

IRENA ALEKSIĆ-HAJDUKOVIĆ*

UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE, SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

SERBIA

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1884-4784>

ANA MUŽAR

UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE, SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

SERBIA

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6158-7861>

MULTIMODALITY IN ESAP: PEER-ASSESSMENT OF MULTIPLE SEMIOTIC MODES IN DENTAL STUDENTS' ORAL PRESENTATIONS

Abstract: Previous studies have reiterated the need for assessment practices that acknowledge multimodal meaning-making by taking into account students' semiotic work that is often disregarded in educational contexts and, therefore, requires assessment strategies adjusted to multimodal learning environments (Bezemer and Kress 2015, Ørevik 2023). This research aims to examine how dental students assess different semiotic modes (speech, gestures, gaze) when evaluating the effectiveness of their peers' oral presentations delivered on a topic from the field of medicine or dentistry. A total of 76 first-year students taking the obligatory English Language course at the School of Dental Medicine, University of Belgrade, participated in the present study. The findings of this research reveal that intonation, diction, eye contact and language use, primarily, should be addressed and fine-tuned in classroom settings, thus contributing to the explorations of multimodality and interactivity in academic presentation courses, as suggested by Morell, García, and Sanchez (2008).

Keywords: English for Specific and Academic Purposes, dentistry, multimodal pedagogy, peer-assessment

1. INTRODUCTION

This research highlights the importance of multiple modes (speech, gestures, gaze) that can contribute to the (in)effectiveness of academic oral presentations in the context of English for Specific Purposes, as perceived by dental students

* irena.aleksic@stomf.bg.ac.rs

in a peer-assessment process. According to Kessler (2022, 551), the concept of multimodality pertains to how individuals use various modes of communication channels for the purpose of conveying meaning. Kress (2010, 79) defined a mode as a “socially shaped and culturally given semiotic resource for making meaning”. The need to simultaneously analyse multiple modes is derived from the following understanding of communication:

“Language is widely taken to be the most significant mode of communication; this is particularly so in contexts of learning and teaching. Multimodality, however, proceeds on the assumption that representation and communication always draw on a multiplicity of modes, all of which have the potential to contribute equally to meaning” (Jewitt 2017, 15).

Accordingly, the present study aims to contribute to the body of multimodal research that has challenged the presumption that “gaze, gesture, and posture [...] tend to be considered a support to speech; reinforcing or otherwise modifying speech but not providing communication in its own right” (Jewitt 2017, 15).

Oral presentations of ESP learners represent the focus of the current research since important pedagogical multimodal affordances are woven into this type of multimodal assignments. Ross, Curwood, and Bell (2020, 290) note that multimodal assignments have become an integral part of higher education. The field of languages for specific purposes at tertiary level is no exception with students being required to be able to engage in e.g., (patient) case presentations or research presentations in a foreign language throughout their future careers. Integrating multimodal assignments enables learners to “cultivate multimodal literacy, which draws upon a social semiotic approach to emphasise how multiple modes (e.g., written words, visual images, or moving digital images) serve as socially and culturally shaped resources for meaning making” (Ross, Curwood, and Bell 2020, 290).

The multifold benefits of generating multimodal compositions with the aim of language learning, also relevant for the processes of creating and delivering oral presentations, are evident in the literature: “Integrating multimodal projects in ESL courses has the capacity to promote collaboration and learner autonomy” (Macknish 2019). Furthermore, “[language learners] are also responsible for becoming better listeners and must be receptive to linguistic and nonverbal cues in spoken communication” (Yamashiro and Johnson 1997). This can be accounted for by the fact that combining several modalities, along with the consequential interplay of modes, leads to “the capacity to comprehend and convey information via different modes – including those that are linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and spatial in nature” (Lim and Kessler 2024, 184). It is implied that multimodal presentations expand communication skills beyond the verbal ones. In alignment with this, Stein (2008, 26) states that the concept of multimodality cannot be separated from bodies since bodies generate multimodality “through how they are constituted sensually and how these senses act on the world and are acted

on". Hence, it should be pointed out that a multimodal analysis of students' digital multimodal compositions, e.g., in terms of the presentations' layout, images (either still or moving), colours, and fonts used is beyond the scope of this study. Instead, the focus of this research is on the multimodality of presentation delivery as perceived by learners' peers.

Evaluating students' multimodal assignments requires practices that acknowledge multimodal meaning-making by taking into account students' semiotic work that is often disregarded in educational contexts and, therefore, requires assessment strategies adjusted to multimodal learning environments (Bezemer and Kress 2015; Ørevik 2023). In line with the objectives of this research, peer-assessment (PA) was applied in order to evaluate multiple semiotic modes in dental students' oral presentations. PA is defined as "an arrangement for learners to consider and specify the level, value, or quality of a product¹ or performance of other equal-status learners" (Topping 2009, 20). It has been reiterated in the literature that PA contributes to fostering the learning process, which provides solid evidence for incorporating PA into course frameworks (White 2009, 30). What is more, Double (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of 55 experimental and quasi-experimental studies that evaluated the effect of peer-assessment on academic performance. These findings further supported the use of PA as a formative method by indicating that this approach was "more effective than no assessment and teacher assessment and not significantly different in its effect from self-assessment" (Double 2019, 503).

The development of critical thinking skills and metacognition is closely connected to peer-assessment (Macknish 2019). Previous studies have demonstrated that students tend to exhibit a positive attitude towards peer-assessment (De Grez, Valcke, and Roozen 2012; Double 2019).

However, there is at least one blatant caveat to be considered when conducting peer-assessment of students' multimodal assignments, including oral presentations. Namely, being complex and multifaceted artefacts, multimodal texts are problematic in terms of description, evaluation and assessment (Levy and Kimber 2009, 491). We argue that this pertains to academic oral presentations that comprise multimodal compositions created using a software tool and the accompanying oral delivery. Still, teachers' guidance and aid enable and facilitate peer-assessment (Black et al. 2003, 52). One study (Murillo-Zamorano and Montanero 2018) analysed 96 recorded oral presentations of economics and business students and concluded that when adequate support and resources (videos and rubrics) are provided, the peer assessments of higher education students appear to be more effective when it comes to improving those presentations than the assessments made by the teachers. The same authors noted that both verbal and non-verbal eloquence were improved when

¹ According to Topping (2009, 20), "products to be assessed can include writing, oral presentations, portfolios, test performance, or other skilled behaviors".

the rubric was part of the peer-evaluation process. It has also been reported that when rubrics are used as a scaffolding method, this leads to peer-assessment being more accurate (Double 2019, 485).

Finally, Beltrán-Palanques (2023, 2) sums up previous claims and states that even though multimodality is not a recent phenomenon, its pedagogical applicability in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) contexts represents an emerging realm of research that is expanding (e.g., Hafner and Miller 2018; Querol-Julián and Fortanet-Gómez 2019).

Therefore, this research aims to:

- 1) explore how ESP students evaluate and perceive different semiotic modes (speech, gestures, gaze) employed by their peers while delivering oral presentations in academic settings;
- 2) obtain preliminary key insights regarding the effectiveness of dental students' presentations so as to adapt the pedagogical strategies that will help reinforce the most challenging aspects (e.g. language use, eye contact, intonation, etc.) realised through different semiotic modes.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

2.1. Study design

For the purposes of this research, a Google Forms questionnaire was composed with the aim of obtaining insights into peer-evaluation of multiple semiotic modes (speech, gestures, gaze) in dental students' oral presentations. First-year Serbian students attending the obligatory English for Specific Purposes course at the School of Dental Medicine, University of Belgrade, filled in the questionnaire on a voluntary basis in November 2023, which resulted in a total of 76 recorded survey answers. The introductory part of the questionnaire consisted of one open-ended and two multiple-choice questions eliciting information on the title of the presentation under scrutiny, as well as on the name and the group number of the team representative whose presentation was being evaluated. The main sections of the questionnaire were firmly based on a peer-rating score sheet adapted from North Carolina State University's peer review digital teaching resources². The peer-rating score sheet comprised a five-point Likert scale (1 – poor, 2 – weak, 3 – average, 4 – good, 5 – very good), employing the scoring system similar to the one suggested by Yamashiro and Johnson (1997) and further adapted by White (2009) aimed at rating presenters on individual points and arriving at an overall score. The peer-evaluated categories included *voice control* (mode: speech), *body language* (modes: gestures and gaze), *contents of presentation* (mode: speech), and *effectiveness* (mode: speech). Within the category of *voice control*, *projection*,

2 NC State University Teaching Resources. s.d. "Peer Evaluation: Speech of Introduction." Accessed January 8, 2025. <https://li.wsu.edu/documents/2020/03/motivating-students-peer-evaluation-speech-of-introduction.pdf/>

pace, *intonation*, and *diction* were assessed, while *posture*, *eye contact*, and *gestures* were rated as part of the *body language* category. The aspects pertaining to *contents of presentation* that were evaluated included *introduction*, *body* and *conclusion*, whereas *topic choice*, *language use*, *vocabulary*, and *purpose* were examined within the category of *effectiveness*. These subcategories were further explicated in brackets so as to avoid any potential misunderstandings and direct the participants' attention to what needed to be taken into account when rating each of them. Thus, the focus was placed on how loudly or softly the presenters projected their voice, how fast or slow their speech rate was, whether they managed to vary their intonation patterns, enunciate words clearly, stand with a straight back and in a relaxed manner, maintain eye contact with the audience, and use body gestures in a balanced way that was not distracting. Moreover, emphasis was laid on how successfully the introduction grabbed the audiences' attention and encompassed the main points, to what extent the body of the presentation highlighted the key ideas and was marked by smooth transitions, how pronounced the summary of the main points and the closing statement were in the conclusion, whether the topic choice was interesting for the audience, to what degree the presenters' language was accurate, whether their vocabulary was well-chosen and well-used, and how informative the presentation was. Furthermore, one open-ended qualitative question was also included with a view to complementing the obtained quantitative insights by giving the respondents a chance to reflect more closely on the peer-evaluation task.

2.2. Context

It should be noted that this oral presentation assignment was not part of any public speaking course; rather it was incorporated in the mandatory English for Medical and Dental Purposes course as a pre-exam requirement to provide first-year students at the School of Dental Medicine in Belgrade with an opportunity to develop higher-order thinking skills, search electronic sources in English, acquire the basics of secondary research, and speak English in public. Consequently, it is crucial to point out that for many of them this was the first time ever to present in English.

Prior to the in-class delivery of oral presentations, the guidelines had been presented so that the students could have a better understanding of the task in question and its requirements. Around 250 first-year dental students, who took obligatory ESP practical lessons divided in 10 groups (i.e., 24-25 students per group), were advised to organise in teams of 4 to 5 members within each group for the sake of their convenience, easier task completion, and an equal share of the work. To that end, each presenter was allocated a three-minute time slot. All teams were supposed to select one team representative whose responsibility was to inform the teacher of the chosen topic and the names

of other team members by filling in a short Google Form posted on Google Classroom. Another duty of each team representative was to upload their PowerPoint presentation (61 in total) via the Learning Management System (Google Classroom) in advance of the delivery date. All deadlines were clearly stated and the structure of PowerPoint presentations thoroughly explained. In addition to that, both organisation and content checklists were provided, as well as a list of useful phrases for the introduction, effective openings, the body part, describing visuals, the conclusion and dealing with questions, inasmuch as learners in a mixed-ability class such as this one possess a varying command of English. The students were recommended to use trustworthy resources such as the websites of major healthcare organisations (e.g. WHO, GMC, BMA, NHS, FDI, ADA, BDA) and scientific publications related to their topic, and to consult some of the reliable online dictionaries if having any difficulties with pronouncing new words or medical terms. They were also familiarised with the importance of non-verbal communication in class. Moreover, students' attention was drawn to the fact that reading out the text they had prepared would significantly affect their pre-exam score. Finally, it was stressed that, preferably, one topic was supposed to be covered by one team only within a single group for the purposes of exploring a wide array of topics from the fields of both medicine and dentistry. The list of suggested topics was as follows:

MEDICINE	DENTISTRY
Transplantation: Past, Present and Future	Halitosis: Cause, Treatment and Prevention
Emergency Medicine: Sepsis	Gingivitis: Cause, Treatment and Prevention
Alzheimer's Disease: Cause, Symptoms and Treatment	An Insight into TMJ Disorders
Common Tropical Diseases: Overview	Tobacco Use and Oral Health
Immunisation: the MMR Vaccine	Alcohol Consumption and Oral Health
Stem Cell Therapy	(A)Esthetic Dentistry: Veneers, Crowns and Implants
Ethical Issues in Medicine: Euthanasia	(A)Esthetic Dentistry: Teeth Whitening Techniques
MedTech: Medical Technology in the 21st century	Toothbrushing Techniques: (Modified) Bass and Fones
Coronavirus What Do We Know About COVID-19?	Pregnancy and Dental Health

3. RESULTS

Upon observing the multiple-choice questions regarding the choice of presentation topics, a marked discrepancy was found between the topics most frequently chosen for in-class delivery and the ones most frequently selected for peer-evaluation. Namely, the questionnaire submitted by 61 team representatives showed that the greatest number of teams (18) most readily opted for presenting *Alcohol Consumption and Oral Health* (9) and *Tobacco Use and Oral Health* (9) in class, while the biggest majority of the survey participants (19) decided on evaluating multiple semiotic modes of team presentations on *Pregnancy and Dental Health*. Interestingly enough, *Pregnancy and Dental Health*, together with (A)*Esthetic Dentistry: Veneers, Crowns and Implants* and (A)*Esthetic Dentistry: Teeth Whitening Techniques*, was the second most prominent topic – covered by 7 teams each. Conversely, *Transplantation: Past, Present and Future*, *Common Tropical Diseases: Overview* and *Coronavirus: What Do We Know About COVID-19?* turned out to be the topics that the students were least interested in presenting in front of the class – explored solely by 2 teams each.

As for peer-evaluation, *Alcohol Consumption and Oral Health*, *Toothbrushing Techniques: (Modified) Bass and Fones* and *Alzheimer's Disease: Cause, Symptoms and Treatment* were other prevalent topics peer-reviewed by 10, 9 and 8 survey participants, respectively. In contrast, *Gingivitis: Cause, Treatment and Prevention*, *Tobacco Use and Oral Health* and (A)*Esthetic Dentistry: Teeth Whitening Techniques* transpired to be the least peer-assessed topics – only 2 to 3 respondents per topic taking on the role of a peer-reviewer.

When it comes to *voice control* (Table 1), the first peer-evaluated category, approximately 60 out of 76 participants deemed their peers' projection and pace more than satisfactory, whereas only 2 of them still saw some room for improvement. On the other hand, instances of weak and average scoring are definitely more noticeable for *intonation* and *diction* than *projection* and *pace*. Namely, 5 to 6 respondents regarded their peers' ability to enunciate words clearly and vary intonation patterns as inadequately demonstrated.

Table 1. Peer evaluation of voice control

Voice Control	1	2	3	4	5
Projection	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	12 (15.8%)	63 (82.9%)
Pace	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	19 (25%)	56 (73.7%)
Intonation	0 (0%)	2 (2.6%)	4 (5.3%)	15 (19.7%)	55 (72.4%)
Diction	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	4 (5.3%)	18 (23.7%)	53 (69.7%)

Pertaining to *body language* (Table 2), the second peer-evaluated category, it can be observed that the presenters did not mostly struggle with *posture* – 60

out of 76 raters perceiving their classmates as exceptionally good in this respect. In a similar vein, the presenters were reported to be well in control of *gestures*. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for *eye contact* insofar as more than a quarter of the survey subjects (22.4%) noticed that their peers' insecurity and anxiety were reflected in the absence of or insufficient eye contact, which in turn resulted in some notably average or weakly-scored performance in this subcategory.

Table 2. Peer evaluation of body language

Body language	1	2	3	4	5
Posture	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	2 (2.6%)	13 (17.1%)	60 (78.9%)
Eye contact	0 (0%)	4 (5.3%)	13 (17.1%)	20 (26.3%)	39 (51.3%)
Gestures	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.9%)	17 (22.4%)	56 (73.7%)

With regard to *contents of presentation* (Table 3), the third peer-evaluated category, *introduction*, *body* and *conclusion* came out as quite positively scored, with only 1 to 3 participants opting for either weak or average scoring. Interestingly enough, the figures also indicate that the presenters managed to excel more noticeably in the wrapping up segment of their presentation and summing up the most important bits and pieces of it than in coming up with an attention-grabbing introduction.

Table 3. Peer evaluation of contents of presentation

Contents of presentation	1	2	3	4	5
Introduction	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	17 (22.4%)	57 (75%)
Body	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.9%)	15 (19.7%)	58 (76.3%)
Conclusion	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.9%)	8 (10.5%)	65 (85.5%)

Finally, concerning presentation *effectiveness* (Table 4), the fourth peer-evaluated category, the peer-reviewed topics proved quite riveting for the audience – 65 out of 76 survey subjects being completely engrossed in them. Furthermore, clear and correct sentences prevailed, though 3 respondents spotted some grammar inaccuracies in their classmates' speech. Vocabulary was mostly well-selected too, with 84.2% of the participants considering the choice of the vocabulary items used more than appropriate for the first-year dental students' level of English knowledge. Similarly, the presentations delivered were deemed highly informative for the purposes of this first-year English for Medical and Dental Purposes course.

Table 4. Peer evaluation of presentation effectiveness

Effectiveness	1	2	3	4	5
Topic choice	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	9 (11.8%)	65 (85.5%)
Language use	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.9%)	15 (19.7%)	58 (76.3%)
Vocabulary	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)	10 (13.2%)	64 (84.2%)
Purpose	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	6 (7.9%)	69 (90.8%)

The next section will shed light on the inferences that can be made based on the results of peer-evaluation of different semiotic modes in dental students' oral presentations delivered in English.

4. DISCUSSION

Indubitably, at first glance, an overall positive score across all peer-evaluated categories can be noticed. Nonetheless, having had a closer look, it can be maintained that *effectiveness* achieved the highest *very good* (5) score, while *body language* achieved the lowest *very good* (5) score – amounting to a total of 256 and 155 responses, respectively, across all categories. *Body language* got, in turn, the highest *weak* (2) score as well, whereas *contents of presentation* got the lowest *weak* (2) score – coming to a total of 5 and 1 responses, respectively, across all categories. As for *poor* (1) score, it made up zero responses across all peer-evaluated categories. The explanation for such survey results may lie in the fact that the presenters were provided with the list of topics, as well as organisation and content checklists, prior to the in-class delivery. Besides, they also obtained advice on language use and vocabulary since grammar was covered in class and lists of useful vocabulary were shared on Google Classroom. The presenters' knowledge of the subject-based content was also satisfactory enough to deliver quite informative presentations, in a rather comprehensive manner, on a wide range of topics from the fields of both medicine and dentistry. On the other hand, non-verbal communication transpired to be a more serious obstacle in the path of delivering effective presentations confidently, being indicative of the presenters' mounting anxiety, uneasiness, and stage fright.

A study carried out within an ESP course focusing on product pitches (Edo-Marzá and Fortanet-Gómez 2022) yielded quite similar results. Namely, their students were not as well versed in non-verbal dimension of communication as in the verbal one (2022, 74). The authors explain (2022, 74) that language, traditionally deemed the main mode of communication, has long been the focal point of assessment, which is assumed to be one of the reasons for being awarded higher ratings. Furthermore, gestures, eye rapport and prosodic features were not only assigned lower scores on a five-point continuum in their study, but they were also reported to be more difficult to peer-evaluate since students “may

not be ready yet to perceive their correct use and harmonious integration in their classmates' performance" (2022, 75). Thus, Edo-Marzá and Fortanet-Gómez (2022, 74–76) arrived at the conclusion that observing an oral activity through a multimodal lens with the aim of discerning its non-verbal characteristics was beyond students' capacity at the time of the research due to the lack of formal in-class instruction and proper student training in multimodal literacy.

Upon diving even deeper into the present findings, it can be noted that *projection* and *pace* achieved slightly higher scores in comparison to *intonation* and *diction* within the category of *voice control*. Namely, regular in-class emphasis was laid on projection and pace, while there was little opportunity for students to hone their presentation skills, which naturally resulted in students' insufficient experience in public speaking. Conversely, it was noticeably higher scores that *posture* and *gestures* got compared to *eye contact* within the category of *body language* – the lack of eye contact being a major indicator of jitters and physical unease, and concurrently the most challenging aspect of this assignment that the presenters had to grapple with. What is more, the findings of the study conducted by Edo-Marzá and Fortanet-Gómez (2022, 77) indicate that *eye rapport* received significantly lower ratings in comparison to other non-verbal semiotic modes, which aligns with our insights.

Moreover, in the current study, *conclusion* was awarded somewhat higher scores than *introduction* and *body* within the category of *contents of presentation*. As it turned out, despite the equal instruction focus, the presenters directed a bit more attention to how impactful their closing remarks were in comparison to the opening ones. *Topic choice*, *purpose* and *vocabulary* also achieved moderately higher scores contrasted to *language use* within the category of *effectiveness*. Evidently, the exposure to in-class grammar instruction led to students' heightened alertness to grammatical errors in this instance. Nevertheless, the optional open-ended section of the questionnaire also provided one respondent's commentary on some words being too complex to grasp easily, which is understandable when dealing with a mixed-ability class such as this one. Additionally, two respondents expressed a difference of opinion, stating that their classmates' presentations contained too many unnecessary pieces of information, which consequently made their attention wander.

Finally, the results of another study conducted within an English for Linguistics course (Sindoni 2013) also converge with ours, confirming that "language skills, coverage and general "knowledge" of the presented topic [are] both maximally valued and easily recognised by students" (2013, 154). Another point of agreement between Sindoni (2013, 154) and Edo-Marzá and Fortanet-Gómez (2022, 74) is that it is more challenging to evaluate non-verbal aspects of communication because they are considered as less traditional assessment criteria. Besides, apart from being rarely instructed in non-verbal communicative strategies, students are generally not provided with many opportunities to practise peer-assessment (Sindoni 2013, 155).

Consequently, in spite of an overall positive score across all peer-evaluated categories, it can be finally concluded that formal, in-class instruction coupled with verbal aspects of communication significantly contributes to higher peer-evaluation scores in dental students' oral presentations, while the lack of or insufficient formal, in-class instruction – especially in non-verbal communication – inevitably leads to a less polished and less effective performance.

5. CONCLUSION

This research has demonstrated the importance of employing different semiotic modes successfully in order to deliver effective academic oral presentations on various topics from the fields of both medicine and dentistry. Such multimodal assignments prove indispensable in the context of English for Specific Purposes at tertiary level, reinforcing multimodal literacy skills, enhancing meaning-making, and fostering collaborative learning and learner autonomy. As the present study has shown, insufficient experience in public speaking becomes increasingly ubiquitous in non-verbal communication, which necessitates a higher degree of formal, in-class instruction concerning semiotic modes other than speech. Not addressing a multiplicity of modes in an ESP classroom, especially gestures and gaze, represents a major stumbling block to expanding communication skills beyond the verbal ones. The key insights obtained from this research provide guidance in terms of what pedagogical strategies need to be adopted in order to effectively deal with the most challenging aspects of public speaking (i.e., intonation, diction, eye contact, and language use) realised through different semiotic modes.

What calls for a tentative interpretation of the survey results is the lack of clarity regarding the differences between the scores on this five-point continuum since the respondents were not provided with any rubric descriptors more specific than the following: 1 – poor, 2 – weak, 3 – average, 4 – good, 5 – very good. Besides, as White (2009, 22) indicates, “students’ lack of PA experience, insufficient time, or simply the inherent, often complex, nature of making assessment judgements” may further account for the participants’ hesitancy and uncertainty when filling in the survey. It is also important to underline that the survey participants evaluated the aforesaid multiple semiotic modes in their peers’ *group* presentations. And while the categories of *contents of presentation* and *effectiveness* can be regarded as the outputs of collaborative work, the categories of *voice control* and *body language* are more speaker-specific. Accordingly, although each team member’s performance undoubtedly contributes to reinforcing impressions on a group level, it is more difficult to assign one group score to possibly varying degrees that each team member displays in terms of managing voice control and body language successfully. For that reason, the latter may be considered a limitation of the study, and therefore examining each team member’s voice control and body language within a single

group and how such individual performance can lead to forming overall group impressions may as well represent a practical implication for further research.

REFERENCES

- Beltrán-Palanques, Vicent. 2024. "Teaching elevator pitch presentations through a multimodal lens: Insights from ESP students' experiences." *TESOL Journal* 15, no. 2: e769. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.769>
- Black, Paul, Christine Harrison, Clare Lee, Bethan Marshall, and Dylan Wiliam. 2003. *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Open University Press.
- Double, Kit S., Joshua A. McGrane, and Therese N. Hopfenbeck. 2020. "The impact of peer assessment on academic performance: A meta-analysis of control group studies." *Educational Psychology Review* 32, no. 2 (June): 481-509. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09510-3>
- De Grez, Luc, Martin Valcke, and Irene Roozen. 2012. "How effective are self- and peer assessment of oral presentation skills compared with teachers' assessments?." *Active Learning in Higher Education* 13, no. 2: 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146978741244128>
- Edo-Marzá, Nuria, and Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez. 2022. "New genres and new approaches: Teaching and assessing product pitches from a multimodal perspective in the ESP classroom." *Porta Linguarum* 38 (June): 65-81. <https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.vi38.21621>
- Hafner, Christoph., and Lindsay, Miller. (2018). *English in the disciplines: A multidimensional model for ESP course design*. London: Routledge.
- Jewitt, Carey. 2017. "An introduction to multimodality." In *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*, edited by Carey Jewitt, 15-30. London: Routledge.
- Kessler, Matt. 2022. "Multimodality". *ELT Journal* 76, no. 4: 551-554. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac028>
- Kress, Gunther. 2010. *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bezemer, Jeff, and Gunther Kress. 2015. *Multimodality, learning and communication: A social semiotic frame*. Routledge.
- Levy, Mike, and Kay Kimber. 2009. "Developing an approach for comparing students' multimodal text creations: A case study." *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 25, no. 4: 489-508.
- Lim, Jungmin, and Matt Kessler. 2024 "Multimodal Composing and Second Language Acquisition." *Language Teaching* 57, no. 2: 183-202. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444823000125>.
- Macknish, Cynthia J. 2019. "Creating Multimodal Reflections in an IEP Speaking-Listening Course." *TESL Canada Journal* 36, no. 3:173-85. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v36i3.1326>
- Morell, Teresa., Miguel García, and Inés Sánchez, I. 2008. Multimodal strategies for effective academic presentations in English for non-native speakers. In *25 years of applied linguistics in Spain: Milestones and challenges*, edited by R. Monroy and A. Sanchez, 557-568. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.

- Murillo-Zamorano, Luis R., and Manuel Montanero. 2018. "Oral presentations in higher education: a comparison of the impact of peer and teacher feedback." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 43, no. 1: 138-150.
- NC State University Teaching Resources. s.d. "Peer Evaluation: Speech of Introduction." Accessed January 8, 2025. <https://li.wsu.edu/documents/2020/03/motivating-students-peer-evaluation-speech-of-introduction.pdf/>
- Querol-Julián, M., and Fortanet-Gómez, I. (2019). Collaborative teaching and learning of interactive multimodal spoken academic genres for doctoral students. *International Journal of English Studies* 19, no. 2: 61–82. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.348911>
- Ross, Jen, Jen Scott Curwood, and Amani Bell. 2020. "A multimodal assessment framework for higher education." *E-learning and Digital Media* 17, no. 4: 290-306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753020927201>
- Sindoni, Maria Grazia. 2013. "English for Linguistics and multimodal peer-assessment at university postgraduate level." In *ESP Across Cultures 10*, edited by Marina Bondi and Christopher Williams, 147–160. Italy: Edipuglia. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4475/721>
- Stein, Pippa. 2007. *Multimodal pedagogies in diverse classrooms: Representation, rights and resources*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Topping, Keith J. 2009. "Peer assessment." *Theory into practice* 48, no. 1: 20-27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569>
- Yamashiro, Amy D., and Johnson, Jeff. 1997. "Public Speaking in EFL: elements for course design." *The Language Teacher*. Accessed January 3, 2025. Retrieved from <https://jalt-publications.org/tlt/articles/2124-public-speaking-efl-elements-course-design>
- White, Eddy. 2009. "Student perspectives of peer assessment for learning in a public speaking course." *Asian EFL Journal* 33, no. 1 (January): 1-36.
- Ørevik, Sigrid. 2023. "Assessing Students' Multimodal Texts in the Subject of English: Synthesising Peers' and Teachers' Recognition of Semiotic Work". *Designs for Learning* 15, no. 1: 44–57. <https://doi.org/10.16993/dfl.216>

VRŠNJAČKO OCENJIVANJE RAZLIČITIH SEMIOTIČKIH RESURSA U USMENIM PREZENTACIJAMA STUDENATA STOMATOLOGIJE

Rezime

Prethodna istraživanja su naglasila potrebu da se pri ocenjivanju značaj prida multimodalnom stvaranju značenja, uzimajući u obzir semiotičku komponentu studentskog rada koja se često zanemaruje u obrazovnim kontekstima i, stoga, zahteva strategije ocenjivanja prilagođene multimodalnim okruženjima za učenje (Bezemer i Kres, 2003; Ørevik, 2023). Ovo istraživanje ima za cilj da ispita kako studenti stomatologije ocenjuju različite semiotičke resurse (govor, pokreti, pogled) prilikom procenjivanja celokupne uspešnosti usmenih prezentacija svojih kolega na teme iz oblasti medicine ili stomatologije, služeći se unapred zadatim rubrikama. U literaturi se smatra da vršnjačko ocenjivanje ima pozitivan uticaj na akademsku

uspešnost, pritom pospešujući razvoj kritičke misli i metakognicije (Makniš, 2019). Ranije studije su takođe pokazale da vršnjačko ocenjivanje, prema kome studenti ispoljavaju pozitivan stav, kao i rubrike za ocenjivanje značajnije doprinose unapređenju akademskog usmenog izlaganja u poređenju sa drugim formama ocenjivanja (De Grez, Valke i Ruzen, 2012; Dabl 2019; Murilo-Zamorano i Montanero, 2018). U istraživanju je učestvovalo ukupno 76 studenata prve godine koji pohađaju obavezni kurs engleskog jezika na Stomatološkom fakultetu Univerziteta u Beogradu. Rezultati ove studije pokazuju da u nastavnom okruženju fokus, pre svega, treba staviti na intonaciju, dikciju, kontakt očima i jezičku upotrebu i tako ih unaprediti. Međutim, kao jedno od ograničenja ove studije izdvaja se činjenica da su studenti ocenjivali različite semiotičke resurse u grupnim prezentacijama svojih kolega. Stoga, iako nastup svakog člana tima doprinosi formiranju utisaka na grupnom nivou, dodeljivanje grupne ocene različitim stepenima uspešnosti koje svaki član tima zasebno ispoljava pri verbalnoj i neverbalnoj komunikaciji predstavlja značajan izazov. U skladu sa time, važna implikacija za buduća istraživanja bi bila da se u sam fokus stavi način na koji svako individualno izlaganje utiče na stvaranje sveukupnih impresija u okviru svake grupe izlagača ponaosob.

Ključne reči: Engleski jezik za posebne i akademske svrhe, multimodalna pedagogija, stomatologija, vršnjačko ocenjivanje

Appendix 1: Presentation Peer Rating Sheet
(adapted from Yamashiro and Johnson, 1997 and White, 2009)

1. Group No.

Choose your group number:

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5
- ☐ 6
- ☐ 7
- ☐ 8
- ☐ 9
- ☐ 10

2. Presentation Title

Choose your presentation topic:

1. Transplantation: Past, Present and Future
2. Emergency Medicine: Sepsis
3. Alzheimer's Disease: Cause, Symptoms and Treatment
4. Common Tropical Diseases: Overview
5. Immunisation: the MMR Vaccine
6. Stem Cell Therapy
7. Ethical Issues in Medicine: Euthanasia
8. MedTech: Medical Technology in the 21st century
9. Coronavirus: What Do We Know About COVID-19?
10. Halitosis: Cause, Treatment and Prevention
11. Gingivitis: Cause, Treatment and Prevention
12. An Insight into TMJ Disorders
13. Tobacco Use and Oral Health
14. Alcohol Consumption and Oral Health
15. (A)Esthetic Dentistry: Veneers, Crowns and Implants
16. (A)Esthetic Dentistry: Teeth Whitening Techniques
17. Toothbrushing Techniques: (Modified) Bass and Fones
18. Pregnancy and Dental Health

3. Team Representative

First Name and Surname:

4. Voice Control

Rate the following aspects pertaining to voice control according to the following:

1 (poor), 2 (weak), 3 (average), 4 (good), 5 (very good)

Projection (loud/soft)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Pace (speech rate: fast/slow)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Intonation (patterns, pauses)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Diction (clear speaking)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

5. Body Language

Rate the following aspects pertaining to body language according to the following:

1 (**poor**), 2 (**weak**), 3 (**average**), 4 (**good**), 5 (**very good**)

Posture (standing straight, relaxed)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Eye contact	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Gestures (well-used, not distracting)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

6. Contents of Presentation

Rate the following aspects pertaining to contents of presentation according to the following:

1 (**poor**), 2 (**weak**), 3 (**average**), 4 (**good**), 5 (**very good**)

Introduction (grabs attention, has main points)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Body (focused on main ideas, has transitions)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Conclusion (summary of main points, closing statement)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

7. Effectiveness

Rate the following aspects pertaining to effectiveness according to the following:

1 (**poor**), 2 (**weak**), 3 (**average**), 4 (**good**), 5 (**very good**)

Topic choice (interesting for audience)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Language use (clear, correct sentences)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Vocabulary (words well-chosen and used)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good
Purpose (informative, teaches about topic)	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Very good

8. Additional comments and suggestions

If you have any additional comments or suggestions, please note them down:
