researcher intends to find out how peer feedback is implemented, the focus especially discusses the types of feedback used by the participants in this study, and the effect of conducting peer feedback on students' speech. This study makes use of descriptive qualitative method involving 32 participants. The data sources of this research are observations and student speech scores. The results show that peer-feedback techniques also have a positive effect on participants. Peer feedback can improve student speech, student confidence, and fun learning activities.*

Key words. *Peer feedback, pre-test, post-test, observation*

The desire of English language learners is to communicate, but some students are hesitant to use English in the classroom because they fear making mistakes; therefore, the goal of this project is to create a safe environment in which students can improve their speaking ability through speaking interactions and peer feedback. Peer feedback, according to Hyland and Hyland (2006), is a technique that enables students to take responsibility for what they have learned and, as a result, influence their own learning. Peer feedback also enables students to evaluate their own and others' creations.

Feedback can be given by teachers or their peer. In fact, peer feedback is believed to be able to foster students' participation as well as communicative competence in compared with the feedback from the teacher (Liu & Carless, 2006).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section was oriented toward the definition of variables and the exploration of previous studies.

Peer Feedback

Srinivas (2019) characterizes peer feedback as any communicative activity occurring among learners with minimal teacher involvement, involving corrections, comments, suggestions, or shared ideas. Implementing this strategy in a course ensures that students actively participate in rectifying errors made by themselves or their peers (Sindhy, 2020). Working together with a peer offers valuable opportunities for EFL learners to enhance their language skills. In small groups, students feel less hesitant to communicate, facilitating better understanding of each other's ideas while effectively expressing their own thoughts.

Peer feedback training

Sufficient and systematic training of students before the implementation of peer review is necessary for them to become more proficient in analyzing peer feedback and assessing whether this feedback is effective for subsequent reviews. Peer review training workshops are meant to help students become not only better peer reviewers but also conscientious editors who take responsibility for their work interactively.

Lam (2010) developed a three-stage training program for peer feedback. The initial phase, Modeling, involves preparing students for peer review by explaining different types of errors and providing practical suggestions. This step is crucial to convince students to consider and implement peer comments in their revisions, as they may otherwise disregard feedback without valid reasoning. According to Ferris (1999), rectifiable errors, particularly those related to verbs such as tense, form, passives, and modal usage, are typically more rule-bound and easier for peer reviewers to address. On the other hand, issues regarding prepositions, sentence structures, and non-idiomatic expressions are considered untreatable due to their complexity in explanation. The next stage, Exploring, focuses on assessing students' abilities to identify and elucidate content and language-related issues while providing constructive feedback to their peers. The final stage, Consciousness-Raising, teaches students how

to evaluate peer feedback critically. Despite the necessity of teacher supervision, this phase underscores the importance of students becoming more self-reliant in peer review activities.

Exploring Research on Peer Feedback

Studies have found that peer feedback improves oral production and helps students speak accurately and appropriately.

In Iraq, Khoram et al. (2020) conducted an experimental study with high school students with an intermediate level of proficiency in English as a foreign language. Peers gave feedback on their classmates' mistakes, and the findings showed that students' speech accuracy increased as a result. That is, in a range of linguistic structures like prepositions, articles, subject-verb agreement, and the past tense.

Valdiviezo (2021) examined the use of peer review and its impact on oral production in Ecuador. According to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), the study's participants were seventh-semester National and Foreign Languages Pedagogy Career students at the Technical University of Ambato, who were categorized as level B1. The students were between the ages of 19 and 26 on average. The participants were assessed using an oral evaluation rubric during the pretest and posttest. The outcome was an increase in the spoken production.

METHODOLOGY

This study 'aims to fill the gaps in the literature by measuring the effect of peer feedback on students' speech delivery. To achieve this research aim, the study will use qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Qualitative research is effective in obtaining culturally specific information about the values, opinions, behaviors, and social contexts of a particular population. In other words, qualitative research is used to obtain information from a specific population. The data is obtained to find the social context and certain people. Qualitative do not use the procedure of statistical analysis or other quantification.

For a quantitative approach, a pre and posttest with an intervention generated quantitative data to explain why some results were statistically significant. The

qualitative approach, in contrast, provides a deeper understanding of the investigated topic by valuing the participants' perspectives (Dawadi et al., 2021).

The research was conducted as part of a regular learning unit with an emphasis on oral interaction. This research involved 7 weeks. Participants were instructed during this time on how to provide feedback to their peers by using a checklist and engaging in interactive activities.

Pre and posttests were administered to a sample of 32 participants to generate quantitative data. During a seven-week period, data were collected at the beginning and end of the innovation. After entering and encoding quantitative data in an Excel spreadsheet, they were transferred to the JASP program to generate descriptive and inferential statistics.

This study was conducted to answer the following research questions:

Research Questions

1. To what extent did peer feedback improve the speaking accuracy of students?

2. What attitudes would students have toward the use of peer feedback?

Participants

The participants were 32 students enrolled in the first year of Uzbekistan State World Languages University. Their ages range between 18 and 19. According to the proficiency test, their level of English is B2. Some participants have not yet developed adequate oral abilities. Therefore, the researcher decided to conduct a study aimed at encouraging students to use peer feedback to improve their speaking as well as their accuracy.

Instruments

The instruments designed to collect quantitative and qualitative information were pretest and posttest.

Pretest and Posttest

A pretest is an assessment measure given to participants before they have undergone some type of treatment as part of a research study. A posttest is an assessment measure given to participants after they have received treatment as part of a research study (Budert-Waltz, 2022). The purpose of the pretest-posttest research

design was to give the participants the same assessment measures before and after treatment to determine if any changes can be connected to the treatment. A pretest-posttest design is considered a quasi-experimental approach, which means the approach aims to establish a cause-and-effect relationship (Budert-Waltz, 2022).

Speaking Part 2 questions of IELTS before the training began was considered a pretest, and the subsequent peer feedback training was designed so that, the final Speaking Part 2 questions after the training was considered a posttest. Both tests provided quantitative data to determine whether there was an improvement in accuracy, vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, pronunciation, and interaction in oral communication; thus, the results can be compared, and the treatment's efficacy determined.

This instrument served to answer research question 1: To what extent did peer feedback improve the speaking accuracy of students?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Result of the Observation

For the case of descriptive and inferential statistics, data were coded in Excel, and the mean scores were calculated and analyzed with the JASP program (Jeffreys' Amazing Statistic Program). The difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores was analyzed using the "Statistical T-test." This was done to determine if the difference between variables was statistically significant and to assess the effect of peer feedback on improved accuracy in oral expression. After collecting the results, the data were presented in tables and statistical graphs, with percentages established for analysis and interpretation. The evaluative criteria included vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and interaction, which was worth 4 points.

The results, based on the research questions, are presented below.

Research question 1: To what extent did peer feedback improve the speaking accuracy of students? The information was properly treated, analyzed, and interpreted with the help of tables and figures to have a better appreciation.

Pre-test and Post-test Results

The test results are presented below:

***Table 1** Descriptive Statistics of the Pre- and Post-test*

Descriptive Statistics

		Valid	Mean	Std. Deviation	Shapiro-Wilk	P-value of Shapiro-Wilk	Minimum	Maximum
Pre test	Student	32	3.438	0.669	0.740	< .001	2.000	4.000
Post test	Student	32	3.844	0.369	0.438	< .001	3.000	4.000

The result of the paired samples T-test from the above table indicates that there are differences between the means of pre-test and posttest. i.e. the mean speaking score of the students before the peer feedback was 3.438, but this speaking mean score increased to 3.844 after involving the participants in peer feedback session. This means that peer feedback helped the students to improve their accuracy of speaking achievement.

Moreover, depending on the table above, p= significance level. Since the significance is <.001, which based on the assumption that if p-value is less than .001 (p< .001), this mean difference between the pre-test and post-test is statistically significant at .001 level of significance.

***Table 2** Effect size (Cohen's d)*

Paired Samples T-Test

Measure 1	Measure 2	t	df	p	Cohen's d	SE Cohen's d
Pre test	- Post test	-4.104	31	< .001	-0.726	0.189

Note. Student's t-test.

The data in the table illustrates the Cohen's d of -0.726 indicating a large effect size.

DISCUSSION

The results from Table I demonstrate that students have really shown great enhancement in their speaking accuracy due to the comments they had received from

their peers. This was proved in the descriptive statistics of the group that the minimum score of the students in the pre-test was 2. After the intervention, we have witnessed a change in the minimum post-test score of the students, comprising 3. Furthermore, the paired samples t-test results in Table 2 affirm this difference as statistically significant (p <.001), indicating that the experimental intervention had a substantial impact on improving accuracy.

Moreover, the effect size, reflected by a Cohen's d of -0.726, underscores the magnitude of this difference, pointing to a large effect attributable to the intervention. These findings suggest that the experimental intervention led to significant improvements in speaking accuracy among participants, highlighting the effectiveness of the intervention in enhancing language learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This research aimed to improve speech accuracy through peer feedback. After engaging in brief social exchanges, students commented and reflected on the interactions of their classmates. The students' speech scores from the assessments of their peers before and after peer feedback were observed. From the observation, the researchers identified the types of feedback that were often used by participants, namely corrective feedback. Also, the researcher claimed that the students found it beneficial from given feedback.

Grammar and pronunciation were the most difficult aspects to master, particularly in terms of sentence structure; however, the student's performance was acceptable; nevertheless, additional practice is necessary. Peer feedback increased students' responsibility and autonomy and facilitated their transition from passive to active learners because, when students engage in peer feedback, they learn from their classmates' work and have the opportunity to enhance their own dialogues. Utilizing peer feedback has more advantages than disadvantages. It increased the collaborative work of students to improve their speaking.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Budert-Waltz, T., & Levitas, J. (2022, July 7). *Quasi-experimental research pretest-posttest design. study.com.*

2. Dawadi, S., Shrestha, S., & Giri, R. (2021). Mixed-Methods Research: A Discussion on its Types, Challenges, and Criticisms. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, *2*(2), 25–36.

3. Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 1–11.

4. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*(2), 83-101.

5. Khoram, A., Darabi Bazband, A., & Sarkawt Sarhad, J. (2020). Error feedback in second language speaking: Investigating the impact of modalities of error feedback on intermediate EFL students' speaking ability. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 63–80.

6. Lam, R. (2010). A peer review training workshop: Coaching students to give and evaluate peer feedback. *TESL Canada Journal*, *27*(2), 114–127.

7. Liu, N., and Carles, D. (2006). Peer Feedback the Learning Element of Peer Assessment Teaching in Higher Education, 11 (3).

8. Sindhy, M. (2020*). The impact of peer corrective feedback toward descriptive writing quality of junior high school students*. University of Islam Malang Graduate Program English Language Teaching Study Program, 1–28.

9. Srinivas Rao, P. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*, *2*(2), 6–18.

10. Valdiviezo,B. (2021). Peer feedback and the oral production [Tesis de Licenciatura, Universidad Técnica de Ambato, Ecuador. *Universidad Técnica de Ambato database.*