

# TRANSLATION STUDENTS' PEER FEEDBACK FOR LEARNING ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES (ESP): FINDINGS FROM A CASE STUDY IN LITHUANIA

NIJOLĖ BURKŠAITIENĖ

Department of Translation Studies, Institute for Literary, Cultural and Translation Studies Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University  
Universiteto g. 3, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania  
**E-mail address:** [nijole.burksaitiene@flf.vu.lt](mailto:nijole.burksaitiene@flf.vu.lt)  
**ORCID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3806-3392>

## ABSTRACT

**Aim.** The use of feedback (including peer-generated feedback) for learning has been widely investigated across many fields of study; however, no research into its use in Translation Studies has been conducted yet. To fill in this gap, the present small-scale study was carried out at a university in Lithuania. It investigated undergraduate translation students' feedback on their peers' ESP oral performance by addressing the main research question: what areas are identified as those that need further improvement?

**Methods.** The present research was conducted with the participation of 42 undergraduate students who were majors in Translation Studies. To carry out the research, a qualitative methodology was chosen. The data were drawn from the study participants' feedback sheets and investigated using inductive content analysis.

**Results.** The study resulted in the identification and detailed description of four major categories and ten subcategories that reflect the areas that call for further work on, including the presentation content, the use of language, the presentation delivery mode, and the use of slides.

**Conclusion.** The findings lead to the conclusion that peer feedback, as used in this study, can be viewed as a tool providing its receivers with an opportunity for learning as it supports and directs them toward further improvement.

**Originality.** The present research contributes to the literature by providing insights into the use of peer feedback for learning ESP in Translation Studies at the university.

**Key words:** peer feedback, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), presentations, Translation Studies, higher education



## INTRODUCTION

The use of feedback for learning and assessment purposes has been extensively researched in different fields of study. It has been reported that it is a powerful tool to improve learning and achievement (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Carless et al., 2010; Filius et al., 2018; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Huang, 2018; Liu & Carless, 2006; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). It has been established that to foster learning, feedback should be effective. This means that it should be used so that students are actively engaged in the process of learning and in the dialogue with feedback providers (teachers and/or peers), which helps feedback receivers understand feedback, learn from it and act on it (Burkšaitienė, 2012; Gan et al., 2021; Geitz et al., 2015; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Walker, 2009).

Investigations into the use of feedback for assessment purposes demonstrate that it can be difficult to measure its effectiveness and that students may not always recognise its benefits (Price et al., 2010). It has been suggested that it is vital to maintain a dialogue between feedback providers and receivers in order to reach a mutual understanding of the purposes of feedback as well as to develop “assessment literacy” of both parties, which can contribute to feedback effectiveness (p. 288). It has also been reported that feedback effectiveness is related to a student’s ability to self-regulate one’s own learning, which in turn may promote their academic achievement, motivation, and lifelong learning (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Zumbunn et al., 2011).

The most recent research has been focused on sustainable feedback and sustainable assessment (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Carless et al., 2010; Geitz et al., 2015). For example, David Carless et al. (2010) stressed the importance of moving away from what they called conventional feedback practices that are based on teacher-generated feedback toward sustainable feedback which was defined as “dialogic processes and activities which can support and inform the student on the current task, whilst also developing the ability to self-regulate performance on future tasks” (p. 397). It was concluded that even though students may view self-regulatory practices as challenging, the process can be supported by involving them in regular self-evaluation and peer feedback practices. Along similar lines, David Boud and Elizabeth Molloy (2013) proposed a model aimed at fostering learning in which students were enabled to self-generate feedback and self-assess their own learning. According to the authors, in this way conditions for sustainable assessment were created, which had an impact on students’ goal orientation and could lead to a shift in their approach to learning. On the other hand, it was also established that moving to the model where the focus is placed on student self-feedback rather than on teacher-generated feedback can pose a challenge for the developers of curricula. Similar findings were reported by Gerry Geitz et al. (2015), who followed Boud and Molloy’s (2013) suggested approach to student-generated (sustainable) feed-

back and used it in an experiment in an undergraduate course of Business Administration. The results demonstrated that self-feedback supported a deep learning-related behaviour of those students whose goals were mastery-oriented and that the students “lacking sustainable feedback showed a decrease of deep learning on an individual level” (p. 289).

In higher education contexts, research into the use of peer-feedback for learning and assessment purposes has been conducted in different fields of study, including teacher training, epidemiology, teaching foreign languages, etc. It has been reported that peer feedback can have different impacts on student learning and performance, which depends on its type and the way it is provided to learners (Chen, 2016; Day et al., 2022; Filius et al., 2018; Gikandi & Morrow, 2016; Pham, 2021; Ruegg, 2018; Yang, 2016). For instance, Jane Gikandi and Donna Morrow (2016) investigated peer formative feedback used in online learning environments in postgraduate continuing teacher education. Their findings showed that it fostered students’ engagement in learning and promoted self-regulation of learning. On the other hand, the results of other studies were different. To illustrate the point, Indira Day, Nadira Saab and Wilfried Admiraal (2022) analysed the use of online peer feedback on video presentations. Their investigation, which was conducted in undergraduate Education and Child Studies, showed that peer feedback did not have a direct impact on the improvement of the study participants’ performance (i.e., on their presentation skills). Similarly, the study of Renée Filius et al. (2018), who focused on the use of peer feedback in a postgraduate online epidemiology course, demonstrated that students’ deep learning was fostered not by the feedback itself but by the dialogues held between the feedback providers and feedback receivers.

The relevant literature shows that investigations into peer feedback in the field of English studies have been mainly focused on its use for learning English as a second language (ESL) or English as a foreign language (EFL). Most of these investigations have reported on the benefits of peer feedback for productive skills of ESL and EFL (Chen, 2016; Pham, 2021; Ruegg, 2018; Yang, 2016); however, research into peer feedback for learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP) has been scarce. To the best of our knowledge, a single known previous study explored peer feedback used to foster undergraduate law students’ metacognitive skills at a university in Lithuania (Burkšaitienė, 2012). The findings revealed that the feedback providers were actively engaged in the process of reflecting on their peers’ performance and that peer feedback directed its receivers towards further learning.

The literature review shows that no research into the use of peer feedback for fostering learning ESP in Translation Studies has been conducted yet. To fill in this gap, the present study was carried out at a university in Lithuania. It aimed at answering two major research questions: (1) what areas in ESP oral performance are identified by peer feedback providers as those that meet the established academic requirements? and (2) what areas

in ESP oral performance are identified by peer feedback providers as those that need further improvement? To carry out the research, a qualitative approach was chosen. The present investigation reports only on the results regarding the second research question. It starts from a review of the relevant literature, followed by the description of the research methodology and the research limitation. Then the findings of the study are presented, the conclusions drawn, and implications for further research made.

## LITERATURE OVERVIEW

### **Peer Feedback in the Studies of ESL/EFL and ESP in Higher Education**

In the present research, peer feedback is operationalised as information which is provided to students by other students and denotes communication via which they discuss performance and performance standards (Liu & Carless, 2006). Prior research shows that in higher education peer feedback can be used as a strategy aimed at supporting other students' learning or as a form of assessment (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Liu & Carless, 2006). It is worth noting here that peer feedback is considered to have more potential when it is used to promote learning rather than for assessing it because "while producing feedback, students engage in the process of articulating their understanding of what they are learning" (Liu & Carless, 2006, p. 281). The process of generating feedback may result in developing students' deeper understanding of the subject matter, of the required performance benchmarks and the ability to learn from their peers' successes and/or failures.

The literature reporting on the use of peer feedback in the studies of ESL/EFL has demonstrated two main trends. First, due to the rapid development of Web 2.0 technologies, computer-assisted/technology-enhanced peer feedback has been extensively used instead of or together with traditional face-to-face peer feedback. Second, recent research has been mainly focused on the impact that peer feedback makes on students' ESL/EFL productive skills (Chen, 2016; Ruegg, 2018; Yang, 2016). For instance, in her research synthesis of 20 articles published from 1990 to 2010, Tsuiping Chen (2016) established that technology-enhanced peer feedback has been widely used in ESL/EFL classrooms to foster productive writing skills since 1990. According to the author, the situation changed in 2000. Since then, the use of technology-enhanced feedback has been growing steadily in comparison with the use of traditional face-to-face peer feedback. Chen (2016) noted that technology-enhanced feedback was reported as being beneficial both for ESL/EFL students and teachers. On the one hand, it widened students' access to written discourse. This indirectly promoted their writing skills and helped them solve some problems that are common in face-to-face peer feedback practices (e.g. unequal student participation, dominating personalities, etc.). On the other hand, it allowed ESL/EFL teachers to

manage the process of students' interactions more effectively. Similar findings were reported by Yu-Fen Yang (2016) who used online collaborative peer feedback in an experiment at a university of science and technology in Taiwan. The researcher aimed at establishing the impact of summary writing on EFL graduate students' academic knowledge. The findings showed that peer feedback fostered the experimental group students' academic reading and writing skills, raised their language awareness and promoted critical thinking. However, it was also reported that some students found it difficult to provide feedback on their peers' summaries. It seems that the challenge was due to the lack of feedback providers' self-confidence to comment on their peers' work, which suggested that students should be adequately trained to be able to overcome such a challenge.

In the most recent research on peer feedback in EFL studies, a comparative analysis of the impacts of peer feedback and teacher feedback on students' self-efficacy (confidence) in EFL essay writing was carried out by Rachael Ruegg (2018). The author conducted an experiment at a Japanese university during which one group of students received teacher-generated feedback on the drafts of their essays. The students in the other group generated feedback themselves and received feedback from their peers on each draft of their essay. It was found that the essay writing self-efficacy (confidence) increased significantly more in the group which received teacher-generated feedback than in the group which gave and received peer feedback. It was suggested that when given alone, peer feedback may be less beneficial for self-efficacy (confidence) in writing than the feedback given by the teacher alone. In another example, in a small-scale study conducted by Ha Pham (2021) the impacts of two forms of peer feedback (asynchronous computer-assisted written feedback and traditional oral face-to-face feedback) and their sequences on students' comments and revision of writing tasks were analysed. The research was carried out at a university in Vietnam with the participation of future ESP (English for Engineering) teachers. The study participants provided asynchronous computer-assisted written feedback in Google Docs and traditional oral face-to-face feedback on their peers' written works in two different sequences. The study revealed that the impact of each form of peer feedback differed. For example, it was established that a bigger number of revision-oriented comments were related to asynchronous computer-assisted written peer feedback which was followed by traditional oral face-to-face feedback. It is worth mentioning that even though the students viewed asynchronous computer-assisted written peer feedback as more useful than traditional oral face-to-face feedback, most of them agreed to using both forms of feedback.

As it has already been mentioned, the use of peer feedback in the studies of ESP in higher education contexts has not been investigated much yet. To the best of our knowledge, one more previous study explored peer feedback used for fostering undergraduate law students' metacognitive skills of thinking about learning in a course of Legal English at a university in Lithu-

ania (Burkšaitienė, 2012). It was established that peer feedback providers were actively engaged in the process of reflecting on their peers' performance and provided feedback which was beneficial for both the feedback providers and feedback receivers.

The literature review shows that the use of peer feedback for learning ESP in Translation Studies has not been conducted yet. To fill in this gap, the present study was conducted at a university in Lithuania. It explored 42 undergraduate translation students' feedback on their peers' individual oral presentations on an ESP topic by addressing two main research questions: (1) what areas in ESP oral performance are identified by peer feedback providers as those that meet the established academic requirements? and (2) what areas in ESP oral performance are identified by peer feedback providers as those that need further improvement? The present paper reports only on the results of students' responses to the second research question. To carry out the research, a qualitative approach was chosen.

## METHODOLOGY

The theoretical rationale behind this study is the theory of formative assessment, also called assessment for learning. Its central idea is that the main purpose of feedback is to reduce discrepancies between current understandings, student performance and the goal (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). The most important theoretical assumption underlying this theory is that feedback should support and direct learners to move forward on the level of the task, process, self-regulation, and self-level (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). According to Shu-Chen Huang (2018), to help students to improve, their ability to provide feedback for future learning should be fostered. This includes not only formulating the shortcomings or gaps in one's performance, but also suggesting ways of how to improve, reflecting on them and presenting them to the peers.

### Research Context and Participants

The present research was conducted with the participation of 45 second-year students of Translation Studies who attended an English for Specific Purposes course. The course lasted for 16 weeks (4 academic hours per week) and consisted of different mandatory and optional assignments. Making a presentation on a chosen ESP topic was a mandatory assignment which had to be prepared individually and accounted for at the end of the course. All study participants were pre-taught how to make academic presentations. To support them to provide feedback on their peers' presentations, the following performance criteria were pre-taught: presentation structure, the use of ESP language, answering the problem question, presentation delivery mode, and different aspects of preparing one's presentation. The study participants were asked to listen to their peers' presentations, compare their performance against these criteria and respond to

two open-ended questions mentioned above. After the presentations, the feedback receivers had a possibility to analyse the feedback provided to them and discuss it with its providers as well as with the teacher.

### **Data Analysis**

The present study is part of a bigger investigation in which 45 study participants were asked to respond to two open-ended questions mentioned above. Forty-two students responded to both questions. To address the research question of the present study, the findings regarding the second question will be discussed.

The data for the present research were drawn from the study participants' feedback sheets and analysed using the method of inductive content analysis. The suitability of this method for the present study is supported by the literature. According to Satu Elo and Helvi Kyngäs (2007), this method allows to establish content-related categories that result in a comprehensive description of the phenomenon. Content analysis may be used in a deductive and inductive way. Deductive content analysis is usually used when the purpose of the study is to test a previous theory or to retest previously established data in new contexts. To analyse the data in the present study, inductive content analysis was chosen as "it is used in cases where there are no previous studies dealing with the phenomenon or when it is fragmented" (Elo & Kyngäs, 2007, p. 107).

The data for the present research were analysed following the analysis process described by Elo and Kyngäs (2007). During the preparation stage, students' responses were read several times and the units of analysis that were relevant to the research questions were selected. The second stage consisted of (i) open coding (the headings reflecting all aspects of peer-identified performance gaps and peer-perceived ways how to close them were written down in the margins of the feedback sheets and initial categories were generated); (ii) grouping (lists of categories were grouped under higher order headings), and (iii) abstraction (each category was named, subcategories identified and grouped). During the final stage, samples illustrating each subcategory were provided.

The limitation of the present research is the number of its participants, which does not allow for wide-scale generalisations. However, this number could not have been bigger as all undergraduate students who were in their second year of Translation Studies participated in the investigation.

## **RESULTS**

The results of the inductive content analysis of the data of peer feedback on ESP oral presentations revealed four major categories that include ten subcategories. They reflect the areas in the feedback receivers' performance that needed further improvement: (1) Presentation content, (2) Use of lan-

guage, (3) Delivery mode, and (4) Presentation slides, summarised in Table 1. As some students (S) presented more than one response, the number of responses is bigger than the number of the students.

**Table 1**

*The Main Categories and Subcategories of the Areas that Need Further Improvement*

Categories	Subcategories
1. Presentation content	1.1. Presentation focus and unsupported ideas (n = 4) 1.2. Recommendations (n = 2)
2. Use of language	2.1. Pronunciation & grammar mistakes (n = 16) 2.2. Improper use of ESP vocabulary (n = 2)
3. Delivery mode	3.1. Reading (n = 15) 3.2. Eye contact (n = 6) 3.3. Loudness (n = 9) 3.4. Timing (n = 2)
4. Presentation slides	4.1. The amount of text/information (n = 14) 4.2. Use of visual information (n = 7)

Source: own research

### **Category 1: Presentation Content**

The first category, *Presentation content*, emerged when the feedback providers were analysing the validity of relations between the central idea of their peers' presentation and the main concepts used by them or between the central idea, the supporting ideas and the samples chosen to illustrate them, as well as the validity of conclusions. This category covers two subcategories (reported by 6 feedback providers): *presentation focus and unsupported ideas* and *recommendations*. The first subcategory, *presentation focus and unsupported ideas*, covers four cases (examples 1-4). Examples 1-2 illustrate the feedback providers' comments regarding a mismatch between the topic of the presentation and the actual information provided by the presenters:

- (1) "The topic [of the presentation] and the information presented should match; some information was not to the point." (S 20)
- (2) "The topic mentioned Europe, however, it was not discussed at all." (S 24)

Example 3 shows that the presenter did not explain the rationale for choosing the topic for analysis and that the presentation was not adequately supported by evidence and examples. Similarly, example 4 demonstrates that the presenter did not illustrate the main ideas:

- (3) "The reason why this topic was chosen was not mentioned. The talk could be based on more interesting sources, and more evidence and examples could be provided." (S 26)
- (4) "The main ideas were not supported by examples. More examples would have made a better presentation." (S 28)

The second subcategory (examples 5-6) includes *recommendations* given by two feedback providers to their peers. These examples suggest that both

feedback providers were aware of the requirements of making academic presentations on a specific ESP topic, which enabled them to identify important gaps in their peers' performance and make these recommendations:

- (5) "Specific research should be used for the talk, e.g. talking to an expert in the field or conducting a survey." (S 27)
- (6) "It would be great to add English subtitles to the video because it was really difficult to understand what foreign students were saying in their native languages." (S 41)

Thus, example 5 illustrates that the feedback provider indirectly stated that their peer's presentation did not include research-based facts and/or expert-provided information, which was one of the main requirements for ESP presentations. Example 6, on the other hand, shows that a problem caused by a video demonstrated during the presentation was identified, i.e. the video had no subtitles in English, which was mandatory in cases when the interviewees spoke other languages than English.

These findings show that presentation content was the area which caused some problems to only a few presenters, suggesting that most presenters were aware of the main requirements regarding this aspect and met them while making ESP presentations.

### Category 2: Use of Language

The second category, *Use of language*, emerged when the feedback providers were describing the use of ESP domain-related language, pronunciation of ESP terms and grammatical accuracy of the presentation language. This category covers two subcategories (reported by 18 feedback providers): *pronunciation & grammar mistakes* (examples 7-14) and the *improper use of ESP vocabulary* (examples 15-16). The extracts presented below illustrate that 16 feedback providers noted that their peers made pronunciation mistakes and that 4 feedback providers from among those 16 stated that their peers made both pronunciation and grammar mistakes (example 7):

- (7) "There were some pronunciation and grammar mistakes." (S 12, 15, 20, 36)
- (8) "There were some pronunciation issues." (S 16, 17)
- (9) "Work on your pronunciation of business English." (S 22)
- (10) "There were some pronunciation mistakes." (S 18, 19, 23, 37, 38)
- (11) "Some ESP terms (e.g. nausea) were mispronounced." (S 24)
- (12) "I think there were some difficulties with the pronunciation of legal terms." (S 31)
- (13) "A good presentation, only you should work on your pronunciation." (S 35)
- (14) "I'd recommend improving your pronunciation." (S 39)

The second subcategory, *Use of ESP vocabulary*, covers comments made by 2 feedback providers (examples 15-16):

- (15) "ESP terms were not explained; thus, it was difficult to understand them." (S 21)
- (16) "The language was too scientific." (S 28)

Example 15 shows that the feedback provider established that the presenter did not explain ESP terms to the audience, which caused difficulty to understand them. Example 16 demonstrates that the language of the presentation was perceived as too scientific, suggesting that ESP-related words and phrases could have been new to the audience and could not have been explained during the presentation.

These findings show that, on the one hand, pronunciation in general and pronunciation of ESP terms and specific phrases in particular was the area which was challenging to 18 presenters and called for further learning. On the other hand, it can be stated that the use of ESP domain-related language was a challenge to just a few presenters.

### Category 3: Delivery Mode

The third category, *Delivery mode*, emerged when the feedback providers were describing the way how presentations were made. This category includes four subcategories: *reading* (reported by 15 feedback providers, examples 17-25), *eye contact* (reported by 6 feedback providers, examples 26-31), *loudness* (reported by 9 feedback providers, examples 32-37), and *timing* (reported by 2 feedback providers, examples 38-39). The findings show that the major problem in their peers' presentation delivery mode was reading from one's slides or notes rather than talking while making a presentation:

- (17) "Too much reading!" (S 4)
- (18) "Reading from the slides." (S 5, 21, 23, 24, 25)
- (19) "Less reading from the slides." (S 3, 14)
- (20) "Too much reading from the notes." (S 1, 27)
- (21) "It is more interesting when a person doesn't read from his slides because it's difficult to focus." (S 30)
- (22) "Less reading from the slides." (S 32)
- (23) "I wish you could speak, not read." (S 33)
- (24) "The disadvantage was reading from your notes." (S 38)
- (25) "Next time, try not to read." (S 42)

The second subcategory, *eye contact*, includes six feedback comments illustrating that the presenters either did not use eye contact effectively or that it was used only with the teacher, forgetting about one's audience:

- (26) "More interaction needed." (S 2)
- (27) "There was almost no eye contact." (S 7)
- (28) "More eye contact with the audience, not only with the teacher." (S 18)
- (29) "More contact with the audience is desired." (S 33)
- (30) "Use eye contact with the audience!" (S 36)
- (31) "I'd recommend speaking freely and having eye contact with the audience." (S 40)

The third subcategory, *loudness*, shows that nine feedback providers considered that their peers' talk was not loud enough, suggesting that it was difficult to hear what was being said. The examples below also show

that it was recommended to talk louder while making presentations in the future and that in one case it was stated that the presenter's voice made a feedback provider sleepy:

- (32) "I couldn't hear anything. You have a nice voice, please speak louder next time!" (S 1)
- (33) "You should talk louder." (S 4)
- (34) "You were speaking not loud enough." (S 3, 5, 7, 8)
- (35) "It would have been better if you had talked louder." (S 6)
- (36) "Louder speaking is recommended." (S 9)
- (37) "Your voice made me sleepy." (S 13)

The fourth subcategory, *timing*, reveals that the formal requirement of presentation time (15 minutes) was not met by two presenters, which can be seen from these extracts:

- (38) "Your presentation was too short." (S 2)
- (39) "It's too short, not according to the requirements." (S 6)

These results demonstrate that the mode of delivering presentations was the area which calls for much improvement in the future and that particular attention should be paid to fostering one's ability to talk in front of the audience rather than to read while making a presentation.

#### **Category 4: Presentation Slides**

The fourth category, the *Presentation slides*, covers the comments made by 21 feedback providers (examples 40-52). This category includes two subcategories that reflect the areas that the students should reflect on and work on: the *amount of text or information* on the slides (reported by 12 feedback providers, examples 40-45) and the *use of visuals* for one's presentation (reported by two feedback providers, examples 46-47). Examples 40-45 show that the amount of text or information (e.g. statistics) given on their peers' slides was considered by feedback providers as too big:

- (40) "... Too much text on the slides." (S 2, 6, 7, 11, 18)
- (41) "On some slides, there was too much text." (S 3, 4)
- (42) "Less text on the slides. More visual information." (S 9)
- (43) "Less text on the slides." (S 14)
- (44) "Too much information." (S 16, 17)
- (45) "Too many numbers and statistics." (S 34)

Examples 46-47 show that two feedback providers not only stated the fact that the amount of information given on the slides was too big, but also that some of it was boring (example 46) and that one's slides should include statements of one's talk rather than a long text (example 47):

- (46) "... There was too much information on the slides, and some of it was boring." (S10)
- (47) "I'd recommend less text on the slides, there should be bullets and statements instead." (S 38)

The subcategory the *use of visual information* covers the comments of 7 feedback providers (examples 48-52) that demonstrate different aspects of

inadequate use of visual information in their peers' presentations. They include poor design of the slides, complete absence of visual information (e.g. pictures, photos, etc.) or lack of visual information:

(48) "The design was a minus." (S 12)

(49) "There should be more photos of environmental issues you have mentioned." (S 19)

(50) "No pictures nor videos were used." (S 21)

(51) "Lack of visual material and/or videos." (S 23, 29, 30)

(52) "There should be more photos or images on the slides." (S 39)

These results suggest that the major problem in this area was caused by the presenters' inadequate skills in summarising and generalising. It is these skills that are vital in the academic environment as they enable the students to put lengthy sources into a short form. On the other hand, the findings also suggest that feedback providers were aware of the requirements regarding the quality of slides and identified the cases in which these requirements were not met.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present study allow us to conclude that the area which needs most improvement is the presentation delivery mode (mentioned by 76% of feedback providers). This area covers problems that are both language specific and general competencies-related: reading rather than talking while making a presentation was identified by feedback providers as the most common gap in their peers' performance (stated by 36%), followed by speaking not loudly enough (21%), ineffective use of eye contact (14%), and not meeting the requirement of a presentation time limit (5%). These findings can be useful both to the feedback receivers and to their teachers as they can direct their learning and teaching towards better future results.

The second major area which needs further work on is the use of presentation slides (mentioned by half of the feedback providers), which includes two performance gaps. First, it was established that peers should learn to use a proper amount of information on their slides. Second, they should learn how to use visual information effectively. It might seem that those students who used too much text on their slides did not know the requirements regarding the amount of text to be used on them. However, this may not be the case as all students were pre-taught how to prepare presentation slides. Thus, it may be assumed that the students who used too much text on the slides were reading it while making their presentations.

The third area which was viewed as one which calls for further learning is the use of language (mentioned by almost 43% of feedback providers), including pronunciation accuracy (38%) and grammar accuracy (5%). These

results suggest that pronunciation of ESP terms and specific phrases was challenging to more than a third of presenters, whereas grammar did not pose many difficulties to most presenters. Such results may be explained by the fact that translation students usually have a B2-C1 level of English, whereas pronunciation problems may have been caused by the novelty of the ESP language (the study participants had not studied it before they took this course).

The fourth area in presenters' ESP oral performance which calls for attention is presentation content (reported by 15% of feedback providers). This includes a wrong presentation focus and the use of unsupported ideas (each gap was reported by 5% of feedback providers) and concrete suggestions for the improvement of peers' presentation content (made by 5% of feedback providers). These findings suggest that most presenters met the requirements regarding presentation content successfully and that those who did not meet them were provided with clearly formulated feedback that they could later reflect and act on.

The findings of the present study show that feedback receivers were given an opportunity to analyse and reflect on the feedback formulated as their ESP performance gaps. These findings are in accord with what John Hattie and Helen Timperley (2007) call "Feed forward" feedback. Such feedback provides its receivers with the answers to the question "Where to next?", which is vital to improving one's performance.

The results of the present research lead to the general conclusion that peer feedback, as used in the present study, can be viewed as a tool providing its receivers with an opportunity for learning as it supports and directs them toward further improvement. More specifically, the results show that feedback was communicated clearly and understandably; thus, it could be viewed as an opportunity for learning, which is in line with Peter Knight and Mantz Yorke's (2003) idea that feedback should show how the student can develop in respect of future learning.

The findings of this study also allow us to conclude that feedback receivers were provided with a possibility to analyse and reflect not only on understandably formulated comments regarding the established discrepancies between their ESP oral performance and the requirements but also on some concrete suggestions or solutions to the identified problem areas. These results support Huang's (2018) idea that providing feedback for future learning includes not only formulating performance gaps or shortcomings but also making suggestions on what can be done and reflecting on them to the feedback receivers.

The present research is innovative as it is one of the first investigations in the field of Translation Studies which has focused on the use of peer feedback for learning ESP. It contributes to the literature by widening our understanding of peer feedback providers' views of their peers' ESP oral performance.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There is little known research on how peer feedback on ESP performance is perceived by peer feedback receivers themselves and how they act on such feedback. Therefore, further research in the field is recommended. It would deepen our understanding of the ways how peer feedback receivers can be supported to act on valuable feedback.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Boud, D. (2000). Sustainable assessment: Rethinking assessment for the learning society. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 22(2), 151-167.
- [2] Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698-712.
- [3] Burksaitienė, N. (2012). Peer feedback for fostering students' metacognitive skills of thinking about learning in a course of English for Law. *Socialinių mokslų studijos/Societal Studies*, 4(4), 1341-1355.
- [4] Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J. (2010). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(4), 395-407.
- [5] Chen, T. (2016). Technology-supported peer feedback in ESL/EFL writing classes: A research synthesis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(2), 365-397.
- [6] Day, I. N. Z., Saab, N., & Admiraal, W. (2022). Online peer feedback on video presentations: Type of feedback and improvement of presentation skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 183-197. DOI:10.1080/02602938.2021.1904826.
- [7] Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2007). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x.
- [8] Fillius, R. M., de Kleijn, R. A. M., Uijl, S. G., Prins, F. J., van Rijen, H. V. M., & Grobbee, D. E. (2018). Strengthening dialogue peer feedback aiming for deep learning in SPOCs. *Computers & Education*, 125(2018), 86-100. DOI: 10.1016/j.compedu.2018.06.004
- [9] Gan, Z., Hu, G., Wang, W., Nang, H., & An, Z. (2021). Feedback behaviour and preference in university academic English courses: Associations with English language self-efficacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 740-755. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1810628.
- [10] Geitz, G., Joosten-ten Brinke, D., & Kirschner, P. (2015). Goal orientation, deep learning, and sustainable feedback in higher business education. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 26, 273-292.
- [11] Gikandi, J. W., & Morrow, D. (2016). Designing and implementing peer formative feedback within online learning environments. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 25(2), 153-170.
- [12] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 8-112.
- [13] Huang, S.-C. (2018). A GEARed peer feedback model and implications for learning facilitation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1194-1210. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2018.1439881.
- [14] Knight, P., & Yorke, M. (2003). *Assessment, learning and employability*. Maidenhead, UK: SRHE/Open University Press.
- [15] Liu, N.-F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 279-290.
- [16] Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- [17] Pham, H. T. P. (2021). Computer-mediated and face-to-face peer feedback: Student feedback and revision in EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. DOI: 10.1080/09588221.2020.1868530.
- [18] Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what

is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(3), 277-289.

- [19] Ruegg, R. (2018). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in EFL students' writing self-efficacy. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(2), 87-102.
- [20] Walker, M. (2009). An investigation into written comments on assignments: Do students find them usable? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(1), 67-78.
- [21] Yang, Y.-F. (2016). Transforming and constructing academic knowledge through online peer feedback in summary writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 29(4), 683-702.
- [22] Zumbrunn, S., Tadlock, J., & Roberts, E. D. (2011). *Encouraging self-regulated learning in the classroom: A review of the literature*. Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium: Virginia Commonwealth University. [https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=merc\\_pub](https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1017&context=merc_pub).