Al-Noor Journal for Humanities, Vol.4, Issue2, 2026 (157-173)
ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a9

Al-Noor Journal for Humanities

https://jnh.alnoor.edu.iq/

Students' Problems of Rendering Metadiscourse in Consecutive Interpreting of English Political Discourse into Arabic.

A S Abdulmohsin **S Y Fathi**

Department of translation, college of arts, university of Mosul
Department of English, College of Basic Education, University of Mosul, Mosul, Iraq.

Article information

Article history:
Received: *15 August 2025*
Revised: *1 September 2025*
Accepted:*5 Janurery 2026*

Keywords:
consecutive interpreting
metadiscourse
political text

Correspondence:

Abdullah saud abdulmohsin
Abdullahsaudabdulmohsen@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the rendering of metadiscourse resources in consecutive interpreting from English into Arabic. Metadiscourse has been extensively studied in written genres, including academic writing, advertisements, textbooks, and popular science articles. However, there is a significant gap in the exploration of how metadiscourse is interpreted, conveyed, or perhaps lost during consecutive interpreting of political texts. This research aims to close this gap by investigating the extent to which student interpreters recognize and reproduce metadiscourse elements in consecutive interpreting from English into Arabic. Political texts are chosen because they are rich in rhetorical devices and persuasive strategies, making them fertile ground for metadiscourse analysis. It is hypothesized that metadiscourse is context-bound and multifunctional. The data draw on a speech delivered by Boris Johnson (2021), interpreted by ten MA candidates at the Department of Translation, University of Mosul. Hyland's (2005) model and Nida's (1964) model are adopted in the analysis and interpretation of metadiscourse resources employed in the text. The study revealed that the students were unable to capture the rhetorical function of metadiscourse resources, which resulted in inadequate and undesirable output.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a9 © Authors, 2026, College of Education, Alnoor University.
This is an open-access article under the CC BY 4.0 license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

مشكلات الطلبة في نقل مؤشرات ما وراء الخطاب في الترجمة الشفوية التتابعية للخطاب السياسي من الإنجليزية إلى العربية

عبدالله سعود عبدالمحسن **سالم يحيى فتحي**
قسم الترجمة ، كلية الآداب ، جامعة الموصل ، العراق

الخلاصة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقصّي ترجمة الإدخالات الخطابية أثناء الترجمة التعاقبية من اللغة الإنجليزية إلى اللغة العربية. وقد أُجريت العديد من الدراسات السابقة على أنماط مختلفة من النصوص المكتوبة، مثل المقالات الأكاديمية، والإعلانات، والكتب المنهجية، والنصوص الجدلية، والمقالات العلمية، إلا أن هناك فجوة واضحة في دراسة كيفية ترجمة هذه الإدخالات أثناء الترجمة التعاقبية للنصوص السياسية. وتسعى هذه الدراسة إلى سدّ هذه الفجوة من خلال التحقق من مدى قدرة المترجمين على إدراك وتوظيف الإدخالات الخطابية أثناء الترجمة من الإنجليزية إلى العربية. وقد تم اختيار نص سياسي لما يتسم به من ثراء في الأساليب البلاغية والاستراتيجيات الإقناعية. وتفترض الدراسة أن الإدخالات الخطابية تعتمد على السياق وتؤدي وظائف متعددة، وقد تم اعتماد خطاب ألقاه رئيس الوزراء البريطاني بوريس جونسون كنص للتحليل، وقام بترجمته عشرة طلاب في مرحلة الماجستير بقسم الترجمة في جامعة الموصل. واعتمدت الدراسة نموذج هايلاند (2005) لتحليل الإدخالات الخطابية، إلى جانب نموذج نايدا (1964) في التعامل مع آليات الترجمة. وقد أظهرت النتائج أن غالبية الطلاب لم يتمكنوا من ترجمة هذه الإدخالات بشكل مناسب، مما أدى إلى إنتاج ترجمات غير دقيقة وضعيفة التأثير من حيث الوظيفة البلاغ

The Concept of Translation

Translation is regarded as a means of communication across different languages and cultures. It is a multifaceted concept that carries various definitions depending on the theoretical orientation discussed by theorists and researchers of translation. Generally, translation is understood as a process of transferring meaning from a Source Language (SL) to a Target Language (TL), often aiming for realizing functional equivalence. Many scholars have defined translation in terms of this equivalence, though the nature and degree of equivalence may vary across models and types of translation. For instance, Eugene A. Nida (1964), a pioneer in translation theory, introduced the concept of functional equivalence (originally termed dynamic equivalence) as a model aimed at achieving equivalent effect in translation. He defines it as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message, first in meaning and second in style" (Nida, 1964: 166). This model prioritizes the intended meaning and communicative impact of the original message rather than its formal linguistic features. In other words, the focus is not on a word-for-word rendering, but rather on producing a translation that elicits the same response from the target audience as the original audience did.

One of the earliest definitions is provided by Catford (1965: 20), who states that translation is "the replacement of (written or spoken) textual material in one language by equivalent textual material in another language." Catford focuses on the concept of textual equivalence, emphasizing the need to identify linguistic units in the target language (TL) that correspond to those in the source language (SL) in terms of meaning and structure. Similarly, Pinchuk (1977: 38) characterizes translation as "the process of finding an equivalent expression in the target language for a given utterance in the source language," reinforcing the idea that translation is primarily a linguistic substitution guided by equivalence.

The Concept of Interpreting

Interpreting is a highly complex mental, psycho-affective, and linguistic task, comprising a plethora of skills, knowledge, and competences (Mercer, 2008; Gile, 2010). As it is commonly known, interpreters, unlike translators, deal with spoken communication, necessitating excellent verbal skills. They must be thoroughly prepared before an assignment, as there's no opportunity to consult external resources, such as dictionaries or electronic devices (Pöchhacker, 2004; Gile, 2009; Nolan, 2012). This highlights a key distinction between interpreting and translation, which are considered separate professions by many scholars. Translators have the luxury of time to ponder their word choices and even revise their work, but interpreters operate at a much faster pace, making on-the-spot decisions that are difficult to correct. Unlike translators, interpreters typically can't consult external resources while they're working. Interpreting is more than a simple word-for-word translation; it's a complex process of understanding and conveying meaning, as Seleskovitch (1975) emphasized. She further elaborated (1978) that interpreting involves expressing concepts verbally while spontaneously creating linguistic equivalents. Rather than merely overcoming linguistic obstacles, interpreters facilitate connections and associations (Jones, 2002), consistently acting as mediators of communication, a role distinct from that of simple "transcoders" who only convert language forms (Hermann, 2002; Pöchhacker, 2006). Interpreters operate under significant time pressure, producing real-time renditions that are difficult to correct or review later (Moser-Mercer, 2008; Gile, 2009; Walczynski, 2019). This immediacy is crucial for facilitating cross-linguistic communication (Pöchhacker, 2004; Gile, 2009; Seeber, 2015).

Consecutive Interpreting

Consecutive interpreting is a distinct mode of oral translation where the interpreter begins rendering the message only after the original speaker has completed a segment or an entire utterance of their speech. This method, as described by Pöchhacker (2011) and Seeber (2015), requires the interpreter to listen attentively, often taking notes, before accurately conveying the message in the target language. Unlike simultaneous interpreting, this method allows the interpreter time to process and reconstruct the speech in a different language. During the speaker's delivery, the interpreter typically takes notes to aid in recalling and accurately reproducing the message (Russell, 2015; Setton, 1999). This means that the interpreter is present with the speakers, actively listening and noting key points before delivering their interpretation.

Russell (2005) defines consecutive interpreting as the process where the interpreter begins their rendition after the source language speaker has finished and paused. This mode inherently allows the interpreter more time to process the input, facilitating a more considered output in terms of meaning and form (Walczynski, 2019). Crucially, consecutive interpreters rely heavily on both their memory and detailed notes taken during the original speech. Should any comprehension gaps arise, they also have the advantage of being able to seek clarification from the speakers (Herbert, 1952; Gile, 2009).

Consecutive interpreting is primarily divided into two categories: short and long. Short consecutive interpreting involves rendering brief segments, ranging from a single phrase to a few sentences, at a time. This method is frequently employed for dialogues and monologues where the speaker pauses regularly, typically after no more than two or three sentences (Setton, 2015). In this "short chunk" approach, the interpreter translates concise portions of the source language into their equivalent target language. Often referred to as liaison interpreting, this type of consecutive interpreting is characterized by interpreters taking turns to facilitate communication. It is considered the most natural form of oral translation and is widely used due to its minimal technical requirements (Setton, 2015).

Consecutive interpreting, conversely, involves the rendition of longer passages, often several minutes in duration, and heavily relies on a systematic note-taking approach. This method allows speakers to develop intricate arguments, complete with illustrations, facts, and figures, without interruption. In this process, the interpreter waits for the source language speaker to conclude their whole speech, and then, utilizing their comprehensive notes and memorized information, delivers the complete speech in the target language (Russell, 2005; Russell & Malcolm, 2010).

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

Identifying and categorizing metadiscourse resources in English political texts and examining how they are rendered during consecutive interpreting into Arabic.

Assessing the extent to which student interpreters recognize and convey metadiscourse resources.

3. Examining the translation strategies (based on Nida's 1966 model) employed in interpreting metadiscourse and the implications of misrepresentation or omission.

4. Investigating the most common types of metadiscourse misrepresented or ignored during consecutive interpretation.

The Concept of Metadiscourse

Metadiscourse has received considerable attention from many linguists and discourse analysts. The term "metadiscourse" was first introduced by Harris (1970) to refer to discourse about discourse. In her argument, she states the following:

The various sentences of a text differ in informational status, and even specific sentences that may be of interest to readers of the text may not be requested or useful in retrievals. These are metadiscourse kernels that talk about the primary material. (Harris, 1970:466).

Several terms have been used to describe a similar area of metadiscourse in language use. In written texts, Enkvist (1978, cited in Crismore et al., 1993, p. 40) and Swales (2001) employ the term "meta-text." Ventola and Mauranen (1991: 463) use the term "self-referentiality" in academic written discourse, Mauranen (1993) refers to metadiscourse as "reference items" and "text reflexivity as self-awareness", and Johns (1997: 120-122) calls them "pre-revealing features". In spoken text, similar phenomena have been given names such as "gambits" (Keller, 1979), "metatalk" (Schiffrin, 1980), "metamessages" (Tannen, 1986), and "meta-communication" (Hoppenbrouwers and Weigand, 2000). According to the terms scholars used, it could be argued that all communications and texts (spoken or written) are accompanied by metadiscourse. However, some researchers concentrate on textual metadiscourse, whereas others focus on interpersonal one. Tittula (1990) limits the term metadiscourse to refer only to textual metadiscourse. However, Perkins (1983), Stubbs (1986), and Biber and Finnegan (1989) contend that modality, particularly its epistemic form—which reflects personal stances on truth and knowledge—is closely linked to interpersonal metadiscourse. Mao (1993: 265) elaborates on this by explaining that metadiscourse inherently holds at least a dual meaning: it can refer to "discourse about discourse," encompassing any critical analysis or theoretical explanation of a specific discourse or theory.

Halliday's Theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics

According to Halliday's theory of systemic functional grammar, a central concept is metafunction, which posits that the English clause is composed of three interconnected functional-semantic components. These "metafunctions" are: the ideational, which views the clause as a representation of experience; the interpersonal, which sees the clause as a means of exchange between interactants; and the textual, which considers the clause as a cohesive and coherent message (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

1. The Ideational Component

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 26) explain that the ideational component of a linguistic system is divided into two distinct yet related parts: the experiential and the logical. The experiential part directly addresses how language represents our experiences, essentially capturing what Malinowski referred to as the "context culture." Conversely, the rational part deals with more abstract connections, expressing logical relationships that aren't directly observed but are instead derived indirectly from those experiences. Consequently, the ideational component fundamentally serves to convey content and reflects language's primary role in being about something in the world.

2. The Interpersonal Component

A text serves as a reflection of the writer's identity, social standing, attitudes, and judgments, all of which are conveyed through their active involvement in the content. Halliday and Hasan (1976) propose that the interpersonal aspect of language is specifically activated when a writer intentionally engages the reader, treating them not merely as a recipient of information but as an active conversational partner or "interlocutor." This deliberate act of engagement, in their view, highlights the writer's discernible presence and influence within the text itself, which is considered the very hallmark of language's crucial interpersonal function.

3. The Textual Components

The textual component, the third key metafunction, is responsible for a text's overall texture and its ability to cohere internally and with its context (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 27). This component is crucial for making a text operationally relevant. Core aspects of the textual metafunction include the Given-New (Theme-Rheme) relationship, cohesion, coherence, and rhetorical organization. Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that the textual component incorporates meaning patterns that operate outside the traditional hierarchical structure of language. One such pattern is information structure, which dictates how a text is ordered into "given" and "new" information, independent of its sentential or clausal construction. The other vital part of the textual component is cohesion, without which, "the remainder of the semantic system cannot be effectively activated at all" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 28).

Metadiscourse and context

By the subservience of linguistic to non-linguistic behavior, Harris (2020) refers to the fact that people know (from the context in which they are situated) how to understand somebody's utterance. Van Dijk (2008) posits that context is an inherently fuzzy and human-determined concept, taking into consideration the singularity of each text as well as the shared body of knowledge and shared representations that language users share (van Dijk 2008). From his perspective, contexts are not objective realities, but rather dynamic, intersubjective constructions continuously shaped by participants as they interact within groups or communities. This profound connection between language systems and their context-dependent meanings is a fundamental aspect of J. R. Firth's (1935, 1957) linguistic work, as well as that of Michael Halliday (1971, 1989) and John Sinclair (2004), all of whom have been significant in the field of discourse analysis. Firth (1957: 84) focuses on the connection between system and use in terms of the anthropologist Malinowski's (1923, 1935) concepts of situational context and cultural context. However, it is understood that understanding the meaning of spoken or written communication hinges on our awareness of its situational and cultural context. As Martin (2001: 151) concisely puts it, "if you don't know what the people behind mediating a text are doing and don't understand their culture, then you can't make sense of their text."

Taxonomies of Metadiscourse in English

As discussed above, most linguists and discourse analysts agree that metadiscourse resources are classified into two types: textual and interpersonal. However, they categorize and subcategorize these resources:

. Williams (1981). This refers to a classification system that divides metadiscourse into three main types, with each of these types further broken down into two distinct sub-categories. Table (1) below displays this method of categorization.

Metadiscourse		
Item	Function	Example

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

Hedges and Emphatics	Express the certainty with which a writer presents material.	possibly, might Indeed, it is obvious that
Sequencers and Topicalizers	Lead a reader through a text.	First, therefore Regarding, there is
Attributors and Narrators	Tell a reader where facts or opinions come from.	According to X, X notes I found that I would note

INTERPERSONAL METADISCOURSE			
Item	**Function**	**Example**	
Validity **Markers**	Assess the truth value of the propositional content and show the author's degree of commitment to that assessment.	Hedges	might, perhaps.
		Emphatics	obviously
		Attributors	According to X
Attitude **Markers**	Reveal the writer's attitude toward the propositional content.	Surprisingly, It is fortunate that	
Commentaries	Draw readers into an implicit dialogue with the author.	You may disagree that, dear reader.	

Table (1): William's Classification System for Meta discourse (Williams, 1981)

Vande Kopple

Building on William's (1981) framework, Vande Kopple (1985), an influential early scholar in metadiscourse studies, developed a comprehensive classification system. This taxonomy is rooted in Halliday's concept of language's metafunctions, recognizing two primary categories of metadiscourse: textual and interpersonal. Vande Kopple further breaks these down into seven specific forms that writers employ: Text Connectives, which link ideas; Code Glosses, which clarify terms; Illocution Markers, indicating the writer's communicative intent; Validity Markers, expressing the certainty of a statement; Narrators, referring to the author's voice; Attitude Markers, revealing the writer's stance; and Commentary, offering direct remarks. This detailed classification, visually represented in Table 2–2, provides a valuable tool for analyzing how metadiscourse functions within written texts.

TEXTUAL METADISCOURSE:		
Item	**Function**	**Example**
Textual **Connectives**	Help readers recognize how texts are organized and how different parts of the text are connected to each other functionally or semantically.	first,next,However, but
Code glosses	Help readers grasp and interpret the meanings of words and phrases.	X means Y
Illocutionary **Markers**	Make explicit what speech act is being Performed at specific points in texts.	I hypothesize that,To sum up, I promise to give an example
Narrators	Let readers know who said or wrote something.	according to

able (2-2): Vande Kopple's Classification System for Meta discourse

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

(Vande Kopple, 1985)

Hyland's (2005) Model:

According to Hyland (2005), metadiscourse resources are categorized under two main headings. The first one is interactive while the second is interactional.

1. Interactive Metadiscourse: As discussed, these features help organize information in a way that aims to be clear and persuasive for a specific audience. There are five main sub-categories:

A. Transitions: primarily consist of conjunctions and adverbial phrases that assist readers in understanding the logical connections within an argument. They indicate additive, causal, and contrasting relationships in the writer's thought process, linking different parts of the discourse. (e.g., "in contrast," "anyway").

B. Frame markers: help readers understand a text's structure and organization. These aren't about chronological events; instead, they order arguments within the text. They work to sequence, label, predict, and shift arguments, making the discourse easier for readers or listeners to follow. (e.g., "to summarize," "by way of introduction").

C. Endophoric markers: are textual references that point to other parts of the exact text. They highlight relevant information, helping readers understand the writer's intended meaning. Examples include phrases like "As mentioned above" or "see the table."

D. Code glosses: To ensure readers fully grasp the writer's intended meaning, writers often provide redundant information. They achieve this by rephrasing, explaining, or elaborating on concepts already introduced, which reflects the writer's assumptions about the reader's existing knowledge. These explanatory additions are frequently signaled by phrases such as "this is called," "in other words," "that is to say," "to put it another way," or "which means." This technique helps to clarify complex ideas, reinforce key points, or define unfamiliar terms, ultimately enhancing reader comprehension.

2. Interactional resources

These features draw readers in, allowing them to engage with the author's viewpoint on both the subject matter and the readers themselves. They help manage the tone of a text, as writers connect with others, guiding them through the argument, directing their focus, addressing their potential doubts, and leading them towards specific interpretations.

A. Hedges: are linguistic tools, like "possible," "might," and "perhaps," that signal a writer's acknowledgment of alternative ideas or viewpoints. By using hedges, writers avoid fully committing to a statement, presenting information as an opinion rather than an absolute fact, which then opens the statement up for discussion and debate.

B. Boosters are linguistic devices used to express certainty and assertiveness in a writer's or speaker's message. They serve to strengthen claims, reduce ambiguity, and limit the space for opposing views.

C. Attitude markers: are crucial linguistic tools writers use to express their personal feelings or emotional stance regarding the information they present, rather than simply commenting on its factual status or truthfulness. (for example, "agree," "prefer").

D. Self-mentions: indicate how explicitly the author is present in a text, typically measured by the use of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives (like I, me, mine, and the exclusive we/our).

E. Engagement markers: Engagement markers are linguistic tools that directly address readers, either to grab their attention or to involve them in the discussion.

Nida's (1964) model

According to Nida, "Translation consists in reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style." (Nida,1964:12).

Formal equivalence (also known as formal correspondence) refers to a translation strategy that aims to stay as close as possible to the linguistic and structural features of the source text. The focus is on a word-for-word or morpheme-for-morpheme translation, retaining grammatical structures and stylistic features wherever possible. This method is often preferred in texts where the form carries significant meaning, such as in legal or sacred texts (Munday, 2016: 66). According to Nida (1964), formal equivalence attempts to allow the reader of the target language to understand the form and content of the original as precisely as possible, even if the result feels less natural.

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

In contrast, dynamic equivalence prioritizes the effect of the translation on the target audience. It is oriented toward achieving equivalent response, aiming to reproduce the meaning of the original message in a way that evokes the same reaction in the target audience as it would in the original audience. This approach emphasizes naturalness, fluency, and cultural relevance, often involving adjustments to grammar, idiom, and style (Nida & Taber, 1969). Munday (2016) emphasizes that dynamic equivalence focuses not on linguistic similarity but on communicative function and audience reception.

Data analysis:

The analysis below reveals that student interpreters encountered significant challenges in preserving the discourse functions of metadiscursive items, particularly in identifying their rhetorical roles within the broader structure of the speech. In this study, four metadiscourse resources, namely: transitions, code glosses,

Transitions

Utterance (1) And it is, of course, vital at the same time.

Table(4)

SL Item	Function
And	Consequence

TL	Interpreting	Function	Type of equivalence	Approp.
TR1	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR2	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR3	وعليه , فان من المؤكد	Consequence	Dynamic (Alternative)	+
TR4	وبالطبع هذا الامر	Additive	Formal	_
TR5	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR6	None	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR7	وبالطبع هذا الامر	Additive	Formal	_
TR8	وبالطبع في نفس الوقت	Additive	Formal	_
TR9	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR10	وفي الوقت ذاته	Additive	Formal	_

In this instance, the student interpreters failed to distinguish between the coordinating "and" and the consequential "and", a distinction that is essential to preserving the intended rhetorical function. This misinterpretation was repeated multiple times throughout the speech, resulting in recurrent patterns of error across most translations. However, TR3 stands out as an exception. The translator in this case successfully conveyed the intended consequential function in a manner that was both accurate and dynamically equivalent, thus maintaining the coherence and pragmatic clarity of the original discourse.

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

Code Glosses

The following example highlights the challenge that many students face in recognizing and accurately rendering adversative markers that convey concessive meaning within global discourse structures.

Utterance (2) No ifs or buts.

Table (5)

SL Item	Function
No ifs or buts.	Code glosses

TL	Translation	Function	Type Of Translation	Approp.
TR1	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR2	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR3	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR4	دون اي تاجيل	Code glosses	Dynamic (Alteration)	+
TR5	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR6	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR7	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR8	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR9	من دون اعذار او تاجيل	Code glosses	Dynamic (Alteration)	+
TR10	دون اي تاخير	Code glosses	Dynamic (Alteration)	+

The phrase "No ifs or buts" operates as an idiomatic code gloss, emphasizing a non-negotiable stance and serving a paraphrastic function to exclude hesitation or opposition. Its metadiscursive role is to clarify the firmness of the speaker's position by eliminating alternative interpretations.

TR4, TR9, and TR10 succeeded in reflecting the idiomatic and rhetorical force of the original by using appropriate Arabic equivalents such as "دون أي تأجيل" and "من دون أعذار أو تأجيل". These translations, although dynamically equivalent, effectively preserved the illocutionary intent and clarificatory tone of the original. The remaining interpretations (TR1–TR3, TR5–TR8) omitted the marker entirely. This complete subtraction resulted in a significant loss of rhetorical clarity and speaker authority. In these cases, the speaker's uncompromising tone is flattened, and the strategic force of exclusion embedded in the gloss is not transferred to the TL.

Given that code glosses serve to guide interpretation, their omission deprives the target audience of critical cues about how to read or evaluate the surrounding discourse. The translator's failure to recognize such idiomatic glosses as rhetorical devices, rather than just colloquialisms, leads to under-translation at the discourse level.

Interactional Metadiscourse

Boosters

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

Utterance 3: I have every confidence that in 99 Days, We Will Have Cracked it.

Table (7)

SL Item	Function
I Have Every Confidence	Booster

TL	Interpreting	Function	Type of equivalence	Approp.
TR1	ونحن سوف نقوم بالحقيقة بتعديل تلك المسائل حلال تسعة وتسعون يوما وسوف ننفذ كل ما ذكر	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR2	عندي ثقة في ,بان ثلاثة وثلاثين يوما	Booster	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR3	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR4	كما يوكد رئيس الوزراء ثقته التامة بان بريطانيا ستكون مستعدة خلال التسعون يوما	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR5	وبكل ثقة اننا سننجز خلال تسعة وتسعون يوما	Booster	Formal	+
TR6	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR7	سنكتسب خلال هذه التسعة والتسعون يوما هذه الثقة	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR8	Non	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR9	انا واثق تماما اننا خلال التسع وتسعون يوما سننجح	Booster	Formal	+

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

The expression "I have every confidence" serves as a powerful booster, conveying a high level of certainty and the speaker's assurance. Boosters are crucial metadiscursive elements that reinforce commitment to a proposition and limit alternative interpretations. TR5 and TR9 managed to preserve this rhetorical force through formal equivalents such as "وبكل ثقة" and "أنا واثق تماماً...". These renderings accurately reflect the certainty and assertive tone of the original, marking the speaker's confidence and reinforcing the authoritative stance of the discourse. TR2, despite preserving the booster function, introduced a serious numerical error—substituting "99 days" with "33 days." This factual distortion undermines the overall accuracy of the message, even though the rhetorical force was partially maintained; however, it is inappropriate.

TR4 correctly transferred the propositional meaning but shifted the subject from the first-person speaker to the Prime Minister, thus altering the interpersonal dynamic and softening the speaker's stance. The use of third-person distance reduces the immediacy of the booster. TR7 partially expressed the original idea, but omitted critical elements of the booster. As a result, the emphatic tone was diluted, and the sentence lost its full rhetorical effect.

The remaining interpretations either omitted the sentence (TR3, TR6, TR10, TR8) or produced renditions lacking clear boosters (TR1). This widespread subtraction reflects the students' limited awareness of how boosters function beyond mere lexical emphasis—they serve to establish the speaker's authority and to guide audience alignment.

Engagement Markers

Utterance 4/ And so, I Am Standing Before You Today to Tell You – The British People- That Those Critics Are Wrong.

Table (8)

SL item	Function
I am standing before you.	Engagement marker

TL	Interpreting	Function	Type of Equivalence	Approp.
TR1	انا اقف اليوم امامكم لاؤكد	Engagement marker	Formal	+
TR2	None	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR3	None	_	Dynamic (subtraction)	_
TR4	وهنا اقف امامكم اليوم ايها الشعب البريطاني	Engagement marker	Formal	+
TR5	وانا اليوم اقف امامكم	Engagement marker	Formal	+
TR6	None	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR7	None	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR8	None	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR9	اقول لكم اليوم يا شعب بريطانيا	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_
TR10	None	_	Dynamic (Subtraction)	_

ISSN: 3005-5091 **DOI**: https://doi.org/10.69513/jnfh.v4.i2.a8

The clause "I am standing before you today to tell you…" functions as an engagement marker, explicitly addressing the audience and creating a sense of dialogue and inclusion. In persuasive discourse, such markers establish a relational dynamic, drawing the listener into the speaker's reasoning.

TR1, TR4, and TR5 successfully maintained this engagement strategy through expressions like “أنا أقف اليوم أمامكم لأؤكد” and “وهنا أقف أمامكم اليوم أيها الشعب البريطاني”. These interpretations employed a formal equivalence strategy, preserving both the speaker-audience connection and the formal tone of the original.

TR9 adopted a dynamic equivalence strategy with “أقول لكم اليوم يا شعب بريطانيا”. While it does not replicate the precise structure of the original, it effectively retains the interactive function and the speaker's direct address to the audience.

The remaining interpretations (TR2, TR3, TR6, TR7, TR8, TR10) omitted the engagement marker entirely. This subtraction disrupts the interpersonal framework of the discourse, eliminating cues that invite audience participation and affective alignment.

Engagement markers are crucial in formal addresses, where the speaker seeks to establish alignment and solidarity with the audience. Their omission reduces the discourse's inclusiveness and weakens its persuasive power.

The example below reflects the students' difficulty in identifying engagement markers that signal speaker involvement and encourage audience attention.

Conclusion

This study reveals the challenges faced by student interpreters in rendering metadiscourse elements during the consecutive interpretation of political texts from English into Arabic. The findings show an apparent lack of awareness regarding the rhetorical and pragmatic functions of metadiscourse, with only 29.5% of such elements successfully transferred into the target language. This is primarily due to students' tendency to prioritize propositional content while overlooking the evaluative and functional layers that contribute to the persuasive structure of political discourse.

The study also highlights the context-dependent nature of metadiscourse, which plays a crucial role in shaping stance, building solidarity, and guiding audience alignment—particularly in political speech. However, these functions are often lost in the interpreted versions. Formal equivalence was found to be more frequently applied than dynamic equivalence, although dynamic strategies may offer greater rhetorical effectiveness. The difficulty in applying such strategies is attributed in part to the linguistic and cultural disparities between Arabic and English, especially in terms of rhetorical norms and discourse conventions.

The results underscore the need to train interpreters in identifying and rendering metadiscourse markers in a way that preserves the original text's rhetorical coherence and communicative intent. Enhancing students' discourse awareness and interpretive skills is essential to achieving a balance between linguistic accuracy and rhetorical effectiveness in the consecutive interpretation of political discourse.

References

Al-Nashmi, E., & Al-Khawalda, M. (2019). Interpersonal Metadiscourse in Arabic and English Opinion Articles.

Al-Saidi, A. K. (2017). Metadiscourse in Arabic and English Newspaper Editorials: A Contrastive Study.

Baker, M. (1992). In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. London: Routledge.

Crismore, A. (1989). Talking with Readers: Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act. New York: Peter Lang.

Farahani, A. K., & Hadavand, S. (2017). A Comparative Study of Metadiscourse in Translated vs. Non-Translated Political Speeches.

Gile, D. (2009). Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hassani, M. T. (2020). The Role of Metadiscourse Markers in Simultaneous Interpreting of Political Speeches.

Hatim, B. (2001). Teaching and Researching Translation. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Hatim, B., & Mason, I. (1990). Discourse and the Translator. London: Longman.

House, J. (2006). Text and Context in Translation. London: Routledge.

Hyland, K. (1998). Persuasion and Context: The Pragmatics of Academic Discourse. Journal of Pragmatics.

Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the Reader: Addressing the Reader in Academic Articles. Written Communication.

Hyland, K. (2004). Disciplinary Interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 Postgraduate Writing. Journal of Second Language Writing.

Hyland, K. (2005). Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. London: Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2017). Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing (2nd ed.). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Munday, J. (2016). Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Nida, E. A. (1964). Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Nolan, J. (2012). Interpretation: Techniques and Exercises. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pöchhacker, F. (2004). Introducing Interpreting Studies. London: Routledge.

Pöchhacker, F. (2016). Introducing Interpreting Studies (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Schäffner, C. (1998). Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Seleskovitch, D., & Lederer, M. (1995). A Systematic Approach to Teaching Interpretation. Silver Spring, MD: RID Press.

Vande Kopple, W. (1985). Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse. College Composition and Communication, 36(1), 82–93.

Wang, W. (2009). Interpersonal Metadiscourse in Chinese and English: A Contrastive Study.

Williams, J. M. (1981). Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Zarei, G. R., & Mansoori, S. (2019). Metadiscourse in Translation: A Contrastive Study of Persian and English Editorials.

Zhang, M. (2013). A Contrastive Study of Metadiscourse in English and Chinese Academic Writing.

Zhao, Y. (2021). Metadiscourse in Political Speeches: A Contrastive Analysis of English-Chinese Interpretation.

There is general agreement on the definition of feedback; yet it is also acknowledged as one of the most essential components of proficiency. Black and Wiliam (1998) (1) , as cited in (2) support this view and stress the crucial role of feedback in developing a learner's language use. As a formative mechanism, feedback can be used to assess and monitor students' progress over time. Likewise, Brookhart (2008) (3) describes feedback as a precious commodity that allows teachers and students to see whether or not learning has been achieved. Yet, a gap persists in comprehending feedback's effectiveness and consequences.

1.1 Research Questions

This research aims to explore the following questions:

1. How can feedback effectively support students' learning?
2. What are the main advantages and disadvantages of using feedback in educational settings?

1.2 Research Aims

This research aims to:

1. Examine the effectiveness of feedback as a pedagogical strategy in educational settings.
2. Evaluate the advantages and disadvantages linked with the implementation of feedback within the learning process.

1.3 Procedure

This study employs a qualitative methodology grounded in an extensive literature review, drawing on a wide range of academic sources, including journal articles, scholarly books, and empirical studies within the disciplines of education, psychology, and pedagogy. The literature selection prioritizes sources published within the past twenty years to ensure the information's relevance and up-to-dateness. The collected material is subjected to thematic analysis to extract and synthesize recurring patterns and critical insights concerning the advantages and disadvantages of feedback in educational contexts.

2. Literature review

The following subsections provide an overview of key theoretical perspectives on feedback, including its definitions, roles, types, principles, and criteria, as well as its pros and cons.

2.1 The Concept of Feedback

Feedback is widely acknowledged as a fundamental element in the educational process, particularly in the realm of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learning. According to the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, feedback is defined as information concerning reactions to a product, a person's performance of a task, and so forth, which is utilized as a basis for improvement. This definition underscores the developmental function of feedback, namely, its place in cultivating learner development and supporting lifelong learning. Feedback as Process Askew (2000) (4) cited in (5) views feedback as an evaluative judgment about another person's performance, providing information about what was done right and what was done wrong, and how to improve.

Alternatively, Hattie and Timperley (2007) (6) define feedback as descriptive information from an external source, for instance, a teacher, peer, or system, provided to prompt a learner to reflect on their performance or comprehension. The two definitions share the central meaning of using feedback constructively. Feedback is a potent educational tool that assists learners in identifying the gap between their current performance and the optimal performance (learning target) and to take targeted action to close that gap.

2.2 The Role of Feedback in Education

In the EFL context, feedback is recognized as an important, indispensable tool that can help direct learners' attention to the quality of their language performance and prompt them to make the adjustments required to upgrade their language output. As per Ur (1999) (7), feedback consists of two essential elements, namely assessment (where a user is told that s/he has made an error) and correction (where an explicit correction is made to learners' linguistic output). In the same context, Pica (1994, as cited in Tabatabaei & Birjandi, 2009) (8) also emphasizes the importance of feedback in promoting learner reflection and enabling learners to make changes in their language use, which in turn helps them perform better than in the past. Thus, feedback goes beyond being a corrective tool: it becomes an essential and integral feature of the learning process, closely connected to learners' overall linguistic development and educational progression.

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) (9) describe it as an essential element of formative assessment that supports self-regulation by helping learners evaluate their progress and refine their learning strategies. This dynamic function of feedback fosters informed decision-making, continuous improvement, and the development of a growth mindset. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007) (6), feedback is "one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement," particularly when it is specific, timely, and focused on closing the gap between current performance and intended goals.

Moreover, feedback is not a monolithic concept. (3,6). Underline its dual role, addressing both cognitive and motivational dimensions. When effectively delivered, feedback enhances learners' self-awareness and influences affective responses, thereby improving motivation and achievement. (1

2) Also consider feedback among the most influential tools in the development of foreign language proficiency.

Shute (2008) (10) categorizes feedback into formative and summative types, arguing that formative feedback, being continuous and developmental, provides greater benefits compared to summative feedback, which is evaluative and final. Sadler (1989) (11) supports this perspective by stating that effective feedback should be comprehensible, actionable, and aligned with explicit learning criteria.

To maximize its effectiveness, feedback must be adapted to the learner's proficiency level. Krashen (1982) (12) stresses the need for comprehensible input, while Spolsky (1998) (13) highlights the importance of tailoring feedback to individual learner needs. This adaptability reinforces the formative role of feedback by increasing learner motivation and encouraging mindful learning. Sheen (2011) (14) emphasizes this by asserting that feedback fosters learner autonomy and promotes active involvement in the learning process.

From a structural perspective, Tunstall and Gipps (1996) (15) classify feedback strategies into verbal, non-verbal, and written forms. Verbal feedback is often immediate and interactive; non-verbal feedback involves gestures and body language; and written feedback tends to be more detailed and typically follows an activity. Furthermore, Hargreaves, McCallum, and Gipps (2004) 16 distinguish between evaluative feedback, used to motivate or discourage through praise or criticism, and descriptive feedback, which provides specific, actionable guidance for improvement.

Brookhart (2008) (6) elaborates on the significance of feedback timing, quantity, and mode. Timely feedback delivered shortly after performance is more effective, especially when the amount of information is manageable. While feedback can be provided to groups, individualized feedback tends to be more impactful. The chosen mode, whether verbal or non-verbal, should be compatible with the nature of the task, learners' characteristics, and instructional goals.

Nevertheless, not all feedback leads to positive outcomes. Kluger and DeNisi (1996) (17), find that in over a third of the cases, feedback interventions reduce performance, often due to ambiguous messages or negative emotional responses from learners. Zamel (1985) (18), similarly warns that overemphasis on error correction may undermine learner confidence and suggests placing more focus on meaning rather than form.

Cultural and contextual variables also shape the way feedback is perceived and utilized. Carless (2006) (19) reports that in some educational settings, learners may not actively engage with feedback due to a lack of clarity, perceived irrelevance, or anxiety associated with criticism. Crystal (2008) (20) adds that feedback also functions as a mechanism for evaluating the success of communication through response signals during interaction.

In conclusion, feedback in EFL contexts is a complex, multi-dimensional construct that supports assessment, promotes learning, and encourages motivation and autonomy. However, its impact depends on how it is delivered, the learner's willingness, and the broader educational context.

2.3 Types of Feedback

Feedback in educational settings is a complex phenomenon that educators classify in numerous ways based on its objectives, timing, origins, and formats. Hattie and Timperley (2007) (6) emphasize that feedback is an indispensable component of the learning process, as it offers insights that help learners bridge the gap between their current performance and the goals they aspire to achieve.

A common classification separates feedback into formative and summative types. Formative feedback is provided throughout the learning experience to facilitate improvement and guide learning efforts (Black & Wiliam, 1998) (1). Conversely, summative feedback is usually administered after the completion of a task or assessment to evaluate overall performance (Sadler, 1989) (11).

Another notable classification differentiates between oral and written feedback. Oral feedback tends to be immediate and engaging, enabling real-time clarifications (Brookhart, 2008) (3), while written feedback offers a permanent record that learners refer to for reflection (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006) (9).

Moreover, feedback is further categorized by its source, including teacher feedback, peer feedback, and self-assessment. Peer feedback promotes collaborative learning experiences and enhances critical thinking skills (Topping,2009) (21), whereas self-feedback cultivates learner independence and supports metacognitive understanding (Boud & Molloy, 2013) (22).

Additionally, feedback is classified as directive, which involves explicit corrections or recommend-dations, or facilitative, which encourages learners to engage in self-reflection and explore their own solutions (Ellis, 2009) (23). The effectiveness of each feedback type is influenced by various contextual factors, including the learner's level, the learning environment, and the specific educational objectives.

2.4 Feedback Principles

According to Hart (2012) (24), the first fundamental principle of feedback is that the recipient determines how they respond to it. Whether consciously or subconsciously, the individual receiving feedback interprets the message through their own perspective and reacts accordingly. It is impossible to "force" someone to appreciate or reject feedback. The same feedback, conveyed with the same wording and tone, may be interpreted as constructive by one individual and detrimental by another. Certain individuals accept blunt, direct, and critical feedback and immediately use it for self-improvement; their mental frameworks enable them to process it productively.

Conversely, others respond negatively to the same bluntness and criticism, interpreting it as hostile, poorly intended, or damaging, thereby rendering it ineffective. To provide feedback effectively, one must aim to ensure the message is received positively
rather than dismissed. In other words, a crucial element of effective feedback is increasing the likelihood that the recipient is in a receptive psychological state and, upon receiving the feedback, feels positive about themselves and the person providing it, gains clarity, feels motivated, and understands the necessary next steps.

This leads to the second principle of feedback: the recipient is more inclined to accept feedback constructively if it is not delivered in an authoritarian manner. This principle concerns the contrast between authority and autonomy, condescension and respect, and domination and collaboration. If the recipient perceives the feedback as coming from an authoritative stance, defined by positional power, a commanding or arrogant demeanor, or self-centered reasoning, they are more likely to respond defensively, engage in argumentation, shift blame, challenge the validity of the information, or exhibit excessive compliance without genuine commitment. Such reactions may include internalizing negative emotions that later manifest as unproductive behavior. On the other hand, when feedback is conveyed in a non-authoritative, collaborative manner, it is more likely to foster a productive dialogue. The recipient then engages, consciously or unconsciously, with the feedback positively. Consequently, the message becomes more effective in reinforcing desirable behavior, encouraging change, or advancing the conversation in a constructive direction.

The third principle asserts that a feedback recipient does not govern the thoughts, emotions, or actions of others in response to their behavior. This principle rests on the belief that individuals possess autonomy in how they choose to react.

However, it is important to distinguish this from the tangible outcomes resulting from one's actions. For example, if an irate manager physically pushes an employee, causing the employee to fall and break an arm, the manager is responsible for the injury. Nevertheless, the emotional and psychological reactions of the employee, such as their thoughts, feelings, and subsequent behaviors, remain within the employee's control, shaped by their personal mindset and life perspective. One individual experiences humiliation, while another perceives an opportunity to manipulate the incident and retaliate against the manager.

Additionally, different individuals who provide feedback perceive and respond to the same behavior in distinct ways, which influences the nature of their feedback. For instance, if three colleagues provide feedback to a newly appointed team leader regarding her facilitation of a meeting, one comments, "I feel free to bring anything up"; another states, "I am frustrated by the lack of structure"; while a third remarks, "I am fully engaged." Despite the team leader exhibiting identical behavior toward all three, their perceptions and reactions vary considerably.

2.5 Criteria for Good Feedback

There are several criteria that educators consider when they provide learners with feedback. Black and William (1998) (1) assert that feedback focuses on the specific qualities of a student's work, offers guidance on how to improve, and avoids comparisons with the work of other students. This implies that teachers identify errors in a student's individual work without drawing comparisons to others. Consistent with this view, Black and William (2002) (25) argue that the quality of feedback, rather than the quantity, is crucial when giving students feedback. Therefore, educators carefully select their language, ensuring that the goal is to correct errors systematically and consistently.

2.6 Pros and Cons of Feedback

Providing feedback in educational settings presents both advantages and disadvantages. The following sections outline the main pros and cons associated with its use:

a. Pros of Feedback

Feedback serves as an essential instructional tool because it:

1. Offers Explicit and Constructive Direction: Feedback that is descriptive in nature elucidates for students both the strengths and weaknesses of their work, simultaneously offering practical suggestions for enhancement (Hargreaves et al., 2000) (16).

2. Promotes Skill Acquisition and Learning: By highlighting areas for correction, feedback enables students to recognize their mistakes and subsequently refine their work, thereby optimizing the learning process (Westberg & Hilliard, 2001) (26)

3. Augments Personalization and Accessibility: The provision of diverse digital resources through feedback mechanisms significantly influencing learning environment, catering to individual student needs (Ally, 2004) (27).

4. Exerts a Significant Impact on Achievement and Learning: Feedback is recognized as a critical determinant in academic success, exerting a substantial influence on student outcomes (6).

5. Stimulates Engagement Through Diverse Methodologies: The utilization of varied feedback strategies, encompassing verbal, written, and non-verbal approaches, accommodates different learning styles (3).

6. Cultivates 21st-Century Competencies: The integration of feedback mechanisms fosters the development of essential skills, including digital literacy, critical thinking, and problem-solving capabilities (28).

7. Aids in Language Acquisition: In the context of EFL instruction, oral feedback plays a pivotal role in enhancing language proficiency among students (23).

8. Encourages Autonomy and Collaboration: Feedback supports both independent learning and interaction among peers and instructors through digital platforms (14, 29 , 30-32).

b. Cons of Feedback

Despite the well-documented advantages of feedback in educational contexts, several disadvantages can hinder its effectiveness:

1. Potential for Misinterpretation: When feedback lacks clarity or disproportionately emphasizes errors, it may lead to learner confusion and diminished motivation (Zamel, 1985) (18).

2. Inequitable Access to Feedback Resources: Disparities in access to technology can create inequitable learning opportunities for students to benefit from feedback tools and platforms (33).

3. Absence of Reflective Teaching Practices: Some educators may not critically reflect on the impact of their feedback strategies, thereby reducing their instructional value to support meaningful learning (1).

4. Overemphasis on Assessment: Feedback that is predominantly linked to punitive or reward-based evaluation may fail to support omission, deep learning processes (16).

5. Over-Dependence on Feedback Tools: Excessive reliance on technological feedback mechanisms can at times diminish the value of personal teacher-student interaction (34).

6. Distraction from Learning: Digital platforms used to deliver feedback may unintentionally distract learners, reducing their focus and engagement (35).

7. Cognitive Overload and Inappropriate Timing: When feedback is overwhelming in volume or poorly timed, students may experience cognitive overload, leading to decreased processing and retention (3).

3. Discussion

Building upon the foundational insights from the literature review, it becomes clear that feedback within educational environments, particularly in the context of EFL instruction, is not a monolithic concept. Rather, it represents a complex and dynamic pedagogical instrument shaped by theoretical frameworks, contextual realities, and learners' psychological dynamics. This section seeks to synthesize key theoretical positions, assess their practical significance, and draw meaningful thematic linkages that align with the study's core aims and research questions.

The literature consistently highlights feedback as a dual-function mechanism, both cognitive and motivational, that assists learners in bridging the gap between their current performance and the desired learning outcomes (6). Feedback emerges not only as a tool for correction but also as a driving force for learner autonomy learning process. Effective feedback transcends the mere identification of errors; it encourages learner autonomy by inviting active participation in academic growth. Ideally, it should be descriptive and dialogic, fostering a collaborative learning atmosphere rather than placing learners in a passive role.

Another recurrent theme concerns the necessity of individualizing feedback and being attuned to learners' specific contexts. As demonstrated in the works of Brookhart (2008) (3), Sheen (2011) (14), and Hart (2012) (24), the effectiveness of feedback is contingent on its psychological and cultural resonance with the learner. The same comment may uplift one student while discouraging another. This inherent subjectivity means educators must approach feedback with flexibility, modulating tone, timing, and delivery style to align with the learner's cognitive development and emotional state. Hart's (2012) (24) principles highlight that the effectiveness of feedback lies not only in its content, but also in its manner and delivery style and timing. Additionally, the literature draws attention to the various forms of feedback, formative versus summative, oral versus written, teacher-led versus peer-delivered, underscoring the importance of employing a balanced and strategic mix. Formative feedback, which is continuous and focused on progression, is especially valued for maintaining student motivation and reinforcing positive learning behaviors. This is particularly critical in EFL settings, where feedback goes beyond grammatical precision to encompass the development of communicative competence. Both teacher and peer feedback, when applied constructively, contribute to a rich dialogic learning space that supports reflection, meaning negotiation, and learner independence (9, 21)

The benefits of feedback are widely recognized. It promotes skill acquisition, deepens engagement, and supports personalized learning pathways, particularly when integrated through interactive and multimodal approaches (3, 28). Moreover, it helps develop crucial 21st-century competencies, such as critical thinking and digital literacy. However, the literature also cautions against the drawbacks of feedback. When delivered poorly, whether overly critical or poorly timed, it can cause cognitive strain and diminish learner confidence (17,18). Over-reliance on digital tools or inconsistent feedback practices can further undermine its instructional value and contribute to inequitable learning experiences.

Finally, the criteria for effective feedback proposed by Black & Wiliam (1998, 2002) (1, 25) offer a useful framework for maintaining both quality and impact. These guidelines stress the importance of clarity, specifically, transparency, and avoiding comparisons that may damage intrinsic motivation or self-esteem.

4. Conclusion

In conclusion, feedback constitutes an essential pillar of the educational process, playing a crucial role in facilitating student learning, maintaining motivation, and fostering both academic and linguistic development. However, its effectiveness is influenced by a range of critical variables, including the clarity and relevance of its content, the timing of its delivery, and the modality of its communication. To fully realize the pedagogical value of feedback, educators must remain mindful of contextual challenges such as time constraints, cultural sensitivities, and varying degrees of learner receptivity. Proactively addressing these considerations through informed and reflective instructional practices enhances the positive impact of feedback on students' academic growth and overall learning trajectories.

Furthermore, feedback operates across multiple dimensions, not only as a mechanism for correction and as a powerful motivational tool. While its capacity to shape learner outcomes and maintain engagement is well-established, optimizing its influence necessitates a strategic and deliberate approach that takes into account its qualitative attributes, frequency, temporal placement, and delivery method. When systematically integrated into the instructional framework, feedback emerges foundational elements of effective teaching and a key driver for sustained, lifelong learning.

References

1.Black P, & Wiliam D. *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. Granada Learning.1998.

2.Harmer J. *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.2007.

3.Brookhart SM. *How to give effective feedback to your students*. ASCD. 2008.

4.Askew S. *Feedback for learning* (No. 272224). S. Askew (Ed.). London: Routledge Falmer. 2000.

5.Mahdi HS, & El Saadany A S. Teacher written feedback: What do students think? *Internat J Appl Linguist English Liter. 2013;2*(3):7–12.

6.Hattie J & Timperley H. The power of feedback. Review Educa Res. 2027;77(1):81-112.Doi;10.3102/003465430298487.

7. Ur P. *A course in language teaching trainee book*. Cambridge University Press.1999.

8.Tabatabaei O Birjandi, P. The effect of focus on form instruction on intermediate EFL learners' writing performance. *J Teach Lang Skills. 2009;1*(2):103–124.

9.Nicol D J & Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in higher education. 2006;31*(2):199-218.

10.Shute VJ. Focus on formative feedback. *Rev Educat Res*. 2008;*78*(1):153-189. DOI:10.3102/0034654307313795.

11Sadler DR. Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instruct Sci*. 1989;*18*(2):119-144.

12.Krashen SD. Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon.1982.

13.Spolsky B. *Sociolinguistics* (Vol. 1). Oxford university press.

14.Sheen, Y. (2011). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning, Vol. 13, New York: Springer.1998.pp:pp. 1-175). pp. 1-175.

15.Tunstall P & Gipps C. Teacher feedback to young children in formative assessment. *British Educa Res J. 1996;22*(4), 389–404.

16.Hargreaves E, McCallum B, & Gipps C. Teacher feedback strategies in primary classrooms–new evidence. In *Feedback for learning. 2004;*pp:20-31). Routledge.

17.Kluger A N, & DeNisi A. The effects of feedback interventions on performance: a historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological bulletin*,1996;*119*(2):254. DOI:10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254

18.Zamel V. Responding to student writing. *TESOL quarterly*. 1985;*19*(1), 79-101.https://doi.org/10.2307/3586773.

19.Carless D. Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in higher education. 2006;31*(2):219-233.

20.Crystal D. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (6th ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.2008.

21.Topping KJ. Peer assessment. *Theory into practice*. 2009;*48*(1), 20-27. doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577569.

22.Boud D & Molloy E. Rethinking models of feedback for learning: the challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in higher education*. 2013;*38*(6): 698-712. https://doi.org/10.1080 /02602938.2012.691462

23.Ellis R. Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal: An electronic refereed journal for foreign and second language educators. 2009; 1*(1).doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054

24.Hart E W. *Feedback in performance reviews*. John Wiley & Sons.2012.

25.Black P & Wiliam D. *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment.* London: GL Assessment.2002.

26.Westberg J & Jason H. *Fostering reflection and providing feedback: Helping others learn from experience*. Springer Publishing Company.2001.

27.Ally M. Foundations of educational theory for online learning. *Theory and practice of online learning*. 2004; *2*(1):15-44.

28.Dede C. Immersive interfaces for engagement and learning. *Science*. 2009;*323*(5910):66-69.

29.Garrison D R. E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice (2nd ed.). Routledge.2011. https:// doi.org /10.4324/9780203838761

30.Miller M D. *Minds online: Teaching effectively with technology*. Harvard University Press. 2014.

31.Maolida E H. A quantitative study of students' perceptions of teacher written feedback. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 2913;3*(1):1–10.https://doi.org/10.17509 /ijal. v3i1 .189

32.Ran A & Danli Z. Research on the effectiveness of online feedback in EFL writing. English Language Teaching. 2016; 9(3): 22–31. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n3p22

33.Wenglinsky HDoes it compute? The relationship between educational technology and student achievement in mathematics.1998.

34.Cuban L. Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom. Harvard University Press.2001.

35.Hembrooke H & Gay G. The laptop and the lecture: The effects of multitasking in learning environments. *J comput higher educat*. 2003;*15*: 46-64.