Journal Of the Iraqia University (75-4) March (2026)

ISSN(Print): 1813-4521 OnLine ISSN:2663-7502

Journal Of the Iraqia University

available online at

https://iasj.rdd.edu.iq/journals/journal/view/247

The Impacts of Individual and Collaborative Students' Oral Presentations on Their Learning Achievement, Attitudes, and Confidence in Online Courses of TEFL in Higher Education

Asst. Prof. Mohammed Abed Salih Albadri

mabdsalih@uowasit.edu.iq

Wasit University College of Education for Humanities

Abstract

Students' active participation in online courses is an issue that has attracted considerable attention nowadays. Student presentations are a technique to increase the level of participation in online classes. The study was designed based on a mixed-methods design using questionnaires and a quasi-experimental design. In this study, three groups of pre-service TEFL (MA students) participated: the control group (CG, n=19), the individual presentation group (IPG, n=21), and the collaborative presentation group (CPG, n=24). The experimental groups gave 30-minute presentations individually and collaboratively in each session of the online course. The ANOVA test results indicated a significant difference among the achievement scores of the three groups of participants. Both the CPG and IPG scored higher than the control group; however, there was no significant difference between the scores of the CPG and IPG.

Keywords: TEFL, collaborative presentations, individual presentations, attitudes, confidence, learning achievement

اثر العروض الشفوية الفردية والجماعية للطلاب على تحصيلهم الدراسي ومواقفهم وثقتهم في دورات تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية عبر الإنترنت في التعليم العالي

أ.م محمد عبد صالح البدري

mabdsalih@uowasit.edu.iq

جامعة واسط كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية

المستخلص

تحظى المشاركة الفعّالة للطلاب في الدورات الدراسية عبر الإنترنت باهتمام كبير في الوقت الحالي. ويُعدّ تقديم الطلاب للعروض التقديمية في الدورات الدراسية عبر الإنترنت أسلوبًا لزيادة مستوى مشاركتهم فيها. وقد صُممت الدراسة بناءً على تصميم متعدد الأساليب باستخدام الاستبيانات وتصميم شبه تجريبي.

في هذه الدراسة، شاركت ثلاث مجموعات من معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (TEFL) قبل الخدمة (طلاب ماجستير)، وهي المجموعة الضابطة (CG، عددهم ١٩)، ومجموعة العروض الفردية (IPG، عددهم ٢١)، ومجموعة العروض التعاونية (CPG، عددهم ٢٤). قدمت المجموعات التجريبية عروضًا مدتها ٣٠ دقيقة بشكل فردي وتعاوني في كل جلسة من جلسات الدورة التدريبية الإلكترونية.

أشارت نتائج اختبار تحليل التباين (ANOVA) إلى وجود فرق كبير بين درجات التحصيل في المجموعات الثلاث. وقد سجّل كلٌّ من اختبار CPG وIPG درجات أعلى من المجموعة الضابطة؛ مع ذلك، لم يكن هناك فرق كبير بين درجات اختبار CPG وIPG.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (TEFL)، العروض التقديمية التعاونية، العروض التقديمية الفردية، المواقف، الثقة، التحصيل الدراسي

Introduction

Considerable emphasis has been placed on the role of interactivity and interactive learning in online courses (Schroeder-Moreno, 2010; Bowen, Chingos, Lack, & Nygren, 2014). In the same vein, various technologies and digital tools have been utilized to develop interactive learning environments in educational contexts. Research on implementing interactive learning has focused on issues such as mobile learning in online courses (Caudill, 2007; Shih, 2007), the use of social network sites in learning (Blue & Tirotta, 2011; Irwin, Ball, Desbrow, & Leveritt, 2012), the application of interactive learning strategies and scaffolding in online learning (Salyers, Carter, Cairns, & Durrer, 2014) and game-based learning (Hung, Sun, & Yu, 2015),.

Student engagement and participation are essential issues in online courses. One way to motivate online students to increase their participation in class activities is to encourage them to give oral presentations. McIntyre et al. (2001) emphasised that self-confidence has a vital influence on students' willingness to

communicate in a foreign language**.** Li (2018) stated that presentation is a complex task involving vocabulary, phonetics, syntax, and text information, particularly in terms of cohesion and coherent devices. Thus, when students present, they face linguistic and psychological challenges. Similarly**,** Maftuna (2020) assered that self-confidence, as a psychological and personal factor, might impact students' oral skills and performance, playing a crucial role in achieving the goal of foreign language learning. Therefore, this study used a quasi-experimental design to explore whether students' individual or collaborative presentations can have a significant impact on their learning. The findings of the survey can help online teachers develop interactive learning environments and may have implications for reconsidering the role of students in online courses.

Literature Review

Oral presentation is considered one of the key elements of higher education and professional life, requiring students to effectively communicate concepts, ideas, arguments, and views to an audience. In higher education, oral presentations are employed as a vital device for developing crucial skills such as communication and presentation, achieving confidence and promoting interaction between students. In addition, it encourages peer and individual students to rethink their speaking, listening, and non-verbal communication skills. Moreover, it assists students in thinking critically and logically, organising their spoken text, and managing their time with straightforward, coherent matter.

Regarding learning achievement, Al-Hebaish (2012) stated that oral presentations can enhance students' text memorisation, allowing them to present and utter it orally, fluently, and accurately with high spirit. He also asserts that oral presentation is considered one of the learning techniques employed in the learning process of any subject material. According to Al-Nouh, Abdul-Kareem and Taqi (2015), researchers view oral presentations as learning activities that can cause students anxiety, especially when audience is actively judging their performances, particularly during question sessions. It can also assist students in improving their public speaking skills (Yahay & Kheirzadeh, 2015 and Fitria & Salwa, 2018), as oral presentations can significantly influence learning achievement, particularly in terms of language accuracy and fluency.

Previous research has focused on the quality and evaluation of students' presentations in educational contexts. For instance, Nouri and Shahid (2005) explored learners' attitudes toward PowerPoint presentations and their learning opportunities in such contexts. They reported that the students had a positive attitude toward the presentations given in the classroom. However, the results did not show the effect of the presentations on students' memory capacity. Beyer (2011) explored the effectiveness of a presentation software tool called Pecha Kucha in comparison to conventional PowerPoint presentations. The choice and use of Pecha Kucha had a positive impact on the quality of the students' presentations. Higgins-Opitz and Tufts (2010) used students' presentations as tools to improve medical students' learning. The results indicated that the majority of the students were positive about their presentations. The presentations also encouraged learners to foster more cooperation in class, adopt group learning techniques, and enhance their research knowledge and competence.

In a similar study, Sander and Sanders (2005) examined the impact of student presentations on their learning. They reported that student presentations could have a positive influence on students' confidence. Students who presented had positive attitudes toward student presentations. One drawback was that some students found some presentations confusing and had difficulty learning from their peers. Ortaçtepe (2016) investigated the application of webcasts for students' presentations. Results showed that the students were in favour of in-class presentations. Moreover, the students found the use of webcasts beneficial due to their potential in providing audio-visual learning resources. Ottman (2007) carried out a study comparing student-centred and teacher-centred presentations. The findings of the experimental study showed that students made improvements under both learning conditions; however, there was no significant difference in their achievement between the two conditions.

Having conducted a study on science and environment students' use of presentation, Lee and Woods (2010) reported that the students held highly positive attitudes toward giving presentations. In general, the presentations were appropriate tools for students to conduct research and interact with their peers. Sander, Sanders, and Stevenson (2002) analyzed the efficacy of student presentations for psychology instruction. The results depicted generally favourable attitudes among students, despite some anxiety and stress. The students

were worried about whether their presentations were of high quality. Regarding business presentations, Oliver and Kowalczyk (2013) investigated students' achievements using traditional PowerPoint presentations and a modified version of Pecha Kucha in a marketing course. The results demonstrated the more positive effects of Pecha Kucha presentations compared to traditional ones.

It appears from the classroom presentation that students focus on the content rather than learning the language. Coyle (2007) stated that Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) includes a 4 Cs Framework: content, communication, cognition, and culture/community, to aid learners' linguistic progress and acquisition of topic knowledge. Freeman (2000) describes Content-Based Instruction (CBI) as a method that incorporates language learning with other content, often academic topics. Academic topics provide natural content for language learning, significantly contributing to the knowledge of different disciplines. According to Coyle et al. (2010), CLIL is an educational approach with two layers, employed for teaching and learning both language and content.

As the literature suggests, the majority of studies on student presentations have focused on a single factor, such as attitudes, and have overlooked other important variables, such as students' learning achievement. Moreover, there is a dearth of research on the effect of student presentations on their learning and attitudes in online learning contexts. Considering the popularity of online courses at the higher education level in many countries, including Iran, this study set out to use a quasi-experimental design to investigate the effect of individual and collaborative student presentations in three MA TEFL courses. The results can help course designers, practitioners, and students improve their pedagogical practices and develop interactive learning environments in online classes.

Methodology

The study was based on a quasi-experimental design. In this study, the two tools are used for quantitative analysis since all the data are analyzed numerically. Therefore, the study is only a quasi-experimental design with four independent variables: achievement, confidence, attitude, and quality. The questionnaires were used to assess students' attitudes and confidence levels, while the quasi-experimental design was employed to explore the effect of the treatment conditions.

Research Questions

Having taken into consideration the aims and goals of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. Do individual and collaborative students' oral presentations have an impact on their learning achievement in online TEFL?
2. Do individual and collaborative students' oral presentations have an impact on their attitudes toward giving presentations in online courses of TEFL?
3. Do individual and collaborative students' oral presentations have an impact on their confidence level in presenting in online courses of TEFL?
4. Which has a greater impact on online TEFL students' quality of presentations: collaborative presentations or individual presentations?

Research Hypotheses

1. Individual and collaborative students' oral presentations do not have an impact on their learning achievement in online TEFL.
2. Individual and collaborative students' oral presentations do not have an impact on their attitudes toward giving presentations in online courses of TEFL.
3. Individual and collaborative students' oral presentations do not have an impact on their confidence level in presenting in online courses of TEFL.

Participants

Participants of the study included 19 TEFL pre-service teachers in the control group (CG), 21 in the individual presentation group (IPG), and 24 in the collaborative presentation group (CPG). In general, a total of 64 participants took part in the study. The participants were MA students of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) from three universities in Iraq. The age average of the CG was 27.15, the IPG's age average was 27.41, and the average age of the CPG was 26.84. The sample included 38 females and 26 males. Three intact groups of participants were included in this study. The participants were MA students who took part in three courses. The courses were presented online. The same subject was taught in all three classes, and the

same university instructor taught all of them. The instructor was a faculty member who had taught subjects related to TEFL for about 8 years. Four raters were invited to evaluate the quality of the presentations given by the students. The raters were university instructors who all had taught the same subject at the MA level. A total of 10 presentations from the IPG and 10 presentations from the CPG were rated by the four raters.

Instruments and Data Collection

The first instrument of the study was a questionnaire (See Appendix A). The questionnaire was prepared and comprised 13 items. The first section explored the attitudes of the participants, and the second section examined their confidence levels in giving presentations. To identify changes in the participants' perspectives, the questionnaires were administered to students before the course started and after it finished. Therefore, a pre-study and post-study questionnaire was used in this study. A panel of four university professors, who were experts in educational technology and TEFL, examined the content of the questionnaire. Also, the previous findings of other studies were utilised and considered in designing the questionnaire. The attitude section of the questionnaire showed an acceptable level of reliability (pre-study questionnaire: 0.63, post-study questionnaire: 0.814), and the confidence section indicated acceptable reliability indices (pre-study questionnaire: 0.67, post-study questionnaire: 0.709). The other instrument was an achievement test designed by the instructor. The test was written and contained eight questions based on the course syllabus.

The questions of the test were examined and evaluated by the panel of experts. The last instrument was a checklist designed for rating the presentations. The checklist was piloted, and its content was validated by consulting with a panel of experts. A high level of rater consistency (Cohen's Kappa=94.8) was also achieved. A total of 10 presentations from the IPG and 10 presentations from the CPG were rated by the four raters. The checklist contained seven items with a Likert Scale format ranging from totally unacceptable to perfectly acceptable.

Three conditions were considered for this study. The first group of participants (the control group) received the standard online instruction, where the instructor gave presentations and lectures, and the students engaged in chatting and speaking with the instructor and other class members. The students were not supposed to give presentations in this group. The second group (IPG) was encouraged to give individual presentations. The students chose different lessons and gave a 20–30-minute presentation on each topic. All the students gave presentations based on a timetable that was designed for them. Then, the instructor lectured and presented the lessons after each student's presentation ended. Giving individual presentations by students was a course requirement, and a portion of the final score was based on it. The last group (CPG) was encouraged to give presentations in groups of three or four. Each student was responsible for one part of the presentation. One student was responsible for designing the PowerPoint file, another for searching for the content, and the third for giving the presentation. At times, two students gave the presentations together. The students of each group selected different lessons and gave a 20–30-minute presentation on their chosen topics.

Data Analysis

To analyze the difference between the final scores of the three groups, an ANOVA test was used using SPSS 16. Also, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to check the normality of the scores. For a more in-depth analysis, the post-hoc test of Turkey was utilized. The results of the questionnaires were shown using the mean and standard deviation for each item. To check whether the scores of each group were normally distributed, the Kolmogorov-

Smirnov Z test was utilized. The reliability of the questionnaire and the ratings were estimated using Cronbach's Alpha test. Cohen's F test was also utilized to check the effect size.

Findings

The Impact of Individual and Collaborative Students' Oral Presentations on Their Learning Achievement

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics relevant to the scores of the three groups of participants. As is obvious, the control group achieved the lowest mean score (M=18.03), while the collaborative presentation group achieved the highest mean score (M=18.67).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Scores of Each Group

Group name	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error

Control Group	18.0395	0.59665	0.13688
Individual Presentation Group	18.4881	0.48397	0.10561
Collaborative Presentation Group	18.6771	0.63622	0.12987

To check whether the scores of each group were normally distributed, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z test was utilized. The results indicated that the scores of each group of participants were normally distributed (Table 2). Since the scores are normally distributed, the parametric ANOVA test could be run for the data analysis.

Table 2 Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test of Normality

Score	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	sig.
CG Scores	1.147	0.144
IPG Scores	0.757	0.615
CPG Scores	0.875	0.42

To determine if the difference among the scores of the groups was significant, the ANOVA test was run. The results indicated that the difference between the groups was significant (F=6.626, sig=0.002). The Cohen's F test (0.4570) showed a large effect size for the differences between the scores of the groups (Table 3).

Table 3. ANOVA Results for Comparing the Scores of the Three Groups

		ıf Squares		**Square**	
Between groups	4.433	2	2.216	6.626	**0.002***
Within groups	20.402	61	0.334		
Effect size	**Cohen's F 0.4570**				

* p≤ 0.05

To identify the differences between the groups more closely, the Turkey test was also run. Table 4 illustrates there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the Individual Presentation group (sig=0.045), Collaborative Presentation Group (sig=0.002) and the control group. However, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the Individual Presentation group (sig=0.522) and the Collaborative Presentation Group (sig=0.522). The mean scores showed that the Collaborative Presentation Group (M=18.6) achieved the highest mean score. The Individual Presentation group (M=18.48) scored higher than the control group (M=18.03).

Table 4: Turkey Post-Hoc Test for Comparing the Scores of the Three Groups

	CG	IPG	CPG
CG	--	**0.045***	**0.002***
IPG	**0.045***	--	0.522
CPG	**0.002***	0.522	--

* p≤ 0.05

The Impact of Individual and Collaborative Students' Oral Presentations on Their Attitudes towards Giving Presentations in Online Courses

Table 5 indicates the attitudes of the participants toward oral presentations. The results show a significant attitude difference in the CPG. Comparing the results of the pre-study and post-study questionnaires depicts

that the CPG's attitudes improved significantly. In contrast, the attitude change of the CG and IPG was not significant.

Table 5. Students' Attitudes towards Giving Presentations

			Mean	SD	Sig.
Students' oral presentations increase their motivation to learn	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.00	0.66	0.317
		Post-study questionnaire	3.94	0.70	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.04	0.86	0.763
		Post-study questionnaire	4.09	0.62	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.04	0.95	**0.033***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.41	0.71	
Students' oral presentations foster their Responsibility for learning	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.89	0.65	0.317
		Post-study questionnaire	3.94	0.70	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.95	0.92	0.378
		Post-study questionnaire	4.14	0.57	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.95	0.75	**0.020***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.45	0.72	
Students' oral presentations increase their confidence	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.94	0.77	0.617
		Post-study questionnaire	4.05	0.70	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.00	0.83	0.855
		Post-study questionnaire	4.04	0.66	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.00	0.72	**0.046***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.33	0.70	
Students' oral presentations increase students' level of participation	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.73	80	0.527
		Post-study questionnaire	3.84	89	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.90	0.76	0.405
		Post-study questionnaire	4.09	0.53	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.08	0.65	**0.046***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.41	0.58	
Students' oral presentations increase their self-esteem level	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.94	80	0.819
		Post-study questionnaire	3.84	89	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.09	0.77	0.558
		Post-study questionnaire	4.23	0.54	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.08	0.77	**0.033***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.45	0.58	
Students' oral presentations increase Students' collaboration level	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.00	0.74	0.782
		Post-study questionnaire	4.05	0.70	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.90	0.70	0.033
		Post-study questionnaire	4.28	0.46	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.12	0.61	**0.011***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.45	0.58	
Students' oral presentations enhance students' critical	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.05	0.97	0.792
		Post-study questionnaire	4.00	0.81	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.00	0.63	0.058
		Post-study questionnaire	4.28	0.56	

thinking	**CPG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.87	0.79	**0.016***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.57	0.71	

Likert scales: 1. Strongly disagree; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither agree nor disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Strongly agree, ($p \leq 0.05$)

The Impact of Individual and Collaborative Students' Oral Presentations on Their Confidence Level in Presenting in Online Courses

Regarding the confidence level, the results shown in Table 6 indicate that while the confidence levels of the CG and IPG remained constant, significant differences were identified regarding the CPG.

Table 6: Students' Confidence Levels

			Mean	SD	Sig.
Designing the Graphical features of My presentation	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.78	1.03	0.803
		Post-study questionnaire	3.84	0.95	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.14	0.57	0.655
		Post-study questionnaire	4.19	0.51	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.79	0.93	**0.045***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.20	0.77	
Choosing the right content for The presentation	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.68	0.82	0.558
		Post-study questionnaire	3.84	0.95	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.80	0.81	0.149
		Post-study questionnaire	4.14	0.65	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.79	0.95	**0.012***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.37	0.71	
Collaboration with my classmates for preparing the presentation	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.94	0.97	0.317
		Post-study questionnaire	4.00	0.57	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.04	0.80	0.327
		Post-study questionnaire	4.28	0.56	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.83	0.96	**0.018***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.41	0.58	
Using the Presentation software tools/ applications	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.05	0.62	0.813
		Post-study questionnaire	4.00	0.88	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.00	0.94	0.250
		Post-study questionnaire	4.28	0.71	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.91	0.77	0.059
		Post-study questionnaire	4.25	0.60	
Managing my stress when presenting in The class	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.68	1	0.713
		Post-study questionnaire	3.73	0.99	
	IPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.14	0.57	0.180
		Post-study questionnaire	4.28	0.56	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.95	0.90	**0.026***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.45	0.50	
Speaking English	**CG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.84	0.83	0.218
		Post-study questionnaire	4.10	0.65	

when presenting	**IPG**	*Pre-study questionnaire*	4.14	0.72	0.366
		Post-study questionnaire	4.28	0.56	
	CPG	*Pre-study questionnaire*	3.70	0.85	**0.027***
		Post-study questionnaire	4.20	0.58	

Likert scales: 1. Not confident at all; 2. Slightly confident; 3. Moderately confident; 4. Confident; 5. Very confident, ($p \leq 0.05$)

The Quality of Collaborative Presentations or Individual Presentations

Concerning the quality of the presentations given by the IPG and CPG, Table 7 illustrates that there was a significant difference between the mean scores of the raters. The raters evaluated the CPG presentations as acceptable; however, they believed the IPG presentations were either unacceptable or slightly acceptable.

Table 7: The Quality of Collaborative Presentations or Individual Presentations

Checklist Item	Group	Raters' mean scores	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.
The organisation of the Presentation	IPG	2.57	317.000	**0.000***
	CPG	4.2		
The clarity of the content of the presentation	IPG	3.12	545.000	**0.010***
	CPG	4.00		
Audio-visual support of the presentation	IPG	2.85	389.000	**0.000***
	CPG	4.15		
Time-management of The presentation	IPG	2.72	381.500	**0.000***
	CPG	4.1		
Proper English speaking During the presentation,	IPG	2.70	3.44	**0.000***
	CPG	4.13		
The quality of the content of the presentation	IPG	2.67	348.000	**0.000***
	CPG	4.15		
The inclusion of proper sources in the presentation	IPG	2.25	181.500	**0.000***
	CPG	4.15		
Total Score	IPG	2.70	12.500	**0.000***
	CPG	4.13		

Likert scales: 1. Totally unacceptable; 2. Unacceptable; 3. Slightly acceptable; 4. Acceptable; 5. Perfectly adequate ($p \leq 0.05$)

Discussion and Conclusion

The study investigated the impact of using students' presentations on their learning achievement, attitudes, and confidence levels. The results indicated a significant difference between the mean scores of the three groups of participants. There was a learning improvement in the IPG and CPG, which was not seen in the control group. However, there was no significant difference between the learning achievement of the CPG and IPG based on the results of the Turkey test. This finding aligns with previous research, which demonstrated the positive effect of student presentations on their learning achievement (Oliver & Kowalczyk, 2013; Ottman, 2007). Students must be involved in the learning process in online courses. The results of the study showed that students can actively participate in an online course by giving presentations. The results did not support

the idea that specific types of presentations, such as individual or collaborative ones, could lead to better learning achievement. Instructors should include more interactive techniques and activities in online courses. Students' presentations can also make them more responsible for their own learning and that of their classmates. For better learning achievement, combining students' collaborative and individual presentations may yield improved results and learning gains. This study provided insights into how both types of presentations can affect students' learning.

Moreover, the analysis of the participants' attitudes towards student presentations illustrates that the CPG significantly improved their attitudes towards giving collaborative presentations. However, this attitude change was not observed in the CG and IPG. The critical point is that collaboration among students in online courses can be achieved in different ways. Giving responsibility to students can be a practical approach to increasing students' motivation. Previous research also showed the positive attitudes of students toward student presentations (Lee & Woods, 2010; Sander & Sanders, 2005; Sander, Sanders, & Stevenson, 2002). Students' attitudes towards technology or technology-based teaching/learning techniques are essential and should be taken more seriously into account. In this study, collaboration and interaction seemed to foster students' attitudes and acceptance. Teachers in online courses need to motivate students to collaborate and interact more by using interactive teaching techniques, such as involving them in collaborative presentations. The study's findings also indicated that when students are required to work on their presentations individually, they might find it somewhat difficult and time-consuming. Therefore, the students may adopt a negative attitude toward giving presentations and find them a burden. In contrast, when students are encouraged to provide collaborative presentations, they can be more motivated and learn to take responsibility for their learning and the part they will prepare for the presentation.

Furthermore, the results of the present study demonstrated that students' collaborative presentations can affect their confidence levels. This finding is in line with previous research, which showed an increase in students' confidence levels using student presentations (e.g., Sander & Sanders, 2005). It was interesting that the students who gave individual presentations did not show a change in their confidence levels. When students work in groups, they can learn from other group members and become aware of their weaknesses and learning problems. It is recommended that teachers in online courses create opportunities for students to become involved in the process of collaborative learning. Collaborative presentations by students can increase their motivation and confidence levels. It is also essential to encourage students to give collaborative presentations in flipped online courses. Ideally, future research can focus on the parameters and conditions that may enhance the quality of student presentations and teach students how to develop social skills and responsibility within the groups they are expected to collaborate with. Educational directors should lead the way in training teachers to build an interactive and collaborative environment in online courses.

The results of the study also illustrated that the CPG's presentation quality was more acceptable than the IPG's presentation quality. This is an important finding which provides insight into the effect of collaboration on the quality of students' activities and products in the classroom. In many cases, some students might not be able to design PowerPoint presentations due to the complexity of their visual elements. When collaboration is the issue, each student can carry out a task that aligns with their ability and interest. This issue can make students interested in designing and giving quality presentations. Based on the study results, it is suggested that instructors do not rely solely on students' individual presentations but also assess their work in collaborative presentations. This is a practical step towards a fairer assessment of students' work and better learning opportunities for students.

Implications

Interaction and collaboration are two concepts that might be implemented and conceptualised differently in online and face-to-face courses. The first step towards implementing interactive learning is to train students and teachers in online classes. Teachers should know how to encourage students to collaborate effectively in online courses. This study showed that collaboration in online classes can play a considerable role in enhancing students' learning achievement, attitudes, and confidence levels. Many online courses are taught in a teacher-centred manner, and many teachers believe that interaction and collaboration cannot take place in online courses. It is recommended that educational directors and supervisors of online courses encourage teachers and students to increase the level of interaction in the classroom. Student presentations are only one way of creating

interactive learning environments. Other approaches and techniques can be adopted by students and teachers in online courses as well. Raising awareness about the effects and benefits of collaborative learning can be an essential step towards including interactive learning in online courses.

The other implication of this study is that interactive learning should be implemented by using innovative techniques in online education. Educational directors and course designers of online education should consider workshops and training courses on adopting innovative teaching methodologies and strategies. At times, teachers who teach in face-to-face classes are invited to teach in online courses. This can pose challenges for teachers who lack adequate knowledge and experience in teaching online courses. It is recommended that trained teachers familiar with the specific conditions of online education be employed for online teaching.

Future research can focus on the efficacy of online interaction in online courses. For example, the effectiveness of combining individual and collaborative student presentations requires further investigation. In addition, the effect of students' learning styles on the quality of their presentations can be another subject for further research.

Appendices

Appendix A

Sample of a Participant's Answers to the Questionnaire

Part A: Attitudes

Teacher profile

Years of teaching experience: …… **Age: ……**

University degree: …… **Years of computer experience: ……**

To what extent do you agree with the following items? Please put a tick in the box at the appropriate spot.

	Items	ongly disa	Disagree	ther agree disagree	Agree	trongly agr
1	nts' oral presentations se their motivation to			X		
2	nts' oral presentations their responsibility for learning			X		
3	nts' oral presentations se their confidence				X	
4	nts' oral presentations se students' level icipation			X		
5	nts' oral presentations se their self-esteem				X	
6	nts' oral presentations se students' oration level					X
7	nts' oral presentations ce students' critical ng				X	

Part B: Confidence Levels

How confident do you find yourself in the following skills? Please put a tick in the box at the appropriate spot.

	Items	confident	htly confi	erately con	Confider	ery confide
1	Designing the graphical features of my presentation				X	
2	Choosing the right content for the presentation				X	
3	Collaboration with my classmates for preparing the presentation			X		
4	Using the Presentation software tools/ applications				X	
5	Managing my stress when presenting in the class			X		
6	Speaking English when presenting				X	

Part C: The Quality of Collaborative Presentations or Individual Presentations

How did you feel about the quality of collaborative presentations or individual presentations? Please put a tick in the box at the appropriate spot.

	Items	ly unacce	nacceptab	htly accept	cceptab	ectly accep
1	The organisation of the presentation				X	
2	The clarity of the content of the presentation				X	
3	Audio-visual support of the presentation			X		
4	Time-management of the presentation				x	
5	Proper English speaking during the presentation				X	
6	The quality of the content of the presentation				X	
7	The inclusion of proper sources in the presentation					X