Nastava i vaspitanje, 2026, *75*(2), 373-391
https://doi.org/10.5937/niv75-64939

ISSN 0547-3330
eISSN 2560-3051
Originalni naučni rad

Vršnjačka povratna informacija i usmeno izlaganje u nastavi engleskog jezika struke: percepcije studenata i pedagoške implikacije

Mirna Vidaković[1]
Ekonomski fakultet u Subotici, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Subotica, Srbija

Apstrakt *Iako se smatra jednom od ključnih kompetencija svršenih studenata i stručnjaka, veštini usmenog izlaganja se i dalje ne pridaje dovoljna pažnja u visokom obrazovanju. S obzirom na to da vršnjačka povratna informacija zauzima sve značajnije mesto u savremenom pedagoškom diskursu, ovaj rad sagledava njen potencijal za unapređenje veštine usmenog izlaganja studenata. U istraživanju, sprovedenom u kontekstu engleskog jezika struke, ispituju se iskustva davalaca i primalaca povratne informacije u pogledu prednosti i izazova ovog pristupa, kao i njegovog uticaja na kvalitet usmenog izlaganja. Cilj je formulisanje smernica za uspešnu integraciju vršnjačke povratne informacije u nastavnu praksu. Uzorak čini 60 studenata prve godine koji su pohađali predmet Engleski jezik za ekonomiste. Oni su, po završetku aktivnosti, popunili upitnik koji je sadržao pitanja višestrukog izbora, otvorenog tipa i Likertove skale. Kvantitativni i kvalitativni podaci analizirani su primenom deskriptivne statistike, Men–Vitnijevog testa i tematske analize sadržaja. Rezultati ukazuju na pozitivne stavove prema vršnjačkoj povratnoj informaciji, naročito kod onih ispitanika koji su preuzeli obe uloge. Učesnici u istraživanju su ovaj pristup prepoznali kao koristan za razvoj veštine usmenog izlaganja, kritičkog mišljenja, refleksije i samoregulisanog učenja. Uočeni su i izazovi u pogledu kvaliteta povratne informacije, emocionalne nelagodnosti, angažovanosti studenata i vremenskih ograničenja. Istraživanje naglašava značaj pažljivo osmišljenih nastavnih aktivnosti i istovremenog sagledavanja kognitivnih, socijalnih i afektivnih dimenzija prilikom uvođenja vršnjačke povratne informacije u proces učenja.*

Ključne reči: *vršnjačka povratna informacija, davalac povratne informacije, primalac povratne informacije, visoko obrazovanje, veština usmenog izlaganja.*

1 mirna.vidakovic@ef.uns.ac.rs

Uvod

Veština usmenog izlaganja danas se smatra jednim od ključnih atributa studenata i stručnjaka (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Palmour, 2026; van Ginkel et al., 2015, 2017). Međutim, obrazovne institucije neretko zanemaruju razvoj znanja i veština neophodnih za uspešno izlaganje ili primenjuju neefikasne pristupe (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Palmour, 2026; van Ginkel et al., 2015, 2017). Naime, veština usmenog izlaganja se uglavnom podrazumeva ili podučava kroz tradicionalne, preskriptivne oblike nastave i ocenjivanja, koji zapostavljaju aktivnu ulogu studenata i ograničavaju mogućnosti za vežbanje i dobijanje pravovremene i individualno prilagođene povratne informacije (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020; Qaiser et al., 2022; Zareva, 2009). Jedna od često navođenih definicija određuje ovaj konstrukt kao „kombinaciju znanja, veština i stavova neophodnih za javno nastupanje radi informisanja, samoizražavanja, uspostavljanja odnosa i ubeđivanja" (De Grez, 2009, str. 5), čime se naglašava njegova složenost i međusobna povezanost kognitivne, bihejvioralne i afektivne dimenzije (van Ginkel et al., 2015).

Tokom poslednje dve decenije sve više se potvrđuje efikasnost vršnjačke povratne informacije kao strategije za razvoj komunikativne kompetencije studenata. Ovaj oblik saradničkog učenja podstiče smisleno angažovanje i preuzimanje odgovornosti za sopstveno učenje, te je u skladu sa principima socijalno-konstruktivističke pedagogije. Osim toga, on doprinosi razvoju metakognitivnih, interpersonalnih i drugih profesionalnih veština (Adachi et al., 2017; Ardill, 2025; Carless & Boud, 2018; Jerotijević Tišma, 2016; Stančić, 2020; Topping, 2017; Zamorano et al., 2025), čime se povećavaju izgledi za zapošljavanje i napredovanje mladih stručnjaka.

Međutim, vršnjačka povratna informacija nije dovoljno zastupljena niti istražena u obrazovanju u Srbiji. Malobrojne studije bave se ovim fenomenom u kontekstu veštine pisanja (Anđelković, 2022; Čorbić, 2024; Prodanović Stankić, 2017), dok je, prema saznanjima autorke, samo jedan rad ispitivao vršnjačko ocenjivanje govorne produkcije i poredio ga sa nastavničkim ocenjivanjem (Jerotijević Tišma, 2016). Stoga, s ciljem unapređenja naučnih saznanja i pedagoške prakse, ovaj rad razmatra primenu vršnjačke povratne informacije u kontekstu razvoja veštine usmenog izlaganja studenata. Istraživanje je sprovedeno u okviru predmeta Engleski jezik za ekonomiste i ispituje iskustva studenata kao davalaca i/ili primalaca povratne informacije, te analizira njihova shvatanja benefita, izazova i uticaja ovog pristupa na veštinu usmenog izlaganja. Dobijeni rezultati rasvetljavaju ključne aspekte datog procesa, omogućavaju njegovo potpunije razumevanje i pružaju značajne pedagoške implikacije za primenu vršnjačke povratne informacije i van konteksta nastave engleskog jezika struke.

Pregled literature

Vršnjačka povratna informacija predstavlja „aktivnost učenja u kojoj pojedinci ili male grupe razmenjuju informacije o učinku na određenom zadatku, reaguju na njih i/ili

postupaju u skladu sa njima, s ciljem ostvarivanja eksplicitnih ili implicitnih zajedničkih i individualnih ciljeva učenja" (Alqassab et al., 2018, str. 12). U procesu vršnjačke povratne informacije, studenti mogu preuzeti ulogu davaoca i/ili primaoca povratne informacije. Svaka od ovih uloga podrazumeva specifičnu dinamiku interakcije i ishode učenja, što nastavnici treba da prepoznaju kako bi efikasno usmeravali ovaj proces (Zamorano et al., 2025). U nastavku će biti razmotrena ključna pitanja koja proizilaze iz navedenih uloga, kao i dosadašnji nalazi o uticaju vršnjačke povratne informacije na veštinu i uspešnost usmenog izlaganja.

Davaoci vršnjačke povratne informacije: koristi i izazovi

Studenti koji daju povratnu informaciju „koriste svoja znanja i veštine kako bi analizirali, razjasnili i korigovali rad kolega" (Kim, 2009, str. 105). Ovoj ulozi dugo nije posvećivana dovoljna pažnja, a novija istraživanja ukazuju na to da i nastavnici i studenti smatraju čin davanja povratne informacije izuzetno korisnim u pogledu angažovanosti, ishoda učenja i razvoja veština (Adachi et al., 2017; Ardill, 2025; Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Nicol et al., 2013). Pojedini autori je čak smatraju korisnijom od samog primanja povratne informacije (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Nicol et al., 2013).

Kada je reč o prednostima, autori ističu da davanje vršnjačke povratne informacije unapređuje kritičko mišljenje i evaluativno rasuđivanje, samoregulisano učenje, refleksiju, komunikativne i interpersonalne veštine, te poboljšava učinak na konkretnoj aktivnosti (Ardill, 2025; Nicol et al., 2013; Prodanović Stankić, 2017; Winstone & Carless, 2020). Studenti navode da su kroz ovaj proces razvili strategije za analizu i vrednovanje, te produbili razumevanje kriterijuma ocenjivanja (Nicol et al., 2013; Winstone & Carless, 2020), što je doprinelo većoj autonomiji u učenju (Ardill, 2025). Vršnjačka povratna informacija takođe redefiniše odnose između nastavnika i studenata (Ardill, 2025). Stančić (Stančić, 2020) ističe da učešće studenata u procesu donošenja odluka doprinosi njihovom osećaju uvaženosti.

Međutim, davaoci povratne informacije suočavaju se i sa izazovima. Studenti mogu smatrati da ne poseduju dovoljno predmetnog i jezičkog znanja za pružanje kvalitetne povratne informacije (Ardill, 2025; De Grez et al., 2012; Stančić, 2020; Zhan, 2024). Na primer, Džan (Zhan, 2024, str. 7) jeste uočio da su studenti „bili zabrinuti zbog svoje sposobnosti da precizno formulišu komentare na engleskom jeziku", zbog čega su izbegavali da iznose zapažanja koja nisu umeli jasno da iskažu. U Ardilovom (Ardill, 2025) istraživanju, ispitanici su posebno naglasili značaj jasnih uputstava i ciljeva za davanje vršnjačke povratne informacije. Prema Adači i saradnicima (Adachi et al., 2017, str. 8), „studenti se manje angažuju u samovrednovanju i vršnjačkom ocenjivanju ukoliko taj čin ne doživljavaju kao svoj i ne razumeju zašto se to od njih očekuje". Nedovoljno angažovanje davalaca povratne informacije može demotivisati njihove vršnjake (Nicol et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2020).

U literaturi se takođe ukazuje na pitanja nelagodnosti i pristrasnosti. Studenti se mogu osećati neprijatno prilikom kritikovanja rada svojih kolega (Ardill, 2025; Stančić, 2020; Topping, 2017), posebno kada povratna informacija utiče na konačnu ocenu. Kajser i saradnici (Qaiser et al., 2022) i Prosenjak i Lučev (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020) su uočili da neki studenti daju visoke ocene iz straha od narušavanja odnosa sa vršnjacima. U kontekstu obrazovanja u Srbiji, Čorbić (Čorbić, 2024, str. 100) ovaj fenomen povezuje sa kolektivističkom kulturom, koju odlikuju „izražena težnja ka izbegavanju neizvesnosti i solidarnost."

Primaoci vršnjačke povratne informacije: koristi i izazovi

Za razliku od uloge davalaca, perspektiva primalaca povratne informacije znatno je više ispitivana. Istraživanja pokazuju da studenti, kao primaoci povratne informacije, „unapređuju svoj učinak na zadatku, veštine samoregulisanog učenja i kritičkog mišljenja" (Tsivitanidou & Constantinou, 2016; Zamorano et al., 2025, str. 2). Oni povratnu informaciju kolega smatraju pristupačnijom i razumljivijom od nastavničke, što se objašnjava zajedničkim jezikom i iskustvima (Adachi et al., 2017; Ardill, 2025). Razmatrajući povratne informacije dobijene od većeg broja vršnjaka, studenti stiču širi uvid u sopstveni rad i razvijaju kritičko mišljenje i refleksivne veštine (Ardill, 2025; Nicol et al., 2013). Čo i Makartur (Cho & MacArthur, 2011) uočili su da veći broj povratnih informacija podstiče njihovo usvajanje i primenu.

Studije, međutim, upućuju i na to da različiti izazovi mogu otežati proces usvajanja povratne informacije. Studenti ispoljavaju skepticizam prema sposobnosti svojih vršnjaka da pruže konstruktivnu i korisnu povratnu informaciju (Ardill, 2025; van Ginkel et al., 2017), navodeći da je ona ponekad suviše uopštena, površna ili nejasna (Nicol et al., 2013; Stančić et al., 2024; Zhan, 2024), što može otežati korekciju rada i negativno se odraziti na kvalitet konačnog proizvoda.

Često navođen izazov jeste i nedostatak spremnosti za usvajanje dobijene povratne informacije (Price et al., 2010; Zhan, 2024). Uzroci se mogu naći u prethodnom iskustvu studenata, emocionalnom otporu, uverenju da povratna informacija neće uticati na konačnu ocenu, pa čak i u lenjosti (Price et al., 2010; Zhan, 2024). Džan (Zhan, 2024), takođe zapaža da je emocionalni otpor naročito izražen kada studenti dobiju kritiku.

Na kraju pregleda o koristima i izazovima vršnjačke povratne informacije iz perspektive različitih uloga, važno je naglasiti da su se dosadašnja istraživanja uglavnom bavila davaocima i primaocima povratne informacije odvojeno, ponekad čak ne razlikujući ove uloge (Zamorano et al., 2026). Uz to, znatno veća pažnja posvećena je perspektivi primalaca povratne informacije. Stoga je potrebno dodatno ispitati iskustva studenata koji preuzimaju obe uloge u okviru istog ciklusa vršnjačke povratne informacije, jer takav pristup omogućava sveobuhvatnije razumevanje potencijala ove pedagoške prakse.

Uticaj vršnjačke povratne informacije na veštinu izlaganja

Uprkos ograničenom obimu, istraživanja koja se bave uticajem vršnjačke povratne informacije na veštinu usmenog izlaganja pružaju značajne nalaze.

Van Ginkel i saradnici (van Ginkel et al., 2015, 2017) su uočili prednost nastavničkog ocenjivanja u odnosu na vršnjačko i samoocenjivanje kada je reč o ponašanju tokom usmenog izlaganja, dok je na kognitivnom i afektivnom planu ustanovljen napredak nezavisno od izvora povratne informacije. Nasuprot tome, Muriljo-Zamorano i Montanero (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018, str. 141) konstatovali su da vršnjačka povratna informacija praćena rubrikama za ocenjivanje (eng. *rubrics*) i diskusijom može imati veći uticaj na kvalitet usmenog izlaganja od tradicionalne nastavničke povratne informacije, budući da ovi elementi obezbeđuju „strukturisan okvir za socijalizaciju i refleksiju". Ispitanici u njihovom istraživanju su ostvarili značajan napredak, kako u pogledu sadržaja prezentacije (uvod i struktura), tako i izražajnosti (verbalna i neverbalna komunikacija). Autori (Gudiño et al., 2024; Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018) takođe su istakli da jednokratna obuka za primenu rubrika nije dovela do trajnih efekata, što ukazuje na potrebu za sistematičnim i kontinuiranim osposobljavanjem. S druge strane, Urena-Rodrigez i saradnici (Urena-Rodriguez et al., 2025), kao i Dej i saradnici (Day et al., 2021) nisu utvrdili poboljšanje govorničkih veština i usmenog izlaganja. Dej i saradnici (Day et al., 2021) ovakav ishod dovode u vezu sa izostankom konkretnih smernica za njegovo unapređenje (eng. *feed forward*).

Kada je reč o uticaju vršnjačke povratne informacije na različite aspekte veštine usmenog izlaganja, Dikson i saradnici (Dickson et al., 2019) i Prosenjak i Lučev (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020) zabeležili su napredak u ocenama studenata, razumevanju kriterijuma ocenjivanja, uverljivosti izlaganja i samopouzdanju, kao i smanjenje anksioznosti. King i saradnici (King et al., 2000, str. 365) pokazali su da je trenutna povratna informacija efikasnija za aspekte prezentacije koji se mogu trenutno uočiti, kao što je kontakt očima, dok se odložena povratna informacija pokazala korisnijom za „promišljenu i svesnu obradu informacija", kao što je prilagođavanje dužine uvodnog dela prezentacije.

Uopšteno govoreći, nalazi ukazuju na potrebu za daljim ispitivanjima u oblasti vršnjačke povratne informacije, ne samo zbog ograničenog broja istraživanja već i neujednačenih empirijskih rezultata. Dosadašnje studije upućuju na to da efikasnost ovog pristupa u velikoj meri zavisi od načina na koji je osmišljen. Stoga je potrebno utvrditi koje nastavne komponente doprinose ostvarivanju pozitivnih ishoda učenja.

Istraživanje predstavljeno u nastavku rada oslanja se na ključne teme i zapažanja proistekla iz navedenih studija, ali istovremeno ostavlja prostor za identifikovanje novih aspekata koji mogu doprineti potpunijem razumevanju uloge vršnjačke povratne informacije u razvoju veštine usmenog izlaganja.

Metodologija istraživanja

Kontekst istraživanja

Istraživanje je sprovedeno u okviru predmeta Engleski jezik za ekonomiste, koji pohađaju studenti prve godine osnovnih akademskih studija. Usmeno izlaganje predstavlja obaveznu nastavnu aktivnost koja ulazi u strukturu konačne ocene. Polazeći od uočenih nedostataka u načinu na koji studenti drže prezentacije, kao i ograničene efikasnosti tradicionalnih nastavnih pristupa, autorka je odlučila da u nastavni proces integriše vršnjačku povratnu informaciju s ciljem unapređenja veštine usmenog izlaganja. Ovaj poduhvat manjeg obima sproveden je u tri faze tokom nekoliko nedelja nastave. Održana su dva ciklusa: prvi tokom letnjeg semestra školske 2022/2023. godine, a drugi tokom letnjeg semestra školske 2023/2024. godine. Prema tome, obuhvaćene su dve generacije studenata prve godine. U nastavku su prikazane faze projekta:

1. Obuka: Studenti su učestvovali u obuci za usmeno izlaganje i davanje vršnjačke povratne informacije. U okviru obuke u domenu vršnjačke povratne informacije, upoznati su sa rubrikama koje su koristili za ocenjivanje izlaganja svojih kolega. Rubrike su obuhvatile sledeće kategorije: izlagač, struktura izlaganja, komunikativni stil i vizuelni elementi prezentacije. Svaka kategorija sadržala je više kriterijuma. Tako su, na primer, u okviru kategorije izlagač vrednovani pripremljenost govornika, zainteresovanost za temu i sposobnost uključivanja publike, dok su u okviru komunikativnog stila procenjivani tečnost, jezička tačnost, izgovor i govor tela. Po završetku obuke, studenti su pozvani da pripreme petominutna izlaganja na temu iz svoje discipline, koja su potom bila predmet vršnjačkog vrednovanja. Učešće u ulozi izlagača bilo je dobrovoljno, a broj je bio ograničen na deset studenata po grupi. Od izlagača se očekivalo da učestvuju u dva kruga izlaganja.

2. Prvi krug izlaganja: Izlagači su održali svoja izlaganja, nakon čega su dobili pisanu vršnjačku povratnu informaciju s ciljem da ih unaprede. Davaoci povratne informacije su, radeći u parovima, za svaki kriterijum u rubrikama birali odgovarajuću opciju (prisutno, nije prisutno, potrebno unapređenje) i davali konkretne, konstruktivne komentare i preporuke. Po završetku aktivnosti, izlagači su prikupili dobijene povratne informacije.

3. Drugi krug izlaganja: Izlagači su održali svoja korigovana izlaganja koja je nastavnik ocenjivao koristeći iste rubrike za ocenjivanje koje su prethodno upotrebljene u procesu vršnjačke povratne informacije. Za učešće u aktivnosti izlagači su dobili dodatne bodove.

Svi izlagači su preuzimali i ulogu davaoca povrante informacije (ali nisu učestvovali u samoocenjivanju), dok su ostali studenti učestvovali isključivo kao davaoci povratne informacije. Zahvaljujući utvrđenoj strukturi aktivnosti, svi studenti su učestvovali pod istim uslovima. Po završetku aktivnosti, učesnici su popunili upitnik čiji su cilj, struktura i rezultati predstavljeni u ovom radu.

Cilj

Istraživanje je osmišljeno sa ciljem ispitivanja stavova i iskustava studenata u vezi sa primenom vršnjačke povratne informacije kao sredstva za unapređenje veštine usmenog izlaganja. Ono je obuhvatilo sledeća istraživačka pitanja:

- Kako studenti doživljavaju proces davanja vršnjačke povratne informacije i kakva su njihova iskustva u vezi sa navedenim procesom?
- Kako izlagači doživljavaju dobijenu vršnjačku povratnu informaciju i kakva su njihova iskustva u vezi sa navedenim procesom?
- Kako studenti u celini poimaju pristup zasnovan na vršnjačkoj povratnoj informaciji u pogledu njegovih benefita, ograničenja i nedostataka?
- Da li postoji statistički značajna razlika između studenata koji su imali različite uloge (davaoci povratne informacije naspram studenata koji su preuzimali ulogu davaoca i primaoca) u pogledu stavova o integraciji vršnjačke povratne informacije u redovnu nastavnu praksu i zadovoljstva sprovedenom aktivnošću?

Rezultati pružaju značajne pedagoške uvide koji mogu doprineti efikasnijoj primeni vršnjačke povratne informacije u nastavi.

Uzorak

Uzorak je obuhvatio 60 studenata prve godine osnovnih studija, od kojih je po 30 pohađalo predmet Engleski jezik za ekonomiste tokom školske 2022/2023. i 2023/2024. godine. Primenjen je pristup namernog uzorkovanja, budući da su relevantni podaci mogli da budu prikupljeni isključivo od studenata koji su učestvovali u aktivnosti vršnjačke povratne informacije. Među ispitanicima je bilo 61.67% studentkinja i 36.67% studenata, dok 1.67% nije želelo da se izjasni o polu. Znanje engleskog jezika, utvrđeno na osnovu Oksfordskog dijagnostičnog testa (Oxford Placement Test) sprovedenog na početku semestra, uglavnom je bilo na nivoima B2 (30%) i C1 (38.33%) Zajedničkog evropskog referentnog okvira za jezike. Zastupljeni su bili i drugi nivoi, ali u manjem postotku (A1: 6.67%; A2: 1.67%; B1: 16.67%; C2: 6.67%). Kada je reč o ulogama u aktivnosti, 71.66% studenata je vršilo ulogu izlagača i davaoca povratne informacije, dok je preostalih 28.33% preuzelo ulogu davaoca povratne informacije.

Istraživački instrument i obrada podataka

Za potrebe istraživanja konstruisan je anonimni onlajn upitnik (Microsoft Forms), zasnovan na relevantnim istraživanjima iz ove oblasti (Huisman et al., 2018; Strijbos et al., 2010). Upitnik je sproveden tokom školske 2022/2023. i 2023/2024. godine. Studenti su bili informisani o cilju istraživanja i dobrovoljnoj prirodi učešća. Upitnik se sastojao iz dva

dela. Prvi je obuhvatio tri pitanjavišestrukog izbora, čiji je cilj bio prikupljanje opštih podataka o ispitanicima: pol, nivo znanja engleskog jezika prema Zajedničkom evropskom referentnom okviru za jezike i uloga u aktivnosti vršnjačke povratne informacije. Drugi deo, koji je sadržao četiri petostepene Likertove skale, jedno pitanje višestrukog izbora i tri pitanja otvorenog tipa, bio je fokusiran na ključne teme istraživanja. Ova pitanja su bila grupisana u tri kategorije:

- percepcije i iskustva u vezi sa davanjem povratne informacije (jasnoća uputstava i kriterijuma, samopouzdanje davalaca povratne informacije, benefiti davanja povratne informacije, teškoće sa kojima su se studenti suočavali tokom ovog procesa);
- percepcije i iskustva u vezi sa korišćenjem dobijene povratne informacije (tačnost i korisnost povratne informacije, spremnost na unapređenje veštine usmenog izlaganja, uticaj povratne informacije na kvalitet usmenog izlaganja); i
- opšta ocena aktivnosti vršnjačke povratne informacije u pogledu njenih prednosti, ograničenja i nedostataka; mogućnosti integracije aktivnosti u redovnu nastavnu praksu i zadovoljstvo studenata.

Visok stepen pouzdanosti Likertovih skala potvrđen je Kronbahovim koeficijentom *α*, koji je iznosio .885 za četvrto pitanje sa četiri tvrdnje i .816 za šesto pitanje sa pet tvrdnji.

Analiza podataka sprovedena je u programskom paketu SPSS 20. Kvantitativni podaci analizirani su primenom deskriptivne statistike: frekvencije, procenti, medijana i standardna devijacija (*SD*). Za ispitivanje statističkih razlika u stavovima studenata o integraciji vršnjačke povratne informacije u redovnu nastavnu praksu, kao i u stepenu zadovoljstva aktivnošću u zavisnosti od uloge koju su imali, primenjen je Men–Vitnijev test. Ovaj test je izabran jer su podaci dobijeni Likertovim skalama pokazivali asimetriju udesno. Uz to, s obzirom na nejednaku veličinu grupa (izlagači i davaoci povratne informacije: 43; davaoci povratne informacije: 17) i kršenje pretpostavke normalnosti raspodele, neparametarski pristup zasnovan na rangovima pruža pouzdanije rezultate.

Kvalitativni podaci analizirani su primenom tematske analize sadržaja, koja je obuhvatila kodiranje odgovora i identifikovanje tematskih celina. Upotreba mešovitog pristupa omogućila je detaljnije sagledavanje ključnih pitanja povezanih sa vršnjačkom povratnom informacijom, kao i uočavanje dodatnih nalaza koji su se pojavili tokom analize. Kvalitativni podaci korišćeni su i za objašnjavanje i kontekstualizaciju kvantitativnih rezultata, čime je unapređen njihov interpretativni potencijal i, posledično, validnost istraživanja.

Rezultati i diskusija

U prvom istraživačkom pitanju, studenti su zamoljeni da iskažu stepen slaganja, odnosno neslaganja sa tvrdnjama o davanju povratne informacije (Tabela 1).

Tabela 1
Percepcije studenata u vezi sa davanjem povratne informacije

Tvrdnja	Ne slažem se uopšte	Ne slažem se	Niti se slažem, niti se ne slažem	Slažem se	Slažem se u potpunosti	*Medijana*	*SD*
1. Dobio/la sam jasna i dovoljno detaljna uputstva za davanje povratne informacije.	1.67%	1.67%	8.33%	30.00%	58.33%	5	.850
2. Kriterijumi za davanje povratne informacije bili su jasno definisani u obrascu.	1.67%	3.33%	10.00%	36.67%	48.33%	4	.899
3. Umem da pružim kvalitetnu povratnu informaciju.	1.67%	5.00%	21.67%	48.33%	23.33%	4	.892
4. Smatram da je davanje povratne informacije korisno.	1.67%	3.33%	11.67%	40.00%	43.33%	4	.898

Većina ispitanika smatra da je dobila adekvatna uputstva za učešće u ovoj aktivnosti i prepoznala je vrednost davanja vršnjačke povratne informacije, pri čemu je više od 80% studenata iskazalo slaganje sa tvrdnjama 1, 2 i 4. Pozitivan stav studenata prema povratnoj informaciji predstavlja jedan od ključnih faktora njihovog angažovanja u ovom procesu (Huisman et al., 2018). Čak 85% učesnika u istraživanju je navelo da razume kriterijume u rubrikama za ocenjivanje, što predstavlja važan preduslov za unapređenje kvaliteta povratne informacije, pa time i kvaliteta izlaganja. Muriljo-Zamorano i Montanero (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018) takođe su konstatovali da rubrike preusmeravaju pažnju studenata sa samih izlagača na izlaganje i mogućnosti njegovog unapređenja. Nešto manji, ali i dalje visok procenat ispitanika (71.66%) veruje da su sposobni da pruže kvalitetnu povratnu informaciju. Iako je ovaj nalaz u skladu sa prethodnim, on istovremeno ukazuje na to da je određenom broju studenata potrebno dodatno uvežbavanje za sticanje kompetencija i samopouzdanja neophodnih za vrednovanje rada svojih vršnjaka. U literaturi se naglašava značaj podrške tokom primene pristupa vršnjačke povratne informacije kroz upotrebu rubrika, kontinuirano vođenje i potporu nastavnika (Ardill, 2025; Gudiño et al., 2024; Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Zhe Dong et al., 2023), jer doprinosi dubljem

razumevanju samog procesa, razvoju pismenosti u domenu povratne informacije (eng. *feedback literacy*) i jačanju poverenja u sposobnost vršnjaka da daju kvalitetnu povratnu informaciju.

Cilj drugog pitanja bio je da ispita teškoće sa kojima su se studenti susretali prilikom davanja povratne informacije. Ispitanici su mogli da odaberu više ponuđenih odgovora, kao i da navedu sopstveni ukoliko ponuđene opcije nisu odražavale njihovo iskustvo. Pošto su procenti iskazani za svaku opciju pojedinačno, višestruki odabir može da proizvede ukupan zbir koji premašuje 100%.

Polovina ispitanika (50%) nije navela nikakve poteškoće. Međutim, preostali učesnici u istraživanju su se susreli sa različitim izazovima (35% je navelo više od jednog problema), pri čemu su najizraženiji bili strah od povređivanja osećanja kolega (30%) i teškoće u jasnom formulisanju komentara u rubrikama za vršnjačko ocenjivanje (25%). Manji postotak studenata smatrao je da njihova povratna informacija neće biti uvažena (15%), dok su neki izrazili zabrinutost zbog moguće pristrasnosti (15%), nedostatka vremena (13.33%), nedovoljne kompetentnosti (11.67%) i nezainteresovanosti (10%). Jedan student je dodao da mu je bilo teško da proceni da li su pojedini kriterijumi bili ispunjeni ili neispunjeni tokom prezentacije. Navedeni izazovi zabeleženi su i u prethodnim istraživanjima (Ardill, 2024; De Grez et al., 2012; Stančić, 2020; Zhan, 2024), a pojedini od njih javiće se i među odgovorima na otvoreno pitanje u vezi sa ograničenjima i nedostacima vršnjačke povratne informacije.

Uopšteno govoreći, dobijeni rezultati ukazuju na značaj istovremenog razmatranja kognitivnih, afektivnih i socijalnih aspekata pre i tokom primene vršnjačke povratne informacije. Iako su studenti prethodno tvrdili da su dobro pripremljeni za učešće u ovom procesu, rezultati jasno upućuju na potrebu za intenzivnijom nastavničkom podrškom i uvežbavanjem kroz analizu primera dobre prakse i stvarnu upotrebu rubrika. Nalazi takođe naglašavaju važnost stvaranja okruženja u kom su studenti spremniji da prihvate kritiku i prepoznaju vrednost povratne informacije, što može da poveća njihovo angažovanje.

U narednom pitanju nastojao se steći uvid u stavove studenata u vezi sa dobijenom povratnom informacijom, njenom primenom i uticajem na izlaganje. Izlagači su zamoljeni da izraze stepen slaganja, odnosno neslaganja sa tvrdnjama u sklopu petostepene Likertove skale (Tabela 2).

Najveći postotak studenata iskazao je spremnost da unapredi veštine izlaganja (90.69%), dok je 76.24% ispitanika navelo da je, zahvaljujući aktivnosti vršnjačke povratne informacije, poboljšalo kvalitet svog usmenog izlaganja. Većina studenata smatrala je dobijenu povratnu informaciju korisnom (88.36%), tačnom (79.07%), i nije je zanemarilo (69.76%). Dati rezultati su međusobno usklađeni i ukazuju na visok nivo motivacije i angažovanosti studenata. Oni potvrđuju zapažanje Prajs i saradnici (Price et al., 2010, str. 279) da „povratna informacija može biti delotvorna samo ako je student razume i ako je spreman i sposoban da postupi u skladu sa njom."

Tabela 2
Percepcije izlagača u vezi sa dobijenom povratnom informacijom, njenom primenom i uticajem

Tvrdnja	Uopšte se ne slažem	Ne slažem se	Niti se slažem, niti se ne slažem	Slažem se	Slažem se u potpunosti	*Medijana*	*SD*
1. Smatram da su povratne informacije kolega bile tačne.	2.33%	.00%	18.60%	51.16%	27.91%	4	.835
2. Smatram da su povratne informacije kolega bile korisne.	2.33%	2.33%	6.98%	44.18%	44.18%	4	.886
3. Zanemario/la sam povratne informacije dobijene od kolega.	25.58%	44.18%	25.58%	2.33%	2.33%	2	.905
4. Bio/la sam spreman/ na da unapredim svoje izlaganje.	2.33%	.00%	6.98%	20.93%	69.76%	5	.849
5. Unapredio/la sam svoje izlaganje. zahvaljujući vršnjačkoj povratnoj informaciji.	4.76%	2.33%	16.67%	28.62%	47.62%	4	1.171

U narednom pitanju otvorenog tipa studenti su zamoljeni da dodatno obrazlože svoje stavove. Nešto više od polovine uzorka (53.33%) dalo je komentare koji su uglavnom potvrđivali njihov pozitivan stav prema aktivnosti (npr. „Ideja da nam kolege daju povratnu informaciju je bila odlična. Pomogli su mi da unapredim veštine izlaganja."; „Povratna informacija koju sam dobila od kolega bila je veoma korisna. Pružila mi je nove uvide u moje izlaganje. Bila sam spremna da unapredim izlaganje."). Pojedini komentari su ukazali na izazove (npr. „Mislim da je povratna informacija bila korisna, ali kolege nisu bile dovoljno motivisane da daju detaljnije komentare."; „Nisam zanemario komentare svojih kolega jer sam ih smatrao korisnim, iako ne u potpunosti tačnim."). Odgovori pokazuju da su studenti kritički pristupali dobijenoj povratnoj informaciji i upućuju na potrebu da se dodatna pažnja posveti pitanjima tačnosti i angažovanosti. U prilog tome govori i procenat studenata koji su odabrali opciju „niti se slažem niti se ne slažem" za tvrdnje koje se odnose na tačnost vršnjačke povratne informacije (tvrdnja 1) i njeno prihvatanje i primenu (tvrdnja 3).

Na osnovu navedenog se može zaključiti da je aktivnost dovela do ostvarenja primarnog cilja, a to je unapređenje veštine usmenog izlaganja i kvaliteta prezentacija studenata. To je uočeno i tokom nastavničkog ocenjivanja. Iako pojedini autori ističu da studenti

mogu biti skeptični prema sposobnosti vršnjaka da pruže kvalitetnu povratnu informaciju, rezultati ovog istraživanja potvrđuju nalaze Ardila (Ardill, 2025), Gudina i saradnika (Gudiño et al., 2024), Murilja-Zamorana i Montanera (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018), kao i Prosenjaka i Lučev (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020), prema kojima pažljivo osmišljena i strukturirana aktivnost, mogućnost ponovnog izlaganja nakon korigovanja, upotreba rubrika i podrška nastavnika mogu značajno doprineti njenoj uspešnoj realizaciji.

U narednom pitanju otvorenog tipa ispitivani su stavovi studenata o benefitima vršnjačke povratne informacije. Analiza odgovora 55 studenata prikazana je u Tabeli 3.

Tabela 3
Percepcije studenata o benefitima vršnjačke povratne informacije

Tema	Ilustracija	Broj navođenja
Unapređenje komunikativnih veština i veštine izlaganja	„Unapredio sam govor tela [...], vizuelne elemente i kvalitet prezentacije (tekst, struktura, navođenje ključnih ideja, kontrast boja ...).“ „[Vršnjačka povratna informacija] razvija komunikativne i govorničke veštine.“	29
Svest o prednostima i nedostacima	„[Vršnjačka povratna informacija nam pomaže da] bolje razumemo probleme s kojima se susrećemo tokom izlaganja.“	13
Smernice za unapređenje	„[Vršnjačka povratna informacija] mi je pružila konstruktivnu kritiku i pomogla da prepoznam oblasti koje treba da unapredim.“	8
Uvid u različite perspektive	„[Vršnjačka povratna informacija] mi je pomogla da sagledam prezentaciju iz različitih perspektiva i steknem nove uvide.“	7
Povećanje samopouzdanja	„[Ova aktivnost] mi je povećala samopouzdanje.“	6
Učenje kroz ponavljanje	„Ogromna korist ovog projekta je bila mogućnost da prezentujemo dva puta.“	5
Smanjena anksioznost	„Imali smo probni krug izlaganja [...], i to je mi je zaista pomoglo da prevaziđem tremu.“	4
Unapređenje veština u domenu povratne informacije	„Rad na konstruktivnoj kritici i učenje kako da se ona prihvati bez negativnih emocija [mi je bilo korisno].“	2
Saradnja	„[Vršnjačka povratna informacija] je unapredila saradnju i doprinela kreiranju podsticajnog okruženja za učenje.“	1

Benefiti koje su studenti naveli su u skladu sa rezultatima prethodnih istraživanja (Ardill, 2025; Nicol et al., 2013; Prodanović Stankić, 2017; van Ginkel et al., 2017; Winstone & Carless, 2020) i pokazuju da vršnjačka povratna informacija može uticati kako na kvalitet samog izlaganja tako i na kognitivne, afektivne i socijalne aspekte učenja, što potvrđuje njenu višedimenzionalnu i transverzalnu prirodu. Odgovori ispitanika ukazuju na njihovu angažovanost i razumevanje kriterijuma evaluacije, spremnost da prihvate različite perspektive i da kritički sagledaju sopstvene slabosti. Takođe, naglašen je značaj strukturiranja procesa vršnjačke povratne informacije kroz upotrebu rubrika i kontinuirano uvežbavanje.

U narednom pitanju otvorenog tipa ispitivane su percepcije studenata o ograničenjima i nedostacima vršnjačke povratne informacije. Od 52 studenta koji su odgovorili na ovo pitanje, njih 22 nije navelo nikakve probleme, dok su ostali ukazali na ograničenja prikazana u Tabeli 4.

Tabela 4

Percepcije studenata u vezi sa nedostacima i organičenjima vršnjačke povratne informacije

Tema	Ilustracija	Broj navođenja
Nedostatak iskrenosti, tačnosti i specifičnosti	„Pojedine kolege nisu davale iskrene povratne informacije." „Neki komentari nisu bili dovoljno specifični." „Pojedine povratne informacije su bile u suprotnosti sa drugim komentarima."	12
Kompetencije davalaca povratne informacije	„Neki studenti ne umeju jasno da izraze svoje ideje." „[Ponekad] ne razumemo dovoljno temu da bismo mogli da damo povratnu informaciju, pa ne znam koliko je ona bila korisna."	7
Nizak stepen angažovanosti	„Mislim da [studenti] nisu posvećivali dovoljno pažnje izlaganjima." „Smatram da studenti često nisu zainteresovani za aktivnosti koje ne utiču na poene i ocenu."	6
Vremenska organičenja	„Nije bilo dovoljno vremena da iskažem mišljenje. Možda su pitanja bila previše detaljna."	4
Strah od narušavanja odnosa	„Po mom mišljenju, mnoge moje kolege su se plašile da ne povrede osećanja izlagača." „Studenti mogu oklevati da upute kritičke komentare jer bi to moglo da naruši odnose sa kolegama."	4
Trajanje aktivnosti	„Ova aktivnost je oduzimala dosta vremena."	3

Kada je reč o nedostacima i ograničenjima vršnjačke povratne informacije, odgovori studenata su u skladu sa nalazima dobijenim u okviru pitanja višestrukog izbora koje se odnosilo na prepreke, te na taj način potvrđuju određene manjkavosti u implementaciji aktivnosti i potrebu za daljim razvojem veština studenata u domenu povratne informacije. Većina ispitanika je kao ključne izazove identifikovala teme koje su zapravo međusobno povezane: kvalitet povratne informacije i kompetentnost njenih davalaca. Naglasili su potrebu za sistematičnom obukom za davanje povratne informacije. Poslednji komentar, koji se odnosi na kompetentnost davalaca povratne informacije, ističe to da se ova veština razvija postepeno, kroz vežbanje. Ipak, loš kvalitet povratne informacije može biti povezan i sa drugim uočenim temama, kao što su nedovoljna angažovanost studenata, vremenska ograničenja i strah od narušavanja odnosa sa vršnjacima, što zapažaju i Kajser i saradnici (Qaiser et al., 2022). Stoga bi obuka trebalo da obuhvati i afektivnu dimenziju, odnosno da studente osposobi za konstruktivno davanje i prihvatanje kritike.

Valja napomenuti da se i afektivni aspekt i kvalitet povratne informacije mogu dovesti u vezu sa kolektivističkom kulturom (Čorbić, 2024). Čorbić (Čorbić, 2024) je utvrdila da su komunikativne strategije i jezički izbori studenata prilikom davanja vršnjačke povratne informacije određeni njihovom željom da ispolje solidarnost, učtivost i prijateljski odnos prema kolegama. Slično objašnjenje može se primeniti i na rezultate ovog istraživanja. Naime, studenti su skloni da ublažavaju uočene nedostatke i pružaju nedovoljno konkretnu ili preterano pozitivnu povratnu informaciju kako bi očuvali dobre međusobne odnose i ojačali osećaj pripadnosti grupi.

Nadalje, nalazi ukazuju na značaj motivacije i potrebu za uvođenjem mehanizama koji bi podstakli veće angažovanje studenata (npr. dodeljivanje poena i davaocima povratne informacije, a ne samo izlagačima). Ardil (Ardill, 2025) zastupa stav da nastavnici treba kontinuirano da naglašavaju vrednost povratne informacije kao veštine značajne za profesionalni i lični razvoj.

Poslednje dve stavke u okviru Likertove petostepene skale ispitivale su stavove studenata o uključivanju vršnjačke povratne informacije u redovnu nastavnu praksu i njihovo ukupno zadovoljstvo sprovedenom aktivnošću. Kada je reč o prvom pitanju, većina ispitanika podržala je integraciju vršnjačke povratne informacije u nastavu (36.67% se složilo, a 26.67% se u potpunosti složilo), dok je 33.33% odabralo odgovor „niti se slažem, niti se ne slažem", a 3.33% je iskazalo neslaganje. Medijana je iznosila 4, a standardna devijacija 0.889. Što se tiče zadovoljstva aktivnošću, gotovo polovina uzorka (48.33%) odabrala je najvišu vrednost (vrednost 5), 35% vrednost 4, dok je preostalih 16.67% odabralo vrednost 3. Nijedan ispitanik nije odabrao najniže vrednosti (1 i 2). Medijana za ovu stavku je iznosila 4, a standardna devijacija .748.

Ovi rezultati su ohrabrujući i sugerišu da, uz određena unapređenja u načinu sprovođenja, koja su istaknuta u prethodnim pitanjima, vršnjačka povratna informacija predstavlja delotvoran i podsticajan pristup razvoju veštine usmenog izlaganja. Poređenje stavova studenata u zavisnosti od njihove uloge u aktivnosti pokazalo je statistički značajne razlike kod oba pitanja. Kod prvog pitanja utvrđena je srednja veličina efekta (z = -3.139,

$p = .002$, $r = .41$), dok je kod drugog veličina efekta bila između srednje i velike ($z = -3.598$, $p < .001$, $r = .46$). Studenti koji su preuzeli obe uloge pokazali su veći stepen prihvatanja i zadovoljstva aktivnošću u odnosu na one koji su učestvovali samo kao davaoci povratne informacije. Ovaj nalaz ukazuje na to da iskustvo sa obema ulogama u okviru vršnjačke povratne informacije doprinosi boljem razumevanju njene vrednosti, naročito zato što su ti studenti mogli neposredno da uoče i njen uticaj na sopstveno usmeno izlaganje.

Zaključak

U ovom istraživanju su ispitivani stavovi i iskustva studenata na predmetu Engleski jezik za ekonomiste u vezi sa benefitima i izazovima vršnjačke povratne informacije, kao i shvatanja njene uloge u razvoju veštine usmenog izlaganja. Analiza perspektiva kako davalaca tako i primalaca vršnjačke povratne informacije omogućava dublje razumevanje mehanizama i potencijala ovog procesa. Dobijeni nalazi pružaju značajne pedagoške implikacije koje prevazilaze okvire nastave engleskog jezika struke.

Uopšteno govoreći, vršnjačka povratna informacija kao sredstvo razvoja veštine usmenog izlaganja pokazala se višestruko korisnom. Studenti su naveli da je doprinela unapređenju kvaliteta njihovih izlaganja i transverzalnih veština. Kada je reč o samom izlaganju, aktivnost im je pomogla da bolje razumeju kriterijume uspešne prezentacije, prepoznaju aspekte koji zahtevaju unapređenje i steknu samopouzdanje. Navedeno je uočeno i od strane nastavnika tokom ocenjivanja korigovanih prezentacija. U pogledu transverzalnih veština, studenti su istakli da su aktivnim korišćenjem rubrika za davanje povratne informacije, razmatranjem različitih perspektiva i saradnjom sa vršnjacima unapredili kognitivne sposobnosti, kritičko mišljenje i samoregulisano učenje. Pedagoška implikacija ovih nalaza ogleda se u činjenici da uspešnost primene vršnjačke povratne informacije u velikoj meri zavisi od načina na koji je osmišljena. Obuka koja uključuje primere dobre prakse i upotrebu rubrika, kao i ciklična priroda procesa (mogućnost ponovnog izlaganja nakon korigovanja i ponavljanje postupka davanja povratne informacije) pospešuju ostvarivanje ishoda učenja. Pri tome je od presudnog značaja spremnost studenata da se aktivno uključe u ovaj proces.

Međutim, izazovi koje su studenti naveli upućuju na određene nedostatke u realizaciji aktivnosti. Najčešći izazov odnosio se na kvalitet povratne informacije, pre svega njenu tačnost, konkretnost i objektivnost; kompetentnost davaoca povratne informacije; afektivne faktore, poput pristrasnosti i straha od narušavanja odnosa sa kolegama; angažovanost studenata, naročito davaoca povratne informacije; kao i vremenska ograničenja. Konzistentno javljanje ovih tema u nalazima istraživanja naglašava potrebu za preduzimanjem konkretnih mera kako bi se ublažio njihov negativan uticaj na ishode učenja i zadovoljstvo studenata. Ovi aspekti su međusobno povezani, što svedoči o složenosti procesa i potrebi da se kognitivna, afektivna i socijalna dimenzija posmatraju kao celina tokom faze planiranja i sprovođenja vršnjačke povratne informacije. Sa pedagoškog stanovišta, rezultati ukazuju na potrebu da se veća pažnja posveti razvoju

sposobnosti studenata da pruže kvalitetnu povratnu informaciju kroz modelovanje, kontinuirano uvežbavanje i potporu nastavnika. Posebno je važno da studenti nauče kako da na konstruktivan način formulišu i pozitivne i kritičke komentare. Pažljivo oblikovanje povratne informacije i stvaranje podsticajnog okruženja mogu doprineti smanjenju emocionalnih barijera. Kada je reč o angažovanosti studenata, rezultati pokazuju da preuzimanje dvostruke uloge doprinosi dubljem razumevanju vrednosti povratne informacije. Pored toga, određeni oblici podsticaja mogli bi pozitivno uticati na učešće studenata. Ipak, studenti treba da prepoznaju stvarnu vrednost vršnjačke povratne informacije, što zahteva od nastavnika da kontinuirano ističu njen značaj za „celoživotni profesionalni razvoj tokom visokog obrazovanja i budućeg profesionalnog angažovanja" (Ardill, 2025, str. 20).

Na kraju, potrebno je ukazati na određena ograničenja ovog istraživanja. Uzorak je obuhvatio samo jednu visokoškolsku ustanovu i specifičan profil studenata (studente ekonomije). Sprovođenje istraživanja na većem i raznovrsnijem uzorku, koji bi obuhvatio više institucija, povećalo bi mogućnost generalizacije rezultata i potencijalno ukazalo na disciplinarne razlike u pristupu ovoj praksi. Nadalje, oslanjanje isključivo na upitnik zasnovan na samoproceni povećava rizik od pristrasnosti u odgovorima. Uključivanje dodatnih izvora podataka, kao što su video-snimci prezentacija i/ili nastavnička evaluacija, moglo bi povećati objektivnost i pouzdanost zaključaka. Uprkos navedenim ograničenjima, istraživanje je značajno jer pruža važne uvide u pristup čije su brojne obrazovne prednosti potvrđene. Buduća istraživanja mogla bi biti usmerena na perspektivu nastavnika, naročito na njihova uverenja i prakse u vezi sa vršnjačkom povratnom informacijom. To bi omogućilo sveobuhvatnije razumevanje postojećeg obrazovnog konteksta i pružilo osnovu za sistematičniju integraciju ove aktivnosti u nastavu.

Literatura

Adachi, C., Tai, J. H. M., & Dawson, P. (2017). Academics' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of self and peer assessment in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(2), 294-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1339775

Alqassab, M., Strijbos, J. W., & Ufer, S. (2018). Training peer-feedback skills on geometric construction tasks: Role of domain knowledge and peer-feedback levels. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *33*(1), 11-30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0342-0

Anđelković, J. (2022). Peer and teacher assessment of academic essay writing: Procedure and correspondence. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 10*(1), 171-184. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2201171A

Ardill, N. (2025). Peer feedback in higher education: student perceptions of peer review and strategies for learning enhancement. *European Journal of Higher Education*, *15*(4), 696-721. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2457466

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(8), 1315-1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2011). Learning by reviewing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *103*(1), 73-84. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021950

Čorbić, I. (2024). Speech act of criticism in peer feedback on argumentative essays of university students of English in computer-mediated communication (CMC). *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies, 16*(1), 85-110. https://doi.org/10.18485/bells.2024.16.4

Day, N. Z. I., Saab, N., & Admiraal, W. (2021). Online peer feedback on video presentations: type of feedback and improvement of presentation skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(2), 183-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1904826

De Grez, L. (2009). *Optimizing the instructional environment to learn presentation skills* (PhD Thesis). Academic bibliography. https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/7051516

De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2012). How effective are self- and peer assessment of oral presentation skills compared with teachers' assessments? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *13*(2), 129-142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412441284

Dickson, H., Harvey, J., & Blackwood, N. (2019). Feedback, feedforward: evaluating the effectiveness of an oral peer review exercise amongst postgraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(5), 692-704. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1528341

Dong, Z., Gao, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2023). Assessing students' peer feedback literacy in writing: scale development and validation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(8), 1103-1118. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2175781

Gudiño, D., Fernández-Sánchez, M. J., Becerra-Traver, M.-T., & Sánchez-Herrera, S. (2024). University students' perceptions of peer assessment in oral presentations. *Education Sciences*, *14*(3), 221 -236. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030221

Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(6), 955-968. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318

Jerotijević Tišma, D. (2016). Serbian EFL teachers and learners' attitudes to peer assessment and the comparison of teacher and peer speaking assessment scores. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *65*(2), 379-393. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas1602379j

Kim, M. (2009). The impact of an elaborated assessee's role in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *34*(1), 105-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801955960

King, P. E., Young, M. J., & Behnke, R. R. (2000). Public speaking performance improvement as a function of information processing in immediate and delayed feedback interventions. *Communication Education*, *49*(4), 365-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379224

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*(1), 30-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

Murillo-Zamorano, L. R., & Montanero, M. (2018). Oral presentations in higher education: a comparison of the impact of peer and teacher feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(1), 138-150. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1303032

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2013). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(1), 102-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518

Palmour, L. (2026). What teachers and students value in presentation style: towards inclusive oracy practices in Higher Education assessment. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 50*(1), 166-183. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2025.2587826

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007

Prodanović Stankić, D. (2017). Peer feedback as a collaborative task used in improving writing skills: A case study. *Nastava i vaspitanje 66*(3), 515-526. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas1703515P

Prosenjak, B., & Lučev, I. (2020). The impact of peer assessment on the attainment level of oral presentations skills. *Language Value*, *12*(1), 30-55. https://doi.org/10.6035/LanguageV.2020.12.3

Qaiser R., Fadden P., Rustom S., & Shaw J. (2022). Real-time peer-to-peer observation and feedback lead to improvement in oral presentation skills. *Cureus*, *14*(2), e21992. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.21992

Stančić, M. (2020). Peer assessment as a learning and self-assessment tool: a look inside the black box. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *46*(6), 852-864. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1828267

Stančić, M., Milin, V., & Gašić, A. (2024). Peer feedback in higher education: How students' roles affect providing and receiving feedback. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *83*, 101408, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101408

Strijbos, J.-W., Pat-El, R. J., & Narciss, S. (2010). Validation of a (peer) feedback perceptions questionnaire. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, C. Jones, M. de Laat, D. McConnell, & T. Ryberg (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Networked Learning*, *7,* 378-386. Aalborg University Open Publishing. https://doi.org/10.54337/nlc.v7.9203

Topping, K. J. (2017). Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology, 1*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.31532/InterdiscipEducPsychol.1.1.007

Tsivitanidou, O. E., & Constantinou, C. P. (2016). A study of students' heuristics and strategy patterns in web-based reciprocal peer assessment for science learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *29*, 12-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.11.002

Urena-Rodriguez, L., Lowell, V. L., & Yan, W. (2025). Peer Feedback, English Public Speaking Self-Efficacy, and Performance in Facebook and Brightspace. *Education Sciences*, *15*(7), 879. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070879

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

van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2017). Fostering oral presentation performance: does the quality of feedback differ when provided by the teacher, peers or peers guided by tutor?

Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, *42*(6), 953-966. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1212984

Winstone, N., & Carless, D. (2020). *Designing Effective Feedback Processes in Higher Education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351115940

Zamorano, D., Panadero, E., Alqassab, M., & Amillano, A. (2025). Effect of peer feedback role: Task performance, feedback implementation and perceptions on learning and trust. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *94*(4), 797-821. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2025.2466146

Zamorano, D., Panadero, E., Alqassab, M., & Gómez-Varela, J. F. (2026). Provider versus recipient: Peer feedback roles effect on task performance, perceptions of learning, trust, and epistemic emotions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *88*, 101560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2026.101560

Zareva, A. (2009). Informational packaging, level of formality, and the use of circumstance adverbials in L1 and L2 student academic presentations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*(1), 55-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.12.002

Zhan, Y. (2024). Are they ready? An investigation of university students' difficulties in peer assessment from dual perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(4), 823-840. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.2021393

Zhou, J., Zheng, Y., & Tai, J. H. M. (2020). Grudges and gratitude: the social-affective impacts of peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *45*(3), 345-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1643449

Primljeno: 13.02.2026.
Korigovana verzija primljena: 30.04.2026.
Prihvaćeno za štampu: 04.06.2026.

Mirna Vidaković
Ekonomski fakultet u Subotici, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu, Subotica, Srbija
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8986-7505

Ovaj rad je objavljen pod licencom Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). Dopušteno je da se delo kopira i distribuira u svim medijima i formatima, da se prera đuje, menja i nadograđuje u bilo koje svrhe, uključujući i komercijalne, pod uslovom da se na pravilan način citiraju njegovi prvobitni autori, postavi link ka originalnoj licenci i naznači da li je delo izmenjeno. Korisnici su pri tome dužni da navedu pun bibliografski opis članka objavljenog u ovom časopisu (autori, naslov rada, naslov časopisa, volumen, sveska, paginacija), kao i njegovu DOI oznaku, a u slučaju objavljivanja u elektronskoj formi takođe su dužni da postave i HTML link.

Studies in Teaching and Education, 2026, *75*(2), 503-519
https://doi.org/10.5937/niv75-64939

ISSN 0547-3330
eISSN 2560-3051
Original research paper

Peer Feedback in ESP Presentation Tasks: Students' Perceptions and Pedagogical Implications

Mirna Vidaković[1]
Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad,
Subotica, Serbia

Abstract *Although presentation competence is considered one of the core competences of graduates and professionals, it is still inadequately addressed in higher education. Given the growing prominence of peer feedback in contemporary pedagogical discourse, this paper explores its potential to foster students' presentation competence. The study, set within an English for Specific Purposes context, examines the experiences of feedback providers and recipients in terms of benefits and challenges of this approach, and their perceptions of its impact on presentation performance. The aim is to obtain guidelines for the successful integration of peer feedback into classroom practice. The sample included 60 first-year university students attending the English for Economists course. They filled out a questionnaire upon completing the activity, which comprised multiple-choice, Likert-scale, and open-ended questions. Quantitative and qualitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics, the Mann-Whitney test, and thematic content analysis. The findings reveal positive attitudes towards peer feedback, particularly among students who assumed both roles. Respondents perceived the approach as beneficial for improving presentation skills, critical thinking, reflection, and self-regulated learning. The results also reveal challenges related to feedback quality, emotional discomfort, engagement, and time constraints. The study highlights the importance of well-designed instruction and joint consideration of cognitive, social, and affective dimensions when integrating peer feedback into the learning process.*

Keywords: *peer feedback, peer reviewer, peer feedback recipient, higher education, presentation competence.*

1 mirna.vidakovic@ef.uns.ac.rs

Introduction

Presentation competence is nowadays considered an indispensable attribute of higher education students and professionals (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Palmour, 2026; van Ginkel et al., 2015, 2017). However, educational institutions often fail to (effectively) equip undergraduates with the knowledge and skills needed to deliver impactful presentations (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Palmour, 2026; van Ginkel et al., 2015, 2017). Presentation competence is either assumed by educators or addressed through traditional, prescriptive instruction and assessment, which overlook student agency and limit the opportunities for practice and timely, individual feedback (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020; Qaiser et al., 2022; Zareva, 2009). A commonly cited definition describes the construct as "the combination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to speak in public in order to inform, to self-express, to relate and to persuade" (De Grez, 2009, p. 5), highlighting its complexity and interplay between cognitive, behavioural, and affective domains (van Ginkel et al., 2015).

Over the past two decades, peer feedback has been recognised as an increasingly effective strategy to foster students' communication competence. As a collaborative form of learning which promotes students' meaningful engagement and accountability, it aligns closely with the principles of social-constructivist pedagogy. Additionally, it strengthens metacognitive, interpersonal, and other professional skills (Adachi et al., 2017; Ardill, 2025; Carless & Boud, 2018; Jerotijević Tišma, 2016; Stančić, 2020; Topping, 2017; Zamorano et al., 2025), increasing young professionals' employability and career prospects.

Peer feedback, however, is not sufficiently employed and explored in the Serbian educational context. Scant research addresses it in relation to writing skills (Anđelković, 2022; Čorbić, 2024; Prodanović Stankić, 2017), and, to the authors' knowledge, only one article explores peer assessment of speaking performance, comparing it with teacher assessment (Jerotijević Tišma, 2016). Therefore, to contribute to the body of research and pedagogical practice, this paper examines peer feedback in the context of enhancing students' presentation competence. Set within an English for Economists course, it investigates students' experiences as providers and/or recipients of feedback, analysing their perceptions of its benefits, challenges, and the impact on presentation competence. The findings highlight the key aspects underlying the process, thus deepening understanding of this practice and providing significant pedagogical implications for its implementation that extend beyond the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) context.

Literature review

Peer feedback is "a learning activity where individuals or small group constellations exchange, react to and/or act upon information about their performance on a particular learning task, with the purpose to accomplish implicit or explicit shared and individual learning goals" (Alqassab et al., 2018, p. 12). In peer feedback, students can act as providers and/or recipients of feedback. Participation in these two roles entails distinct dynamics

and learning outcomes, which teachers need to be aware of in order to guide this process effectively (Zamorano et al., 2025). The following paragraphs will explore the key issues that arise from these two roles and review existing findings on the impact of peer feedback on presentation competence and performance.

Peer feedback providers: benefits and challenges

Students who provide feedback "use their knowledge and skills to review, clarify and correct others' work" (Kim, 2009, p. 105). This role has long been under-researched, but recent studies indicate that the act of producing feedback is perceived by both teachers and students as highly useful in terms of student engagement, learning outcomes, and skills enhancement (Adachi et al., 2017; Ardill, 2025; Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Nicol et al., 2013). Some authors consider it even more beneficial than receiving feedback alone (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Nicol et al., 2013).

Focusing on benefits, authors note that peer feedback providers experience strengthening of critical thinking and evaluative judgement, self-regulated learning, reflection, communication and interpersonal skills as well as improvements in their own task performance (Ardill, 2025; Nicol et al., 2013; Prodanović Stankić, 2017; Winstone & Carless, 2020). Students reported devising methods to analyse and evaluate work and gaining a better understanding of assessment criteria (Nicol et al., 2013; Winstone & Carless, 2020), which led to greater learner autonomy (Ardill, 2025). Peer feedback shifts power dynamics between teachers and students (Ardill, 2025). Stančić (Stančić, 2020) notes that students' participation in decision-making increases their sense of being respected.

However, feedback providers also encounter challenges in this process. Students may believe they lack sufficient content and linguistic knowledge necessary to produce good-quality feedback (Ardill, 2025; De Grez et al., 2012; Stančić, 2020; Zhan, 2024). Zhan (Zhan, 2024, p. 7), for example, observed that students "worried about their ability to accurately express their comments in English", so they refrained from offering comments that were difficult to articulate. In Ardill's (Ardill, 2025) study, students highlighted the significance of obtaining clear instructions and objectives for producing peer feedback. Adachi et al. (Adachi et al., 2017, p. 8) noted that "students engage less with self and peer assessment when they do not 'own' the assessment and understand 'why' they are asked to it." A lack of effort invested by feedback producers may discourage their peers (Nicol et al., 2013; Zhou et al., 2020).

Concerns have also been raised about discomfort and bias. Students may feel uncomfortable when criticising peers' work (Ardill, 2025; Stančić, 2020; Topping, 2017), especially if it affects peers' final grades. Qaiser et al. (Qaiser et al., 2022) and Prosenjak and Lučev (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020) found that some students provided inflated feedback out of fear of jeopardising peer relationships. In the context of Serbian education, Čorbić (Čorbić, 2024, p. 100) linked this issue to the collectivist culture, characterised by "a high tendency towards uncertainty avoidance and solidarity."

Peer feedback recipients: benefits and challenges

Unlike the role of peer feedback providers, the perspective of feedback recipients has been investigated much more extensively. Research has shown that as recipients of feedback, students "improve their task performance, their self-regulated learning, or critical thinking" (Tsivitanidou & Constantinou, 2016, as cited in Zamorano et al., 2025, p. 2). Student feedback is deemed more accessible to peers than teachers' which is a result of shared language and experiences (Adachi et al., 2017; Ardill, 2025). By processing feedback from multiple peers, students broaden perspectives on their own work and foster critical thinking and reflective skills (Ardill, 2025; Nicol et al., 2013). Cho and MacArthur (Cho & MacArthur, 2011) observed increased feedback uptake due to the multiplicity of feedback.

However, the research has revealed that responding to feedback may be hindered by different challenges. Students may feel sceptical about their peers' ability to provide constructive, helpful feedback (Ardill, 2025; van Ginkel et al., 2017). They report the feedback being too general, superficial, or unclear (Nicol et al., 2013; Stančić et al., 2024; Zhan, 2024), which may hamper revisions and the quality of the final output.

A lack of willingness to respond to feedback is another commonly cited challenge (Price et al., 2010; Zhan, 2024). It may stem from students' past experiences, emotional resistance, a lack of impact on the final grade, or even laziness (Price et al., 2010; Zhan, 2024). Zhan (Zhan, 2024) also noted that emotional resistance becomes particularly prominent when students receive criticism.

At the end of this section on overall benefits and challenges of peer feedback across different roles, it is important to emphasise that existing research has largely focused on feedback producers and recipients separately, or sometimes even without distinguishing between them (Zamorano et al., 2026). Also, much greater attention has been given to the role of feedback recipients. Therefore, further investigation into students' experiences of performing both roles within the same feedback cycle is necessary, as it provides a more comprehensive understanding of the potential of this practice.

Impact of peer feedback on presentation competence

Although limited, research on the effectiveness of peer feedback on presentation competence has yielded significant results.

Van Ginkel et al. (Van Ginkel et al., 2015, 2017) observed the superiority of teacher over peer and self-assessment in terms of presentation behaviour, whereas attitudinal and cognitive dimensions improved regardless of the feedback source. Murillo-Zamorano and Montanero (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018), on the other hand, showed that when accompanied by rubrics and oral discussion, peer feedback can have a higher impact on presentation performance than traditional teacher feedback, as these tools provide "a structured framework for socialisation and reflection". Their respondents demonstrated significant improvements in both the content (introduction and structure) and expressiveness (verbal and non-verbal eloquence). The authors (Gudiño et al.,

2024; Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018) also noted that a single training session with rubrics did not yield sustained results, indicating the need for consistent, continuous training. Contrary to this study, Urena-Rodriguez et al. (Urena-Rodriguez et al., 2025) and Day et al. (Day et al., 2021) did not observe improvements in public speaking skills and performance, which Day et al. (Day et al., 2021) linked to the lack of feed forward, i.e., suggestions for improvement.

In terms of more specific impact on various aspects of presentation competence, Dickson et al. (Dickson et al., 2019) and Prosenjak and Lučev (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020) reported improvements in grades, understanding of assessment criteria, persuasiveness, confidence, and anxiety levels. King et al. (King et al., 2000, p. 365) showed that immediate feedback was more effective for immediate aspects of presentations, such as maintaining eye contact, whereas delayed feedback proved more beneficial for "deliberative and effortful processing", such as adjusting the length of a presentation introduction.

Overall, the findings indicate that this area requires further investigation, not only due to limited research but also mixed empirical evidence. The results suggest that the effectiveness of practice is highly dependent on its design. Therefore, instructional elements which lead to positive learning outcomes should be examined more thoroughly.

The research presented in the following sections draws on key themes and observations from the aforementioned studies while also allowing new topics to emerge that would shed more light on peer feedback as used to enhance presentation competence.

Research methodology

Research context

The research was conducted within the ESP course *English for Economists*, offered to first-year Bachelor's-level students. Giving a presentation represents a compulsory course assignment and contributes to the overall course grade. Having observed weaknesses in students' presentation delivery and the limited effectiveness of traditional instruction, the author decided to incorporate peer feedback to enhance students' competence. This small-scale project consisted of three phases spanning several weeks of the course. It had two iterations, the first in the spring semester of the academic year 2022/2023 and the second in the spring semester of the academic year 2023/2024, encompassing two generations of freshmen. Below are the phases that the project comprised:

1. Training: Students attending the course participated in the presentation and peer feedback training sessions. Within the latter, they were acquainted with a feedback form, i.e., a rubric, which they would use to assess their peers' presentations. The rubric included categories concerning the presenter, presentation structure, communication style, and visuals. Each category consisted of multiple items. For example, the presenter criterion addressed the speaker's preparedness, interest in the topic, and ability to engage the audience, whereas the communication style referred to fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and body language. At the end of the training, students were invited to prepare five-minute presentations on a topic related to their discipline, which would

subsequently be reviewed by peers using the rubric. Presenting was voluntary, with a maximum of 10 students per group. Presenters were expected to participate in two rounds of presentations.

2. The first round of presentations: Volunteer presenters gave their presentations, each followed by written peer feedback intended to guide presenters' revisions. Reviewers, working in pairs, had to select the appropriate option (present, absent, needs improvement) for each criterion in the rubric and provide specific, constructive comments and advice. The presenters collected their feedback.

3. The second round of presentations: The presenters gave the reviewed presentations, which were graded by the teacher based on the same rubric that students had used in the peer feedback process. The presenters received additional points for their participation.

All presenters also acted as reviewers (though not as self-assessors), whereas other students performed only the role of reviewers. The task structure ensured that all students participated under the same conditions. Upon completing the activity, the participants filled out a questionnaire, whose aim, design, and results are presented in this paper.

Aim

The research was designed to explore students' attitudes and experiences which concern the implementation of peer feedback as a means of enhancing presentation competence. It comprised the following research questions:

1. How do reviewers perceive and experience providing peer feedback?
2. How do presenters perceive and experience obtained peer feedback?
3. How do students perceive the peer feedback approach overall in terms of benefits, limitations, and drawbacks?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between students who assumed different roles (reviewers vs. presenters and reviewers) regarding peer feedback incorporation into regular classroom practice and their satisfaction with the activity?

The results offer valuable pedagogical insights which can inform a more effective implementation of peer feedback.

Sample

The sample comprised 60 first-year university students, with 30 attending the English for Economists course in each of the 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 academic years. Purposive sampling was employed as the relevant information could only be obtained from individuals who participated in the feedback activity. There were 61.67% female and 36.67% male respondents, whereas 1.67% did not disclose their gender. Their English proficiency level, as determined by the Oxford Placement test taken at the beginning of the

course, was mainly at B2 or C1 CEFR levels (30% and 38.33% respectively). Other levels were also represented, but with lower percentages (A1: 6.67%; A2: 1.67%; B1: 16.67%; C2: 6.67%). As for the activity roles, 71.66% acted as both presenters and reviewers, whereas the remaining 28.33% participated solely as reviewers.

Research instrument and data analysis

An anonymous online questionnaire (Microsoft Forms) was designed, drawing on relevant research (Huisman et al., 2018; Strijbos et al., 2010). It was administered during the 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 academic years. The students were informed about the purpose of the research and the voluntary nature of their participation. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first, containing three multiple-choice questions, aimed to collect general data on participants: gender, English language proficiency according to CEFR, and role in the feedback activity. The second section, comprising four five-point Likert-scale items, one multiple-choice, and three open-ended questions, focused on the central research topics. These are divided into three categories:

1. Perceptions and experiences related to giving feedback (clarity of instructions and criteria, reviewers' confidence, usefulness of providing feedback, difficulties encountered when providing feedback);
2. Perceptions and experiences related to using feedback (accuracy and usefulness of feedback, willingness to improve presentation competence, impact of feedback on presentation performance); and
3. Overall view of the feedback activity in terms of benefits, limitations, and drawbacks, integration of peer feedback into regular classroom practice, and student satisfaction with the activity.

The strong reliability of the Likert scales was confirmed by Cronbach's Alpha coefficients of .885 for Likert-scale question 4, containing 4 items, and .816 for Likert-scale question 6, containing 5 items.

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 20. Quantitative data were analysed through descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, medians, and standard deviations (*SD*). The study of statistical differences in students' perceptions of the integration of peer feedback into regular classroom practice, and their satisfaction based on assumed roles, employed the Mann-Whitney test. This test was used because the Likert-scale data exhibited right-skewness. Additionally, given the unequal sample sizes (presenters and reviewers: 43 vs. reviewers: 17) and the violation of the normality assumption, a nonparametric rank-based approach provided more reliable results. Qualitative data were examined through thematic content analysis, involving coding responses and identifying themes. The mixed-method approach helped analyse key peer feedback issues and capture additional emerging findings. Furthermore, qualitative data were used to explain and contextualise quantitative results, thereby enhancing the potential for interpretation and, consequently, the validity of the study.

Results and discussion

In the first research question, students were asked to express their level of agreement or disagreement with general statements regarding giving feedback (Table 1).

Table 1
Students' perceptions about giving feedback

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	*Median*	*SD*
1. I was provided with clear and sufficient instructions for giving feedback.	1.67%	1.67%	8.33%	30.00%	58.33%	5	.850
2. Feedback criteria were clearly defined in the feedback form.	1.67%	3.33%	10.00%	36.67%	48.33%	4	.899
3. I can provide good-quality feedback.	1.67%	5.00%	21.67%	48.33%	23.33%	4	.892
4. I consider giving feedback useful.	1.67%	3.33%	11.67%	40.00%	43.33%	4	.898

The majority of respondents felt well-instructed to undertake this activity and recognised the value of giving peer feedback, with over 80% agreement on statements 1, 2, and 4. Students' positive attitude towards feedback is a key factor for their engagement (Huisman et al., 2018). Notably, 85% of students understood the rubric criteria, a prerequisite for enhancing the quality of feedback and, eventually, performance. Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018, p. 141) also found that a rubric helps students focus not on their peers, but on "what they observe in the products and what can be improved." A slightly smaller, but still significant percentage of the sample (71.66%) believed they could produce good-quality feedback. Though aligned with the previous finding, this result also suggests that some students require more practice to gain competence and confidence in reviewing peers' work. Scaffolding peer feedback through sustained coaching, a rubric, and tutor facilitation is generally emphasised in literature (Ardill, 2025; Gudiño et al., 2024; Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018; Dong et al., 2023). It deepens students' understanding of the process, develops feedback literacy, and helps establish trust in peers' capabilities.

The second question investigated the types of difficulties students encountered when giving feedback. The surveyed participants could select multiple answers and add their own if the provided options did not reflect their experience. Since percentages are reported per option, the total may exceed 100% due to multiple selections.

Half of the sample (50%) did not report any difficulties. However, the remaining participants faced various challenges (35% reported multiple issues), the most prominent being fear of hurting their colleagues' feelings (30%) and difficulty expressing ideas clearly in the peer feedback form (25%). A smaller percentage believed their feedback would be disregarded (15%), and had concerns about personal bias (15%), time constraints (13.33%), lack of competence (11.67%), and disinterest (10%). One student added that it was diffi-

cult to determine which criteria were met/unmet by presenters. These obstacles have also been documented in research (Ardill, 2025; De Grez et al., 2012; Stančić, 2020; Zhan, 2024), and some of them will be reiterated in the open-ended question on drawbacks and limitations of peer feedback. Overall, the results point to the importance of joint consideration of cognitive, affective, and social aspects prior to and during the implementation of feedback. Although students previously claimed to be well-prepared for peer feedback, the data clearly indicate the need for more tutor support and practice, including exemplars and a rubric, along with their actual use. The results also emphasise the importance of creating an environment where students are more willing to accept criticism and recognise the value of feedback, which might increase their engagement.

The following question aimed to gain insight into students' perceptions of the obtained feedback, its uptake, and impact on presentation performance. The presenters were asked to express their agreement or disagreement with five claims on a five-point Likert scale (Table 2).

Table 2
Presenters' perceptions of the obtained feedback, its uptake and impact

Statements	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	*Median*	*SD*
1. I consider my colleagues' feedback accurate.	2.33%	0.00%	18.60%	51.16%	27.91%	4	.835
2. I consider my colleagues' feedback helpful.	2.33%	2.33%	6.98%	44.18%	44.18%	4	.886
3. I disregarded my colleagues' feedback.	25.58%	44.18%	25.58%	2.33%	2.33%	2	.905
4. I was willing to improve my presentation performance.	2.33%	0.00%	6.98%	20.93%	69.76%	5	.849
5. I have improved my presentation performance as a result of peer feedback.	4.76%	2.33%	16.67%	28.62%	47.62%	4	1,171

The largest portion of students expressed willingness to improve their presentation performance (90.69%), and a significant percentage (76.24%) reported that their performance improved as a result of the peer feedback activity. Most respondents considered feedback helpful (88.36%), accurate (79.07%), and did not disregard it (69.76%). The results reflect inter-alignment and show that students were highly motivated and engaged in the activity. They support the observation by Price et al. (Price et al., 2010, p. 279) that "feedback can only be effective when the learner understands the feedback and is willing and able to act on it."

In the next, open-ended question, students were invited to elaborate on their responses. Half of the sample (53.33%) provided comments which mainly reiterated their

positive attitudes (e.g., "It was such a good idea to let our colleagues give us feedback. They helped me improve my presentation skills.", "The peer feedback I received was really helpful. It provided me with new insights and perspectives on my presentation. I was definitely open to improving my performance."). Certain comments pointed to challenges (e.g., "I think that feedback was helpful, but peer reviewers were not motivated enough to give detailed feedback.", "I didn't disregard my colleagues' comments because I found them useful, though not completely accurate."). They reveal that students approached the feedback critically and highlight the need to address the issues of accuracy and engagement. This is additionally supported by the percentage of students who selected the "Neither agree, nor disagree" option for the statements regarding peer feedback accuracy (statement 1) and uptake (statement 3).

Overall, the activity fulfilled its main learning objective, with students reporting enhanced presentation competence and performance. This was also observed by the teacher during the assessment. Although some authors note that students may be sceptical about their peers' ability to provide good-quality feedback, this study corroborates the findings by Ardill (Ardill, 2025), Gudiño et al. (Gudiño et al., 2024), Murillo-Zamorano and Montanero (Murillo-Zamorano & Montanero, 2018), and Prosenjak and Lučev (Prosenjak & Lučev, 2020), who suggest that careful scaffolding of the activity, the opportunity to deliver a revised presentation, incorporation of a rubric, and teacher guidance can greatly contribute to its successful outcome.

The following open-ended question aimed to examine students' perceptions of the benefits of peer feedback. The analysis of responses provided by 55 students is presented in Table 3.

Table 3
Students' perceptions of benefits of peer feedback

Theme	Illustration	Number of mentions
Presentation and communication skill improvement	"I improved body language [...], presentation visuals, and the quality of the presentation (text, structure, bullet points, contrast in colours...)." "It [peer feedback] develops communication and public speaking skills."	29
Awareness of strengths and weaknesses	"[Peer feedback helps] better understand the problems we encounter during presenting."	13
Direction for improvement	"It offered constructive criticism, helping me identify areas for improvement."	8
Insight into multiple perspectives	"It [peer feedback] provided diverse perspectives, giving me insights from different viewpoints."	7
Increased confidence	"It [the activity] boosted my confidence."	6

Learning through repetition	"The huge benefit of this whole project is that we could present two times."	5
Reduced anxiety	"We had a trial round [...], and it was really helpful to get past the stage fright."	4
Improved feedback skills	"Working on constructive criticism and learning how to take it in without feeling blue [was beneficial for me]."	2
Cooperation	"It [peer feedback] enhanced collaboration, fostering a supportive learning environment."	1

The benefits expressed by students align with previous research (Ardill, 2025; van Ginkel et al., 2017; Nicol et al., 2013; Prodanović Stankić, 2017; Winstone & Carless, 2020) and demonstrate how peer feedback can influence the actual performance as well as related cognitive, affective, and social dimensions, indicating its multifaceted and transversal nature. Responses reflect students' engagement with the criteria and willingness to accept diverse perspectives and address their own weaknesses. They also emphasise the importance of scaffolding peer feedback through the rubric and iterative practice.

The following open-ended question examined students' perceptions of limitations and drawbacks of peer feedback. Of the 52 students who responded, 22 did not report any problems, whereas the rest highlighted limitations presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Students' perceptions of the drawbacks and limitations of peer feedback

Theme	Illustration	Number of mentions
Lack of sincerity, accuracy, depth	"Some of the peer feedback reviewers did not provide sincere information." "Some comments from reviewers were not specific enough." "Some feedback went against the other feedback."	12
Reviewer competence	"Some people don't know how to express their ideas." "[Sometimes] we don't understand a topic well enough when giving feedback, and I don't know if the feedback was useful."	7
Low engagement	"I think that some of them [students] did not pay much attention to presentations." "I believe that students are often not interested in activities without value (in terms of grade or points)."	6
Time constraints	"[There was] limited time to write my own opinion. Maybe the questions were too detailed."	4
Fear of jeopardising relationships	"My personal opinion is that many of my colleagues were afraid to hurt colleagues who presented." "Peers may hesitate to be critical because it could strain relationships."	4
Time-consuming nature	"[It was] time-consuming."	3

In terms of drawbacks and limitations, students' responses corroborate previous findings on a multiple-choice question addressing obstacles, indicating certain instructional gaps and the need to enhance students' feedback literacy. Most respondents identified challenges related to feedback quality and reviewers' competence, which are interconnected. The comments emphasise the necessity to train students to produce feedback. The last comment about reviewers' competence highlights that this skill develops gradually through practice. However, the poor quality of feedback may be linked to other themes too, such as low engagement, time constraints, and fear of damaging relationships, as Qaiser et al. (Qaiser et al., 2022) noted. Therefore, the training should also address the affective dimension, teaching students how to deliver and respond to criticism constructively.

It is worth mentioning that both the affective aspect and the quality of feedback can also be associated with collectivist culture, as observed by Čorbić (Čorbić, 2024). The author found that the communication strategies and linguistic choices employed in students' peer feedback were influenced by their desire to demonstrate solidarity, politeness, and friendliness. The same explanation is plausible in this case, i.e., students tend to minimise mistakes and offer insufficiently specific or inflated feedback to maintain friendly relationships and strengthen group membership.

Furthermore, the findings emphasise the issue of motivation and the need to introduce mechanisms in order to increase student engagement (e.g., by awarding points to reviewers as well). Ardill (Ardill, 2025) also argues that educators should continuously articulate the value of feedback as a lifelong skill.

The final two five-point Likert-scale items examined students' attitudes towards incorporating peer feedback into regular classroom practice and their overall satisfaction with the activity. With respect to the first question, the majority of the sample supported integration (36.67% agreed and 26.67% strongly agreed), 33.33% neither agreed nor disagreed, whereas 3.33% opposed it. The median was 4, with a standard deviation of 0.889. As for the latter, nearly half of the sample (48.33%) reported the highest level of satisfaction (value 5), 35% selected value 4 and the remaining 16.67% value 3. None opted for the lowest values 1 and 2. The median for this item was 4, with a standard deviation of 0.748. These results are encouraging and suggest that, with certain adjustments to the implementation (as indicated in previous questions), peer feedback is an effective and engaging approach to increase presentation competence. The analysis of statistical differences in attitudes by a role assumed during the activity revealed significant differences for both questions. The first result indicated a medium effect size ($z = -3.139$, $p = .002$, $r = .41$), whereas the second indicated a medium to large effect size ($z = -3.598$, $p < .001$, $r = .46$). Students performing both roles expressed greater recognition and satisfaction with the activity than those who only produced feedback. This indicates that experiencing feedback from both perspectives increased students' understanding of its value, especially as they could also observe its impact on their actual performance.

Conclusion

This study examined ESP students' attitudes and experiences regarding benefits and challenges of peer feedback, and their perceptions of its role in enhancing presentation competence. Analysing the perspectives of both producers and recipients of peer feedback provides a deeper understanding of the mechanisms and potential of this process. The findings offer valuable pedagogical implications that extend beyond the ESP field.

Overall, the peer feedback activity used to enhance presentation competence has proven beneficial in many ways. Students reported that it improved their presentation performance and transferable skills. In terms of performance, the activity helped respondents better understand the criteria for effective presentations, identify areas for improvement, and gain confidence. This was also observed by the teacher during the assessment of the revised presentations. Regarding the latter, students reported that, by actively engaging with the feedback rubric and multiple perspectives, and through collaboration, they enhanced their cognitive and critical thinking skills as well as self-regulated learning. The pedagogical implication of these gains is that the impact of peer feedback is highly dependent on the instructional design. The provision of training using exemplars and the rubric, and the iterative nature of the process (the opportunity to deliver the revised presentation and the repeated production of feedback) contribute to positive learning outcomes. Important, indisputably, is the students' willingness to engage in the process.

However, the challenges reported in the study revealed certain gaps in the implementation process. The major concerns focused on the quality of feedback in terms of accuracy, specificity, and objectivity; reviewers' competence in providing feedback; affective factors, such as personal bias and fear of damaging relationships with peers; engagement, particularly on the part of reviewers; and time constraints. The consistent occurrence of these themes throughout the research highlights the need for specific actions in order to mitigate their impact on learning outcomes and student satisfaction. These issues are interconnected, indicating the complexity of the process and the necessity to consider cognitive, affective, and social dimensions together during the pre-implementation and implementation phases of peer feedback. Pedagogically, the findings suggest that more focus should be placed on scaffolding students' ability to produce good-quality feedback through modelling, ongoing practice, and tutor guidance. It is especially important for students to learn how to give both positive and critical feedback constructively. Careful framing of feedback and fostering a supportive learning environment can help reduce emotional barriers. Regarding engagement, the research indicates that assuming dual roles helps students gain a deeper understanding of the value of feedback. Also, incentivising students' participation might help in the process. However, students must recognise

the true value of peer feedback, which requires educators to continually emphasise its benefits for "lifelong professional development throughout higher education and future practice" (Ardill, 2025, p. 20).

Finally, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations of the study. The sample was restricted to a single institution and a specific student profile (economics students). Conducting a study with a larger, more diverse sample in a multi-institutional setting would increase the generalizability of the findings and possibly reveal disciplinary differences in the approach to this practice. Furthermore, the reliance on a self-report questionnaire increases the risk of response bias. Including additional data sources, such as video recordings of presentations and/or teacher assessment, could enhance the objectivity and credibility of conclusions. Despite constraints, the research is valuable as it provides important insights into a practice which has proven numerous learning benefits. Further research might focus on teachers' perspectives, particularly on their beliefs and practices regarding peer feedback. This would help gain a more comprehensive understanding of the current educational context in this respect and inform a more systematic integration of this activity into classrooms.

References

Adachi, C., Tai, J. H. M., & Dawson, P. (2017). Academics' perceptions of the benefits and challenges of self and peer assessment in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(2), 294-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1339775

Alqassab, M., Strijbos, J. W., & Ufer, S. (2018). Training peer-feedback skills on geometric construction tasks: Role of domain knowledge and peer-feedback levels. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *33*(1), 11-30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-017-0342-0

Anđelković, J. (2022). Peer and teacher assessment of academic essay writing: Procedure and correspondence. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, 10*(1), 171-184. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP2201171A

Ardill, N. (2025). Peer feedback in higher education: student perceptions of peer review and strategies for learning enhancement. *European Journal of Higher Education*, *15*(4), 696-721. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2025.2457466

Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(8), 1315-1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2011). Learning by reviewing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *103*(1), 73-84. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021950

Čorbić, I. (2024). Speech act of criticism in peer feedback on argumentative essays of university students of English in computer-mediated communication (CMC). *Belgrade English Language and Literature Studies, 16*(1), 85-110. https://doi.org/10.18485/bells.2024.16.4

Day, N. Z. I., Saab, N., & Admiraal, W. (2021). Online peer feedback on video presentations: type of feedback and improvement of presentation skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(2), 183-197. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1904826

De Grez, L. (2009). *Optimizing the instructional environment to learn presentation skills* (PhD Thesis). Academic bibliography. https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/7051516

De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2012). How effective are self- and peer assessment of oral presentation skills compared with teachers' assessments? *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *13*(2), 129-142. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787412441284

Dickson, H., Harvey, J., & Blackwood, N. (2019). Feedback, feedforward: evaluating the effectiveness of an oral peer review exercise amongst postgraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *44*(5), 692-704. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1528341

Dong, Z., Gao, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2023). Assessing students' peer feedback literacy in writing: scale development and validation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(8), 1103-1118. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2023.2175781

Gudiño, D., Fernández-Sánchez, M. J., Becerra-Traver, M.-T., & Sánchez-Herrera, S. (2024). University students' perceptions of peer assessment in oral presentations. *Education Sciences*, *14*(3), 221-226. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14030221

Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J., & van den Broek, P. (2018). Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(6), 955-968. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318

Jerotijević Tišma, D. (2016). Serbian EFL teachers and learners' attitudes to peer assessment and the comparison of teacher and peer speaking assessment scores. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, *65*(2), 379-393. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas1602379j

Kim, M. (2009). The impact of an elaborated assessee's role in peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *34*(1), 105-114. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801955960

King, P. E., Young, M. J., & Behnke, R. R. (2000). Public speaking performance improvement as a function of information processing in immediate and delayed feedback interventions. *Communication Education*, *49*(4), 365-374. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520009379224

Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *18*(1), 30-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002

Murillo-Zamorano, L. R., & Montanero, M. (2018). Oral presentations in higher education: a comparison of the impact of peer and teacher feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *43*(1), 138-150. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1303032

Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2013). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 39*(1), 102-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518

Palmour, L. (2026). What teachers and students value in presentation style: towards inclusive oracy practices in Higher Education assessment. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 50*(1), 166-183. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2025.2587826

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. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903541007

Prodanović Stankić, D. (2017). Peer feedback as a collaborative task used in improving writing skills: A case study. *Nastava i vaspitanje 66*(3), 515-526. https://doi.org/10.5937/nasvas1703515P

Prosenjak, B., & Lučev, I. (2020). The impact of peer assessment on the attainment level of oral presentations skills. *Language Value*, *12*(1), 30-55. https://doi.org/10.6035/LanguageV.2020.12.3

Qaiser R., Fadden P., Rustom S., & Shaw J. (2022). Real-time peer-to-peer observation and feedback lead to improvement in oral presentation skills. *Cureus*, *14*(2), e21992. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.21992

Qaiser R., Fadden P., Rustom S., & Shaw J. (2022). Real-time peer-to-peer observation and feedback lead to improvement in oral presentation skills. Cureus, 14(2), e21992. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.21992

Stančić, M. (2020). Peer assessment as a learning and self-assessment tool: a look inside the black box. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *46*(6), 852-864. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1828267

Stančić, M., Milin, V., & Gašić, A. (2024). Peer feedback in higher education: How students' roles affect providing and receiving feedback. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *83*, 101408, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101408

Strijbos, J.-W., Pat-El, R. J., & Narciss, S. (2010). Validation of a (peer) feedback perceptions questionnaire. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, C. Jones, M. de Laat, D. McConnell, & T. Ryberg (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Networked Learning*, *7,* 378-386. Aalborg University Open Publishing. https://doi.org/10.54337/nlc.v7.9203

Topping, K. J. (2017). Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology, 1*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.31532/InterdiscipEducPsychol.1.1.007

Tsivitanidou, O. E., & Constantinou, C. P. (2016). A study of students' heuristics and strategy patterns in web-based reciprocal peer assessment for science learning. *The Internet and Higher Education*, *29*, 12-22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.11.002

Urena-Rodriguez, L., Lowell, V. L., & Yan, W. (2025). Peer Feedback, English Public Speaking Self-Efficacy, and Performance in Facebook and Brightspace. *Education Sciences*, *15*(7), 879. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15070879

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

van Ginkel, S., Gulikers, J., Biemans, H., & Mulder, M. (2017). Fostering oral presentation performance: does the quality of feedback differ when provided by the teacher, peers or peers guided by tutor? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *42*(6), 953-966. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1212984

Winstone, N., & Carless, D. (2020). *Designing Effective Feedback Processes in Higher Education*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351115940

Zamorano, D., Panadero, E., Alqassab, M., & Amillano, A. (2025). Effect of peer feedback role: Task performance, feedback implementation and perceptions on learning and trust. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *94*(4), 797-821. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2025.2466146

Zamorano, D., Panadero, E., Alqassab, M., & Gómez-Varela, J. F. (2026). Provider versus recipient: Peer feedback roles effect on task performance, perceptions of learning, trust, and epistemic emotions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *88*, 101560. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2026.101560

Zareva, A. (2009). Informational packaging, level of formality, and the use of circumstance adverbials in L1 and L2 student academic presentations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *8*(1), 55-68. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.12.002

Zhan, Y. (2024). Are they ready? An investigation of university students' difficulties in peer assessment from dual perspectives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *29*(4), 823-840. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.2021393

Zhou, J., Zheng, Y., & Tai, J. H. M. (2020). Grudges and gratitude: the social-affective impacts of peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *45*(3), 345-358. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1643449

Article received: 13.02.2026.
Updated version received: 30.04.2026.
Accepted for publishing: 04.06.2026.

Mirna Vidaković
Faculty of Economics in Subotica, University of Novi Sad, Subotica, Serbia
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8986-7505

This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). It is permitted to copy and distribute the work in all media and formats, to remix, transform, and build upon it for any purpose, including commercial purposes, provided that the original authors are properly credited, a link to the original license is included and it is indicated whether the work has been modified. Users are required to provide a full bibliographic citation of the article published in this journal (authors, title of the work, journal title, volume, issue, pagination), as well as its DOI identifier, and in the case of electronic publication, they are also required to provide an HTML link.