

## THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PEER FEEDBACK VS TEACHER FEEDBACK ON PRONUNCIATION DEVELOPMENT

Akhmadullayeva Mubina Khamidullo qizi

Faculty of Language and Translation,

Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Namangan, Uzbekistan

ahmadullayevamubina2@gmail.com

### Abstract

This study explores the goods of an automated corrective feedback- grounded peer assessment approach on learners' pronunciation development, provocation, and tone- regulated literacy in a foreign language environment. predicated in constructivist and pupil- centred perspectives, aquasi-experimental design was conducted with undergraduate scholars learning French, who were assigned to experimental and control groups. While the experimental group engaged in AI-supported feedback integrated with structured peer assessment conditioning, the control group entered conventional schoolteacher- led feedback. Data were collected through pre- and post-tests, questionnaires, and interviews to capture both performance issues and learner comprehensions. The findings suggest that the integration of automated feedback with peer assessment contributes to conspicuous advancements in pronunciation performance and supports the development of natural provocation and tone-nonsupervisory chops. Although foreign provocation remained largely innocent, scholars in the experimental group displayed advanced situations of engagement, autonomy, and reflective literacy practices. Qualitative results farther indicate that learners appreciated the proximity, clarity, and substantiated nature of feedback, as well as the occasion to laboriously share in cooperative evaluation processes.

**Keywords:** Constructive assessment, provocation, tone-regulated literacy, metacognitive mindfulness, self-regulated learning.

### Introduction

In recent decades, perspectives on learning in advanced education have shifted from a traditional transmission model where knowledge is delivered by preceptors to a constructivist view in which scholars laboriously construct knowledge through engagement with content, discussion, and connection to previous understanding( Barr & Tagg, 1995; DeCorte, 1996; Nicol, 1997). This shift has led to the emergence of pupil- centred literacy, which emphasizes active participation and learner responsibility in managing the literacy process( Lea et al., 2003).

Despite these developments, constructive assessment and feedback practices have changed more sluggishly. In numerous educational surrounds, feedback remains largely schoolteacher- controlled and is viewed as the transmission of information about scholars' performance, which learners are anticipated to use to ameliorate unborn work( Boud, 2000; Sadler, 1998; Yorke, 2003). still, experimenters decreasingly question this approach.

The transmission model has several limitations. When feedback is dominated by preceptors, scholars have smaller openings to develop tone- regulation chops essential for lifelong literacy( Boud, 2000). likewise, feedback dispatches are frequently complex and may bear discussion



and active engagement for effective interpretation and use( Higgins et al., 2001 Ivanic et al., 2000). Feedback is also nearly linked to learners' provocation, beliefs, and emotional responses, impacting how scholars perceive themselves and regulate their literacy( Dweck, 1999; Garcia, 1995).

Given these challenges and the growing workload for preceptors in large classes, scholars have suggested redefining the sources of feedback, including peer and tone- assessment, as ways to enhance literacy processes( Boud, 2000). Accordingly, models of constructive assessment decreasingly emphasize learner tone- regulation, where scholars laboriously cover their progress, interpret feedback, and acclimate their literacy strategies( Black & Wiliam, 1998; Butler & Winne, 1995; Ivanic et al., 2000). This perspective aligns with pupil- centred and social constructivist approaches that punctuate active participation and cooperative literacy( Lea et al., 2003; Palinscar, 1998).

### LITERATURE REVIEW

In instructed alternate language accession, the primary thing is to enhance learners' L2 proficiency( Gass et al., 2013). Within this environment, the effectiveness of peer feedback( PF) compared to schoolteacher feedback( TF) has been extensively examined. Although PF is frequently considered less accurate and less focused than TF( Philip et al., 2014), exploration across multiple disciplines including alphabet, vocabulary, jotting, and pronunciation — demonstrates that PF can be inversely or indeed more effective than traditional schoolteacher- led feedback( Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Martin & Sippel, 2021a; Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel, 2019).

Empirical studies indicate that learners engaged in PF may outperform those entering TF, indeed when schoolteacher feedback is more frequent and accurate( Sippel et al., 2015). In pronunciation literacy specifically, learners furnishing peer feedback have shown lesser advancements in comprehensibility compared to those entering schoolteacher feedback( Martin & Sippel, 2021a). also, the benefits of PF appear to be more durable over time, as learners who laboriously handed feedback retained their literacy gains better than those who only entered feedback( Sippel & Martin, 2022).

The effectiveness of PF is largely attributed to the cognitive and interactive processes involved in giving feedback rather than entering it. furnishing feedback requires learners to identify crimes, compare them with their own verbal knowledge, and formulate corrections, thereby promoting deeper processing and active engagement( Sato, 2017). In discrepancy, entering feedback tends to be a further unresistant process, which may limit its impact on literacy.

enterprises regarding learners' stations toward PF have also been addressed in the literature. Findings suggest that learners generally hold positive comprehensions of peer feedback and do n't witness significant discomfort when corrected by peers( Martin & Sippel, 2021b).

To maximize the effectiveness of PF, certain educational design factors are essential. Research highlights the significance of training learners to give feedback, as trained scholars demonstrate significantly lesser literacy earnings than untrained peers( Sato & Lyster, 2012). Without similar training, PF may do less constantly and be less effective( Adams et al., 2011). also, incorporating metacognitive mindfulness — by explaining the purpose, mechanisms, and



benefits of PF — can foster more positive learner beliefs and enhance literacy issues( Mackey, 2016; Martin & Sippel, under review).

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed aquasi-experimental design to probe the goods of an automated corrective feedback- grounded peer assessment approach on learners' pronunciation performance, provocation, and tone- regulated literacy within an AI- supported language literacy terrain. The design and perpetration of the intervention were acclimated from former exploration on automated feedback and peer assessment in language literacy( Liu et al., 2023).

A aggregate of 66 undergraduate scholars from a Chinese university shared in the study. The actors included 26 males and 40 ladies with an average age of 21, all majoring in English and studying French as a foreign language. The learners had analogous proficiency situations and educational backgrounds. They were aimlessly assigned to two groups an experimental group conforming of 31 scholars and a control group conforming of 35 scholars. Participation was voluntary, and ethical considerations similar as informed concurrence and confidentiality were assured( Liu et al., 2023).

The study was conducted over a period of five weeks, with one 90- nanosecond session each week. At the morning of the trial, all actors completed a pre-test and questionnaires measuring literacy provocation and tone- regulated literacy. The educational process followed four stages accession, correction, reflection, and operation, grounded on the corrective feedback model proposed by Hattie and Timperley( 2007). In the experimental condition, learners used an AI- grounded operation equipped with automatic speech recognition to admit immediate corrective feedback on their pronunciation. subsequently, they estimated their peers' recordings using a structured assessment rubric. In discrepancy, learners in the control condition entered corrective feedback from the school teacher before engaging in peer assessment conditioning. At the end of the intervention, all actors completed post-tests and questionnaires, and named scholars shared insemi-structured interviews( Liu et al., 2023).

Data were collected using a combination of quantitative and qualitative instruments. Pronunciation performance was assessed through a 30- point test estimated by three experts using a rubric that measured vowels, consonants, stress, accentuation, and ignorance. The trustability of the scoring was assured through inter-rater agreement. Learning provocation was measured using a questionnaire acclimated from Wang and Chen( 2010), while tone- regulated literacy generalizations were assessed using an instrument grounded on Lee and Tsai( 2011). Both instruments employed a five- point Likert scale and demonstrated respectable trustability. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted to explore learners' comprehensions, and the qualitative data were transcribed and anatomized thematically( Liu et al., 2023).

The collected data were anatomized by comparing pre-test and post-test results to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. Quantitative data were used to measure advancements in pronunciation performance, provocation, and tone- regulated literacy, while qualitative data handed deeper perceptivity into learners' gests with the feedback approaches.



## RESULTS

The data were analyzed using ANCOVA after attesting the supposition of unity of regression pitches. The results indicated a statistically significant difference in learning achievement between the groups, with the experimental group outperforming the control group. This suggests that the integration of automated corrective feedback with peer assessment is more effective in perfecting pronunciation performance (Liu et al., 2023).

Regarding literacy provocation, no significant difference was set up in foreign provocation, whereas natural provocation was significantly advanced in the experimental group. This indicates that the intervention had a stronger impact on learners' internal engagement and interest in literacy (Liu et al., 2023).

In terms of tone-regulated literacy generalizations, the experimental group demonstrated significantly advanced situations than the control group, suggesting that the approach supports the development of independent literacy chops (Liu et al., 2023).

The correlation analysis revealed a significant relationship between peer and expert assessments in the experimental group, indicating advanced delicacy in peer evaluation. In discrepancy, no significant correlation was set up in the control group (Liu et al., 2023).

Qualitative findings from interviews showed that learners perceived the approach appreciatively, pressing benefits similar as immediate feedback, substantiated guidance, increased provocation, and deeper reflection. Overall, scholars expressed amenability to continue using the approach despite minor original difficulties (Liu et al., 2023).

DISCUSSION  
The findings of this study indicate that integrating automated corrective feedback with peer assessment significantly enhances pronunciation literacy, natural provocation, and tone-regulated literacy. These results are harmonious with previous exploration pressing the pedagogical value of technology-supported feedback and active learner engagement. For case, the effectiveness of AI-grounded feedback tools in perfecting language performance has been extensively proved due to their capability to give immediate, substantiated, and harmonious feedback (Wang & Zhao, 2020; Cukurova et al., 2019). also, the present findings align with Liu et al. (2023), who demonstrated that combining automated feedback with peer commerce leads to bettered literacy issues.

A crucial explanation for these advancements lies in the active part learners assume in peer feedback processes. Unlike traditional schoolteacher feedback, which frequently positions learners as unresistant donors, peer feedback encourages deeper cognitive engagement and reflection. This supports Sato's (2017) argument that learning earnings are largely driven by the process of furnishing feedback rather than simply entering it. Empirical studies further confirm that peer feedback can be as effective as, or indeed more effective than, schoolteacher feedback in developing pronunciation and other language chops (Martin & Sippel, 2021a; Sippel & Martin, 2022). The current findings support this perspective by demonstrating stronger performance and sustained engagement in feedback-rich surroundings.

The increase in natural provocation observed in this study is also supported by being literature. Technology-enhanced literacy surroundings tend to promote autonomy, inflexibility, and learner control, which are crucial motorists of natural provocation (Alamer & Al Khateeb, 2023; Yang & Chen, 2007). In discrepancy, foreign provocation remained unchanged, which aligns with exploration suggesting that external prices are less sensitive to educational



inventions( Tseng & Tsai, 2010). also, constructive feedback practices that emphasize progress rather than evaluation are known to foster provocation and positive tone- comprehensions( Nicol & Macfarlane- Dick, 2006; Dweck, 1999).

In terms of tone- regulated literacy, the findings confirm that feedback-rich and learner-centered surroundings grease the development of metacognitive and tone- monitoring chops. According to Zimmerman( 2001), tone- regulation involves active thing setting, monitoring, and strategic adaptation, all of which are supported through iterative feedback processes. The results are also harmonious with Nicol and Macfarlane- Dick( 2006), who emphasize that effective feedback should enable learners to close the gap between current and asked performance. The integration of automated feedback and peer commerce appears to give similar openings by encouraging nonstop practice, reflection, and modification.

also, the design of peer feedback interventions plays a pivotal part in maximizing their effectiveness. previous exploration emphasizes the significance of training learners, raising mindfulness about feedback processes, and furnishing clear guidelines( Sato & Lyster, 2012; Adams et al., 2011; Mackey, 2016). The structured approach espoused in this study, including guided feedback tasks and repeated practice cycles, aligns with these recommendations and may explain the positive issues observed.

## CONCLUSION

This study investigated the effects of integrating automated corrective feedback with peer assessment on learners' pronunciation performance, motivation, and self-regulated learning. The findings indicate that this combined approach is more effective than traditional feedback practices, as it contributes to improved learning outcomes, increased intrinsic motivation, and the development of learners' self-regulatory abilities.

The results highlight the value of shifting toward more learner-centered feedback practices. Engaging students in the process of providing and interpreting feedback encourages deeper cognitive involvement and supports more meaningful learning. At the same time, the use of AI-based tools enhances this process by offering immediate, individualized feedback, allowing learners to practice, reflect, and refine their performance more independently.

From a pedagogical perspective, these findings suggest that the integration of technology with structured peer feedback can address some limitations of conventional instruction and better support diverse learning needs. However, the effectiveness of such approaches depends on careful implementation, including appropriate guidance and opportunities for active learner engagement.

As a summary, the study reinforces the importance of interactive and feedback-rich learning environments in language education and points to the potential of combining technological and collaborative strategies to support more effective and autonomous learning.

## REFERENCES

1. Adams, R., Nuevo, A. M., & Egi, T. (2011). Explicit and implicit feedback, modified output, and L2 development. *Language Learning*, 61(1), 88–120.
2. Alamer, A., & Al Khateeb, A. (2023). Effects of using technology on motivation in language learning. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 123–140.



3. Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 27(6), 12–26.
4. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74.
5. Boud, D. (2000). Sustainable assessment: Rethinking assessment for the learning society. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 22(2), 151–167.
6. Butler, D. L., & Winne, P. H. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281.
7. Cukurova, M., Kent, C., & Luckin, R. (2019). Artificial intelligence and multimodal data in education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 50(6), 3031–3046.
8. De Corte, E. (1996). Changing views of learning and instruction. In E. De Corte & F. E. Weinert (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of developmental and instructional psychology* (pp. 33–41). Pergamon.
9. Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Psychology Press.
10. Garcia, T. (1995). The role of motivational strategies in self-regulated learning. In P. R. Pintrich (Ed.), *Understanding self-regulated learning* (pp. 29–42). Jossey-Bass.
11. Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
12. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112.
13. Higgins, R., Hartley, P., & Skelton, A. (2001). Getting the message across: The problem of communicating assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(2), 269–274.
14. Ivanic, R., Clark, R., & Rimmershaw, R. (2000). What am I supposed to make of this? *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 47–65.
15. Lea, S. J., Stephenson, D., & Troy, J. (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student-centred learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(3), 321–334.
16. Lee, M.-H., & Tsai, C.-C. (2011). Students' perceptions of collaboration and self-regulated learning. *Computers & Education*, 56(2), 485–495.
17. Liu, C.-C., Hwang, G.-J., Yu, P., Tu, Y.-F., & Wang, Y. (2023). Effects of an automated corrective feedback-based peer assessment approach. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 2405–2418.
18. Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30–43.
19. Mackey, A. (2016). *Input, interaction, and corrective feedback in L2 learning*. Oxford University Press.
20. Martin, I. A., & Sippel, L. (2021a). Peer feedback and pronunciation development. *Language Teaching Research*.
21. Martin, I. A., & Sippel, L. (2021b). Learner beliefs about peer feedback.
22. Nicol, D. (1997). Research on learning and teaching in universities. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 2(2), 1–14.
23. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218.



24. Palincsar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 345–375.
25. Philip, J., Adams, R., & Iwashita, N. (2014). Peer interaction and second language learning.
26. Sadler, D. R. (1998). Formative assessment: Revisiting the territory. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 77–84.
27. Sato, M. (2017). Oral peer corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 39(2), 277–301.
28. Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(4), 591–626.
29. Sippel, L. (2019). Peer feedback and vocabulary learning.
30. Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. (2015). Peer vs teacher feedback in grammar learning.
31. Sippel, L., & Martin, I. A. (2022). Long-term effects of peer feedback. *Language Teaching Research*.
32. Tseng, S.-C., & Tsai, C.-C. (2010). Self-efficacy and motivation in online peer assessment. *Internet and Higher Education*, 13(3), 164–169.
33. Wang, T.-H., & Chen, Y.-T. (2010). Effects of peer assessment on motivation. *Computers & Education*, 54(4), 1179–1187.
34. Wang, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2020). Automated corrective feedback in pronunciation learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(4), 1–23.s
35. Yang, Y.-F., & Chen, Y.-C. (2007). Effects of technology-enhanced learning on motivation. *Educational Technology & Society*, 10(4), 100–110.
36. Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education. *Higher Education*, 45(4), 477–501.
37. Zimmerman, B. J. (2001). Theories of self-regulated learning and academic achievement. In *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement* (pp. 1–37).

