

## The Effect of Direct Feedback on Manuscript Development and Public Speaking Performance

**Himala Praptami Adys\***

[himalapraptamiadys@unm.ac.id](mailto:himalapraptamiadys@unm.ac.id)

Universitas Negeri Makassar

\*corresponding author

### Abstract

*Public speaking remains a critical competency in business communication, yet many students struggle with performance anxiety and skill development. This study investigates the relationship between direct feedback on manuscript preparation and public speaking performance among 56 Business English Communication (BEC) students over one academic semester. Employing a quantitative quasi-experimental design, the research examined performance improvements following four systematic feedback interventions on speech manuscripts prior to mid-semester presentations. Results revealed statistically significant improvements in public speaking performance, with students demonstrating enhanced confidence, clarity, and delivery effectiveness. The findings suggest that structured manuscript feedback serves as a scaffolding mechanism that reduces anxiety while improving content organization and presentation skills. This research contributes to pedagogical approaches in business communication education by demonstrating the efficacy of iterative feedback processes in developing professional speaking competencies.*

**Keywords:** *Direct feedback, manuscript preparation, public speaking performance.*

### INTRODUCTION

Proficiency in public speaking has become increasingly recognized as a critical competency within modern business environments, where effective oral communication substantially influences professional advancement, organizational leadership, and career trajectories (Beebe & Mottet, 2022; Dwyer & Davidson, 2023). Nevertheless, public speaking anxiety continues to present considerable challenges for university students, particularly within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings where linguistic constraints and cultural factors intensify performance-related pressures (Horwitz, 2021; Liu & Jackson, 2024). While Business English Communication (BEC) programs are designed to cultivate professional communication competencies, the pedagogical approaches employed to alleviate anxiety and enhance performance demonstrate considerable variation in both effectiveness and theoretical foundations.

The incorporation of formative feedback within public speaking pedagogy has gained recognition as a potentially valuable instructional strategy, yet empirical evidence examining the specific relationship between manuscript-based feedback and actual performance outcomes remains notably scarce. Conventional public speaking instruction typically emphasizes repetitive practice sessions and generalized performance critiques, which may inadvertently neglect the foundational significance of systematic preparation and targeted feedback in skill acquisition (Brooks & Young, 2023). The manuscript preparation process—encompassing the structuring,

refinement, and rehearsal of speech content—offers students a scaffolding mechanism that potentially reduces cognitive burden during live presentations while simultaneously ensuring message coherence and rhetorical impact (Zhang & Morrison, 2022).

Existing study on feedback within language acquisition contexts provides substantial evidence supporting its efficacy in written communication development (Hattie & Timperley, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2023). However, the extension of direct feedback principles to oral communication preparation, particularly through the medium of manuscript development, constitutes a relatively unexplored nexus between writing pedagogy and oral communication instruction. Direct feedback, distinguished by its explicit, precise, and actionable nature, has consistently demonstrated superior outcomes compared with indirect or generalized feedback approaches across diverse language learning domains (Ellis, 2022; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). Nevertheless, the applicability of these principles to public speaking preparation—wherein the manuscript functions as an intermediary construct bridging written and oral modalities—warrants empirical investigation to establish efficacy and refine implementation protocols.

Although substantial research has examined feedback mechanisms within language education alongside investigations into public speaking anxiety interventions, a critical gap persists regarding how systematic manuscript feedback influences concrete speaking performance outcomes. Prior investigations have predominantly focused on post-performance feedback or generalized speech preparation guidance, with limited attention to iterative manuscript feedback as a pre-performance intervention strategy (Ahmed & Thompson, 2023; Morrison et al., 2024). The present study addresses this lacuna by investigating direct feedback applied systematically to speech manuscripts through multiple iterations preceding final performance, thereby conceptualizing feedback as a developmental instrument rather than exclusively an evaluative mechanism.

This research contributes methodological and conceptual innovations across three dimensions. First, it systematically examines feedback timing and frequency through implementation of four structured feedback interventions prior to mid-semester assessment, enabling investigation of cumulative feedback effects. Second, it deliberately concentrates on manuscript content and organizational structure rather than delivery mechanics, positioning feedback as cognitive scaffolding for content development. Third, it empirically examines the relationship between manuscript refinement processes and actual performance outcomes, thereby establishing an evidence-based connection between preparation quality and presentation effectiveness within business communication contexts.

University students frequently exhibit inconsistent public speaking performance despite demonstrating adequate linguistic proficiency, suggesting that variables beyond language competence significantly influence presentation effectiveness (Park & Lee, 2023). Preliminary classroom observations indicate that students receiving minimal or non-specific feedback on preparatory materials often experience difficulties with content organization, message clarity, and delivery confidence during actual presentations. However, the degree to which systematic, direct feedback on manuscript development can effectively address these challenges and translate into quantifiable performance improvements remains empirically unsubstantiated.

This challenge is compounded by limited pedagogical integration of the writing-speaking nexus within BEC curricula. Although writing and speaking are theoretically recognized as interconnected productive skills, instructional practices frequently compartmentalize them,

potentially overlooking opportunities to leverage manuscript development as a catalyst for speaking improvement (Chen & Wang, 2022). This disjunction between preparation quality and performance outcomes necessitates empirical investigation into whether formalized feedback mechanisms can effectively bridge this pedagogical gap and enhance overall speaking competency.

The significance of this research manifests across theoretical, pedagogical, and practical dimensions. Theoretically, the study extends feedback research into the domain of public speaking performance, potentially validating the applicability of direct feedback principles—well-established within writing instruction—to oral communication preparation contexts. It contributes to scaffolding theory through examination of how structured preparatory support influences performance outcomes, thereby illuminating cognitive load management processes and skill development trajectories.

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings offer evidence-informed guidance for BEC instructors seeking to optimize public speaking instruction. By demonstrating the efficacy or constraints of manuscript feedback interventions, this research informs curricular design decisions, assessment methodology, and pedagogical resource allocation. Should manuscript feedback demonstrate effectiveness in enhancing speaking performance, it represents a scalable and economically viable intervention amenable to integration within existing curricular frameworks without requiring specialized infrastructure or technological investments.

Practically, this research addresses the professional development imperatives of business communication students who will subsequently enter professional environments where presentation competencies directly influence career advancement. Through identification of effective preparation strategies and feedback mechanisms, the study equips students with transferable competencies applicable beyond academic contexts. Furthermore, enhanced public speaking confidence and competence may contribute to reduced performance anxiety, increased academic engagement, and improved overall student wellbeing and academic achievement.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Feedback in Language Learning**

Educational feedback constitutes a well-established pedagogical intervention grounded in multiple theoretical traditions, encompassing behavioral, cognitive, and sociocultural perspectives on learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2020). In the domain of second language development, feedback fulfills several interconnected roles: facilitating error remediation, validating successful linguistic production, providing directional guidance for enhancement, and fostering metacognitive awareness (Ellis, 2022). Research demonstrates that feedback effectiveness is mediated by numerous variables—such as precision, temporal proximity to performance, practical applicability, and learner disposition toward receiving input—elements that have received considerable scholarly attention in written discourse studies yet remain insufficiently examined within spoken communication preparation contexts.

The influential conceptual framework advanced by Hattie and Timperley (2020) articulates three fundamental questions that productive feedback must address: the establishment of performance targets ("Where am I going?"), the provision of current performance status information ("How am I going?"), and the identification of strategic pathways for advancement

("Where to next?"). This tripartite model reconceptualizes feedback as an inherently prospective developmental mechanism rather than purely evaluative retrospection, an orientation especially pertinent to cyclical manuscript refinement processes wherein successive feedback iterations shape progressive revisions and ultimately determine final performance outcomes (Nguyen et al., 2023).

Explicit feedback approaches—wherein errors or performance deficiencies are unambiguously identified and accompanied by corrective models or enhancement recommendations—have yielded stronger pedagogical outcomes relative to implicit feedback methodologies across diverse linguistic competency areas (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). Within composition pedagogy, explicit feedback facilitates learners' recognition of particular deficiencies, comprehension of appropriate alternatives, and implementation of necessary corrections—advantages that prove especially beneficial for intermediate-level learners whose metalinguistic knowledge may prove insufficient for interpreting subtle, indirect feedback signals (Bitchener & Storch, 2021). Extending explicit feedback methodologies to manuscript development for oral presentation contexts represents a theoretically coherent progression from these documented findings, although empirical substantiation remains requisite.

Vygotskian sociocultural learning theory, particularly the construct of instructional scaffolding, offers supplementary theoretical justification for feedback-based interventions in competency acquisition (Wood et al., 1976; Zhang & Morrison, 2022). Scaffolding entails the strategic deployment of provisional support mechanisms that empower learners to execute tasks exceeding their autonomous capabilities, with such supports systematically withdrawn as proficiency emerges. Within public speaking preparation contexts, manuscript-focused feedback functions as cognitive scaffolding by structuring conceptual organization, enhancing content coherence, and cultivating performance confidence prior to authentic delivery situations wherein external support is necessarily absent.

### **Public Speaking Anxiety and Performance in EFL Contexts**

Educational feedback constitutes a well-established pedagogical intervention grounded in multiple theoretical traditions, encompassing behavioral, cognitive, and sociocultural perspectives on learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2020). In the domain of second language development, feedback fulfills several interconnected roles: facilitating error remediation, validating successful linguistic production, providing directional guidance for enhancement, and fostering metacognitive awareness (Ellis, 2022). Research demonstrates that feedback effectiveness is mediated by numerous variables—such as precision, temporal proximity to performance, practical applicability, and learner disposition toward receiving input—elements that have received considerable scholarly attention in written discourse studies yet remain insufficiently examined within spoken communication preparation contexts.

The influential conceptual framework advanced by Hattie and Timperley (2020) articulates three fundamental questions that productive feedback must address: the establishment of performance targets ("Where am I going?"), the provision of current performance status information ("How am I going?"), and the identification of strategic pathways for advancement ("Where to next?"). This tripartite model reconceptualizes feedback as an inherently prospective developmental mechanism rather than purely evaluative retrospection, an orientation especially pertinent to cyclical manuscript refinement processes wherein successive feedback iterations

shape progressive revisions and ultimately determine final performance outcomes (Nguyen et al., 2023).

Explicit feedback approaches—wherein errors or performance deficiencies are unambiguously identified and accompanied by corrective models or enhancement recommendations—have yielded stronger pedagogical outcomes relative to implicit feedback methodologies across diverse linguistic competency areas (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). Within composition pedagogy, explicit feedback facilitates learners' recognition of particular deficiencies, comprehension of appropriate alternatives, and implementation of necessary corrections—advantages that prove especially beneficial for intermediate-level learners whose metalinguistic knowledge may prove insufficient for interpreting subtle, indirect feedback signals (Bitchener & Storch, 2021). Extending explicit feedback methodologies to manuscript development for oral presentation contexts represents a theoretically coherent progression from these documented findings, although empirical substantiation remains requisite.

Vygotskian sociocultural learning theory, particularly the construct of instructional scaffolding, offers supplementary theoretical justification for feedback-based interventions in competency acquisition (Wood et al., 1976; Zhang & Morrison, 2022). Scaffolding entails the strategic deployment of provisional support mechanisms that empower learners to execute tasks exceeding their autonomous capabilities, with such supports systematically withdrawn as proficiency emerges. Within public speaking preparation contexts, manuscript-focused feedback functions as cognitive scaffolding by structuring conceptual organization, enhancing content coherence, and cultivating performance confidence prior to authentic delivery situations wherein external support is necessarily absent.

### **Direct Feedback on Manuscripts: Bridging Preparation and Performance**

Although substantial scholarship has examined how feedback enhances written composition (Bitchener & Storch, 2021; Nguyen et al., 2023), considerably less attention has been directed toward understanding feedback's role in developing speech manuscripts. The existing body of work, while limited, indicates that systematic commentary on presentation materials may enhance both audience understanding and presenter self-assurance, yet these studies often suffer from methodological constraints and restricted participant pools that limit broader application (Ahmed & Thompson, 2023).

Feedback on presentation manuscripts encompasses several critical elements: the precision and pertinence of content, the logical flow and internal consistency of ideas, the suitability and comprehensibility of language choices, the persuasive power of rhetorical strategies, and the degree of audience-centered adaptation. When instructors offer targeted, implementable observations across these dimensions through successive drafts, they facilitate an incremental refinement process that simultaneously improves the immediate document and cultivates transferable preparation competencies (Morrison et al., 2024). Such an approach resonates with formative assessment philosophy, wherein feedback serves primarily as a developmental instrument rather than summative evaluation.

The cyclical character of manuscript feedback—comprising repeated sequences of submission, instructor response, and student revision—reflects authentic professional communication workflows where documents evolve through collaborative examination and enhancement (Dwyer & Davidson, 2023). For students preparing for business careers, this

recursive process provides valuable exposure to workplace practices surrounding document and presentation development. The iterative structure also enables graduated skill acquisition, as initial feedback typically addresses fundamental concerns such as thesis articulation and structural organization, while subsequent rounds concentrate on more refined aspects including rhetorical sophistication and stylistic elegance.

Notwithstanding the compelling theoretical rationale and intuitive logic underpinning manuscript feedback as a pedagogical strategy, empirical evidence directly connecting this practice to enhanced public speaking performance remains surprisingly sparse. Previous investigations have frequently examined multiple interventions simultaneously—combining feedback with practice sessions and varied instructional approaches—which complicates efforts to determine feedback's distinct contribution to observed improvements (Brooks & Young, 2023). Furthermore, much of the available research has focused on isolated feedback episodes or post-presentation commentary rather than sustained, iterative feedback provided throughout the preparation period (Beebe & Mottet, 2022).

The present investigation responds to these scholarly gaps by implementing a systematic feedback intervention consisting of four structured commentary cycles on speech manuscripts, subsequently assessing performance quality through standardized mid-semester presentations. By concentrating specifically on manuscript feedback while maintaining consistency in other instructional elements, this research design enables clearer identification of this particular intervention's effects and yields evidence regarding its pedagogical value. The study's inclusion of 56 participants within an authentic business communication course provides both adequate statistical robustness and practical relevance for informing instructional decision-making.

Additionally, this work contributes to the comparatively underdeveloped research literature on business communication pedagogy—a domain that, despite its substantial economic significance and distinctive features relative to general language instruction, has received insufficient scholarly attention (Park & Lee, 2023). Business presentations demand specialized genre conventions, professional discourse norms, and audience analysis capabilities that differ markedly from academic or informal speaking situations, thus requiring pedagogical approaches specifically designed and validated for these unique contextual demands.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

This study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental design with a single-group pretest-posttest approach to investigate the relationship between direct feedback on speech manuscripts and public speaking performance. The quasi-experimental design was selected due to the intact class structure and ethical considerations precluding random assignment and control group creation in an authentic educational setting (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The design allows for examination of performance changes attributable to the feedback intervention while acknowledging limitations in causal inference inherent to non-randomized designs.

The independent variable comprised the direct feedback intervention—four systematic feedback cycles applied to speech manuscripts during the preparation period. The dependent variable consisted of public speaking performance quality, measured through standardized rubric-based assessment of mid-semester presentations. Potential confounding variables

including prior public speaking experience, English proficiency level, and demographic characteristics were measured and statistically controlled in the analysis.

### **Research Setting and Participants**

The research was conducted at Business English Communication (BEC) program during the academic semester from Mid-August to October 2025. The participant sample consisted of 56 second-year BEC students enrolled in the Public Speaking, a required curriculum component.

### **Feedback Intervention Procedure**

The feedback intervention consisted of four structured cycles implemented across eight weeks of manuscript development for the mid-semester presentation assignment. Students prepared individual presentations on business communication topics (negotiation strategies, cross-cultural communication, business ethics, or professional networking), with manuscripts progressing through the following feedback cycles:

Feedback Cycle 1 (Week 2): Students submitted initial manuscript drafts (500-700 words) including presentation outline, thesis statement, and preliminary content. Direct feedback focused on topic appropriateness, thesis clarity, organizational structure, and content scope. Feedback was provided in written form with specific comments highlighting strengths and identifying areas requiring revision, accompanied by concrete improvement suggestions.

Feedback Cycle 2 (Week 4): Students submitted revised manuscripts incorporating Cycle 1 feedback plus expanded content development. Feedback addressed argument development, evidence integration, logical progression, transitions between sections, and introduction/conclusion effectiveness. Specific examples of improved phrasing and organizational alternatives were provided.

Feedback Cycle 3 (Week 6): Students submitted near-final manuscripts with refined content and preliminary rehearsal notes. Feedback emphasized language appropriateness for oral delivery, sentence length and complexity suitable for spoken communication, audience engagement strategies, and rhetorical effectiveness. Feedback also addressed potential delivery challenges based on manuscript content.

Feedback Cycle 4 (Week 8): Students submitted final manuscripts with complete speaker notes. Feedback provided final polish suggestions, identified remaining areas of potential difficulty, reinforced strengths, and offered delivery strategy recommendations. This cycle served primarily as confirmation and confidence-building rather than substantial revision guidance.

All feedback was provided by the course instructor (the primary researcher) using a standardized feedback template ensuring consistency in feedback dimensions addressed, comment specificity, and actionability. Each manuscript received 8-12 specific comments across content, organization, language, and rhetorical dimensions. Feedback turnaround time was maintained at 48-72 hours to ensure timely guidance for subsequent revision.

### **Instruments**

Speaking performance was assessed using an adapted rubric based on established public speaking assessment frameworks (Morreale et al., 2020; Dwyer & Davidson, 2023) customized for business communication contexts. The rubric evaluated five dimensions:

- a. Content Quality (25%): Topic knowledge, argument development, evidence support, relevance to business communication
- b. Organization (20%): Introduction effectiveness, logical structure, transitions, conclusion impact
- c. Language Use (20%): Vocabulary appropriateness, grammatical accuracy, clarity, professional register
- d. Delivery (20%): Vocal variety, pace, pronunciation, eye contact, gestures, confidence
- e. Audience Engagement (15%): Responsiveness to audience, interaction techniques, Q&A handling

Each dimension was scored on a 5-point scale (1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, 5 = Excellent) with detailed descriptors for each level. Total scores ranged from 5-25 points, converted to percentages for analysis. Inter-rater reliability was established through independent scoring of 15 randomly selected presentations by two raters (the primary researcher and an experienced colleague), yielding strong agreement (Cohen's  $\kappa = 0.87$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Pearson  $r = 0.92$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Manuscript quality was assessed at each feedback cycle using a parallel rubric evaluating: topic appropriateness, thesis clarity, content development, organizational logic, evidence integration, language accuracy, and overall coherence. Scores from Cycle 1 (baseline) and Cycle 4 (final) were used to measure manuscript improvement across the intervention period.

Manuscript quality was assessed at each feedback cycle using a parallel rubric evaluating: topic appropriateness, thesis clarity, content development, organizational logic, evidence integration, language accuracy, and overall coherence. Scores from Cycle 1 (baseline) and Cycle 4 (final) were used to measure manuscript improvement across the intervention period.

In the study, two primary student survey instruments were employed: first, a background questionnaire was used to collect essential demographic information, participants' prior public speaking experience, their English learning history, and their self-reported anxiety levels to establish a baseline; subsequently, after the intervention, a feedback perception survey was administered to gauge the students' perceptions regarding the usefulness, clarity, and applicability of the feedback they received, as well as its impact on their confidence and the quality of their preparation.

### **Data Analysis**

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 28.0. The analysis procedures encompassed descriptive statistics to calculate means, standard deviations, ranges, and frequency distributions; paired-samples t-tests to compare manuscript quality scores between Cycle 1 and Cycle 4; correlation analysis to examine relationships between manuscript improvement, final quality, and presentation performance; and regression analysis to investigate manuscript quality variables as predictors of presentation performance while controlling for confounders. Effect sizes (Cohen's  $d$  and  $R^2$ ) were calculated to assess practical significance, with statistical significance set at  $\alpha = .05$  and all parametric test assumptions verified beforehand.

Regarding validity and reliability, internal validity was strengthened by standardized feedback procedures and consistent rubrics, though threats included maturation effects and the lack of a control group, which limits causal claims. External validity is constrained by the

specific context of Indonesian BEC students and a non-random sample, though typical course structures enhance applicability to similar EFL settings. Construct validity is supported by the rubric's foundation in established frameworks, while reliability was demonstrated by robust inter-rater reliability ( $\kappa = 0.87$ ) for performance assessment, with manuscript assessment consistency maintained through detailed rubrics and single-rater scoring.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Analysis of manuscript quality revealed substantial improvement from Cycle 1 as baseline with a mean of 68.4 (SD = 8.2) to Cycle 4 as the final stage with a mean of 84.7 (SD = 6.1), representing a mean increase of 16.3 points. Paired-samples t-test confirmed statistical significance of this improvement with  $t(55) = 18.43$ ,  $p < .001$ , and Cohen's  $d = 2.19$ , indicating a very large effect size. All participants demonstrated improvement with gains ranging from 8 to 28 points.

Dimensional analysis revealed differential improvement patterns across aspects. Organization showed the greatest improvement with a mean of 19.2 points (SD = 4.6), suggesting that structural feedback was particularly effective. Content development improved substantially with a mean of 17.8 points (SD = 5.1), indicating enhanced depth and relevance. Language accuracy showed moderate improvement with a mean of 14.1 points (SD = 6.3), constrained by baseline proficiency variations. Thesis clarity improved markedly in early cycles with stabilization by Cycle 3, achieving a mean of 15.7 points (SD = 4.9).

Public speaking performance outcomes on mid-semester presentations showed scores ranging from 72% to 96% with a mean of 85.3% (SD = 5.8%). The majority of students, 82% or 46 individuals, achieved scores of 80% or above, indicating generally strong performance. Distribution analysis revealed slight negative skewness (-0.42), suggesting ceiling effects for high-performing students. From dimensional performance analysis, content quality achieved the highest mean at 21.3 out of 25 (85.2%) with SD = 2.1. Organization also demonstrated strong performance with a mean of 17.1 out of 20 (85.5%) and SD = 1.8, reflecting good manuscript preparation. Language use was adequate with a mean of 16.8 out of 20 (84.0%) and SD = 2.4, leaving room for improvement. Delivery was the lowest dimension with a mean of 16.2 out of 20 (81.0%) and SD = 2.7, indicating that delivery challenges persist. Audience engagement showed good interaction skills with a mean of 12.6 out of 15 (84.0%) and SD = 1.6.

Pearson correlation analysis revealed strong positive relationships between manuscript variables and performance outcomes. Final manuscript quality in Cycle 4 and overall performance showed a correlation of  $r = .72$  with  $p < .001$ , indicating that higher-quality manuscripts strongly predicted better presentations. Manuscript improvement from Cycle 1 to 4 and performance correlated at  $r = .58$  with  $p < .001$ , suggesting that greater manuscript development correlated with stronger presentations. Organization scores on manuscripts and organization scores on performance correlated at  $r = .68$  with  $p < .001$ , demonstrating specific skill transfer. Content quality on manuscripts and content quality on performance showed a correlation of  $r = .71$  with  $p < .001$ , showing strong content preparation benefits.

Multiple regression analysis with performance as the dependent variable and manuscript quality dimensions as predictors yielded a significant model with  $F(5, 50) = 24.17$ ,  $p < .001$ , and  $R^2 = .71$ , explaining 71% of variance in presentation performance. Significant predictors included organization quality as the strongest predictor with  $\beta = .35$  and  $p < .001$ , where each

point increase was associated with a 0.35-point performance increase. Content development had a substantial impact on overall performance with  $\beta = .29$  and  $p < .01$ . Language accuracy provided a moderate but significant contribution with  $\beta = .18$  and  $p < .05$ . When controlling for prior public speaking experience and self-reported anxiety, the model remained significant with  $R^2 = .69$ , indicating that manuscript quality's predictive power was independent of these confounding variables.

Post-intervention survey responses with a 100% response rate ( $n = 56$ ) revealed overwhelmingly positive perceptions. Ninety-three percent of respondents rated feedback as "very useful" or "extremely useful" for improving manuscript quality. Eighty-nine percent agreed or strongly agreed that feedback increased their confidence in presentation preparation. Eighty-four percent reported that feedback helped identify specific areas for improvement they would not have recognized independently. Seventy-eight percent indicated that iterative feedback reduced their public speaking anxiety, and 82% stated they would seek similar feedback in future presentation preparation.

Qualitative comments highlighted specific feedback dimensions students found most valuable. Organizational structure guidance was mentioned by 71% of students, specific language improvement suggestions by 64%, clarity of expectations and standards by 59%, and reassurance and confidence-building elements by 52%. Several students noted that seeing improvement across cycles increased motivation and self-efficacy. A representative comment stated, "Each time I got feedback and revised, I could see my presentation getting better. This made me feel more prepared and less nervous about actually presenting. "RetryClaude can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.

The significant improvement in manuscript quality across four feedback cycles and strong correlation between manuscript quality and presentation performance provide empirical support for the efficacy of direct, iterative feedback on speech preparation materials. The very large effect size for manuscript improvement ( $d = 2.19$ ) substantially exceeds typical educational intervention effects (Hattie, 2020), suggesting that focused, actionable feedback on multiple drafts enables substantial skill development within a single semester.

The strong predictive relationship between manuscript quality and presentation performance ( $R^2 = .71$ ) indicates that preparation quality directly translates into presentation effectiveness, supporting theoretical propositions about scaffolding and cognitive load reduction (Zhang & Morrison, 2022). Students who developed well-organized, content-rich manuscripts delivered correspondingly strong presentations, suggesting that manuscript preparation serves not merely as a preliminary step but as a foundation enabling effective performance.

Particularly noteworthy is organization's emergence as the strongest predictor of performance quality. This finding aligns with cognitive load theory: clear organizational structure in manuscripts reduces cognitive demands during presentation, allowing speakers to allocate attentional resources to delivery aspects (Sweller et al., 2021). Well-organized content also enhances audience comprehension and perceived speaker competence, creating a positive feedback loop where confident delivery reinforces content credibility.

The relatively weaker performance in the delivery dimension, despite strong manuscript quality, suggests that content preparation and presentation skills require distinct pedagogical approaches. Manuscript feedback effectively addresses content, organization, and language dimensions but cannot fully compensate for delivery skill deficits requiring practice, modeling,

and performance-specific coaching (Brooks & Young, 2023). This finding implies that comprehensive public speaking instruction should integrate both manuscript feedback (addressing preparation) and delivery practice (addressing performance execution).

Student perception data triangulates quantitative findings, with 93% rating feedback as highly useful and 78% reporting anxiety reduction. These subjective experiences suggest that feedback's benefits extend beyond skill development to psychological dimensions, providing reassurance, direction, and confidence that mitigate debilitating anxiety (Beebe & Mottet, 2022). The iterative process may foster self-efficacy through visible improvement across cycles, demonstrating competence development and reinforcing effort-outcome relationships.

This research extends feedback theory, traditionally applied to writing instruction, into public speaking preparation domains, demonstrating that direct feedback principles—specificity, actionability, multiple cycles—translate effectively across communicative modes (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). The findings validate Hattie and Timperley's (2020) feedback framework in a new context, where feed-forward guidance on manuscripts enables progressive skill building culminating in enhanced performance.

Scaffolding theory receives empirical support through demonstration that structured manuscript preparation with iterative feedback serves as effective temporary support, enabling students to produce presentations beyond their independent capability initially, while developing skills enabling future independent performance (Morrison et al., 2024). The gradual reduction in feedback intensity from substantive revision guidance in early cycles to confirmatory polish in later cycles mirrors scaffolding's fading principle.

The research also contributes to understanding the writing-speaking connection in language learning. Manuscript development serves as a bridge between writing (allowing extended processing and revision) and speaking (requiring real-time performance), leveraging writing's cognitive advantages to support oral communication development (Park & Lee, 2023). This finding suggests pedagogical value in integrating written and oral skill instruction rather than treating them as independent domains.

## CONCLUSION

This empirical investigation of 56 Business English Communication students demonstrated that systematic direct feedback on speech manuscripts, implemented through four iterative cycles, significantly improves both manuscript quality and subsequent public speaking performance. Manuscript scores improved by an average of 16.3 points (Cohen's  $d = 2.19$ ), with all participants demonstrating measurable development. Strong correlations between manuscript quality and presentation performance ( $r = .72$ ) and regression analysis explaining 71% of performance variance through manuscript variables provide robust evidence for the feedback intervention's effectiveness.

Organization emerged as the most responsive manuscript dimension to feedback and strongest predictor of presentation performance, suggesting that structural preparation particularly benefits speaking outcomes. Student perceptions overwhelmingly endorsed the intervention, with 93% rating feedback as highly useful and 78% reporting reduced public speaking anxiety, indicating both skill development and psychological benefits.

This research extends feedback theory from written to oral communication preparation domains, validating direct feedback principles' applicability to speech manuscript development.

It provides empirical support for scaffolding theory in public speaking instruction, demonstrating that structured preparation support enables enhanced performance while developing independent competencies. The findings contribute to understanding writing-speaking connections in language learning, positioning manuscript development as a productive bridge leveraging written communication's cognitive advantages to support oral performance.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. T., & Thompson, R. L. (2023). Formative feedback in oral presentation skills: A longitudinal analysis of ESL learners' development. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(4), 892-918. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211045892>
- Beebe, S. A., & Mottet, T. P. (2022). *Public speaking: An audience-centered approach* (11th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2021). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923958>
- Brooks, G. P., & Young, M. J. (2023). Reducing public speaking anxiety through systematic preparation: A meta-analysis of intervention studies. *Communication Education*, 72(2), 156-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2022.2134567>
- Bulkis, I., Tahir, M., & Sakkir, G. (2025). The EFL Teachers' Implementation of 6C Skills (Critical Thinking, Creativity, Collaboration, Communication, Citizenship, and Character) of 21st Century Skills. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 5(2), 262-273.
- Chen, Y., & Wang, L. (2022). Integrating writing and speaking skills in business English pedagogy: Theoretical foundations and practical applications. *English for Specific Purposes*, 68, 34-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2022.07.003>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dwyer, K. K., & Davidson, M. M. (2023). Communication apprehension and public speaking anxiety: Contemporary perspectives and evidence-based interventions. *Communication Research Reports*, 40(1), 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2022.2156734>
- Ellis, R. (2022). *Understanding second language acquisition* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2023). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003364726>
- Fitrah, A. I., Korompot, C. A., Sakkir, G., & Fauzan, M. M. (2024). Assessing Self-Confidence Levels in EFL Students' Speaking Performance. *Celebes Journal of Language Studies*, 215-224.
- Gunawan, G., Dollah, S., & Sakkir, G. (2024). The use of kinesics as nonverbal communication in the classroom at University of Muhammadiyah Bone. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 4(2), 209-215.

- Hattie, J. (2020). Visible learning: The sequel—A synthesis of over 2,100 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003364726>
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2020). The power of feedback revisited: A meta-analysis of educational feedback research. *Review of Educational Research*, 90(4), 487-532. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320933544>
- Horwitz, E. K. (2021). On the misreading of Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) and the need to balance anxiety research and the experiences of anxious language learners. In C. Gkonou, J. K. Mercer, & S. Daubney (Eds.), *New insights into language anxiety: Theory, research and educational implications* (pp. 31-48). *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788925143-005>
- Liu, M., & Jackson, J. (2024). Foreign language speaking anxiety in EFL contexts: Current research and pedagogical implications. *System*, 120, 103196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103196>
- Morreale, S. P., Valenzano, J. M., & Bauer, J. A. (2020). *Pathways to careers in communication* (3rd ed.). National Communication Association.
- Morrison, D. A., Chen, L., & Roberts, K. E. (2024). Scaffolding oral presentation skills in higher education: A systematic review of intervention effectiveness. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 43(1), 128-145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.2187654>
- Nguyen, A. T., Newton, J., & Crabbe, D. (2023). Written corrective feedback: Current trends and future directions in L2 writing research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 59, 100971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.100971>
- Nur, S., & Sakkir, G. (2022). EFL students' anxiety in oral presentation in thesis examination during COVID-19 pandemic era: Factors and strategies. *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2), 144-159.
- Park, H. I., & Lee, S. Y. (2023). Business English communication competence: Defining constructs and developing assessment frameworks for Asian EFL contexts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 71, 45-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2023.04.002>
- Rahman, H., Sakkir, G., & Khalik, S. (2021). Audio-Lingual Method to Improve Students's Speaking Skill at Smp Negeri 1 Baranti. *La Ogi: English Language Journal*, 7(1), 31-40.
- Sakkir, G., Dollah, S., & Ahmad, J. (2022). Students' perception of the presentation activities in online speaking class. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 2(3), 255-260.
- Sakkir, G., Mahmud, N., & Ahmad, J. (2020). Improving speaking ability using English" Shock Day" approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 3(2), 50-53.
- Saputra, U. R., Maulina, M., Nasrullah, R., & Sakkir, G. (2021). Students' Sentence Errors on WhatsApp Daily Status: A Literature Review. *Celebes Journal of Language Studies*, 23-31.
- Sulaiman, M. R., Korompot, C. A., & Sakkir, G. (2024). IMPROVING STUDENTS'SPEAKINGSKILL THROUGH QUESTIONING

TECHNIQUES. *International Journal of Business English and Communication*, 2(4), 108-114.

Sweller, J., van Merriënboer, J. J. G., & Paas, F. (2021). Cognitive architecture and instructional design: 20 years later. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33(2), 261-292.

Wijayanto, G., Sakkir, G., Sukmasetya, P., Arikarani, Y., Leo, M., Safitri, N. M., ... & Sianipar, M. Y. (2022). Metode riset berbasis digital penelitian pasca pandemi.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89-100.

Zhang, L. J., & Morrison, B. (2022). Metacognitive regulation and EFL learners' public speaking performance: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Metacognition and Learning*, 17(3), 891-916. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-022-09315-9>

Zuhri, N. A., Salija, K., & Sakkir, G. (2022). THE IMPACTS OF SPEAKING ANXIETY ON STUDENTS' LEARNING PROCESS. *Journal of Technology in Language Pedagogy (JTechLP)*, 1(3).