



Augmenting English public speaking skill through peer evaluation: a case study in Toastmaster International Club

Lailatul Rifah¹, Fardini Sabilah^{2*}

¹ Language Center, Visual Communication Design, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Bina Nusantara Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

² English Language Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

* Email: fardini@umm.ac.id (corresponding author)

Article history: Received: 17 July 2021

Available online: 17 March 2022

Accepted: 8 March 2022

Published regularly: March 2022

Abstract

Having peers to give public speaking feedback is always feasible to measure the learners' performance. However, learners are unwilling to share their feedback in the evaluation due to hesitance. This research investigates the kind of peer evaluation elements that the Toastmaster evaluator used to evaluate the speakers and how they interpret the evaluation given by their peers. An in-depth interview was used to analyze about the elements of peer evaluation and the speakers' feedback towards peer evaluation. Snowballing technique was chosen to select the research subjects. Three research subjects, as the members of Toastmaster International (TMI) in Malang and Surabaya, Indonesia claimed that the elements of evaluation used in TMI increased the ability of public speaking. The assessment aspects were divided into three factors: the script, seen, and spoken. Meanwhile, other crucial evaluation elements in public speaking include the grammatical aspect and proper words instead of filler words. This research found that the TMI speakers felt very satisfied with the implementation of peer evaluation due to its effect on increasing confidence during performing public speaking. It can be implied that peer evaluation element can effectively be used to measure oral communication skills from peer's point of view in TMI.

Keywords: evaluation elements; peer evaluation; Toastmaster International Club

To cite this article: Rifah, L., & Sabilah, F. (2022). Augmenting English public speaking skill through peer evaluation: a case study in Toastmaster International Club. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 12(1), 138-158. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v12i1.3113>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v12i1.3113>



Copyright © 2022 THE AUTHOR(S). This article is distributed under a *Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International* license.

Introduction

Speaking English as a foreign language could be challenging for non-English speaking countries such as Indonesia due to some factors: anxiety, lack of self-confidence, afraid of making mistakes, or other aspects contributing to difficulty in communicating using English (Inayati et al., 2015; Montero & Alvarado, 2019). Public speaking is defined as delivering a speech in front of a group of people in a structured and intended manner. The objective of public speaking is to inform, influence, or entertain an audience with an expectation that the audience could bring the message from the speech given (Yee et al., 2014). In academic settings, learners face difficulty delivering their idea using English due to the lack of vocabulary or grammatical issues (Andika & Mitsalina, 2020). In addition, fear and hesitation became the major problems for learners to do public speaking (Montero & Alvarado, 2019). To be competent in speaking skills, learners should combine various skills, knowledge, processes, and dynamic speech by consuming and producing language through pairs such as discussion and presentation (Anggini & Arjulayana, 2021). At the same time, learners need to be involved actively in practicing the language and evaluating their peers.

Having a peer to give public speaking feedback is always feasible to measure the learners' capability in their performance both in the language usage and the verbal channels. Kerby and Romine (2009) stated that feedbacks as the educational interventions are needed to develop public skills. Using evaluation tools in the educational field has been achieved exponentially in recent decades (Gielen et al., 2011). In addition, peer evaluation is also believed to be the effective way for fostering future learning difficulties and recalls the learners' knowledge on the evaluation process, interaction, critical thinking, and creativity (Alzaid, 2017). However, Kollar and Fischer (2010) found that some learners feel hesitant and fear to share evaluations with others since

arguing that the right person to give an evaluation is the teacher. In many applications, peer evaluation is conducted in a formative form rather than summative form with simple evidence showing that peer evaluation could be used reliably in summative work (Gielen & Wever, 2015; Lladó et al., 2014). In other words, evaluation is generally done by writing down the scores without explaining the strength and weaknesses of the speakers. Buquiran (2014) reported that evaluations using both written and spoken most appropriate way to perform the speech evaluation. Other research discussed the techniques used in Toastmasters International (TMI) Club by providing tools to help the members overcome their problems on distress and anxiety (Raja, 2017) in delivering the speech to the public through the planning and evaluations.

Peer evaluation is described as the representative system for learning, which indicates the intimacy among learners in running effective learning and focusing on collaborations among learners under the teacher's supervision (Thomas et al., 2011). Learners can develop their English knowledge by listening to others and constructing ideas to evaluate others. Landry et al. (2014) found that there was a striving improvement in the students' performance after performing peer evaluation. The result showed that more than 90% of learners (strongly) agreed that peer evaluation was beneficial to the learning process. At the same time, Lladó et al. (2014) mentioned that learners showed a positive attitude regarding peer evaluation before and after application. It encourages the learner to perform better in different levels of learning. Additionally, Kearney et al. (2015) found that students who did not have any experience in doing peer evaluation were able to give a fair judgment.

There are indeed many discussions among researchers about the honesty and credibility of peer evaluation as its way to assess the consistency of peer evaluation. Chang et al. (2011) recommended some useful methods to nurture the credibility of peer evaluation results, such as deep insight of the evaluation purpose and the use of promotion, and various methods of participation in the evaluation process. While MacArthur (2010) reported that speakers who got feedback from peers improved their performance more than that of single feedback from one peer and indicates the level and reliability of consistency between among evaluations from peers. Many learners are not willing to share their feedback in the evaluation due to various aspects such as fear and anxiety. Furthermore, the negative effects of different feedback in peer evaluation on personal variables such as psychological health, trust, independence, and narcissism need to be changed to more the positive effect on the learning process (Kollar & Fischer, 2010) and bias and errors in grading can conceivably be reduced (Elander, 2005).

Toastmaster is an international non-profit organization of a speaking club based in the US which started in 1924 and focuses on developing communication skills and leadership through mentoring, coaching, and regular meeting (Smedley, 2014). Having more than 345,000 members in more than 15,900 clubs in 142 countries by 2016, Toastmaster introduces the members to be able to make impromptu speeches, deliver the prepared speeches, conduct the meeting and evaluate others (Nordin & Shaari, 2017). Learning by doing is the key aspect of learning English in Toastmaster Club in which the members should take part in conducting the meetings. In conducting the regular meeting, whether it is weekly or twice a week, the members should take the roles to ensure the meeting proceeds smoothly. Based on Smedley (2014), the roles and responsibilities in each meeting are as follows; The Toastmaster identifies the agenda and speaks to participants to create interesting introductions, the topic master improves organization skills, time management, and facilitation skills. In this case, the table topics master ensures every member at the meeting has equal opportunities to involved in the impromptu speaking skills. The speakers dedicate time and energy to planning and practicing manual speeches, the general evaluator oversees and coordinates the evaluation segments of club meetings. Furthermore, the speech evaluators guide speakers by providing evaluations using manual form to the speaker's and also reviewing verbally regarding the speaker's strengths and areas for improvement, meanwhile the timekeeper guides speakers learn to convey their messages within the specified time limit and grammarian helps speakers and other meeting participants to be aware of and polish the language use, and Ah-Counter notes any overused words or filler sounds (Smedley, 2014).

In each meeting session in Toastmaster, there will be a part for speech and evaluation part. Each member and guest of the meetings need to take a role to practice their speaking ability. Three speaking activities in Toastmaster can be adopted for public speaking practice (Nawi et al., 2015), namely: prepared speech that is eventually only for the members who are working and completing their levels. In the prepared speech, the speaker needs to speak for around five to seven minutes to deliver the message using the appropriate transitions to convey one to other ideas from opening to closing. Besides, impromptu speech that requests the speaker to be able to speak directly, which requires 3 P's: pre-Planning, pre-Preparation, and pre-Practice (Nawi et al., 2015). In this activity, both members and guests of the meeting need to speak the certain topics, which are not more than three minutes, and evaluation speech that is delivered by the evaluator team, consisting of the general

evaluator, speech evaluator, grammarian, ah-counter, and timekeeper, which is around two to three minutes in total.

“Learning-by-doing” as a core idea in Toastmaster will give a chance to the learners as members or guests to be able to speak appropriately in public. Learners can learn actively by taking part in specific roles as means of active learning as opposed to a teacher-centered learning approach. Applying the tradition of Toastmaster club in the learning activity especially learning English public speaking perceive fun and enjoyable learning experience, learn how to speak English out loud, build confidence, and be active and good listeners (Nordin & Shaari, 2017). The implementation of the Toastmaster provides a variety of rich input from the feedback given by the evaluators, grammarian, ah-counter, and the audience/guest. In sharing the output, the learners modify their speech linguistically or semantically to make a comprehensive message to the audience. In the end, giving awards for outstanding performance, such as awards for the best speaker, best evaluator, best table topic, and best role player is applied by the Toastmaster in each meeting to motivate and show positive reinforcement to the learners (Nordin & Shaari, 2017). As the core of the Toastmaster program, evaluation is ultimately inevitable to give a lesson to all members and participants to sharpen the skills of observation, critical thinking, and creativity and help others with experience/knowledge. Therefore, the implementation of Toastmaster meetings can be adapted by teachers to be implemented in the formal teaching-learning processes in both schools and universities.

The previous study on peer review and its influence on Toastmaster performance speakers (Nordin & Shaari, 2017; Usman et al., 2018) has been widely found, but there has been no study on the appropriate elements which suit the peer evaluation and Toastmaster speaker interpretation toward the peer evaluation. The current study aims to fill in the literature gap on the very limited research that has a specific focus on analyzing the peer evaluation element and the Toastmaster speaker interpretation toward the evaluation given by the peers. To be more specific, the current study explores the kind of peers' evaluation element used by the Toastmaster evaluator and the Toastmaster speaker's interpretation toward the evaluation given by their peers.

Regardless of the scoring in giving peer evaluation, there is disagreement about the assessment carried out by the peers. One of the reasons is the weakness of tests designed to measure students' abilities both in terms of validity and low reliability, making students dissatisfied and sometimes distrustful of the scores earned. Zakian et al. (2012) reported that most language

learners are not satisfied with the final score given by peers, even teachers, because they claim that their knowledge is more than what is scored. In line with the phenomenon, this study concerns finding out how the implementation of peer evaluation in scoring the peers can be accepted by the learners in learning public speaking, in this case in Toastmaster International Club based in Malang and Surabaya, Indonesia.

Method

Research design

The qualitative research method was used to investigate the understanding of the research questions such as to know kinds of peer evaluation element used by the evaluator and to find how the Toastmaster speakers interpret the evaluation given by their peers. To answer the questions, the researcher used the qualitative method to understand the subject's experiences and feelings (Naderifar et al., 2017) as speakers and evaluators in activities on Toastmaster meetings. Qualitative research provides data through a deep overview of phenomena using data collection and presents them through description or in the form of non-numerical data (Polit & Beck, 2014).

Participants

The researcher used the snowball sampling technique to select the research participants. The snowball sampling method is used to gather information to access specific information from one or two people that refer to others (Naderifar et al., 2017). In general, snowball sampling is a beneficial sampling method applied when finding difficulty in accessing participants with the targeted characteristics. It is a gradual process that the sampling process usually continues until reach the saturation data. The snowball method does take not only a little time but also gives the researcher's opportunity to communicate better with the samples (Creswell, 2013). Toastmaster meetings are conducted both online and offline using the same activities and time allocation. There were three participants in this research. Two participants were members of Malang Toastmaster Club, and one participant was a member of Hand Toastmaster Club Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia.

The reason for selecting three participants for this study (see Table 1) was the willingness to participate in the interview session based on their free time. Another reason was the qualifications of the participants. That they have

relatively adequate experience in Toastmaster activities for several years, the participants would be able to provide comprehensive and rigid data in the interview sessions. To ensure the research ethics, the participants' names were made anonymous into R1, R2, and R3.

Table 1. Demographics information of the participants

Socio demographic items	Details	Frequency
Gender	Female	3
Age	20-25	1
	26-31	2
Religion	Christian	1
	Moslem	2
TMT Club	TMI Malang	2
	TMI Surabaya	1

Data collection

In this study, the researcher used the in-depth interview to get the information about the kinds of peer evaluation elements used by the evaluator and how the Toastmaster speakers interpret the evaluation given by their peers using English, with both speakers and evaluators are in Toastmaster Club Malang and Surabaya. Interview is believed to provide a 'deeper' understanding of social phenomena than would be obtained from purely quantitative methods, such as questionnaires (Gill et al., 2008). The interview as used in this research, therefore, most appropriate where little is already known about the study phenomenon or where detailed insights are required from individual participants. In this study, the researcher explored deeper various elements used by the TMI evaluator to assess the speakers and the interpretation from speakers through online zoom meetings. The evaluation process includes what the speakers will present and what they want to gain or achieve, as well as to provide objective verbal and written evaluations for speakers. Therefore, when giving any evaluation, the evaluator offer praise as well as constructive criticism. After completing the interview process, the researcher analyzed and described the conclusion of the interview to get the data needed.

To support the result of the in-depth interview, the researcher also used the participant's artifacts which were to analyze the aspects of the evaluation process used by the evaluators in each session. The participant's artifacts used were the examples of assessment forms for speakers in each session, they were speech evaluation, grammar evaluation, and Ah-counter. These forms were used by the researchers to find out what points were usually used by evaluators in assessing speakers.

Data analysis

The interview data analysis of this research was utilized since this procedure provide logical and coherence action and view of the participants. Qualitative analysis is often started by analyzing and counting the distribution of answers in a question-by-question manner (Talja, 1999). The researcher selects some sections of participants' discourse as providing the satisfactory answers to his or her questions, whereas other parts of participants' discourse are ignored or treated as unimportant. In this present research, the researcher invited three participants in a different schedule based on their available time to conduct the interview via online Zoom meetings. Each interview took around fifty to sixty minutes, and it was recorded to save all the information given related to this study. While doing an interview, the researcher used the semi-guided questions as guidance to grab the information from the participants. The triangulation technique as one of the measurements in checking the data credibility was used by the researcher in this study.

There were three steps of triangulation techniques proposed by Andika and Mitsalina (2020) which was adopted in this research, covering: first, reduction process, the researcher summarized the important information linking to the focus of the research mentioned by the subject study during the interview process. Once the data gathered, the researcher described it in detail to classify each focus of this study. In the last step, the researcher concluded the data as a key point and then described the data in findings and discussion.

Findings

Peer evaluation elements

In the Toastmaster meeting, the evaluation happens in the last session. The Toastmaster members should perform both speech and evaluation processes. Before they become evaluators, they should perform a project of delivering evaluation speech in their third project topic. The new member will be evaluated by the experienced Toastmaster on how they construct their evaluation from the content to the delivery way. Toastmaster club also includes the evaluation speech as one of the annual competitions from the club level to the district level and up to the world speaking championships level (Usman et al., 2018), which means that both the evaluation process and delivering speech were essential in TMI. Based on the result of an in-depth interview with the Toastmaster members in Malang and Surabaya, three main elements were

included in the evaluation process: speech evaluation, grammar evaluation, and filler words evaluation. In speech evaluation, there are three elements on the Toastmaster club, they are explained in Table 2.

Table 2. Speech evaluation form

Elements	No	Aspects	Evaluation					Comment
			5	4	3	2	1	
Script speech	S1	Structure (opening – body – closing)						
	S2	Linkage, logic, flow						
	S3	Interesting						
Seen (Body movement)	B1	Stage presence – presentation						
	B2	Eye contact						
	B3	Gestures / body language						
	B4	Audience awareness						
	B5	Comfort level						
Spoken voice	V1	Clear and easily understood						
	V2	Uses tone, speed, volume as tools						
	V3	Speech style (humorous, informational, and others)						

Notes: 1 = *Developing*, 2 = *Emerging*, 3 = *Accomplished*, 4 = *Excels*, 5 = *Exemplary*

Table 2 indicates three main elements used by Toastmaster members to evaluate peers' speech as cited from (Alzaid, 2017). The three elements include the evaluation of the script content, the body language, and the voice use. The evaluation score starts from one (developing) to five (exemplary) as the highest grading speech of the speaker. The comment column is provided to give feedback and comments to the speakers, including their strengths and weaknesses (see Table 3).

Table 3. Grammar evaluation form

Total use of the word of the day =			
Name	Improper use	Suggestion	Quotes, thought, & interesting words

Table 3 shows the elements used by the Toastmaster club to guide the evaluators to assess the improper use of grammar in the speakers' speech, also quotes, thought, and interesting words used by the speakers. Interestingly, there is the word of the day as one of the unique elements applied in the Toastmaster. Word of the day (WotD) is a word given by the evaluators as a special word of each session and shared in the WhatsApp group or at the beginning of the session. Both speakers and evaluators are required to use the WotD in their speech, and it will be reported in the last session (see Table 4).

Table 4. Ah-counter evaluation form

Name	Ah	Um	Er	Well	So	Like	But	Repeats	Other
------	----	----	----	------	----	------	-----	---------	-------

Table 4 shows the third element of the evaluation process, which is filler words or overused words used by the speakers during their speech. As mentioned, Ah-counter is performed by the evaluator to note any overused words or filler sounds found during the meeting. Filled pauses and discourse markers are two primary categories of filler words. Filled pauses are short assertions commonly used in spontaneous speech, and *uh* and *um* are the most frequently filled pauses used in the English language. On the other hand, discourse markers are short phrases that do not contain any grammatical information yet are frequent in the speech, such as *I mean*, *you know*, or (Laserna et al., 2014). In this evaluation section, the Ah-Counter will share the findings in the last session of the meeting together with feedback on how to avoid and reduce the use of fillers in the speech.

Overall, the application of peer evaluation in the Toastmaster international club is designed to evaluate the whole parts of oral communication. The three elements discussed are used to grade fairly in both written and oral evaluation activity.

Toastmaster members' interpretation toward peer evaluation

The Toastmaster members found it challenging and interesting when performing their speech either in the prepared speech or impromptu speech due to the evaluation session. The speakers were happy when someone listened and focused on their speech content and performance. Compared with another evaluation phase which is always undesirable, in the Toastmaster International club, the members always wait for it because the method of evaluation is interesting. Having peers evaluate speakers in the speech performance made

participants aware that they should not be afraid of making mistakes. Here are the interpretations from the Toastmaster members to Peer evaluation:

Self-improvement

Supporting the purpose of Toastmaster international as a club that focuses on motivating the members to improve both communication skills and leadership, peer evaluation was mentioned as an effective way to improve the competencies. Two participants in the interview stated that:

For me, peer evaluation shows the variety of perspectives from my peers, which can contribute to my self-improvement. (R2)

Peer evaluation helps me to improve my ability in public speaking both in formal and informal situations. (R1)

Peer evaluation was explained as a way to help the Toastmaster members' gain their self-improvement in using English. This is because the input given by the reviewers in each review session gave more positive insights for their self-improvement tool.

Confidence

The element needed to be a good communicator or speaker is confidence. The way speakers create the content and how the speech is delivered are the pinpoints on the speaking performance. The TMI members shared how peer evaluation improves their confidence to deliver their speech. Two participants in the interview revealed that:

Before, I thought having peers to evaluate me would be a disaster. In fact, it boosts my confidence because they share their feedback in a very communicative and informative way. (R2)

Lately, I have been waiting for the peer evaluation session due to absorbing new ideas to improve my public speaking. I am writing the feedback orally and reading the written feedback to sharpen my confidence to perform on my future speech. (R3)

From the above data, it can be sum up that the motivation given during peer evaluation session at each toastmaster session can help them to increase their self-confidence to speak in public, both formally and informally. So, when this peer evaluation format can be adopted in learning English in the classroom, it is hoped that it can trigger students to be able to speak English confidently.

Strengths and weaknesses

Many assume that evaluation is a way to point out others' mistakes or weaknesses in their performance. But in Toastmaster club, peer evaluation is not only looking at the mistakes or weaknesses, but it also shares the strengths of the speaker. Three participants in the interview shared that:

Peer evaluation is not only about the evaluator giving feedback on my weaknesses but also my strengths. I found many of my strengths that I had never known before this evaluation session. (R1)

I did love it when the evaluator gave their notes on my strengths and weaknesses because I can focus on strengthening my strengths and improving my weakness. (R3)

I like to have someone whose suggestion is sharpening one part and reducing the other part. (R2)

Assessing someone's performance does not only focus on his/her weaknesses but also must be able to find the strengths. In this case, the Toastmaster was able to apply constructive assessment to each presenter, and it helped the toastmaster members to understand their strengths and weaknesses. This can be used in the classroom to develop students' mastery of English by showing both the student's weaknesses and strengths.

Critical thinking

In a previous study, Kollar and Fischer (2010) mentioned that someone who is suitable for giving the evaluation is the only teacher who has more understanding. But from peer evaluation, it was believed that doing evaluation can train us to think critically. Two participants in the interview shared that:

I think peer evaluation is not only giving positive feedback to the speakers but also training the evaluator to think critically because they need to identify, analyze, and explain the speakers' performance. It is an effective way to train thinking critically and fairly. (R3)

Peer evaluation allows me to be more critical on many issues regarding public speaking, which I have not gotten before. (R2)

Students' critical thinking needs to be improved to develop their confidence to assess, identify, analyze, and express their opinions both orally and writing. Critical thinking is also very useful for fostering a sense of students' ability so

that they can express their thoughts freely without assuming that they don't have right to share their opinion because they think that the only teacher is right. Practicing a critical thinking attitude for students can be adopted from the application of the peer review process from the Toastmaster members when giving their evaluations.

Comment and recommendation

Scoring in numbers was not the only way to give an evaluation to speakers but also to give comments and recommendations. Two participants in the interview argued that:

The feedback from my peers is very helpful for my improvement because they do not only give a score on my performance but also give comments and recommendations. I love to hear their comments directly because I can listen to their feedback and sometimes examples, while a written comment helps me to learn again once I forget about it. (R2)

What I love about the evaluation session in TMI is the way the evaluators give feedback. They do not point out our mistakes like in an interrogation place. They are objective in their comments and recommendations. (R1)

In delivering an English speech, one can learn from the comments and recommendations of everyone who listens or deliberately judges them. With comments and recommendations, the members at Toastmaster believe that this can have a positive impact on developing one's English language skills both in terms of grammar, sentence construction, gestures, and others. Otherwise, students can receive and process the comments and recommendations to improve their speaking performance.

Acceptance

Toastmaster international introduces evaluation as the important part of accepting others' ideas and comments. Everyone has the rights to share and give feedback to improve their ability to speak. It is the same idea as the TMI members mirroring the effect of peer evaluation. Two participants in the interview claimed that:

Peer evaluation introduces the culture of accepting others' perspectives and being happy to learn from peers, which is one of the main thinking that Indonesian students should learn about. (R1)

Receiving feedback from the evaluator helped me develop my content interestingly. I am happy to accept their feedback because they have proper guides, have passed training, and have performed an evaluation speech task before becoming the evaluator. (R2)

Mind process to accept other people's input also needs to be improved for every student or people in general. The toastmaster member said that receiving feedback easily and peacefully from people could be trained by applying peer evaluation in English learning activities. So indirectly this activity can train mentally and physically performance both inside and outside the classroom.

Proper usage

Learning language, especially English communication, can be more enjoyable if it is performed together with peers. The TMI members mentioned that peer evaluation helps them to learn more about the speech content, grammar, body language, voice, and others. Three participants revealed that:

In my opinion, peer evaluation helps both evaluator and speaker use proper grammar and choose appropriate words in every speech. Especially when I am dealing with content construction. (R2)

The comments and recommendations from my peers help me to improve my body movements and my voice during my performance. (R1)

I learn how to avoid filler words from my first time joining TMI. The evaluator helped me to reduce my filler words that I was not aware of before. (R3)

In peer reviews' activity, the Toastmaster members explained that they received a lot of input to improve their proper usage in terms of speech content, voice, body language, and others. It can be imitated by the students to improve their performance not only from themselves or from their teachers, but also from their friends' reviews who see their performance directly when giving speeches.

Student-centered learning

In teaching language, teachers should not be the center of all activities and materials; rather, they should facilitate the learners to learn better and avoid the boring class situation. Based on some Toastmaster members, learners believed that peer evaluation could be an effective way to support student-centered learning and puts students in many roles in the teaching-learning activity. Two participants opined that:

I adopt some elements in peer evaluation for my teaching activity; I think it is helpful to create student-centered learning. (R1)

As a teacher, I think peer evaluation represents the activity in the classroom, in which the learning center is the students. (R2)

Peer evaluation was said by toastmasters to help establish student center learning because students can be fully involved in developing themselves and supporting each other. In addition, the method used by the toastmaster can be applied in classroom activity and will likely support the student center learning activity in English classes.

Discussion

Peer evaluation elements

Becoming an evaluator in Toastmaster is not easy due to the double roles. On one side, evaluators must be good listeners because they have to pay attention to all details by listening to the speaker's speech, while on another side, evaluators should be good analysts. In the evaluation process, evaluators write comments manually in the evaluation form, and then the comments will be shared orally for about 1 to 2 minutes. Generally, written evaluation by simply showing the total scores without any description of the students' weaknesses is often used in Indonesia, while evaluations using both written and spoken forms are the best way to access speech evaluation (Buquiran, 2014), and this is what the Toastmaster system does. The evaluation process given by the evaluator in the Toastmaster meeting is used CRC Method – which stands for Commend, Recommend, and Commend. The CRC method or 'the sandwich method' represents the commendations and provides a solid foundation for the speaker and acknowledges strengths to improve the speaking performances (Smedley, 2014). This method supports the evidence that peer evaluation could be used reliably in summative work (Gielen & De Wever, 2015 ; Lladó et al., 2014).

As reported by Andika and Mitsalina (2020), the lack of grammatical understanding affected the difficulty of delivering the learners' ideas in using English; thus, grammar is needed to be evaluated as a measurement of speaking skills. In this study, the evaluators review the grammatical usage in the meeting. The grammarian focuses on analyzing the improper grammar used by the speakers while they are delivering the speech and also the participants who are participating in the table topic session. The grammarian will share

improvements and suggestions on improper grammar use. In this session, the grammarian also shares the use of quotes, words, or special terms used by the speaker that can be used by others. Furthermore, word of the day becomes one of the Toastmaster trademarks to expand the members' and audiences' vocabulary. As known, vocabulary might increase when speakers use them daily. The words which can be used as the WotD is frequently applied in several situations such as adjective, verb, and noun (Toastmaster.org). To make the WotD is used more than once, the grammarian shares it at the beginning of the session to be used by the speakers during the meeting. The use of WotD will be counted and be shared in the last session, which is the evaluation session. In addition, Toastmaster International club also puts concerns to the filler words to provide immediate so that speakers will not use the same word repeatedly in the future. In verbal communication, filled pauses are inferences to the unconscious sign of disfluency or as a speaker's signal to convey a certain message (Laserna et al., 2014). Here, the evaluator will report the use of filler words in a speech and then give comments and recommendations for improvement on the next public speaking performance.

Toastmaster interpretation toward peer evaluation

Peer evaluation represents effective learning through collaboration between peers and teachers. It also prepare learners for future learning processes, which involve them in the learning and evaluation process, either short or long-term results (Thomas et al., 2011). Based on the review result, the learners can improve their knowledge and competence to evaluate peers through peer evaluation. It links with the findings stating that peer evaluation is believed to be an effective way to boost speaker's motivation by involving them in the evaluation process and motivating peers to master the learning topics (Alzaid, 2017). Interpretation from speakers related to peer review is also linked to the study by Lutze-Mann (2015) that presented the benefits of using peer evaluation as an instrument of assessment to evaluate learning: (1) Peer evaluation contributes steady result across the evaluation criteria and need a short time to deal with it (2) Peer evaluation gives information about learners' achievement as a part of teachers' evaluation which leads to higher learners achievement, (3) Peer evaluation provides information about the learners' strengths based on their performance in evaluating others, (4) Peer evaluation encompasses learners to think critically, (5) Learning more from the critical evaluation and feedback from others, and (6) Developing cooperative learning as the social skills.

Although the study by Lutze-Mann (2015) found that some learners feel hesitant and fear to show their evaluation work to others because they assume that the only right person to give the evaluation is the teacher, but in these findings, learners have their confidence to share their comments and feedback using the evaluation form provided. Each person can be a speaker, in a prepared speech speaker to impromptu speech and evaluator. As mentioned in the findings, it shows that the evaluator knows exactly what they do and how they evaluate the speakers. Another study by Lutze-Mann (2015) mentioned that most language learners are not satisfied with the final score given by the teachers because they claim that their knowledge is more than what is marked. On the contrary, the finding of the current study reveals that the use of CFR by providing comments and recommendations, including the speaker's strengths and weaknesses, allows the speakers to accept the evaluation given, either oral or written form.

Conclusion

The objectives of this research to know about the kind of peer evaluation elements the evaluator used to evaluate the Toastmaster speakers and to know how the Toastmaster speakers interpret the evaluation given by their peers have been achieved successfully through the investigation survey. All in all, in evaluating the speech, evaluators focus on the speech script, body movement, and voice. While in grammatical aspects, evaluators focus on analyzing the improper grammar used by speakers in their speech. Lastly, evaluation is performed on the filler words by speakers in their speech.

However, further analysis of the data also showed that the elements of peer evaluation need to be more rigid in terms of giving scores and descriptions. Meanwhile, interpretation of the Toastmaster speakers give well motivation to speakers because they are involved in the evaluation process. Also, implementing the CRF method in the evaluation process is considered an effective way on both oral and written evaluation forms because it contains comments and recommendations. Overall, the data provide evidence that the grammatical aspect and proper words are crucial elements used by peers to evaluate the Toastmaster speakers. It can be summarized that the member of Toastmaster very satisfied with the implementation of peer evaluation because it can boost their confidence in performing public speaking. The implication of this research result is that peer evaluation element can effectively be used to

measure the oral communication skills from peer's point of view in Toastmaster International Club.

Finally, the researcher recommends that the peer evaluation element applied in Toastmaster International Club can be used as an alternative method of evaluation in the formal learning process, which might help in assessing the oral communication skills from the peer's point of view. Otherwise, the researcher encourages other researchers to conduct similar research to dig more information about the evaluation on grammatical issues and filler words both in formal and informal learning processes.

Acknowledgment

The researchers would like to express appreciation to the members of Malang Toastmaster club and Hand Toastmaster club Surabaya for their willingness to share ideas supporting this study. Researchers also thank their colleagues for the encouraging feedback.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

ORCID

Lailatul Rifah <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3515-4988>

Fardini Sabilah <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0973-3609>

References

- Alzaid, J. M. (2017). The effect of peer assessment on the evaluation process of Students. *International Education Studies*, 10(6), 159-173. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v10n6p159>
- Andika, A., & Mitsalina, E. (2020). Analysis of variety of learning difficulties in Indonesian language education students on English language courses at university of Ma'arif NU Kebumen. *ETERNAL (English Teaching Journal)*, 11(1), 10–15. <https://doi.org/10.26877/eternal.v11i1.6064>

- Anggini, S. D., & Arjulayana, A.-. (2021). Analysis student's speaking performance as an academic speaker's practice. *Globish: An English-Indonesian Journal for English, Education, and Culture*, 10(1), 58-71. <https://doi.org/10.31000/globish.v10i1.3943>
- Buquiran, E. S. (2014). Factors affecting members' retention in Toastmasters International. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 182-200.
- Chang, C.-C., Tseng, K.-H., Chou, P.-N., & Chen, Y.-H. (2011). Reliability and validity of web-based portfolio peer assessment: a case study for a senior high school's students taking computer course. *Computers & Education*, 57(1), 1306–1316. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.01.014>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and reserach design: choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Gielen, M., & De Wever, B. (2015). Structuring peer assessment: comparing the impact of the degree of structure on peer feedback content. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 52, 315–325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.019>
- Gielen, S., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., Struyven, K., & Smeets, S. (2011). Goals of peer assessment and their associated quality concepts. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(6), 719–735. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003759037>
- Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal*, 204(6), 291–295. <https://doi.org/10.1038/bdj.2008.192>
- Glyn,T., Dona, M., & Pleasants, K. (2011). Using self- and peer-assessment to enhance students' future-learning in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 8(1), 17-29.
- Inayati, N., Nurbatra, L. H., & Maro, R. K. (2015). Implementation of 2015 mentoring program in english department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan (JINOP)*, 3(2), 609–624.
- James, E. (2005). Student assessment from a psychological perspective. *SAGE Journals*, 3(2), 114–121. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2304/plat.2003.3.2.114>
- Kearney, S., Perkins, T., & Kennedy-Clark, S. (2015). Using self- and peer-assessments for summative purposes: analysing the relative validity of the AASL (authentic assessment for sustainable learning) model. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1039484>
- Kerby, D., & Romine, J. (2009). Develop oral presentation skills through accounting curriculum design and course-embedded assessment. *Journal of Education for Business*, 85(3), 172–179.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832320903252389>
- Kollar, I., & Fischer, F. (2010). Peer assessment as collaborative learning: a cognitive perspective. *Learning and Instruction, 20*(4), 344–348. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.005>
- Landry, A., Jacobs, S., & Newton, G. (2014). Effective use of peer assessment in a graduate level writing assignment: a case study. *International Journal of Higher Education, 4*(1), 38-51. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p38>
- Laserna, C. M., Seih, Y. T., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2014). Um. . who like says you know: filler word use as a function of age, gender, and personality. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 33*(3), 328–338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X14526993>
- Lladó, A., P., Soley, L. F., Sansbelló, R. M. F., Pujolras, G. A., Planella, J. P., Roura-Pascual, N., Martínez, J. J. S., & Moreno, L. M. (2014). Student perceptions of peer assessment: an interdisciplinary study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(5), 592–610. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.860077>
- Lutze-Mann, L. (2015). *Peer assessment of assignment drafts: about peer assessment. assessment toolkit, student peer assessment.* UNSW.
- MacArthur, F. (2010). Metaphorical competence in EFL: where are we and where should we be going? a view from the language classroom. *AILA Review, 23*(1), 155–173. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.23.09mac>
- Montero, R. L., & ALvarado, J. S. (2019). Improving English oral and public speaking skills in the classroom. *Revista De Lenguas Modernas, 30*, 143–161.
- Naderifar, M., Goli, H., & Ghaljaie, F. (2017). Snowball sampling: a purposeful method of sampling in qualitative research. *Strides in Development of Medical Education, 14*(3). 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.5812/sdme.67670>
- Nawi, R. A., Yasin, B., & Champion, I. C. R. (2015). Impromptu: great impromptu speaking is never just impromptu. *Studies in English Language and Education, 2*(2), 144-157. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v2i2.2697>
- Nordin, S. M., & Shaari, Z. H. (2017). Implementing the Toastmasters tradition in the L2 classroom. *The English Teacher, XXXIV*(2001), 60–66.
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2014). Essentials of nursing research seventh edition appraising evidence for nursing practice. In *Lippincott Williams & Wilkins*.
- Raja, F. U. (2017). Anxiety Level in students of public speaking: causes and remedies. *Journal of Education and Educational Development, 4*(1), 94-109. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v4i1.1001>
- Smedley, R. C. (2014). *District 7 Toastmasters history.* Oregon: Multnomah.
- Talja, S. (1999). Analyzing qualitative interview data. *Library & Information Science Research, 21*(4), 459–477. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0740-8188\(99\)00024-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0740-8188(99)00024-)

9

- Usman, B., Muslim, A., Champion, I. C. R., & Samad, I. A. (2018). Progressive peer evaluation: important but absent in EFL speaking classes. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 308–327. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.11115>
- Yee, K. M., Jafre, M., & Abidin, Z. (2014). The use of public speaking in motivating esl learners to overcome speech anxiety. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 2(11), 127–135. Retrieved from <https://www.arcjournals.org/pdfs/ijSELL/v2-i11/16.pdf>
- Zakian, M., Moradan, A., & Naghibi, S. E. (2012). The relationship between self-, peer-, and teacher-assessments of EFL learners' speaking. *World J Arts, Languages, and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 1–5.