

Comparing Students' Perceptions of Face-to-Face and Online Group Presentations in Japanese EFL Contexts

Yasunori Matsuzono

Abstract

This study examined Japanese university students' perceptions of online and face-to-face group presentations in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) courses. The study aimed to explore the benefits and challenges students experienced during the preparation and delivery stages of group presentations and to compare students' perceptions across the two presentation environments. The participants consisted of two groups of first-year students majoring in international business at a university in Japan: one cohort experienced online group presentations during the COVID-19 pandemic in 2021, while the other experienced face-to-face presentations after the pandemic in 2023. Data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of Likert-scale and open-ended items. The quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while the qualitative responses were analyzed through thematic analysis.

The findings revealed that students in both environments generally perceived group presentations positively and recognized benefits related to speaking skill development, collaboration, confidence development, and knowledge acquisition. At the same time, students also experienced challenges associated with organizing information, managing group work, and presentation anxiety. Clearer differences emerged between the two presentation environments. Students in the face-to-face class demonstrated stronger awareness of audience interaction and nonverbal communication, whereas students in the online class tended to perceive online presentations as psychologically less stressful. Despite these advantages, most students preferred face-to-face presentations overall. The findings suggest that incorporating both presentation formats into EFL courses may help learners develop broader communicative and presentation-related skills.

Keywords: *group presentations; online learning; face-to-face presentations; EFL; collaborative learning; higher education*

1. Introduction

Oral presentation activities are widely used in higher education as a means of developing students' communication skills, critical thinking abilities, and academic confidence (Chan, 2011; Tsang,

2020). In particular, group presentations have become a common classroom activity in many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts because they encourage collaborative learning, discussion, and the sharing of ideas among students (Brooks & Wilson, 2014; Živković, 2014). Through group presentations, learners are often expected not only to demonstrate their understanding of academic content but also to develop important communication skills such as organizing information, clearly expressing opinions, and appropriately responding to audience questions in English (De Grez et al., 2009). In traditional higher education contexts, these presentation activities have typically been conducted in face-to-face classroom settings, where students interact directly with their group members and audiences.

The present study emerged from the author's teaching experience in two English Communication courses offered to first-year students majoring in international business at a university in Japan. The primary goals of these courses were to help students engage critically with texts, participate in constructive discussions, express their opinions orally, and respond appropriately to the opinions of others in English. The courses also aimed to increase students' confidence in communicating in English. Each course consisted of 90-minute classes conducted over a 15-week semester, and one of the central classroom activities involved group presentations conducted in groups of three or four students. Students were required to complete two group presentations per semester, resulting in a total of four presentations throughout the academic year.

However, the presentation format differed substantially depending on the academic year. In 2021, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all classes and presentation activities were conducted online, whereas in 2023, after the pandemic, these activities returned to a face-to-face format on campus. Although different cohorts of students participated in these courses, the course structure, tasks, and assessment procedures were largely identical, and students' English proficiency levels were generally comparable based on placement test results. This situation led to an important pedagogical question: What advantages and difficulties do students perceive when conducting group presentations in online and face-to-face settings? Furthermore, what implications might these perceptions have for teachers who wish to support students more effectively in both presentation formats?

Based on this pedagogical context, the present study reports questionnaire results examining students' perceptions of the benefits and challenges associated with group presentations conducted in online and face-to-face environments. By comparing student reflections from these two instructional settings, this study aims to provide insights into the distinctive features of each presentation format, identify common tendencies across both environments, and explore possible pedagogical suggestions for improving group presentation activities in EFL higher education contexts.

2. Literature Review

Oral Presentation Activities and Collaborative Learning in Higher Education

Oral communication competence is widely recognized as an important component of higher education because students are increasingly expected to communicate ideas clearly and effectively in academic and professional settings. Previous research has suggested that oral presentation activities can contribute to the development of communication skills, critical thinking abilities, audience awareness, and professional competence (Chan, 2011; De Grez et al., 2009; van Ginkel et al., 2015). In particular, presentation activities are often incorporated into university courses not only to assess students' understanding of course content, but also to promote broader communicative and interpersonal development.

Among various presentation activities, group presentations have attracted considerable attention in higher education because they additionally involve cooperation and interaction among learners. Through group presentation activities, students are often expected to share responsibilities, organize information collectively, coordinate preparation tasks, and communicate ideas effectively to audiences. Such activities may therefore provide opportunities for students to develop oral communication skills as well as teamwork, leadership, and interpersonal communication abilities. In this regard, Rossin and Hyland (2003) argued that group work-based learning can contribute to students' personal and social development while also helping learners develop skills relevant to future workplace environments.

Research on collaborative learning has additionally emphasized the importance of interaction and positive group relationships during classroom activities. According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), effective collaborative learning environments often involve positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, and the development of social skills among group members. In foreign language learning environments, supportive peer interaction may also help reduce learners' anxiety and encourage more active participation in communicative activities.

Similarly, Dörnyei and Murphey (2003) emphasized the importance of group cohesion and supportive classroom relationships in language learning contexts. Their work suggests that creating comfortable interpersonal relationships among learners may positively influence classroom participation, motivation, and communication. In the context of group presentations, students are often required to cooperate closely with peers while simultaneously managing the psychological pressure associated with speaking in front of others; therefore, rapport-building processes may be particularly important. Rapport has been described as a relationship characterized by mutual attentiveness, positivity, and coordination between individuals (Tickle-Degnen & Rosenthal, 1990), and previous re-

search has emphasized the importance of building rapport in EFL classrooms in order to promote learner participation, willingness to communicate, motivation, and classroom interaction (e.g., Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Frisby & Martin, 2010).

Factors Influencing Students' Presentation Learning Experiences

Previous research has indicated that students' presentation experiences may be influenced by various instructional, interpersonal, and psychological factors. For example, De Grez et al. (2009) emphasized that oral presentation competence does not develop automatically through presentation practice alone, but rather through appropriate instructional support, feedback, rehearsal opportunities, and carefully designed learning activities. Their findings highlighted that the quality of students' presentation experiences may be strongly shaped by classroom design and instructional conditions.

In addition, learner-centered discussion activities involving rotating student leadership roles may encourage greater participation, interaction, and communicative responsibility among learners. For example, Ryczek (2019) introduced a discussion-leadership approach in Japanese university EFL classrooms and suggested that giving students opportunities to lead small-group discussions may help promote learner agency and communication development. Such activities may therefore function as preparatory opportunities for collaborative communication tasks such as group presentations.

Similarly, Tsang (2020) reported that students' presentation experiences in EFL contexts were influenced by factors such as preparation processes, audience awareness, classroom atmosphere, and opportunities for interaction. In addition to linguistic challenges, students often experienced psychological pressure associated with presenting in front of others. These findings demonstrate that presentation activities may involve not only language performance itself, but also emotional and interpersonal dimensions that influence learners' perceptions and participation.

Previous studies have additionally emphasized the educational value of peer interaction and feedback during presentation activities. For example, Ho (2020) pointed out that peer review processes in oral presentation activities may encourage reflection and collaborative learning among learners. Likewise, Blumenstock and Peragine (2021) reported that students perceived peer feedback activities positively in online EFL presentation contexts because they provided opportunities to learn from classmates' presentations and reflect on their own performance. These findings lend support to the view that both observation of peer presentations and feedback exchange are important components of students' presentation experiences.

Furthermore, Leichsenring (2010) reported that self- and peer-assessment, teacher support, and observation of other presentations strongly influenced Japanese EFL students' experiences during group oral presentation activities. The study additionally highlighted that collaborative preparation and peer support may help reduce psychological pressure during presentations. Such findings

indicate that group presentations involve not only speaking performance itself but also broader social, emotional, and collaborative learning experiences.

Online and Face-to-Face Presentation Environments

Traditionally, oral presentation activities in higher education have primarily been conducted in face-to-face classroom environments, where students interact directly with group members, teachers, and audiences during both the preparation and delivery stages of presentations. In such settings, learners are generally expected to communicate ideas while simultaneously managing audience reactions, eye contact, body language, and other forms of real-time interpersonal interaction. As a result, face-to-face presentation environments have often been regarded as important opportunities for developing oral communication and public speaking skills.

However, the COVID-19 pandemic, which spread globally beginning in 2020, brought major changes to educational environments throughout the world. During this period, universities throughout the world were required to shift classroom activities to online formats, and presentation activities were no exception. Consequently, online presentation activities conducted through videoconferencing platforms became increasingly common in higher education contexts. This rapid transition led researchers to examine how online presentation environments might influence students' communication experiences, participation, anxiety, and perceptions of presentation activities.

Previous research has indicated that online and face-to-face presentation environments may produce somewhat different learning experiences for students. For example, Campbell (2015) compared students' experiences of face-to-face presentations and webinar-style presentations and reported that online presentation environments may help reduce presentation anxiety for some learners. The study also found that although more than half of the students who responded to the questionnaire perceived online presentations positively, face-to-face presentations were still regarded by nearly half of the participants as valuable and effective communication experiences. One interpretation of these findings is that students evaluate presentation environments based on multiple factors beyond anxiety reduction, including their perceived effectiveness in facilitating communication.

Research has also highlighted the role of online interaction and peer feedback in shaping students' presentation experiences. For example, Ho (2020) examined online peer review processes in oral presentation activities and suggested that online peer feedback may encourage reflection and collaborative learning among learners. Similarly, Blumenstock and Peragine (2021) reported that students perceived asynchronous peer feedback activities positively in online EFL presentation contexts because these activities provided opportunities to observe classmates' presentations, reflect on their own performance, and exchange feedback in supportive ways. At the same time, these studies also demonstrated that online presentation environments may involve communicative limitations related

to audience interaction and immediacy compared with face-to-face settings.

Research Gap and Research Questions

Although previous research has explored oral presentations, collaborative learning, peer feedback, and online presentation environments, relatively limited research has directly examined students' perceptions of the benefits and challenges associated with online and face-to-face group presentations in Japanese university EFL contexts. In particular, little attention has been paid to how students perceive presentation preparation, collaboration, confidence development, audience awareness, and communication experiences across different presentation environments. Therefore, the present study aims to explore students' perceptions of online and face-to-face group presentations by examining their overall impressions, perceived benefits and challenges, and preferences regarding presentation formats.

Based on the previous discussion, the present study addresses the following research questions:

1. What common benefits and challenges do students experience when preparing and delivering group presentations?
2. What benefits and challenges do students experience in online group presentations?
3. What benefits and challenges do students experience in face-to-face group presentations?

3. Methodology

Participants

The study involved two groups of first-year Japanese students majoring in international business. The first group consisted of 22 students who took the English Communication courses in an EMI (English-Medium Instruction) environment during the 2021 academic year. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all classes and presentation activities were conducted online via Zoom. In addition, although the traditional placement procedure involved taking the paper-based TOEFL ITP, this cohort was unable to do so because of pandemic-related restrictions. Taking this situation into consideration, as well as financial and test-administration factors, the students' faculty instead used an online TOEIC mock test provided by EdulinX (n.d.) as an alternative placement procedure. This test simulated the format of the actual TOEIC Listening and Reading test and was used to assess students' English proficiency (EdulinX, n.d.). The second group consisted of 22 students who took the same courses in an EMI environment during the 2023 academic year. By this time, after COVID-19 restrictions had been lifted, all classes and presentation activities had returned to a face-to-face format on campus. In contrast to the 2021 cohort, these students took the paper-based TOEFL ITP for placement purposes.

The results of the first group from the TOEIC online mock test in 2021 showed an average

listening score of 356.1, ranging from 275 to 432, and an average reading score of 312.5, ranging from 260 to 380. Meanwhile, the results of the second group from the TOEFL ITP in 2023 showed an average total score of 480.5, ranging from 467 to 500. Although the two tests differed in terms of structure, content, language use, and assessment purposes, the official score interpretations aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (ETS Japan, n.d.; Institute for International Business Communication, n.d.) suggested that the English proficiency levels of both groups were generally equivalent to the CEFR B1 level prior to taking the courses.

Before the main questionnaire survey, students were asked about their previous experiences with oral presentations. Table 1 summarizes the participants' previous experiences related to online and face-to-face presentations.

Table 1

Students' Previous Experiences Related to Presentations

Experiences	2021 Online (n = 22)			2023 Face-to-Face (n = 22)		
	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No	NA
Online Presentations	1	20	1	0	22	0
Face-to-Face Presentations	13	8	1	15	7	0

Note. NA = No answer.

Among the 2021 online-presentation cohort (n = 22), only one student (4.5%) reported having prior experience with online presentations, whereas 13 students (59.1%) indicated previous experience with face-to-face presentations. Similarly, in the 2023 face-to-face cohort (n = 22), none of the students had previous experience with online presentations, while 15 students (68.2%) reported prior experience with face-to-face presentations. Overall, participants generally had limited experience with online presentations before entering university, whereas prior experience with face-to-face presentations was more common.

To gain a more detailed understanding of students' prior presentation backgrounds, Table 2 summarizes the presentation styles previously experienced by participants who reported having prior presentation experience.

Table 2

Presentation Styles for Students with Previous Presentation Experience

Presentation Style	2021 Online (n = 22)	2023 Face-to-Face (n = 22)
Individual	4	2
Group	2	3
Both	7	10

Based on Table 2, a considerable number of students in both cohorts had previous experience with group presentations before taking the courses. In the 2021 online cohort, 2 students had experience only with group presentations and 7 students had experience with both individual and group presentations, meaning that 40.9% of the students had prior experience with group presentations. Similarly, in the 2023 face-to-face cohort, 3 students had experience only with group presentations and 10 students had experience with both presentation styles, indicating that 59.1% of the students had previous group presentation experience. These students were therefore assumed to possess at least some familiarity with the preparation and delivery processes involved in group presentations. In contrast, students without previous group presentation experience may have required additional instructional support in adapting to this presentation format.

Group Presentation Implementation

Before beginning the group presentation activities, efforts were made throughout the course to help students gradually build rapport with their classmates and develop collaborative communication skills. Previous research has suggested that supportive classroom relationships and rapport-building processes may positively influence learners' participation, motivation, and communication in language learning environments (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Frisby & Martin, 2010). Therefore, preparatory collaborative activities were incorporated before the formal presentation tasks in order to create a more supportive and interactive classroom environment.

In most class sessions other than the midterm and final assessments, students worked in small groups consisting of three or four members. To encourage interaction with a wide range of classmates and reduce psychological pressure during later presentation preparation, the group composition was regularly changed across class sessions. Records of previous groupings were maintained so that students could work with different classmates in subsequent sessions whenever possible. Through these rotating group activities, students were expected to become more comfortable communicating and collaborating with one another prior to engaging in the formal group presentations. These procedures were also intended to promote interaction opportunities and collaborative learning across the classroom community, which have been regarded as important features of effective collaborative learning environments (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

In addition, one student in each group was assigned the role of discussion leader during classroom activities. Learner-centered discussion activities involving rotating student leadership roles have been suggested to promote learner agency, participation, and communication development in EFL classrooms (Ryczek, 2019). The leaders were expected to facilitate group discussions and help manage collaborative tasks within the group. In order to encourage the development of learner autonomy and leadership awareness, records of students who had previously taken the leadership role

were maintained so that all students would experience serving as a group leader at least once before the first presentation session. These instructional procedures were intended to help students develop greater confidence in collaborative communication and presentation-related interaction prior to the formal presentation tasks.

These preparatory collaborative activities were designed to create a supportive classroom environment before students engaged in more formal presentation tasks requiring extended cooperation and public speaking. Following these preparatory classroom activities, students engaged in a series of formal collaborative presentation tasks throughout the academic year. Table 3 summarizes the themes and schedule of these activities.

Table 3

Group Presentation Themes

Week	Spring Semester		Fall Semester	
	Week 8	Week 15	Week 8	Week 15
Theme	News Media	International Tourism	Business	World Affairs

As shown in Table 3, students completed two group presentations in both the spring and fall semesters, resulting in a total of four presentations during the course. The themes assigned to the presentations were News Media, International Tourism, Business, and World Affairs. The presentation themes were selected based on two factors. First, the themes reflected topics covered in the assigned textbook (McEntire & Williams, 2021). Second, they were related to students' participation in study abroad programs at partner institutions in regions ranging from Europe and the United States to Asia (Meiji Gakuin University, n.d.). Each presentation lasted approximately eight minutes and was conducted in groups of three or four students.

Across both cohorts, similar instructional procedures were adopted for the preparation and implementation of the group presentations. Prior to each presentation, one presentation topic was assigned to each group, after which group members engaged in brainstorming activities to generate ideas related to the assigned theme. They then discussed and organized their ideas collaboratively and assigned specific presentation roles to each member. Throughout this preparation process, participants received both peer support and teacher guidance during class time. After each presentation session, students completed a feedback sheet consisting of self-assessment and peer-feedback components. Previous research has suggested that peer review and feedback activities may encourage reflection, collaborative learning, and greater awareness of presentation performance (Blumenstock & Peragine, 2021; Ho, 2020). These feedback activities were conducted four times throughout the academic year in order to encourage reflection on both individual performance and the presentations de-

livered by other groups. In addition, at the end of the fall semester, participants completed a reflection sheet in the form of a questionnaire regarding their overall experiences with group presentations. The responses to this final questionnaire served as the primary source of data for the present study.

Although the presentation format differed depending on the academic year, with presentations conducted online in 2021 and face-to-face in 2023, the overall course structure, presentation schedule, group size, and presentation themes remained consistent across both cohorts. This consistency allowed for a more focused comparison of students' perceptions regarding online and face-to-face group presentations.

Data Collection and Analysis

At the end of the fall semester, students completed a questionnaire regarding their experiences with group presentations (see Appendix A). The questionnaire consisted of closed-ended and open-ended items. Questions 1–8 employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree and were designed to examine students' perceptions regarding communicative development, confidence, collaboration, audience awareness, and presentation performance across different presentation environments. In particular, Question 6 focused on students' self-evaluation of various aspects of their presentations, including content, delivery, body language, and language use. In addition, Questions 9–13 consisted of open-ended items designed to explore students' reflections on the benefits and challenges of preparing for and delivering group presentations, as well as their preferences regarding online and face-to-face presentation formats. Participants were also encouraged to provide additional comments throughout the questionnaire when necessary.

The quantitative data obtained from the Likert-scale items were analyzed using descriptive statistics in order to identify overall tendencies in students' perceptions of the presentation activities. Mean scores and response patterns were compared between the online-presentation cohort and the face-to-face-presentation cohort to examine similarities and differences in students' experiences across the two presentation formats. The qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questionnaire items were analyzed through thematic analysis, with students' responses repeatedly reviewed and coded according to recurring themes and patterns related to the benefits and challenges of preparing for and delivering group presentations. The analysis particularly focused on identifying (a) common benefits and challenges shared across both presentation formats, (b) benefits and challenges specifically associated with online group presentations, and (c) benefits and challenges specifically associated with face-to-face group presentations. These analytical categories were established in alignment with the three research questions of the present study.

4. Findings

This section presents the major findings from a post-presentation questionnaire administered to students in both the online and face-to-face classes. The findings are presented in the same order as the questionnaire and are organized into three domains: (1) overall impressions, including several subcategories; (2) benefits and challenges; and (3) preferences regarding presentation formats. To further illustrate students' experiences, selected comments are included in this section. These excerpts are reproduced in their original form, including grammatical and linguistic inaccuracies. Although some overlap naturally existed between preparation- and delivery-related experiences, student responses were categorized according to the primary focus of each comment.

Overall Impressions: Experience, Topic, Speaking Skills, Confidence, and Collaboration

The quantitative results for Items 1–5, which focused on presentation experience, topic, speaking skills, confidence, and collaboration, are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Questionnaire Results for Items 1–5 (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Items	Options	Online (2021)		Face-to-Face (2023)	
		n	%	n	%
1. Group presentations were a good experience for you.	SA	18	81.82%	17	77.27%
	A	4	18.18%	5	22.73%
	N	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	D	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
2. The topics for group presentations were interesting to you.	SA	15	68.18%	5	22.73%
	A	4	18.18%	13	59.09%
	N	2	9.09%	3	13.64%
	D	1	4.55%	1	4.55%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
3. Group presentations improved your overall speaking skills.	SA	11	50.00%	12	54.55%
	A	8	36.36%	9	40.91%
	N	3	13.64%	1	4.55%
	D	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
4. Group presentations helped you gain confidence in English.	SA	8	36.36%	8	36.36%
	A	9	40.91%	10	45.45%
	N	3	13.64%	3	13.64%
	D	1	4.55%	1	4.55%
	SD	1	4.55%	0	0.00%
5. Group presentations helped you improve your collaborative attitude.	SA	16	72.73%	14	63.64%
	A	6	27.27%	6	27.27%
	N	0	0.00%	1	4.55%
	D	0	0.00%	1	4.55%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neutral; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree

Overall, learners in both classes evaluated the group presentation activities positively. Across all five questionnaire items, most students selected either “strongly agree” or “agree,” whereas relatively few respondents selected neutral or negative responses. These findings suggest that group presentations were generally perceived as beneficial learning experiences regardless of instructional format.

To examine each category in greater detail, Item 1 explored whether group presentation activities were viewed as meaningful learning experiences. All participants in both learning environments selected either “strongly agree” or “agree,” with no neutral or negative responses. This unanimous positive evaluation indicates that the group presentation activities were broadly accepted and regarded as valuable components of the course. Item 2 examined whether students considered the presentation topics interesting. Positive responses were dominant in both learning environments. In both classes, more than 80% of students selected either “strongly agree” or “agree,” demonstrating that the presentation topics were generally perceived positively by students. Item 3 focused on students’ perceptions of improvements in their overall speaking skills through the group presentation activities. In the online class, more than 85% of students selected positive responses, while nearly all students in the face-to-face class selected either “strongly agree” or “agree.” These response patterns suggest that students in both classes generally recognized the presentations as opportunities to practice and develop oral communication skills.

Contrary to the positive patterns identified in Items 1-3, responses to Item 4 regarding confidence development demonstrated a slightly different tendency. In the online class, 77.27% of students selected either “strongly agree” or “agree” that group presentations helped them gain confidence in English, while 13.64% selected neutral responses and 9.09% selected negative responses. In the face-to-face class, 81.82% selected either “strongly agree” or “agree,” whereas 13.64% selected neutral responses and 4.55% selected disagree. Compared with the other questionnaire items, responses to this category appeared somewhat more varied across both learning environments, particularly in the online class. Students’ written comments further illustrated these perceptions. For instance, one participant in the online class commented, “I could gain a confidence when I could give good presentation.” Similarly, a student in the face-to-face class explained that “It was helpful to be able to see others opinions about my presentation on the review sheet.” These comments reveal that successful presentation experiences and peer feedback contributed positively to students’ self-confidence. At the same time, some students also referred to difficulties related to confidence, especially in the online environment. One respondent noted, “It is difficult for me to see audience reaction so I could not know my presentation was interesting for them. Thus, honestly, it is not helpful for me to do an online presentation.” Another learner wrote, “I lose a confidence in English because the pronunciation of other class member was good.” These comments indicate that students experienced both positive and neg-

ative emotional reactions during the presentation activities. They also suggest that audience visibility and peer comparison may have influenced students' confidence differently.

Item 5 examined students' perceptions regarding collaborative attitudes developed through the group presentations. Positive responses were highly dominant in both classes. In the online class, all students selected either "strongly agree" or "agree," with no neutral or negative responses. In the face-to-face class, over 90% of students selected either "strongly agree" or "agree," although a small number of students selected neutral or disagree responses (4.55% each). These findings indicate that collaborative learning was recognized as one of the central features of the presentation activities. At the same time, the written comments additionally revealed both positive and challenging aspects of collaboration. One student in the online class stated, "I worked on my presentation with my classmates outside of class, which I think helped me to be more cooperative." Likewise, a participant in the face-to-face class observed, "Group members were changed every time, so we needed to collaborate." In contrast, several students also described difficulties associated with collaborative preparation. For example, one respondent explained, "It was difficult to gather up and we ended up making slides individually." Another student commented, "I feel my group members always made presentation by ourselves and we need more preparation and practice as a group." These comments suggest that although many students perceived collaborative benefits, some groups experienced difficulties coordinating schedules, sharing responsibilities, and preparing collectively.

Taken together, the findings from Items 1–5 indicate that students in both learning environments generally evaluated the group presentation activities positively. In particular, students frequently recognized benefits related to speaking skill development, collaboration, and overall learning experiences. However, perceptions regarding confidence appeared somewhat more mixed, especially in the online environment, where difficulties related to audience awareness and communication were more noticeable.

Overall Impressions: Delivery and Body Language

Item 6 of the questionnaire included several presentation-related categories, such as content, delivery, body language, and language use. Due to space limitations and the greater relevance of certain findings to the present study, this section focuses primarily on delivery- and body language-related aspects.

First, Table 5 summarizes students' perceptions regarding delivery-related aspects of their presentations.

Table 5

Questionnaire Results for Item 6: Attention to Delivery Aspects of Presentations (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Items	Options	Online (2021)		Face-to-Face (2023)	
		n	%	n	%
You paid attention to the volume of your presentation.	SA	9	40.91%	9	40.91%
	A	12	54.55%	9	40.91%
	N	0	0.00%	4	18.18%
	D	1	4.55%	0	0.00%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
You paid attention to the speed of your presentation.	SA	7	31.82%	11	50.00%
	A	11	50.00%	8	36.36%
	N	2	9.09%	3	13.64%
	D	2	9.09%	0	0.00%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
You paid attention to the use of pausing in your presentation.	SA	4	18.18%	7	31.82%
	A	8	36.36%	10	45.45%
	N	8	36.36%	0	0.00%
	D	2	9.09%	5	22.73%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
You paid attention to the speaking rhythm of your presentation.	SA	5	22.73%	7	31.82%
	A	8	36.36%	12	54.55%
	N	9	40.91%	1	4.55%
	D	0	0.00%	2	9.09%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
You paid attention to the pronunciation of your presentation.	SA	6	27.27%	9	40.91%
	A	10	45.45%	6	27.27%
	N	5	22.73%	5	22.73%
	D	0	0.00%	2	9.09%
	SD	1	4.55%	0	0.00%

Participants in both cohorts reported paying attention to multiple elements of presentation delivery, including volume, speed, pausing, speaking rhythm, and pronunciation. Across most categories, relatively high percentages of students selected either “strongly agree” or “agree,” suggesting that delivery-related skills were important considerations during presentations.

Several common tendencies were observed across the two learning environments. In both classes, many students reported paying attention to presentation volume and speed. More than 80% of students in both classes selected positive responses for presentation speed, while over 80% of students in the online class and approximately 81% of students in the face-to-face class responded positively regarding presentation volume. Positive responses regarding pronunciation were also dominant in both learning environments, although a certain number of students selected neutral responses. These results suggest that students in both classes generally recognized the importance of basic delivery-related skills during presentations.

At the same time, several notable tendencies appeared in the online class. In particular, relatively large percentages of students selected neutral responses for pausing and speaking rhythm. For the item concerning speaking rhythm, 40.91% of students in the online class selected neutral responses, while 36.36% selected neutral responses regarding pausing. In addition, a small number of students selected disagree or strongly disagree responses for speed and pronunciation. Compared with the face-to-face class, students in the online environment appeared to demonstrate less consistent awareness of timing- and rhythm-related aspects of delivery.

In contrast, students in the face-to-face class reported stronger attention to several delivery-related features. Positive responses were especially high for presentation speed, speaking rhythm, and pausing. For example, 86.36% of students selected positive responses regarding speaking rhythm, while 77.27% responded positively for pausing. Furthermore, only 4.55% of students selected neutral responses regarding speaking rhythm, and no students selected neutral responses for pausing. These response patterns imply that students in the face-to-face class may have been more conscious of real-time delivery features while preparing and delivering their presentations. Clearer contrasts between the two classes emerged in relation to pausing and speaking rhythm, with students in the face-to-face class tending to report greater awareness of these aspects than those in the online class.

Table 6 summarizes students' perceptions regarding body language aspects of their presentations.

Table 6

Questionnaire Results for Item 6: Attention to Body Language Aspects of Presentations (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Items	Options	Online (2021)		Face-to-Face (2023)	
		n	%	n	%
You paid attention to making eye contact during your presentation.	SA	3	13.64%	10	45.45%
	A	3	13.64%	7	31.82%
	N	10	45.45%	3	13.64%
	D	4	18.18%	2	9.09%
	SD	2	9.09%	0	0.00%
You paid attention to using hand gestures during your presentation.	SA	2	9.09%	5	22.73%
	A	1	4.55%	7	31.82%
	N	7	31.82%	4	18.18%
	D	8	36.36%	6	27.27%
	SD	4	18.18%	0	0.00%
You paid attention to your posture during your presentation.	SA	2	9.09%	7	31.82%
	A	7	31.82%	9	40.91%
	N	5	22.73%	3	13.64%
	D	7	31.82%	3	13.64%
	SD	1	4.55%	0	0.00%

Compared with the delivery-related findings presented in Table 5, substantially clearer differ-

ences emerged between the two learning environments in relation to body language. In particular, students in the face-to-face class reported much stronger attention to body language-related aspects than those in the online class.

Although students in both learning environments reported some attention to body language during presentations, the degree of attention varied considerably between the two classes. Positive responses were observed in both classes for eye contact, hand gestures, and posture, although the percentages were substantially higher in the face-to-face class. These response patterns imply that students in both environments were at least somewhat aware of the role of nonverbal communication during presentations, while demonstrating markedly different levels of attention to specific body language-related features.

Nevertheless, several notable tendencies appeared in the online class. Responses regarding eye contact showed relatively mixed perceptions, with 45.45% of students selecting neutral responses and 27.27% selecting negative responses. One student commented, "Due to the presentation was done online, I couldn't do eye contact." Similarly, students in the online class reported relatively low levels of attention to hand gestures. More than half of the students selected disagree or strongly disagree responses regarding the use of hand gestures, while only 13.64% selected positive responses. Responses concerning posture also appeared mixed, with positive and negative responses occurring at relatively similar levels. These findings demonstrate that the online environment may have reduced students' awareness of certain nonverbal communication behaviors during presentations.

In contrast, students in the face-to-face class demonstrated considerably stronger positive perceptions regarding body language. For eye contact, more than 75% of students selected either "strongly agree" or "agree" that they paid attention to making eye contact during presentations. Positive responses were also dominant regarding posture, with over 70% of students selecting either "strongly agree" or "agree." One student stated, "I could do presentations with eye contact much better than before." Although responses regarding hand gestures were somewhat more varied than those for eye contact and posture, positive responses still exceeded negative responses overall. These results support the view that students in the face-to-face class were more conscious of body language-related aspects while preparing and delivering presentations.

Overall, much clearer contrasts emerged between the online and face-to-face classes in relation to body language than in relation to the previous delivery-related findings. In particular, students in the face-to-face class tended to report substantially stronger attention to eye contact, hand gestures, and posture, whereas students in the online class appeared less attentive to these nonverbal aspects of presentation performance.

Overall Impressions: Script and Audience

Table 7 summarizes students' perceptions regarding script use and audience experience during the group presentation activities.

Table 7

Questionnaire Results for Item 7–8: Script Use and Audience Experience (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Items	Options	Online (2021)		Face-to-Face (2023)	
		n	%	n	%
7. As a speaker, you tried to avoid relying heavily on presentation scripts.	SA	1	4.55%	6	27.27%
	A	6	27.27%	11	50.00%
	N	9	40.91%	4	18.18%
	D	5	22.73%	1	4.55%
	SD	1	4.55%	0	0.00%
8. Listening to other presentations as an audience was a useful experience for you.	SA	18	81.82%	16	72.73%
	A	4	18.18%	5	22.73%
	N	0	0.00%	1	4.55%
	D	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
	SD	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

Compared with the previous findings related to delivery and body language, the results for Items 7 and 8 revealed contrasting tendencies between the two learning environments. In particular, clearer differences emerged regarding students' reliance on presentation scripts, whereas responses concerning audience experience were highly positive in both classes.

One shared tendency across both learning environments was that students generally perceived listening to other presentations as a valuable experience. In the online class, all students selected either "strongly agree" or "agree" that listening to other presentations as audience members was useful. Similarly, in the face-to-face class, more than 95% of students selected positive responses, while only a small number of students selected neutral responses. No students in either class selected disagree or strongly disagree responses. These results are consistent to the view that students recognized educational value not only in delivering presentations but also in observing and learning from the presentations of others.

At the same time, in the online class, several notable tendencies appeared regarding script use. Responses to Item 7 showed relatively mixed perceptions, with 40.91% of students selecting neutral responses and 27.27% selecting either "disagree" or "strongly disagree" regarding avoiding heavy reliance on presentation scripts. Only 31.82% selected positive responses. Compared with the face-to-face class, students in the online environment appeared more likely to depend on scripts during presentations. By contrast, students in the face-to-face class reported substantially stronger attention to

avoiding excessive script dependence. More than three-quarters of the students selected either “strongly agree” or “agree,” while only 4.55% selected disagree responses. These findings suggest that students in the face-to-face environment demonstrated greater awareness of reducing reliance on presentation scripts, possibly because live interaction with the audience encouraged more spontaneous delivery.

Taken together, the findings indicate that students in both learning environments valued audience experience positively. However, clearer contrasts emerged regarding presentation script use, with students in the face-to-face class tending to report lower levels of script dependence than those in the online class.

Benefits and Challenges of Group Presentation Preparation

Together with examining students’ overall impressions of the presentation activities, the questionnaire also explored students’ perceptions regarding both the preparation and delivery stages of group presentations. Table 8 summarizes students’ responses concerning the perceived benefits and challenges experienced during presentation preparation. These responses revealed that learners in both classes experienced a mixture of academic, linguistic, and collaborative benefits during preparation, while also encountering several practical and communicative difficulties. Although many shared tendencies could be identified across the two classes, some differences also emerged in relation to the specific preparation-related experiences emphasized by students.

A noticeable tendency in both classes was the perceived importance of collaboration and knowledge development during the preparation process. In the online class, the most frequently reported benefits were learning new knowledge and collaborating with others, while students in the face-to-face class also highlighted these categories prominently. In addition, students in both learning environments referred to creating slides, improving English or reading skills, learning presentation skills, and writing presentation scripts as positive aspects of preparation. These responses indicate that preparing for presentations was viewed not only as a task directly related to presentation performance itself, but also as a broader learning opportunity involving communication, language development, and academic skill building.

The responses additionally revealed several challenges shared across the two learning environments. In both classes, students frequently mentioned difficulties related to summarizing content and giving clear explanations, creating and using slides, scheduling meetings and practice sessions, and struggling with English skills. Writing presentation scripts and gathering information were also identified as challenges in both classes. These responses imply that students often experienced difficulties balancing linguistic, organizational, and communicative demands while preparing their presentations.

Table 8

Summary of Student Responses Regarding Group Presentation Preparation (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Categories	Online (2021)	Face-to-Face (2023)
Benefits		
Learning new knowledge	9	7
Collaborating with others	8	7
Creating slides	3	3
Writing presentation scripts	1	2
Crafting effective expressions	1	1
Gathering information	1	1
Preparing online via Zoom and LINE	2	0
Feeling less stressed	1	0
Improving English / reading skills	2	3
Learning presentation skills	2	2
Challenges		
Summarizing content / Giving clear explanations	4	4
Creating and using slides	4	1
Scheduling meetings and practice sessions	3	1
Struggling with English skills	3	2
Writing presentation scripts	3	3
Preparing online	4	0
Gathering information	3	0
Time management during preparation	1	0
Attracting the audience	0	2
Managing time effectively	0	2
Memorizing presentation scripts	0	1
Making presentations	0	1
Feeling nervous	0	1
Collaborating with group members	0	1
NA / Others	1	2

Note. NA = No answer. "Others" includes comments that did not fit the identified categories.

Some preparation-related experiences appeared to be more characteristic of the online class. For example, preparing online via Zoom and LINE was identified as a unique benefit of the online environment, reflecting the role of digital communication tools during collaborative preparation. At the same time, students in the online class frequently referred to time management during preparation, preparing online itself, and gathering information as challenges. Compared with the face-to-face class, these responses suggest that students in the online environment devoted greater attention to coordinating preparation activities and managing tasks remotely.

Different tendencies emerged in the face-to-face class. While collaboration and knowledge development were also emphasized positively, several challenges appeared to be more closely connected to live presentation performance. For instance, students in the face-to-face class referred to at-

tracting the audience, memorizing presentation scripts, making presentations, and feeling nervous as preparation-related difficulties. These responses are consistent with the view that students in the face-to-face environment were more conscious of audience interaction and real-time presentation performance even during the preparation stage.

Overall, the findings indicate that participants in both cohorts experienced both benefits and challenges while preparing for group presentations. However, the nature of these experiences differed to some extent across the two classes. Whereas students in the online class tended to emphasize organizational and remote-collaboration issues, students in the face-to-face class appeared to focus more strongly on concerns associated with live presentation delivery and audience engagement.

Benefits and Challenges of Group Presentation Delivery

In addition to the preparation stage, the study also examined students' perceptions regarding the benefits and challenges experienced during the delivery stage of group presentations. Table 9 summarizes these responses from students in the online and face-to-face classes. Several common tendencies were observed across the two learning environments, although some differences also emerged regarding the specific experiences reported by students.

One common benefit observed in both learning environments was the perceived value of presentation performance itself. In both the online and face-to-face classes, several students identified making presentations as a beneficial experience. Similarly, gaining confidence or feeling less nervous was frequently mentioned in both classes, suggesting that presentation activities contributed to students' emotional development as speakers. Students in both learning environments also referred to gaining new knowledge or vocabulary and improving English skills as positive aspects of the presentation activities. These findings indicate that students perceived both linguistic and personal benefits through the process of preparing and delivering group presentations.

At the same time, several common challenges were reported across the two classes. Managing time effectively was identified as a challenge in both learning environments, particularly in the online class. Students in both classes also mentioned attracting the audience, struggling with delivery or body language, collaborating with others, and writing presentation scripts as difficulties associated with presentations. These responses highlight the challenges students experienced not only in organizing presentation content but also in maintaining effective communication and coordination during presentation preparation and delivery.

Several tendencies appeared to be more characteristic of the online class. The most frequently reported benefit in the online environment was using and creating slides, followed by making presentations and gaining confidence or feeling less nervous. In contrast, conducting presentations online itself was identified as a unique challenge in the online class. In addition, managing time effectively

Table 9

Summary of Student Responses Regarding Group Presentation Delivery (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Categories	Online (2021)	Face-to-Face (2023)
Benefits		
Using and creating slides	7	2
Making presentations	3	3
Gaining confidence / Feeling less nervous	3	3
Gaining new knowledge / vocabulary	2	3
Collaborating with others	2	8
Improving English skills	2	1
Attracting the audience	2	0
Writing presentation scripts	1	0
Feeling a sense of accomplishment	0	1
Researching	0	1
NA / Others	1	1
Challenges		
Managing time effectively	5	3
Creating slides	3	1
Attracting the audience	2	2
Struggling with delivery / body language	2	2
Collaborating with others	2	1
Writing presentation scripts	1	1
Judging the amount / reliability of information	1	1
Feeling nervous	2	0
Conducting presentation online	1	0
Listening to other presentations	1	0
Lacking practice	0	2
Relying on scripts	0	2
NA / Others	1	4

Note. NA = No answer. "Others" includes comments that did not fit the identified categories.

and creating slides were reported relatively frequently as challenges. Compared with the face-to-face class, students in the online environment appeared to focus more heavily on technical and organizational aspects of presentation preparation and delivery.

Different tendencies were observed in the face-to-face class. Collaborating with others was the most frequently mentioned benefit, while making presentations, gaining confidence or feeling less nervous, and gaining new knowledge or vocabulary were also commonly reported. Regarding challenges, feeling nervous was mentioned more frequently in the face-to-face class than in the online class. In addition, relying on scripts and lacking practice were reported only in the face-to-face environment. These findings suggest that students in the face-to-face class experienced stronger awareness of audience interaction and live presentation performance.

Overall, learners in both classes experienced a mixture of benefits and challenges while pre-

paring and delivering group presentations. While students in both classes reported improvements related to presentation experience, confidence, collaboration, and English skills, differences emerged in the types of challenges students emphasized. In particular, students in the online class appeared to report more technical and organizational challenges, whereas students in the face-to-face class appeared to report greater concerns related to live presentation performance and audience awareness.

Students' Preferences: Online, Face-to-Face or Both

The questionnaire used in this study also explored students' preferences regarding presentation formats in order to better contextualize their overall learning experiences. Table 10 presents students' preferences for presentation formats after completing either online or face-to-face group presentation activities.

Table 10

Students' Preferences for Presentation Formats (Online: n = 22; Face-to-Face: n = 22)

Options	Online (2021)		Face-to-Face (2023)	
	n	%	n	%
Online	4	18.18%	0	0.00%
Face-to-face	11	50.00%	18	81.82%
Both formats	6	27.27%	4	18.18%
No response	1	4.55%	0	0.00%

Note. One participant in the online class did not respond to this item.

In both groups, face-to-face presentations were the most preferred format. In the online class, exactly half of the participants selected face-to-face presentations as their preferred format, while nearly 30% preferred both formats and less than 20% preferred online presentations. In contrast, students in the face-to-face class showed a much stronger preference for face-to-face presentations, with more than 80% selecting this option and no students preferring online presentations. Less than 20% of the participants in the face-to-face class selected both formats. One participant in the online class did not respond to this questionnaire item.

These findings suggest that students generally perceived face-to-face presentations more positively than online presentations, regardless of the instructional format they experienced during the course. For example, one student in the face-to-face class stated, "I prefer face-to-face presentations because they make me more nervous than online ones. I have a strong desire to overcome this tension while I am still a student. I think online presentations can be an escape. When I present online, I can look at the script if I want to." This comment is particularly noteworthy, as it may indicate that some students viewed face-to-face presentations as a more meaningful opportunity to develop public

speaking skills and overcome presentation anxiety.

At the same time, a notable minority of students in the online class selected “both formats,” which may indicate that some students recognized advantages in combining the flexibility and convenience of online presentations with the communicative and interactive benefits of face-to-face presentations. Similarly, one student in the face-to-face class commented, “In this day and age, there are likely to be opportunities to give online presentations when we enter the workforce, so I thought it would be nice to have the chance to practice that as well.” This perspective may reflect students' recognition of the practical importance of developing presentation skills in both online and face-to-face environments for future professional contexts.

Another noteworthy characteristic of the students who preferred online presentations was their concern regarding the psychological pressure associated with face-to-face presentations. Importantly, these students had experienced only online group presentations and had not experienced face-to-face presentation activities during the course. Three out of the four participants who preferred online presentations referred to this issue in their additional comments. One example can be seen in the following student comment: “Because I don't have to look directly at the audience which doesn't make me feel more nervous speaking to them.” This observation suggests that online presentations were perceived by some students as psychologically less stressful environments for speaking in front of others.

5. Discussions

The present study explored students' perceptions of online and face-to-face group presentations in English language learning environments by examining their overall impressions, perceived benefits and challenges, and preferences regarding presentation formats. Overall, the findings indicate that students in both learning environments generally evaluated group presentations positively and recognized multiple linguistic, collaborative, and communicative benefits through the activities. At the same time, several noticeable differences emerged between the online and face-to-face presentation environments.

Regarding the first research question, which examined common benefits and challenges experienced across both learning environments, the findings revealed several shared tendencies. In both the online and face-to-face classes, students frequently referred to benefits related to speaking skill development, collaboration, confidence development, and knowledge acquisition. These findings support previous research claiming that group presentation activities can promote communicative competence, collaborative learning, and personal growth in higher education contexts (e.g., Rossin & Hyland, 2003). In addition, many students appeared to perceive group presentations not only as speaking

activities, but also as broader opportunities to develop academic and interpersonal skills through co-operation, information gathering, and presentation preparation, which is consistent with previous discussions of collaborative learning and group work-based development (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Rossin & Hyland, 2003).

At the same time, learners in both environments also experienced several common challenges. Difficulties related to organizing information, summarizing content, creating slides, managing schedules, and English language difficulties were frequently reported in both classes. These patterns indicate that group presentations may impose multiple linguistic, organizational, and collaborative demands on learners simultaneously, supporting previous research indicating that presentation experiences are shaped by various instructional, interpersonal, and psychological factors (De Grez et al., 2009; Tsang, 2020). In particular, successful presentation performance may depend not only on speaking ability itself, but also on students' abilities to coordinate group work, manage time effectively, and communicate ideas clearly to others.

Regarding the second research question focusing on online presentations, several tendencies appeared to be characteristic of the online environment. One notable finding was that students in the online class tended to demonstrate weaker awareness of body language-related aspects such as eye contact, posture, hand gestures, pausing, and speaking rhythm. Compared with students in the face-to-face class, online learners tended to report more neutral or negative responses regarding these nonverbal aspects of presentation performance. One possible explanation is that the online environment reduced students' opportunities to consciously engage with audience reactions and real-time physical interaction during presentations, which has also been suggested in previous studies examining communicative limitations in online presentation environments (Blumenstock & Peragine, 2021; Campbell, 2015).

At the same time, several students in the online class appeared to perceive online presentations as psychologically safer and less stressful than face-to-face presentations. Some participants suggested that online presentations reduced nervousness because they did not need to directly face the audience and could rely more easily on presentation scripts when necessary. These findings partially support the study conducted by Campbell (2015), which suggested that online presentation environments may help reduce presentation anxiety. However, the present study also revealed that students generally preferred face-to-face presentations despite these potential psychological advantages of online presentations. This contrast may indicate that students' evaluations of presentation environments are influenced not only by anxiety reduction, but also by perceptions of communication quality, audience engagement, and opportunities for public speaking development.

Regarding the third research question focusing on face-to-face presentations, students in the face-to-face class demonstrated substantially stronger awareness of audience interaction and live presentation performance. In particular, clearer differences emerged regarding eye contact, posture,

speaking rhythm, pausing, and reducing script dependence. These findings suggest that face-to-face presentations may encourage students to pay greater attention to real-time audience awareness and nonverbal communication behaviors during presentations, which are often regarded as important components of oral presentation competence (De Grez et al., 2009; van Ginkel et al., 2015).

Interestingly, some students also appeared to perceive nervousness itself as educationally meaningful in the face-to-face environment. One participant explicitly stated a desire to overcome presentation anxiety while still being a student and described online presentations as a possible “escape.” This comment is particularly noteworthy because it suggests that certain students may view face-to-face presentations not simply as stressful experiences, but as important opportunities for personal growth and public speaking development. Such findings may indicate that moderate levels of presentation-related tension can sometimes function as productive learning experiences rather than purely negative factors, particularly in communicative learning environments where emotional and interpersonal dimensions influence participation and development (Dörnyei & Murphey, 2003; Tsang, 2020).

Several pedagogical implications can be drawn from the present study. First, the findings suggest that group presentations can provide valuable opportunities for developing speaking skills, collaboration, confidence, and communicative competence regardless of instructional format. In this regard, teachers may be able to motivate students to practice and improve their presentation skills by sharing the positive experiences and benefits reported by previous participants during both the preparation and delivery stages of presentations. At the same time, the findings also highlight the importance of providing sufficient support for students in relation to the various challenges identified during preparation and presentation delivery, particularly those associated with different presentation formats.

Second, because online and face-to-face presentations appeared to promote somewhat different communicative experiences, incorporating both formats into English language courses may help students develop broader presentation-related skills. This interpretation is consistent with previous research suggesting that different presentation environments may support different forms of communication and interaction (Campbell, 2015; Ho, 2020). In particular, face-to-face presentations may contribute more strongly to audience awareness and nonverbal communication skills, whereas online presentations may provide psychologically supportive environments for students who experience strong speaking anxiety while also helping students develop digital communication abilities that are increasingly important in contemporary academic and professional contexts.

The findings additionally suggest the importance of carefully considering the relationship between teaching and learning activities (TLAs) and intended learning outcomes (ILOs). As noted by Leichsenring (2010), differences may exist between teachers' perspectives and students' actual

learning experiences during presentation activities. For example, while teachers may intend presentations to promote spontaneous communication skills, some students may respond to presentation anxiety by memorizing scripts excessively. Similarly, presentation preparation may become overly focused on creating slides rather than developing communication skills, a tendency that was also identified in the results of the present study, while collaborative activities may sometimes lead students to compare themselves negatively with peers and lose confidence. Accordingly, instructors should carefully design presentation-related activities and provide appropriate support in order to encourage closer alignment between students' learning experiences and intended educational outcomes.

Finally, although several noticeable differences emerged between the two learning environments, these findings should be interpreted cautiously. Because the online and face-to-face classes belonged to different academic years and cohorts, some differences may have reflected contextual or cohort-related factors rather than presentation format alone. In addition, the present study relied primarily on self-reported questionnaire data and did not directly measure actual presentation performance or anxiety levels. Future research involving larger participant groups and additional qualitative or performance-based measures may further clarify how different presentation environments influence students' communication development and presentation experiences over time.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated students' perceptions of online and face-to-face group presentations in English language learning environments by examining their overall impressions, perceived benefits and challenges, and preferences regarding presentation formats. Overall, the findings demonstrated that students generally viewed group presentations positively and recognized a range of linguistic, collaborative, and communicative benefits through the activities.

The study additionally revealed that online and face-to-face presentation environments were associated with different types of learning experiences and communicative tendencies. While face-to-face presentations appeared to encourage stronger engagement with audience awareness and live communication, online presentations seemed to provide more psychologically accessible environments for some learners. Taken together, these results highlight the potential value of incorporating both presentation formats into English language courses in order to support the development of diverse presentation-related skills relevant to contemporary academic and professional contexts.

Several limitations should also be acknowledged. The study involved a relatively small number of participants from different academic cohorts and relied primarily on self-reported questionnaire data. Future research involving larger participant groups and additional qualitative or perfor-

mance-based measures may further clarify how different presentation environments influence students' communication development and presentation experiences over time. Despite these limitations, it is hoped that the findings of the present study may assist teachers in higher education in providing appropriate support for students to achieve more successful and meaningful group presentation experiences in both face-to-face and online environments, even though face-to-face instruction has become increasingly common following the COVID-19 pandemic.

References

- Blumenstock, A., & Peragine, M. (2021). Student perception of asynchronous semi-anonymous peer feedback efficacy in online EFL presentation classes. *Journal of Foreign Language Education and Technology*, 6(2), 146–153.
- Brooks, G., & Wilson, J. (2014). Using oral presentations to improve students' English language skills. *Kwansei Gakuin University Humanities Review*, 19, 199–212.
- Campbell, S. (2015). Presentation anxiety analysis: Comparing face-to-face presentations and webinars. *Journal of Case Studies in Education*, 7, 1–13.
- Chan, V. (2011). Teaching oral communication in undergraduate science: Are we doing enough and doing it right? *Journal of Learning Design*, 4(3), 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.5204/jld.v4i3.82>
- De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2009). The impact of goal orientation, self-reflection and personal characteristics on the acquisition of oral presentation skills. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 24(3), 293–306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-008-0016-6>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Murphey, T. (2003). *Group dynamics in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- EduLinX. (n.d.). *Tracker for the TOEIC L&R*. <https://service.edulinx.co.jp/service/courses/tracker-for-the-toeic-lr>
- ETS Japan. (n.d.). *About the TOEFL ITP test*. <https://www.toefl-ibt.jp/toefl-ipt/testtaker/about.html>
- Frisby, B. N., & Martin, M. M. (2010). Instructor–student and student–student rapport in the classroom. *Communication Education*, 59(2), 146–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903564362>
- Ho, E. (2020). Online peer review of oral presentations: Students' perspectives. *RELJ Journal*, 51(3), 436–450. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688219878581>
- Institute for International Business Communication. (n.d.). *TOEIC program and CEFR*. https://www.iibc-global.org/toeic/official_data/toeic_cefr.html
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. *Theory Into Practice*, 38(2), 67–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849909543834>
- Leichsenring, A. (2010). What do first-year Japanese EFL students learn by preparing and presenting group-work-oriented oral presentations? *Bulletin of Hokuriku University*, 34, 1–14.
- McEntire, J., & Williams, J. (2021). *Making Connections Level 2 students' book with integrated digital learning: Skills and strategies for academic reading* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Meiji Gakuin University. (n.d.). *Department of International Business*. https://www.meijigakuin.ac.jp/en/academics/economics/international_business/
- Rossin, D., & Hyland, T. (2003). Group work-based learning within higher education: An integral ingredient for the personal and social development of students. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 11(2), 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611260306860>
- Ryczek, M. (2019). Discussion leadership in the EFL classroom. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & R. Gentry (Eds.), *Teacher efficacy, learner agency* (pp. 358–363). JALT. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2019-42>
- Tickle-Degnen, L., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). The nature of rapport and its nonverbal correlates. *Psychological Inquiry*, 1(4), 285–293. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0104_1
- Tsang, A. (2020). *Enhancing learners' awareness of oral presentation (delivery) skills in the context of self-regulated learn-*

- ing. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 21(1), 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417731214>
- van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2015). Towards a set of design principles for developing oral presentation competence: A synthesis of research in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 14, 62-80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.02.002>
- Živković, S. (2014). The importance of oral presentations for university students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 468-475. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p468>

Appendix A

Group Presentation Questionnaire

General Perceptions

For Items 1–5 and Items 7–8, please choose one of the five options indicated below:

SA = Strongly Agree / A = Agree / N = Neutral / D = Disagree / SD = Strongly Disagree

For Item 6 only, mark “✓” in one of the five categories. Additional comments may be provided for Items 1–8 when necessary.

1. Group presentations were a good experience for you.

SA A N D SD

--

2. The topics for group presentations were interesting to you.

SA A N D SD

--

3. Group presentations improved your overall speaking skills.

SA A N D SD

--

4. Group presentations helped you gain confidence in English.

SA A N D SD

--

5. Group presentations helped you improve your collaborative attitude.

SA A N D SD

--

6. As a speaker, you paid attention to the quality of the following aspects of your presentation. Mark “✓” in one of the five categories.

* Language Use = word choice, grammar, sentence structure

	SA	A	N	D	SD
Content – Overall meaning					
Content – Clear explanation					
Content – Personal experience / opinion					
Content – Group opinion					
Delivery – Volume					
Delivery – Speed					
Delivery – Pausing					
Delivery – Rhythm					
Delivery – Pronunciation					
Body Language – Eye contact					
Body Language – Hand gestures					
Body Language – Posture					
Language Use* – Accuracy					
Language Use* – Variety					
Language Use* – Formality					

7. As a speaker, you tried to avoid relying heavily on presentation scripts SA A N D SD

8. Listening to other presentations as an audience was a useful experience for you. SA A N D SD

Preparation and Presentation

For Items 9–12, please answer each question with some relevant details.

9. What were the greatest benefits for you in preparing for group presentations?

10. What were the greatest challenges for you in preparing for group presentations?

11. What were the greatest benefits for you in making group presentations?

12. What were the greatest challenges for you in making group presentations?

Presentation Preferences

For Item 13, please choose one of the presentation styles: online, face-to-face, or both. Additional comments may be provided to explain the choice.

13. Which would you prefer: online presentations, face-to-face presentations, or both? Why?

Online Face-to-Face Both