THE IMPACT OF PEER FEEDBACK ON ENHANCING WRITING SKILLS OF ESL
LEARNERS: TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' EXPERIENCES AND PREFERENCES
IN THE CONTEXT OF VYGOTSKY'S SOCIOCULTURAL THEORY

By

Lamia Zahid
22377006

A thesis submitted to the Department of BRAC Institute of Languages in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MA in TESOL

BRAC Institute of Languages
Brac University
May, 2024

Declaration

It is hereby declared that

1. The thesis submitted is my/our own original work while completing degree at Brac University.

2. The thesis does not contain material previously published or written by a third party, except where this is appropriately cited through full and accurate referencing.

3. The thesis does not contain material which has been accepted, or submitted, for any other degree or diploma at a university or other institution.

4. I have acknowledged all main sources of help.

Student's Full Name & Signature: Lamia Zahid

_____

Lamia Zahid
22377006

Approval

The thesis/project titled "The Impact of Peer Feedback on Enhancing Writing Skills of ESL Learners: Teachers' and Students' Experiences and Preferences in the Context of Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory" submitted by

1. Lamia Zahid (22377006)

of Spring, 2024 has been accepted as satisfactory in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Masters of Arts in TESOL on 6th June, 2024.

Examining Committee:

Supervisor:

(Member)

_____

John Paul Shimanto Sarkar

Lecturer, Brac Institute of Languages (BIL)

Brac University

External Expert Examiner:

(Member)

_____

Dr. Mohammod Moninoor Roshid

Professor, Institute of Education and Research

Dhaka University

Departmental Head:

(Chair)

_____

Shaila Sultana, PhD

Professor and Director

BRAC Institute of Languages

Ethics Statement

I hereby declare that I am submitting the thesis titled "The Impact of Peer Feedback on Enhancing Writing Skills of ESL Learners: Experiences and preferences of Teachers and Students on Advantages and Disadvantages" to the Brac Institute of Languages (BIL), Brac University, as part of the requirements for my Master's degree in TESOL. I affirm that this dissertation contains no copied or plagiarised content from any published or unpublished works by other authors. Any borrowed or reproduced materials from other sources have been appropriately acknowledged with full references or placed within quotation marks. I realize that the programme granted to me may be revoked if it is later determined that this portfolio is not my own work and includes copied, plagiarized, or borrowed elements without adequate acknowledgment.

Abstract

Peer feedback enhances students' development in writing skills and fosters their enthusiasm for studying. Peer support and constructive criticism in ESL classes promote learner autonomy and improve English writing abilities for academic and vocational objectives. This qualitative research sought to determine the influence and effectiveness of peer feedback in English as a Second Language (ESL) writing classes at a private institution. The study examined the experiences and preferences of both instructors and learners, using Vygotsky's scaffolding and Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). An exhaustive examination of data collected from a total of three interviews with ESL instructors, three interviews with students, and three classroom observations done in Dhaka revealed the impact of peer feedback on enhancing students' writing skills in an ESL class, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of adding peer feedback. The findings highlighted the crucial need for incorporating peer feedback to facilitate collaborative learning, participate in communication activities, and encourage learner autonomy.

Keywords: Peer Feedback, ESL, Learner's Autonomy, ZPD, Scaffolding, Phenomenological Research

Dedication

This work is dedicated to all the educators from various institutions who are willing to integrate peer feedback into their English classes and who are struggling with the challenge.

Table of Contents

Appendix II82

List of Tables

[10]

Glossary

Peer feedback: Peer feedback refers to the process in which students provide each other with constructive criticism and evaluation of their work or performance. Participating in peer feedback while utilizing the appropriate evaluation criteria allows students to examine these criteria and standards within the framework of a particular assignment.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Language acquisition is dependent on the capacity to engage in written communication. The value of the English language increases due to its extensive use in global knowledge mediation, as highlighted by various studies (Mahboob, 2014; Mansoor, 2005; Marlina & Giri, 2014; Rahman, 2002). Although the importance of writing practice in the context of English learning is indisputable, writing classrooms encounter many obstacles for various reasons (Lin and Samuel, 2013). Moreover, it is common for these pedagogical approaches to fail in their objective of enhancing the overall calibre of students' written assignments. Difficulties in writing can be attributed to various factors, including inadequate command of English tenses and syntax, a shortage of innovative concepts, ineffective pedagogical methods employed by educators, inadequate vocabulary, feeble sentence construction, inexperienced instructors, improper terminology usage, and adherence to rhetorical conventions. Academic writers face many challenges when developing their English language proficiency (Alvi et al., 2020). Subsequently, substantial endeavours are required to improve both the standards of writing and the methodologies employed in the field of education. This involves offering learners constructive criticism, suggestions, and high-calibre feedback to facilitate the efficient development of their writing abilities (Tsui & Ng, 2000; Shih-hsien, 2011). A shift in feedback practices has occurred due to modifications to writing methods; peer feedback is now included alongside instructor feedback. Incorporating peer criticism has emerged as an essential element in the multi-draft process-oriented methodology for authoring L2 instructions (Khalil, 2018).

Peer feedback occurs when individual pupils provide one another with feedback (Fatimah & Suharto, 2017). It is an instrument that encourages students to engage in discussions regarding concepts, give and receive constructive feedback, and enhance their writing abilities (Farrah, 2012). It is universally recognised as a practical pedagogical approach

for improving students' writing proficiency. Students strengthen their comprehension by exchanging their work. In addition, active engagement in the learning process and collaborative work can be fostered by implementing peer feedback strategies (Bradley & Thousny, 2017). To integrate peer feedback Frequently, instructors instruct language learners to compose descriptive texts on particular subjects, after which students share their work with their classmates for feedback. Typically, the peer feedback process is executed in this manner.

Peer feedback is an educational practice that involves students working together to improve one another's manuscripts and provide constructive criticism (Lei, 2017). This form of feedback is believed to be beneficial (Nguyen, 2016). The peer feedback technique possesses many benefits, as Tehrani (2018) stated. Through sharing their work with their classmates, students are indirectly taught the value of offering constructive criticism and recommendations for one another's growth. Additionally, it fosters collaboration among students and enhances their proficiency in the four foundational language learning skills. In addition, it encourages critical thinking by allowing students to reflect personally while offering feedback to their classmates. Consequently, receiving feedback from their peers empowers individuals to discern the merits and deficiencies of their writing.

Approximately twenty-five years ago, the focus on providing feedback in ESL writing received considerable attention in the academic literature. A persuasive case has been presented in favor of PF, emphasizing its advantages compared to the conventional teacher-centered approach. By providing the option to incorporate or disregard the criticism of their peers, peer feedback enables ESL writers to gain agency (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994). Students understand that their peers will be the audience during a peer feedback session, which fosters autonomy and empowers them to articulate their viewpoints and writing styles. It provides an

essential element for aspiring authors—an audience (Penaflorida, 2002). In addition, peer feedback is constructive rather than authoritative, enhancing student writers' autonomy.

Despite its numerous benefits, teachers should exercise caution when implementing peer feedback in ESL/EFL writing programs. According to Stanley (1992); Storch (2005); McGroarty & Zhu (1997), students prefer instructor input to peer feedback. Numerous elements contribute to this inclination: It takes time to initially engage colleagues in feedback activities due to the need for more familiarity among learners with the process. As Rollinson (2005) stated, the procedure requires substantial investment in reviewing preliminary versions, annotating, engaging in dialogue with colleagues, and reaching a consensus via written critiques or verbal discussions. Moreover, many students believe that professors possess superior knowledge and are, therefore, capable of providing more credible assessments. In addition, pupils must be more proficient in comprehending peer criticism and have the inadequate skills to implement suitable corrections (Chen & Lin, 2008; Ferris, 2002; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Tang & Tithecott, 1999).

Notwithstanding these challenges, numerous studies indicate that students prioritize the advantages over the disadvantages when evaluating the pros and cons of peer criticism, as Zundert et al. (2010) found.

1.1 Background Information

The topic of corrective feedback in second language acquisition (SLA) has generated considerable theoretical and practical research due to the heated debate surrounding it over the years (Ferris, 2010). The most frequently debated topic in the field of SLA is whether, as nativists and rationalists contend, learners should only be exposed to positive language examples or whether they should also be exposed to negative feedback. Positive corrections are sufficient, according to nativists; conversely, interactionist scholars, including Gass (2003),

stress the significance of incorporating negative evidence to aid in the development of learners. To rectify the improper language usage of learners, both negative and corrective feedback are implemented (Gass, 1997; Schachter, 1991).

In general, corrective feedback refers to the response provided to a student when they make an error while practicing. Ellis (2009) classifies it as negative feedback, which is differentiated from positive feedback by focusing on linguistic mistakes rather than the evaluation of correct expressions. Ellis also underscores the importance of recognizing that educators may use diverse methodologies in their replies. Dignen (2014) asserts that corrective feedback is the most essential communication skill, regardless of the context (educational or otherwise). Furthermore, scholars have categorized feedback in various ways because of its complex nature. Consequently, they discern between explicit and implicit feedback, verbal and written feedback, positive and negative feedback, and immediate versus delayed feedback (Harmer, 2009).

In the past, certain educational philosophies, such as Behaviorism, considered errors unacceptable and advocated for instructors to rectify them promptly (Brown, 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In contrast, Krashen (1981a; 1981b) argued that error correction was not only ineffective but also detrimental to the development of language. Implementing communicative approaches brought about a substantial paradigm shift in the error correction method (Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001; Russell, 2009). Advocates of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) contend that mistakes should be perceived as indications of learners' linguistic progress rather than absolute avoidance. CLT acknowledged the importance of fluency by permitting instructors to overlook certain errors. In SLA, the dilemma of error correction, i.e., whether or not to remedy the mistakes, has generated considerable controversy.

Notwithstanding this, current SLA research is overwhelmingly in favor of error correction and corrective feedback (Ellis, 2006). Hamid and Honan (2012) assert that Bangladesh has among the most substantial populations of children engaged in English language learning, with more than seventeen million pupils utilizing English as a second or foreign language. Nevertheless, there is scholarly consensus regarding classifying English language instruction (ELT) in Bangladesh as EFL or ESL (English as a Foreign Language). As observed in India and Malaysia, Carter and Nunan (2001) define ESL as the extensive use of English in public spaces and government contexts. In contrast, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) pertains primarily to academic settings and classrooms, as observed in countries like China and Pakistan, where the language is not extensively spoken.

McArthur (1996) places Bangladesh in the ESL category but observes that the community's usage of English is somewhere between a second and a foreign language. Although English is the only official language in Bangladesh, along with Bangla, Ali (2010) considers ELT in the nation to be ESL. However, according to Ali and Walker (2014), English language instruction in Bangladesh is better aligned with the EFL method. According to the Ministry of Education (2023), the government of Bangladesh's most recent policy mandates English as a second language in the curriculum.

Chowdhury and Kabir (2014) observe that Bangladesh lacked a defined and consistent English language strategy before implementing the National Education Strategy 2010. The country has three separate educational systems: mainstream secular state education, Madrasah Islamic education, and English-medium education governed by the University of Cambridge under the British Council. Each system views the importance of the English language differently (Ali & Walker, 2014). At the postsecondary level, government schools employ Bangla and English as mediums of teaching, whilst private institutions only use English.

Furthermore, English wields considerable power in official capacities (Hamid, Jahan, & Islam, 2013).

We were expected to teach secondary-level students during a teaching practicum course in my fourth semester. We prioritized "peer feedback" in our lesson design since it was discovered that students were more comfortable hearing comments from their peers than from teachers. This strategy has evolved as an essential means of providing feedback at various academic levels. In an ENG101 class, I recall the instructor having learners develop outlines for opinion-based paragraphs and then trade and evaluate each other's work using specified criteria. While supervising this exercise, I saw that students were enthusiastic about offering and receiving comments from their classmates. According to Liu and Hasen (2018), peer feedback can be useful for both receivers and givers because, during the writing process, learners become "sources of information and interactants for each other" by acting as "teacher, tutor, or editor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts" (p. 1). It can also help students effectively analyze their classmates' papers, become more thoughtful, and improve their editing abilities (Hyland, 2000). The concept is that incorporating peer feedback into second language writing instruction might improve learners' understanding of the writing process, its organization, and its structure. As long as it is executed successfully, this might benefit both the individual providing feedback and the person receiving it (Chowdhury & Akteruzzaman, 2015).

Furthermore, Chowdhury and Akteruzzaman (2021) found out in their recent studies how students from two different universities gradually acknowledged the process of providing effective peer feedback and how they benefited from it. On the other hand, Zaman and Azad (2023), in their research, found that while learners usually value peer input, they also exhibit a reluctance to rely on it. A poll found that 46.33% of learners preferred receiving peer

6

comments, while 28.33% were undecided. However, 42.50% of respondents said they did not trust their peers' opinions. This attitude is shared by instructors, with 58.33% believing that their pupils lack the expertise required to provide meaningful peer criticism.

According to Sarker et al. (2021), English Medium Instruction (EMI) is a typical occurrence in higher education (HE) in nations where English is required as a second or foreign language. Global research reported on EMI's promise, practice, challenges, and outcomes in higher education. Private institutions in Bangladesh, which number roughly 105, have also embraced EMI. According to Sultana (2017), the language of instruction in Bangla-medium schools encompasses English at the primary (Year 1-5), secondary (Year 6-10), and higher secondary (Year 11-12) levels. Nevertheless, there has been a growing emphasis on the English language within universities, particularly private ones. These esteemed academic institutions maintain stringent regulations regarding the implementation of the English language while also providing supplementary English courses tailored to support students who may require additional assistance.

Sarker et al. (2021) further state that the Private University Act of 1992 in Bangladesh does not provide clear instructions on the Medium of Instruction (MOI) - whether English Medium Instruction (EMI) or Bangla Medium Instruction (BMI) should be used. This uncertainty derives from a solid nationalist mood preferring Bangla as a reaction to the historic language movement 1952, which sought to establish Bangla as the national language (Rahman, Singh, & Karim, 2020).

Due to the effect of fierce nationalist ideals, public colleges mainly use BMI (Hamid & Baldauf, 2014). 105 private institutions, on the other hand, have selected EMI to internationalize higher education and provide students with English fluency, linking them with a global identity as citizens (Hamid, Jahan et al., 2013). While private institutions have adopted

English Medium Instruction (EMI) to educate graduates for the global workforce, various studies have shown drawbacks to this method (Sarker et al., 2021). According to reports, EMI may impair students' understanding of course material and limit their involvement in class discussions. For instance, as an undergraduate student at Brac University, the general English proficiency courses included students from diverse backgrounds. Because the classes were conducted in English, many students felt anxious during activities requiring speaking or individual participation. Even in the current ENG101 classes the researcher observed, instructors occasionally switch between Bangla and English based on the circumstances. Still, the use of Bangla could be more frequent as the course primarily focuses on enhancing English proficiency. Islam (2013) observed a similar situation where university students, who play an essential role in implementing and profiting from EMI, struggled to grasp lectures owing to their restricted vocabulary. As a result, they needed help understanding the material during these lectures (Islam, 2013; Hamid, Jahan et al., 2013).

According to a 2015 BBC Bengali article, most students (63%) enrolled in various private institutions across Bangladesh attend Bengali language schools and colleges (Sultana, 2014; Jahan & Jahan, 2011). Typically, approximately 23 percent of students who successfully complete the HSC examination are accepted into first-year courses at both public and private universities annually. According to the current trend, it is projected that by 2020, around 362,000 students will be registered in first-year courses at higher level institutions (Ahmed, Iqbal and Abbasi, 2018). After finishing grade twelve, around 30% of pupils, totaling 185,910 students, get admission to various public colleges in Bangladesh (Rahman, 2014). This research implies that private university education exposes more students to English as a teaching language. According to Sultana (2018), a noticeable split arises when students fail to understand and speak in English during classroom interactions and activities. This language barrier exacerbates inequities among pupils, resulting in the establishment of two different

groups: those who speak Bengali and those who speak English. Students from an English medium background utilize English more frequently than students from a Bengali medium background.

1.2 Problem Statement

Giving students feedback through written comments, error corrections, teacher-student exchanges, or peer assessments is a cornerstone of ESL writing programs worldwide. Feedback promotes a helpful educational atmosphere and is a type of socio-academic interaction.' It guides students, offering reassurance when they are on the correct track and direction when they stray (Leki, 2006). Despite its crucial role in second language writing education and its impact on instructors and students, research on many feedback areas has yielded inconsistent findings and viewpoints. For example, a study by Zaman and Azad (2023) titled "Feedback in EFL Writing at Tertiary Level: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions" where focused on the perceptions of teachers and students on peer feedback in EFL writing classes which provided a positive outcome in favor of peer feedback. Another study by Chowdhury and Akteruzzaman (2021), "The application of guided peer feedback in facilitating L2 writing: Action research with tertiary-level language learners in Bangladesh", aimed to adjust the notion of peer feedback among the students since they were discovered to be generating imprecise, brief, and shallow remarks on their peers' work.

However, an intriguing observation emerges from ESL classrooms: students derive more substantial insights from their peers than from teachers in the context of their writing. Teachers and students are critical stakeholders in these schools. However, an important question arises: do teachers and students share the same assumptions about the effectiveness and efficiency of peer review or feedback in ESL classrooms? Surprisingly, a considerable lack of literature addresses this crucial component, prompting an in-depth investigation of

instructors' and students' viewpoints on the usefulness and impact of peer review or feedback in ESL educational contexts.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The study aims to analyse the impact of peer feedback on the improvement of writing abilities among students with English as a Second Language (ESL) background. This will be done by studying the perspectives and preferences of both teachers and students. This research seeks to comprehend the benefits and drawbacks of incorporating peer feedback in ESL writing classrooms, as perceived by teachers, utilising the Vygotskian sociocultural theory. Furthermore, this study aims to investigate the perspectives and experiences of ESL writing learners about peer review as a feedback mechanism. This study incorporates a qualitative, phenomenological methodology to acquire a thorough comprehension of the cognitive and social elements of peer feedback. The findings provide useful insights for improving instructional tactics in ESL education.

1.4 Objectives

1.4.1 General Objective

1. Evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of implementing peer feedback in English as a Second Language (ESL) schools.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

1. Discussing teachers' experiences and preferences regarding the impact of peer feedback on enhancing the writing skills of ESL learners

2. Examining and comparing the experiences and preferences of ESL students regarding the significance and impact of feedback from their peers on their writing skills in ESL classes

1.5 Rationale

The significance of acquiring proficient writing abilities in English language acquisition is crucial, especially in ESL/EFL contexts where English is a worldwide communication mode. The necessity of obtaining skills in English writing has long been accentuated, specifically in ESL/EFL contexts. Efficiently producing academic content is essential for academic achievement in higher education (Ajmal & Kumar, 2020; Al-Hammadi & Sidek, 2015; Chou, 2011). Therefore, to teach writing effectively, it is important to utilise several strategies and methods (Selvaraj & Aziz, 2019). Even though there is a vigorous focus on enhancing English writing skills, ESL/EFL lessons experience multiple hindrances in students' progress. The challenges mostly circulate among grammatical and syntactical problems to a dearth of cognitive concepts and sometimes ineffective teaching techniques (Haider, 2012; Hyland, 2003). Similarly, writing that lacks coherence cannot deliver concepts significantly, leading to a loss of confidence in learners, regardless of their proficiency in syntax, vocabulary, and grammar when composing texts (Rico, 2014). Hence, there is a requirement to improve both writing quality and teaching methods' efficiency (Quintero, 2008; Nik, Hamzah, & Rafidee, 2010).

To address these challenges, peer feedback has become a great source of information (Van Gennip, Segers, & Tillema, 2010). The learners participate in the peer feedback segments and offer reviews on their peers' written assignments. As a result, they actively engage in constructive critique and promote a collaborative learning environment (Paulus, 1999). Peer review also offers a perspective on writing and encourages the growth of ownership and autonomy among themselves (Tsui and Ng (2000). Although there are advantages of peer review sessions, it is essential to examine the perception of instructors and students on their effectiveness in ESL classes.

The present study emphasises the benefits and drawbacks of peer feedback. Nevertheless, the instructors and students depicted diverse opinions about its efficacy. Therefore, the current study aims to fill this gap by analysing the experiences and preferences of the instructors and students on peer review in ESL writing classes in Bangladesh.

The present study aims to accentuate the advantages and disadvantages of peer review in ESL classes by looking at the viewpoints of instructors and students. The findings will guide educators and policymakers to understand the efficacy of peer feedback as a feedback system in ESL writing classes, resulting in more well-informed instructional approaches and enhanced learning outcomes for ESL students in Bangladesh and other locations.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Peer feedback, as defined by Yu and Lee (2016), is "an activity in which students exchange written and/or oral feedback with their peers regarding their writing in pairs or small groups" (p. 461). Peer review entails students engaging in a collaborative endeavour wherein they "read, critique, and offer feedback on one another's writing." The purpose of this process is twofold: first, to ensure immediate improvement in the quality of the writing, and second, to foster the gradual development of stronger writing skills through mutual scaffolding (Hu 2005). Various scholars have employed different words to designate this practice, such as peer

evaluation (Stanley, 1992), peer revision (McGroarty and Zhu, 1997), peer response (Connor and Asenavage, 1994; Liu and Hansen, 2002), and peer critique (Marx, 1990). Given that we perceive this procedure as a cooperative endeavour involving several students who aim to assist one another in improving their writing while also enhancing their analytical thinking abilities, we favour the term peer review. The aforementioned phrases have additional implications, such as the act of evaluating peers (peer evaluation), making alterations to a peer's writing (peer revision), providing feedback orally (peer response), or offering harsh criticism (peer critique). Therefore, we see peer review as a more impartial and inclusive word that accurately represents our perspective on this undertaking.

2.1 Effectiveness of Peer Feedback in ESL Context

Peer feedback is a component of learner-centred instruction, in which the students take center stage while the instructor acts as a facilitator to coordinate the activity, offer guidance, and monitor progress, and it motivates students to take a more proactive approach in enhancing their writing abilities (Yu & Lee, 2016), thereby refining their capacity for independent problem-solving. As demonstrated by Yang et al. (2006), students who were provided with peer feedback engaged in a greater number of self-corrections than those provided with teacher feedback. This is likely because receiving feedback from peers increased the criticalness of their writing. Peer feedback often places greater emphasis on the development of topics. Peer feedback may, therefore, encourage an equilibrium between form and meaning.

Furthermore, it is advantageous for students to provide and receive feedback (Rouhi et al., 2020). Peer feedback encourages students to critically analyse the writing of their peers to make the composition accessible to audiences with limited knowledge of the essay topic (Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). This assists the L2 learner in writing for their audience (Rollinson, 2005).

Additionally, several scholars have deliberated on various methods by which peer review can positively impact the development of L2 writing. Peer review has been identified as a means for L2 student writers to "develop understandings of themselves and others as writers and as classroom learners of writing" (Hu 2005; Curtis 2001; Stanley 1992). To start with, it has been established that self-efficacy is a critical success factor in language acquisition (Brown and White, 2010; Prat-Sala and Redford, 2010). Research has established a positive correlation between students' writing achievement and their writing self-efficacy (Zimmerman and Bandura, 1994; Pajares and Johnson, 1996; Klassen, 2002; Woodrow, 2011; Han and Hiver, 2018). In theory, student engagement with peer feedback provides them with comprehensive feedback, which may occasionally be more constructive than the instructor's. Peer feedback has the potential to enhance students' self-efficacy through various means.

Additionally, it has been observed that self-efficacy can be enhanced through various other types of peer interaction (Rahimi and Fathi, 2021; Shin and Johnson, 2021). Nevertheless, research examining the impact of peer feedback on writing self-efficacy has yielded inconclusive findings. Peer feedback improved the writing self-efficacy of students, according to several studies (Chaudron, 1984; Tsui and Ng, 2000; Lee and Evans, 2019).

Furthermore, it has been suggested that peer review can enhance students' experiences and preferences on the negotiated socio-cognitive nature of writing (de Guerrero and Villamil 1994; Flower 1994; Lockhart and Ng 1995). In addition to facilitating the development of evaluative skills (Berg 1999), peer review can enable L2 student writers to recognise their strengths and limitations (Tsui and Ng 2000; Tuzi 2004) and "develop an awareness of the rhetorical structure of their writing" (Hedgcock and Lefkowitz 1992, p. 255). Through cognitive and behavioural engagement with peer feedback (Fan and Xu, 2020), students enhance their writing awareness and improve their writing ability. As an illustration, Tsui and

Ng (2000) discovered that through peer feedback, students can enhance their comprehension of the merits and demerits of their writing. Research has demonstrated that the implementation of peer review positively impacts the content of texts produced by students, which is in essence, the purpose of the peer review approach (Deni & Zainal, 2011). Collaborative dialogue has been found to positively impact the quality of texts (Shehadeh, 2011; Martin & Provost, 2014; Baker, 2016; Fernandez Dobao & Blum, 2012; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012). Numerous studies have underscored the favourable impact of peer review on production quality. Kuikken and Vedder (2002) establish that collaborative dialogues improve the quality of L2 texts in their research.

Moreover, peer review can facilitate the development of audience awareness and a sense of text ownership among L2 student writers (Jacobs et al. 1998; Mittan 1989; Paulus 1999; Rollinson 2005; Tsui and Ng 2000; Villamil and de Guerrero 1996), thereby encouraging them to shift their focus from writing for the author to writing for the reader (Stanley 1992). Furthermore, it has been proposed that peer review can contribute to the establishment of "the social foundation for the development of critical revision cognitive processes" (Villamil and de Guerrero 1996, p. 67) and expand the repertoire of effective revision strategies of L2 student writers, which is vital for writing improvement (Arndt 1993; Hedgcock and Lefkowitz 1992; Leki 1990a).

2.2 Student and Teacher's Perspective on Peer Feedback in ESL Writing Context

How students interpret and respond to peer feedback has been identified as a significant determinant of peer feedback quality (Farah, 2012; Lee, 1997; Tang & Tithecott, 1999). According to Tang and Tithecott (1999), students' perceptions undergo a positive transformation over the semester when they appropriately apply the material. Furthermore, these peer efforts engage them in distinct cognitive, social, and linguistic activities. For

instructors to effectively utilise peer feedback in language courses, certain factors must be considered. For instance, instructors may place pupils in groups with which they are familiar or allocate them specific responsibilities that encourage active engagement.

Moreover, instructors can use peer feedback as a routine class activity and explicitly explain the instructions and objectives (Lee, 1997). Students may consequently develop favourable attitudes toward peer feedback in the classroom. In the context of L2 writing courses, positive attitudes toward peer feedback improve students' critical thinking abilities, motivation, self-assurance, and creativity (Farah, 2012).

Students' perceptions of this type of strategy influence the effectiveness of an instructional plan for writing that includes peer feedback as a crucial phase in the writing process (Amores, 1997; Carson & Nelson, 1996; Hu, 2005; Liu & Hansen, 2005; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000). Multiple studies have examined distinct facets of students' experiences and preferences concerning peer feedback in English as a Second Language (ESL) writing courses. An investigation conducted by Poveda and Harutyunyan (2018) revealed that pupils regard it as motivating and suggested an approach that aids in attaining knowledge across various proficiency levels (Planas et al., 2013). Furthermore, they believe that collaborating facilitates the attainment of superior outcomes. These results validate the conclusions reached by Storch (2005). Sixteen of the eighteen students in her study had favourable opinions of the experience. Alternative research yielded comparable findings, wherein 91.6% of students expressed a generally favourable perception of the peer review process. According to Deni and Zainal (2011), students have expressed that they perceive the peer editing practice as intriguing, demanding, and beneficial.

Furthermore, students believe that they contribute in some way to the improvement of their companions, that they receive assistance from their peers, that they are held in high regard

by their peers, and that they reciprocate this sentiment with their classmates. Additionally, participants reached agreements with their partners almost always, even though another was to enhance every facet of the essays. Another study that supports this notion found that students gained confidence, subject knowledge, and an understanding of the complexities involved in evaluating their own and their peers' work by reviewing their peers' written assignments (Planas Lladó et al., 2013).

The results of the study by Husin and Ariffin (2008) indicate that participants' views regarding peer feedback were significantly impacted by their cultural background, linguistic proficiency, and attitude. Undoubtedly, this has had an impact on their conduct throughout the sessions. According to the quantitative data, the participants perceived peer response as beneficial in several ways: revising their drafts (mean = 2.83 on a scale of I to 4), developing their ability to analyse writing (mean = 2.64), uncovering novel ideas and experiences and preferences (mean = 2.50), and enhancing their writing proficiency (mean = 2.34). Five respondents cited the provision of additional ideas to improve the content of their writing as a benefit of peer feedback. Four stated that peer feedback assisted in the clarification of their ideas, three in determining which points required further elaboration, and one in deciding which information to include or exclude. Respondents also found the following areas beneficial: increased audience awareness, assistance with essay organisation, and error correction.

Scholars have extensively documented the significance of peer feedback within the Turkish ESL context (Bilki & Ğrgin, 2021; Ciftci & Kocoglu, 2012). Peer feedback is considered beneficial by Turkish ESL students when it comes to writing courses; they believe it reduces their apprehension and boosts their confidence. Conversely, Kaya (2021) found that students exhibited adverse affective responses towards identifiable peer feedback, whereas the converse was true for anonymous peer feedback. Furthermore, collaborative learning among

Turkish ESL students is facilitated by peer feedback (Yastibas & Yastibas, 2015; Kurt & Atay, 2007). Ciftci and Kocoglu (2012) examined whether peer feedback positively impacted students' revised manuscripts. Kaya and Yaprak (2020) conducted a study to examine the impact of training on students' performance in providing critical and peer feedback. The findings revealed that students' proficiency in providing peer feedback improved. Over time, they could provide their colleagues with more effective and superior feedback. However, further research is required to examine the impact of peer feedback training on students' writing abilities and attitudes toward it.

On the other hand, Saka (2019) in her studies pointed out that, regarding the advantages of peer review, diverse experiences and preferences emerged as a recurring theme. Each of the three instructors described how peer review enables students to understand alternative viewpoints and how they can find motivation in the work of their peers. Each student rated it as beneficial for their peers to view the work of their peers and to practice identifying flaws in the work of others, adding, "I believe it is easier to identify the flaws of others than your own." Finally, Teacher 2 described how, through peer evaluation, students can develop new experiences and preferences and find inspiration in one another (Saka, 2019).

According to Michalsky, T., and Schechter, C. (2013), supportive peer feedback identifies three essential needs: provider and receiver autonomy, engagement, and the feedback structure, which, along with self-efficacy, fosters self-directed learning. In peer feedback-aided writing, students not only analyse their peers' writing and provide ideas and comments, but they also actively act on the feedback and alter their writing accordingly (Ajjawi & Boud, 2017). A further investigation found that peer feedback is essential for engaging students in learning, developing self-regulated learning, and nurturing critical thinking abilities (Winstone & Boud, 2019; Yu & Liu, 2021). According to López-Pellisa et al. (2021), peer feedback

enhances peer learning and improves writing ability, as proven by collaborative writing strategy.

Yu (2013) conducted qualitative research with 26 Chinese EFL instructors and discovered a discrepancy between their professed beliefs and their actual implementation of peer feedback. Although most educators recognised the importance of peer feedback, they refrained from implementing it for various reasons, including personal convictions. Certain educators believed, for instance, that their pupils lacked sufficient English proficiency to derive meaningful peer feedback. Her research findings indicated that teacher feedback followed peer feedback from the vast majority of instructors who integrated peer feedback into the classroom. Not only did this result in an augmentation of the instructor's burden, but it also unequivocally demonstrated the instructors' conviction that peer feedback was inadequate. According to her research findings, EFL instructors needed to be made aware of the potential and value of peer feedback, which required persuasion. Peer assessment can reduce instructors' burden and assist students in acquiring evaluative skills, taking responsibility for their learning, and improving writing abilities (Haaga, 1993; Rushton, Ramsey, & Rada, 1993).

In addition, large class sizes and a teacher-centred approach impede the implementation of peer feedback in the classroom. Zaman and Azad (2012) discovered that despite the Bangladeshi educators' overwhelmingly favourable disposition towards peer feedback, as evidenced by their research on teachers' perceptions of peer feedback, the substantial class sizes prevented any of the educators from implementing it in the classroom (p.150).

Regarding the peer review process, Hu (2005) provides a first-person, teacher-as-researcher viewpoint in one of her articles that concentrates on the teacher's perspective. In his work, Hu (2005) analyses his experience utilising peer review procedures from 2001 to 2003 while instructing upper-intermediate Chinese ESL students enrolled in an EAP (English for

Academic Purposes) course in Singapore. He details his methodology for conducting peer review. The author furnishes an elaborate account of the occurrences that transpired annually in his classrooms during peer review sessions. Each course was six months and its objective was to prepare students for writing assignments at the university level in English by enhancing their writing skills. Six 500-word assignments and a 1500–2000-word research paper were due from the students. "Process-oriented, genre-centered, theme-structured, and task-based" is how the author classifies his pedagogical approach for this writing course (Hu, 2005: 328).

2.3 Challenges and Limitations of Peer Feedback

Despite multiple possible advantages, peer feedback's practicality and effectiveness have been questioned. A presumed constraint is that L2 learners lack confidence in the reliability of feedback provided by peers with equivalent proficiency levels (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). While this concern may seem logical at first glance, its justification is a matter of empirical evaluation. This raises two inquiries: (1) whether learners harbour a negative perception of peer feedback and (2) whether the feedback provided by peers is precise. Regarding the previous inquiry, the research suggests that students hold teacher feedback in higher regard than peer feedback. As an illustration, Tian and Zhou (2020) found that students were 55.3% less likely to respond to peer comments than to teacher comments (85.3%).

On the contrary, participants' attitudes towards instructor and peer feedback varied among and among participants across assignments. Several students expressed that the remarks delivered by the native-speaking instructor could have been more frequently ambiguous or complex to grasp, rendering them arduous to respond to. Prior research has indicated that the quality of peer evaluations and peer feedback is not always sufficient, similar to previous work exploring the nature and quality of self-regulated learning (Misiejuk and Wasson, 2021; Xiong

and Schunn, 2021; Yuan et al., 2016). Lower-quality evaluations may result from a lack of responsibility (Patchan et al., 2018) or a misunderstanding of criteria (Könings et al., 2019).

One participant stated that he preferred peer feedback because it was easier to implement suggestions into his writing due to their shared cultural background and similar thought processes. An additional pertinent investigation (Saeli & Cheng, 2021) unveiled that students preferred faculty-provided language-related feedback and tended to overlook language-related recommendations put forth by their peers. Moreover, students who have received more peer feedback may have a more favourable attitude towards it due to their awareness of its potential advantages. This interpretation is corroborated by the findings of Yang et al. (2006), who discovered that students who were provided with peer feedback exhibited greater satisfaction than those who solely received input from the instructor. In particular, 51 per cent of the peer feedback group and 22 per cent of the instructor feedback group deemed peer feedback "useful."

2.4 Peer Feedback in ESL Classroom

Within English as a Second Language (ESL) writing classes, providing students with feedback about their performance when given a writing assignment is essential. Nevertheless, in a classroom where the instructor is the focus of attention, the teacher often provides feedback. Consequently, the students play a passive role and just receive the input, while the teacher is the one who decides the accuracy of their work and replies (Kline, Letofsky & Woodard, 2013). In a conventional student-centred classroom, teachers utilise peer review as a means for students to evaluate and provide feedback on each other's work. By implementing this methodology in the school, educators transform the students' position from passive recipients of knowledge to engaged participants who are focused on pleasing their professors and striving to satisfy themselves and their classmates. According to Buyse (2011), students

who engage in cooperative assessment of each other's works have the chance to: discover authentic readers for their work and become self-assured writers and decision-makers instead of depending solely on professors' comments.

In recent times, scholarly articles have generally endorsed the utilisation of peer feedback in English as a Second Language (ESL) writing classes due to its potential value as an aid encompassing social, cognitive, affective, and methodological benefits (see, for instance, Mendonca and Johnson 1994; Villamil and de Guerrero 1996). Peer consumers can offer valuable feedback. As an illustration, Rollinson (1998) discovered that his college-level students provided him with substantial amounts of valid feedback: 80% of the comments were deemed valid, while a mere 7% had the potential to cause harm. Caulk (1994) observed comparable outcomes: 89% of his intermediate/advanced level FL students provided feedback that he deemed valuable, and 60% offered suggestions that he had not considered when examining the papers himself. Additionally, he encountered very little negative advice.

Additionally, it has been demonstrated that peer writers can modify effectively in response to peer readers' comments. The study conducted by Mendonca and Johnson (1994) revealed that 53% of revisions consisted of integrating peer comments. Rollinson (1998) discovered even greater reader acceptance of feedback, with 65 per cent of comments being partially or entirely incorporated. Peer feedback is also frequently of a different nature than that of the instructor: Caulk (1994) discovered that instructor feedback was relatively general, in contrast to the more specific responses of students. Therefore, it can be regarded as complementary, as Berg (1999) and Chaudron (1984) noted.

Lastly, students might become more critical consumers and reviewers of their writing if they develop the ability to evaluate the work of others critically.

2.5 Peer Feedback in Bangladeshi ESL Classroom

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method was used in Bangladesh for teaching English at the Higher Secondary Level by the National Curriculum and Textbook Board in 2001. It was anticipated that an English language teaching classroom should prioritise learner-centeredness, ensuring all participants are active members of a communicative language community (Nakamura, 2005).

Richards & Rodgers (2014) have emphasised the need to maintain a learner-centred attitude towards students. This approach ensures that students are exposed to the target language to the fullest extent while minimising fear and fostering self-motivation to learn. From these viewpoints, it is evident that while communicating with students in a classroom setting, whether by delivering directions or offering feedback, the utmost importance should be placed on two fundamental factors: maximising the amount of information received and reducing levels of fear. However, it is often observed that professors in Bangladesh typically guide the writing forms inside the classroom. Nevertheless, many students from diverse backgrounds may need help comprehending the prescribed academic writing patterns they are expected to adhere to. In our view, implementing peer review in the classroom can facilitate students' acquisition of the structures and strategies of writing in English rather than solely relying on instructions provided by their teachers. This approach also fosters a sense of responsibility in students to critically evaluate the structural aspects of writing. Through peer review, students will gain firsthand experience in adhering to the proper progression of writing structures (Hunzer, 2012).

2.6 Research Gap

There has been considerable scholarly inquiry into peer feedback from multiple experiences and preferences. These include the attitudes of learners towards peer feedback

(Tian & Zhou, 2020), the accuracy of peer feedback (Jacobs & Zhang, 1989), how writers integrate input during the revision process (Villamil & de Guerrero, 1998), whether peer feedback enhances writing self-efficacy (Ruegg, 2018), and most significantly, the effectiveness of peer feedback in improvised writing. Peer feedback promotes critical thinking, fosters rapport among students, facilitates the provision of constructive criticism, and compels writers to engage in profound cognitive processing of their written work, according to proponents (Rollinson, 2005).

Numerous scholarly investigations that have been undertaken to examine the peer review phase have provided insights into its impact on various facets of the writing development of ESL students. An example of this can be seen in the research conducted by Stanley (1992), which examined the impacts of a comprehensive peer review training session lasting around seven hours on a single university ESL composition course. According to Stanley's research, the experimental group of ESL students exhibited significantly higher levels of motivation and enthusiasm than the control group, which underwent training for a significantly reduced duration of one hour. Furthermore, they furnished more explicit directives for revising the work of their peers, and the calibre of their comments improved, as evidenced by the following: the frequency with which specific remarks addressed problematic aspects of the writing, the quantity and calibre of recommendations for resolving issues, and the overall clarity of the feedback.

The potential influence of peer review training quality on students' writing quality and the development of their revision abilities should be considered. Berg (1999) conducted a study in which ESL learners with intermediate to high proficiency levels who underwent comprehensive 11-step peer review training (each step lasting between 5 and 45 minutes) made considerably more significant changes in meaning in their revised drafts than their counterparts

in the control group who had not undergone any training. Furthermore, the implementation of peer review training yielded a substantially favourable impact on the calibre of written work, as assessed by the Test of Written English (TWE) scoring criteria.

Similarly, English as a Foreign Language (EFL2) students enrolled at a university in Taiwan were able to revise their writing more frequently due to comprehensive peer review instruction. This instruction comprised two cycles of in-class modelling of peer review sessions, each lasting two hours and two half-hour one-on-half teacher-student conferences, each lasting half an hour (Min, 2006). In conclusion, the implementation of peer review training sessions, as observed in the research conducted by Min (2006), led to an overall improvement in the clarity and progression of ideas in the students' writing compared to their previous work. Thus, ESL/EFL students improved the quality of their writing, became more motivated, and provided more revisions after receiving comprehensive peer review training. Additionally, they provided unambiguous, high-quality feedback to their peers. In addition to research on peer review instruction in ESL/EFL courses, several studies have examined the impact of peer feedback on the writing development of ESL/EFL students.

Therefore, according to the holistic assessment of essays produced before and after peer review, EFL students of high and low proficiency levels in two Japanese university-level courses improved their writing performance substantially due to peer feedback in Kamimura's (2006) study. In addition, the revisions of both groups underwent substantial content enhancements. In conclusion, after the peer review session, participants with a low level of proficiency in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) produced revisions that were equivalent in length to their initial drafts and placed greater emphasis on the local aspects of writing, in contrast to high-proficiency EFL participants who produced longer rewrites compared to their original drafts and prioritised the global aspects of writing.

Moreover, Lee and Vuogan (2022) in their study focused on synthesising the quantitative findings of 26 empirical studies; this meta-analysis serves three purposes: (1) to establish a precise estimation of the efficacy of peer feedback in enhancing L2 writing; (2) to contrast its impacts with those of alternative feedback sources; and (3) identify moderating factors that influence its effectiveness. According to the findings, peer feedback has a statistically significant positive cumulative influence on students' writing (d = 0.73, 95% CI: 0.54–0.92). No substantial disparities were observed in the impacts of peer feedback, teacher feedback, and self-revisions. Nevertheless, this conclusion is provisional due to the limited number of primary studies that have examined the comparison between peer feedback and feedback obtained from alternative sources. Effect sizes were greater in moderator analyses when students were given additional time to compose and when treatments lasted longer. In addition, the studies revealed that peer feedback was more effective regarding content than language (specifically, syntax and grammar), and that its impact on revisions was more pronounced than on new compositions. Recommendations for further research are put forth in light of the findings and methodological aspects of the primary research. These are intended to facilitate the development of more robust conclusions in subsequent meta-analyses.

This study examines the experiences and preferences of ESL learners regarding peer evaluation, teacher feedback, and self-evaluation in the context of the writing process. Anonymised questionnaires, modified from existing research instruments, were distributed to 107 students selected randomly from a private local university in Malaysia. The students perceived the feedback regarding the structure and substance of their writing as more beneficial than the feedback regarding their vocabulary and grammar. Additionally, it was discovered that students regarded self-assessment, teacher feedback, and peer evaluation as all exceedingly beneficial. Furthermore, the findings revealed that although there was no statistically significant distinction (p > 0.05) in the students' assessment of teacher feedback and self-

assessment, both were regarded as considerably more beneficial (p <.001) than peer feedback. Additionally, the students deemed explicit feedback considerably more valuable (p <.001) than implicit feedback. The findings of this study have implications for English language instruction practitioners and researchers. They provide insight into the revision strategies that students in ESL writing classes favour. Further investigation into the impact of teacher feedback, peer feedback, and self-assessment on students' writing performance will yield more comprehensive knowledge regarding the most effective approaches to employ in ESL writing courses that resemble one another (Vasu et al., 2016).

In the Bangladeshi context, very few studies have been mentioned. For example, Chowdhury and Akteruzzaman's (2015) study is based on action research conducted with 117 students enrolled in introductory English language courses at two universities in Bangladesh; this study was developed. Peer feedback (PF), a critical component of collaborative learning, is a significant alternative mode of evaluation that can give the educator a more comprehensive and precise comprehension of the learners' capabilities, thereby assisting in facilitating the learners. By evaluating their peers, not only can the students develop their critical thinking skills, but the peers themselves can also advance through knowledge exchange.

This research aimed to alter the students' perception of PF, which had been observed to consist of imprecise, inadequate, and superficial criticisms of their peers' writing. The research employs the PF comments obtained from peers' writing during the observation phase of an action research project to ascertain the deficiencies in the participants' peer feedback. Subsequently, the process by which the causes of inadequate PF are identified and resolved is documented, and learners are further educated on the significance and advantages of PF. In conclusion, the report analyses the results of a subsequent iteration of PF, demonstrating the

enhancement in the program's quality and the heightened contentment of both PF providers and recipients.

Another study by them focuses on how peer review can be applied to educate beginning English language learners about the fundamentals of academic writing structure. Furthermore, this study aims to investigate the potential impact of peer review on an individual's development as a writer, rational thinker, or critical critic of their peers' writings. In conclusion, this paper will provide suggestions for how peer review can foster students' creativity through the generation of critical and thought-provoking feedback on their peers' writing.

Within the context of Bangladesh, the researcher has only obtained the two papers that she cited earlier. This study primarily examines the usefulness and efficacy of peer feedback in the context of ESL writing at the tertiary level in Bangladesh. Furthermore, in the context of Bangladesh, the researcher was still looking for comprehensive research that specifically examines the experiences and preferences of both students and instructors in this field. It will address a significant gap in the literature. Furthermore, this current study aims to explore the experiences and preferences of students and teachers regarding the effectiveness of peer feedback in the context of English as a Second Language (ESL) writing at the tertiary level in Bangladesh. This research will contribute to future studies by identifying strategies to enhance the practicality and usefulness of peer feedback sessions.

2.7 Theoretical Framework

2.7.1 Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory

The current study is grounded on Vygotsky's socio-cultural framework, which highlights the significance of social interactions for cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1978). According to this approach, students in an ESL class should be viewed as a community where people must engage with their peers to generate meaning. Within this setting, feedback is not

just given by the instructor. Still, students also have an active role in making modifications, offering comments, engaging in dialogues, and discussing experiences within the socio-cultural framework (Evans, 2013).

Vygotsky contends that comprehending a child's growth necessitates an examination beyond the person. It is necessary to analyse the external social environment in which the individual's life has evolved. By engaging in activities that include cognitive and communication abilities, children are encouraged to develop and enhance these abilities in a supportive and structured manner. Kublin et al. (1998) assert that Vygotsky characterised learning as an inherent part of social occurrences, transpiring when children engage with others, things, and occurrences in their surroundings (p. 287). Although SCT was first conceived for L1 learning, it contributes significantly to L2 acquisition in formal settings. This sociocultural perspective on second language acquisition (SLA) highlights the interconnectedness between social interaction and cognitive growth, which encompasses the process of language learning. The main proposition of SCT is that the study of cognition necessitates an examination that does not separate it from its social environment (Vygotsky, 1978).

The Sociocultural Theory proposed by Vygotsky posits that learning is a cognitive phenomenon influenced by various social and cultural elements, with a particular emphasis on the interactions within the learner's surrounding environment (Vygotsky, 1978). The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is a fundamental concept in this theory, suggesting that individuals can gain advantages through engaging in collaborative learning activities and receiving guidance from peers or knowledgeable adults (Vygotsky, 1978). The cultural-historical context plays a fundamental role in Vygotsky's theory, significantly influencing the dynamics of peer feedback in ESL classrooms (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). The influence of

cultural and linguistic backgrounds on peers' understanding and dissemination of feedback substantially impacts the feedback process's effectiveness.

Lantolf (2000) argued that the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) could be a metaphor for seeing and comprehending how mediated instruments are adopted, adapted, and finally internalised. He coined the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as the process of collaboratively creating chances for individuals to enhance their cognitive capacities.

Various studies have investigated interactions between experts (teachers) and novices and interactions amongst novices. Several of these researches utilised the microgenetic technique, which involved thoroughly examining sequences of interactions to demonstrate the transition towards self-regulation that occurred within them (Ellis, 2008, p. 272). Nevertheless, prior research have utilised an experimental design that incorporates pre-tests and post-tests. Nassaji and Swain (2000, cited in Ellis, 2008) conducted a study using microgenetic analysis in an experimental design to assess how a native-speaking tutor provided oral feedback on the written compositions of two Korean learners of English. The study focused on the interactions between an expert tutor and novice learners. The findings indicated that offering targeted feedback within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) yielded positive outcomes. Specifically, it facilitated the learner's ability to produce the desired form during feedback sessions accurately, reduced the need for explicit assistance in subsequent sessions, and enabled the learner to correctly utilise the form in a post-test, which involved a close version of her previously written composition. The user's text is empty.

Peer evaluation uses the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) concept in the ESL classroom. When students participate in peer review, they enter into each other's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), offering structured assistance and direction. Peers with diverse degrees of experience can provide a range of experiences and preferences, assisting the writer

in advancing their writing skills beyond their current ability level (Mercer and Littleton, 2007). Peer feedback sessions facilitate social interaction and foster learning. ESL learners participate in collaborative conversations and feedback exchanges to engage in socio-cognitive processes. During these interactions, they negotiate meanings and co-construct knowledge about successful writing methods (Mercer, 2000).

Teachers are commonly regarded as conventional More Knowledgeable Others (MKOs), but in the context of peer review, fellow students serve as proximal MKOs. The exchange of feedback fosters a dynamic learning environment wherein peers, using their different experiences and preferences, may offer valuable insights and constructive criticism. By utilising Vygotsky's concept of scaffolding, peer feedback functions as a constructive framework. Peers support and enhance one another's writing progress by giving advice, demonstrating successful writing methods, and providing helpful criticism within the learners' Zone of Proximal Development (Kuypers, 2011).

Vygotsky's theory underscores the paramount importance of culture in the learning process. Cultural subtleties and linguistic backgrounds influence the perception and execution of peer review in ESL courses in Bangladesh. Peer feedback sessions can mirror communication patterns deeply ingrained in a particular culture, promoting shared knowledge and common practices (Peeck, 2012).

Implementing the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in practical settings poses significant challenges. Vygotsky's work did not extensively address the practical implementation of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in educational settings, as noted by Shayer (2002). Piaget (1995) proposes that when a kid engages in an activity with someone who has more knowledge, it mostly results in the imposition of the partner's perspectives and does not significantly impact the child's behaviour structures (i.e., social constraint). According

to Mitchell & Myles (2004), the majority of socio-cultural research on language development in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) have mostly examined specific words or grammatical elements, as seen in conventional grammar.

Lambert & Clyde (2000) provided a criticism of the idea of Zone of Proximal Development, "We believe that Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) offers a limited perspective on learning processes and diminishes the learner's function to being passive and reliant on the adult" (p. 29). They neglected to take into account the implementation of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in language acquisition.

2.9 Conceptual Framework

A conceptual framework is a fundamental tool used in academic research and analysis. It provides a structured and theoretical foundation for understanding and interpreting complex phenomena. By establishing a set of interconnected concepts and principles, a conceptual framework helps guide the development of hypotheses, data collection and analysis, and conclusions. The conceptual framework integrates Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), collaborative learning, and peer feedback procedures within educational settings.

2.9.1 Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory and Social Interaction

Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory emphasises the significance of social interactions in cognitive development. Sociocultural theory highlights the importance of individuals' development and education within the framework of their social surroundings. The daily interactions within society enable students to participate in productive endeavours, exchange and discuss ideas, and facilitate the process of collaborative learning. The process allows for students to acquire novel ideas and cultivate their intellectual capacity.

2.9.2 ZPD and Collaborative Learning

The central concept in Vygotsky's theory is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which encompasses a range of tasks that learners cannot accomplish independently but can complete with the assistance of more knowledgeable individuals. Furthermore, the notion of collaborative learning promotes the implementation of activities that are specifically tailored to operate within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). This approach enables students to collaborate to analyse complex issues, attain objectives through task completion, and acquire novel proficiencies. Through active participation in collaborative activities within their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), learners gain valuable peer guidance and advice, ultimately fostering their learning and skill development.

2.9.3. Scaffolding as a Guided Framework for Peer Feedback

Scaffolding guarantees assistance from more proficient peers so that the learners can eventually operate independently. The peer scaffolds supplied during the student-student interactions assist bridge the students' present developmental progress to a higher cognitive level of thinking, which improves their revisions and develops their writing abilities (Lin and Samuel, 2013).

2.9.4 The Role of Peer Feedback in Academic Development

Peer feedback sessions support students' academic growth by offering valuable assistance and nurturing their writing skills. During these sessions, peers provide targeted comments that help students identify areas for improvement. This approach enables the gradual incorporation of existing knowledge alongside the possible cultivation of competency.

2.9.5 Advancement of Metacognitive Skills

Providing peer feedback is instrumental in improving one's writing abilities and fostering metacognitive skills. The Zone of Proximal Development encourages students to

develop metacognitive skills, such as goal-setting, self-evaluation, and planning, which greatly contribute to lifelong learning.

2.9.6 Rationale

Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and the notion of peer feedback are fundamentally connected, since they both emphaises on the significance of interaction and collaborative learning (Lantolf, 2000). Zone of Proximal Development or (ZPD) being the key aspect of sociocultural theory emphaises on the inconsistency between a learner's autonomous capabilities and their prospective attainments through instruction or cooperation (Mercer and Littleton, 2007). Peer feedback provides learners with reciprocal support. They assist one another by offering criticism and simultaneously rectify their own tasks. By participating in interactive feedback sessions, individuals assist each other in enhancing their writing abilities, surpassing their personal limitations (Vygotsky, 1978). Scaffolding provides learners with temporary assistance before they can independently complete activities (Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, in the context of peer feedback, scaffolding refers to the provision of temporary instruction by peers to help learners improve their knowledge and skills in writing.

The present study has utilised sociocultural theory to investigate the influence of peer feedback on the improvement of writing proficiency in ESL learners. Thus, it examines how learners offer feedback and assist each other within their Zone of Proximal Development. It also highlights the way in which they support and enhance one other's learning through scaffolding. This concept facilitated the investigation of how educators and students comprehend the importance of social interactions in the acquisition of information. The educators view peer feedback as a strategy to expand their influence on education, while students see it as a way to acquire diverse perspectives and support from their peers.

Sociocultural theory provides a conceptual framework for understanding the potential benefits and challenges related to peer feedback in ESL contexts.

Vygotsky's theory highlights the crucial significance of interaction in the growth and progress of learners (Vygotsky, 1978). Peer feedback sessions provide a collaborative atmosphere where learners may exchange ideas, understand other perspectives, and participate in activities that enhance their writing abilities (Kline, Letofsky & Woodard, 2013). Engaging in peer conversations enables students to get immediate feedback on their written work, eliminating the need to wait until the following session. Peer feedback is crucial for learners to gain insight into their areas of progress, refine their thoughts, and enhance their writing abilities (Ruegg, 2018).

On the other hand, sociocultural theory takes into account the challenges that are connected with collaborative learning, notably the feedback that is provided by peers. To accomplish this, learners are required to offer assistance and direction to their classmates who are located inside the zone of proximal development (ZPD). Nevertheless, their capacity to properly employ scaffolding tactics within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) may be hindered by factors such as unequal involvement, poor grasp of the subject matter, and inconsistent feedback (Misiejuk and Wasson, 2021; Xiong and Schunn, 2023; Yuan et al., 2016). The importance of collaborative learning cannot be overstated, especially when peers take on the role of MKOs, which stands for most knowledgeable others. When the feedback that is offered by peers is inconsistent or unreliable, it has the potential to have a negative impact on the session that is dedicated to peer feedback (Könings et al., 2019).

Therefore, it is possible to argue that Vygotsky's sociocultural theory offers answers that are both pertinent and substantial to the research questions that are being investigated in this study.

Chapter 3

3.1 Research Methodology

This study aims to examine the experiences and preferences of instructors and students regarding the usefulness and effectiveness of peer feedback in ESL courses. The researcher used a phenomenological approach to gain a deeper understanding of why peer feedback is beneficial and how it helps students improve their writing strategies. This approach allows for

a thorough examination of a specific issue or phenomenon within a defined system. Phenomenological research is a method of inquiry that draws from philosophy and psychology. It involves the researcher's description of the lived experiences of individuals, as recounted by the participants themselves, regarding a specific phenomenon. This description encapsulates the core of the experiences for multiple individuals who have all encountered the phenomenon. The design of this study is deeply rooted in philosophical principles and commonly employs the method of conducting interviews (Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). Phenomenological research focuses on data collection processes like conducting interviews and observing specific research areas (Coombs, 2022). In this study, the researcher interviewed instructors and learners from the same institutional background and observed three ESL writing classes from the same university. Nuan (1992) insisted that the methodology of a study dictates the nature of the question. Since, the thesis attempts to understand human participants' lived experiences and emotions leading to the formation perception of said phenomenon of corrective feedback, utilizing a phenomenological framework of study is deemed appropriate.

Phenomenological research thoroughly examines an individual, organisation, or event to comprehend real-life phenomena. Phenomenological research focuses on data collection processes like conducting interviews and observing specific research areas (Coombs, 2022). In this study, the researcher interviewed instructors and learners from the same institutional background and observed three ESL writing classes from the same university.

3.2 Research Design

The researcher chose a qualitative research method since it presents a distinct perspective on scholarly investigation compared to the methods employed in quantitative research. While there are similarities in the processes, qualitative methods distinguish themselves by relying on textual and visual data, incorporating distinct steps in data analysis,

and utilising a variety of research designs. Qualitative researchers typically gather data in the field, specifically at the location where participants directly encounter the issue or problem being investigated. Qualitative researchers collect data by personally analysing documents, observing behaviour, or interviewing participants. Researchers utilise a protocol, which serves as a tool for documenting data. However, the researchers themselves collect the information and subsequently analyse and interpret it (Creswell, 2012).

Researchers in the qualitative field often collect a variety of data sources, including interviews, observations, documents, and audiovisual information, instead of relying solely on one data source. These data collection methods involve participants freely expressing their ideas without being limited by predetermined scales or instruments (Creswell, 2012).

In this study, interview and class observation techniques are utilised since, through open-ended inquiries, the investigator may motivate subjects to articulate their sentiments and perceptions using their language, thereby gaining a more profound understanding of their encounters with peer feedback in ESL writing courses. This is consistent with the phenomenological methodology, which seeks to elucidate the fundamental nature of the experiences of participation (Creswell, 2012).

Observations function as a supplementary approach to interviews, contributing supplementary data dimensions that bolster the credibility and consistency of the results. By integrating observational data as auxiliary or confirmatory research (Grey, 2009), the researcher can verify and authenticate the information obtained through interviews. Triangulation is a method that contributes to a more comprehensive and precise comprehension of the phenomenon under investigation.

Qualitative researchers utilise various inquiry systems, including biography, case study, historical analysis, discourse analysis, ethnography, grounded theory, and phenomenology, to

investigate human phenomena. These methods differ from logical and statistical approaches (Ugwu and Eze, 2023). As mentioned earlier, the researcher decided to use the phenomenological approach since this research method concentrates on investigating a certain phenomenon. The researchers must select a particular concept or phenomenon for investigation and gather data from persons who have encountered the phenomenon. The individuals under the study must possess prior experience with the phenomenon. The participant group's size might range from 3 to 15 persons (Creswell, 2016). The current research is based on an individual phenomenon of the implementation of peer feedback in ESL writing classes, and the 6 participants are associated with this phenomenon directly.

Phenomenological research aims to elicit individuals' subjective viewpoints and experiences (Giorgi, 2009; Moustakas, 1994). This is of the utmost importance for the present investigation, which aims to explore the intricate and multifaceted experiences and preferences of educators and learners concerning peer assessment. Through a phenomenological approach, the researcher can focus on the participants' experiences, emotions, and experiences and preferences concerning the utilisation of peer feedback in an ESL writing classroom. Adoption of this framework allows the researchers to uncover the meanings of experiences of learners in the Bangladeshi ESL/EFL context related to peer feedback.

Phenomenological research examines a singular phenomenon for exploration. The focal point of this phenomenological study revolves around a singular concept. It also gathers data from individuals who have encountered the phenomenon. This concept holds significant importance within the field of phenomenology. The individuals under study must possess prior familiarity with the phenomenon in question. The size of the group can range from three to fifteen individuals. The data collected in a phenomenological study is varied, encompassing various sources. These can include traditional one-on-one interviews, unconventional sources

like observations, documents such as poems and written letters, and even music and sounds (Creswell, 2016). Therefore, the researcher has applied interviews and observation to extract relevant information from the participants. It brings out comprehensive perceptions from the participants regarding the study topic (Moustakas, 1994). Moreover, the interview technique was semi-structured. Thus, the researcher could build a strong rapport with the participants, and the interview sessions were more like conversations with the participants. Consequently, it brought out a great amount of natural and relevant information.

Data gathered first-hand during this study provided a nuanced understanding of the complexities of corrective feedback in English language teaching. The in-depth data uncovered in a phenomenological research also leaves the scope of future implications, innovation and improvement from a practitioners' standpoint which can aid the development of peer feedback method and process in the ESL/EFL context.

3.3 Participants

The present study has incorporated purposive sampling, expressly, maximum variation sampling. The use of purposive sampling procedures is prevalent in most research papers due to their presence across various research paradigms. These procedures aid in identifying a high-quality sample, free from biases, thereby enhancing the reliability and trustworthiness of the resulting findings (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018; Uprichard, 2013). According to Nyimbili and Nyimbili (2024), maximum variation sampling involves the deliberate selection of participants who possess similar characteristics but have distinct and diverse experiences that are exclusive to each individual. The aforementioned characteristics, such as age, religion, gender, and education, may be shared among individuals from diverse households and backgrounds.

This sampling strategy relies on the researcher's judgment and understanding of the situation. This method is commonly employed in qualitative research to gather thorough knowledge about a specific occurrence rather than making statistical judgments, especially when the population is small and targeted (Obilor, 2023). The participant pool included four males and two girls. The student participants were all tertiary-level learners who had previously completed Bangla language secondary and upper-secondary education and were presently enrolled in a private institution in Dhaka. The establishment of private universities is a relatively recent occurrence in the higher education system of Bangladesh (Sultana, 2018). The inaugural university was founded in 1992, and in the subsequent 25 years, 92 universities have been allowed under the Private University Act 1992, according to the University Grants Commission of Bangladesh (2017). Chowdhury and Kabir (2014) illustrated how the floodgates of English medium instruction (EMI) opened with the advent of the Private University Act which led to all private universities adopting EMI in classrooms at the higher education level. EMI adoption played a great role in the growing use of the corrective feedback process, of which peer feedback is a part. Weekly et al. (2022) opined that foreign language corrective feedback (FLCF) in China unveiled more grammatical accuracy issues compared to others. Teachers feel FLCF should not however focus so much on spoken grammar errors and has a negative perception among educators. Therefore, with EMI already in practice in a classroom, it provides furthermore rationale to conduct a study that illustrates how corrective feedback in an EMI setting affects or is perceived by the learners and teachers alike.

On the other hand, the teacher participants were actively involved in teaching ESL courses at a private institution in Bangladesh. They had prior experience incorporating peer critiques into their writing sessions. The major goal of conducting semi-structured interviews was to engage participants in discussions about their overall experiences with peer feedback

sessions, their assessments of their efficacy, and any observable improvements in learners' performance.

There is a proliferation of private universities in Dhaka, with many offering general courses focused on English language learning (Chowdhury and Haidar, 2012). This particular characteristic facilitates the achievement of the research objective to examine the influence of peer feedback in English as a Second Language (ESL) writing courses. The study aims to thoroughly investigate peer feedback and its impact on learners' writing, with a specific focus on a well-defined group. Furthermore, conducting the survey in Dhaka gives the researcher access to ESL classes and participants. The study upholds the principles of authenticity and homogeneity.

Furthermore, a comprehensive grasp of Dhaka's cultural and educational landscape is imperative to effectively evaluate this study's findings. The distinctive obstacles and benefits experienced by English as a second language (ESL) students in Dhaka provide valuable insights into the practice of peer feedback within ESL classes. The comprehensive comprehension of the subject matter enhances the study's findings and adds to the ongoing discourse on ESL education.

The following tables provide some basic information on both the teacher and student participants:

Table 1

Characteristics of Teachers Participating in Semi-Structured Interviews: T1, T2, and T3, Teaching Experience, Educational Background, and Gender

Names	Gender	Age	Educational Background	Teaching Experience	Number of ESL courses taught

T1	Female	Above 30	MPhil	7 years	2
T2	Male	Above 30	MA	1.5 years	2
T3	Male	Above 30	Msc	6 years	3

Table 2

Characteristics of Students Participating in Semi-Structured Interviews: Level of Education, Age, Gender, and Department

Names	Gender	Age	Level of Education	Department
S1	Male	Below 23	Undergraduate	CSE
S2	Female	Below 23	Undergraduate	ENH
S3	Male	Below 23	Undergraduate	CSE

3.4 Data Collection and Instrumentation

The researcher selected semi-structured interviews, which included open-ended questions, as the study instruments. To investigate the two research topics of the study, the researcher created open-ended questions for the semi-structured interview inspired by existing research questions. Jamshed (2014) highlighted the importance of fostering trust among researchers and participants as a crucial aspect of qualitative social studies research. Since phenomenological inquiries require participants to open up in the hopes of gathering rich data, a face-to-face interview is perceived to be the ideal way to foster trust. Furthermore, a common practice of phenomenological research is to qualify data as themes and codes to conduct a

thematic analysis. This identification requires a large body of data that the researcher can sift through adding another plausible rationale for utilizing interviews as a tool for this research. These questions were used to collect information on instructors' and students' experiences, viewpoints, and experiences and preferences. Additionally, the researcher observed three of ESL classes from a particular private university.

Before conducting the interview and observation, the researcher courteously obtained consent from the participants. Their interviews were recorded with their consent.

A detailed explanation of each instrument is provided below:

3.4.1 Interview

The researcher developed eight semi-structured, open-ended questions (see Appendix - I) for interviews with the instructor and the learner participants. The researcher utilised interview questions from a previously published study report to ensure the integrity and consistency of the acquired data, leaving no room for doubt.

This technique allowed for some flexibility throughout the interview process, which made it easier to collect full qualitative data. Semi-structured interviews, as defined by Rubin and Rubin (2016), include a series of predefined questions or subjects. Still, they allow the interviewer to explore unexpected areas or investigate fascinating replies. To guarantee a complete study of participants' experiences and preferences, experiences, and insights, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews in a conversational format. The questions included demographic queries to gather information on participants' ages, genders, educational and professional backgrounds, as well as inquiries regarding peer feedback sessions, such -

How often are peer review sessions integrated into your ESL writing classes, and what strategies are used to ensure their seamless inclusion? From your perspective, what

positive changes have you noticed in your writing skills due to peer review sessions? What challenges or drawbacks have you encountered when incorporating peer review activities into ESL writing classes? How do participants generally view the peer review process, and have there been any observable shifts in attitudes over time?

Is there any specific training or guidance provided to participants before engaging in peer review sessions, and if so, what is the rationale behind it? Drawing from your experiences, what advice or recommendations would you offer others about effectively implementing peer review in ESL writing classrooms?

Semi-structured interviews are highly suitable for conducting in-depth explorations of participants' experiences and preferences, experiences, and insights. Jamshed (2014) explains that semi-structured interviews entail participants responding to predetermined open-ended inquiries, facilitating an all-encompassing investigation of their experiences and preferences. This approach affords the researcher the ability to delve more extensively into unforeseen domains or intriguing replies, facilitating the collection of comprehensive, intricate data that is critical for comprehending the intricacies of peer feedback in ESL writing courses.

According to Rubin and Rubin (2016), semi-structured interviews are characterised by integrating predetermined inquiries with the opportunity to delve into unforeseen subjects that emerge throughout the interview. The ability to adjust is of the utmost importance in qualitative research, as it enables the interviewer to delve deeper into the participants' experiences and preferences and convictions by following up on their answers. The aforementioned adaptability guarantees that the gathered data is thorough and pertinent to the research's inquiries.

3.4.2 Observation Checklist

A classroom observation checklist (see Appendix - II) was created to evaluate the application of peer feedback in ESL writing courses. This checklist was mainly intended to meet the two study objectives by concentrating on different critical areas, including:

- Clarity of instructions for conducting peer feedback sessions and the stated objectives for incorporating peer feedback.
- Assessment of students' readiness and preparation for conducting the feedback session.
- Evaluation of students' engagement and acceptance of the peer feedback process.
- Examine the teacher's involvement during the session, including whether they actively monitored the proceedings.

These pieces were carefully selected to provide relevant information directly addressing the study topics. The checklist was used to authenticate and validate the insights gained from interviews. The researcher could analyse the most up-to-date information about the peer feedback session through classroom observation. The data collection method employed in this study involved triangulating the info gathered through pre-interviews. Additionally, it emphasises the contextual information that may not be elicited through interviews. During this study, the researcher had the opportunity to observe the entire process unfold and closely monitor how student interactions contributed to their learning outcomes. Using both interview and observation techniques elevated the reliability of the study to a higher level (Creswell, 2007).

3.5 Data Analysis

For the current study, the researcher has incorporated thematic analysis, a highly prevalent qualitative analytic method utilised extensively in various social science disciplines,

including sociology, anthropology, and psychology. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis is considered the primary qualitative method of analysis that researchers should familiarise themselves with. As previously discussed, this approach offers a comprehensive set of fundamental techniques and skills that serve as the basis for various other forms of qualitative analysis. Braun and Clarke further assert that thematic analysis offers a significant level of adaptability and can be utilised within multiple epistemological and ontological frameworks.

Fereday and Muir-Cochrane (2006) provide a comprehensive explanation of thematic analysis, highlighting its significance in capturing the essential themes that contribute to describing a particular phenomenon (p. 82). The process of identifying and encoding patterns of meaning in primary qualitative research is known as thematic analysis. This method, as described by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2013), involves pinpointing and organising themes deemed necessary by the analyst to explain the phenomenon under study. These themes are often associated with a specific research question, as highlighted by Daly et al. (1997).

The researcher converted similar responses from the participants into different themes. She analysed the themes and consolidated all the themes connected to groups to generate the first themes. This was done by studying the relationships and patterns that emerged across different data segments. Subsequently, she evaluated the importance of each subject to the study goals by analysing the interrelationships between themes and their contribution to comprehending the phenomenon holistically.

The researcher employed theme analysis as it facilitates the identification and comprehension of participants' insights in a straightforward manner, which may not be discernible through a descriptive approach. According to Rosario (2023), Typically, it employs a collection of texts that consist of transcribed data obtained from in-depth interviews. The

researcher meticulously analyses the data to discern recurring common themes, including topics, concepts, and patterns of significance. The objective of a thematic analysis is to uncover recurring themes or patterns within the data that are valuable in elucidating a certain behaviour, and thereafter utilise these themes to solve the research question or shed light on a social issue. A thematic analysis involves the interpretation and comprehension of data, rather than just providing a summary of the facts. A topic refers to a collection of facts that arises from the investigation and is given a title by the researcher. A theme list is a collection of subjects that are utilised to direct concentrated or comprehensive interviews during field research.

Additionally, it enables readers to concentrate on the specific salient elements of the papers instead of having to navigate through all the content. It allows for thorough and systematic theoretical study. It is a systematic approach to analysing intricate and extensive data (Hayes, 1997).

3.6 Ethical Consideration

The researcher started by apprising the participants of the study. They received a concise overview of peer feedback and its possible advantages for enhancing writing skills. At the beginning of the data collection process, the researcher asked for participants' permission to discuss their educational and occupational backgrounds. Before commencing the interviews, the researcher sought permission and ensured the recording of said interviews. Participants who underwent online interviews were emailed the interview questions in advance. The instructors were surveyed regarding their availability for the interview segment and their willingness to grant the researcher permission to observe their classes. The interview questions were formulated with a commitment to impartiality and inclusivity, ensuring all participants feel equally represented and enabling the researcher to gather genuine and reliable data. The

responses were subjected to comprehensive analysis, and to maintain anonymity, they were assigned the designations T1, T2, T3, S1, S2 and S3.

Chapter 4

Findings

This chapter comprehensively examines the impact and benefits of integrating peer review in ESL writing classes. The study also emphasises the importance of active student participation and interaction, specifically through peer feedback, to improve their writing skills.

4. 1 Semi-structured Interview: Teacher's Experience and Preference

4.1.1 Peer feedback promoting collaborative learning and learner-centeredness

Peer feedback is a collaborative activity involving at least two peers, as highlighted by Kollar and Fischer (2010). The act of reflection profoundly affects the individuals involved, be it the one providing or receiving the input (Falchikov, 2003). When peers are utilised as the conduit for feedback, students derive advantages from the process as the chance to observe and compare their peers' work can enhance their work (Chang, Tseng & Lou, 2012). Providing feedback to one's peers has been shown to positively impact the improvement of knowledge and skills (Cheng, Liang & Tsai, 2015). Hence, it is imperative to conduct further research studies to gain a deeper understanding of the most effective methods for delivering feedback,

particularly in providing constructive feedback that offers clear guidance for improvement (Fong et al., 2021).

This participation fosters an engaging environment, fostering continuous growth in writing techniques and collaborative efforts for a positive classroom dynamic. In this regard, T3 added, "One of the positive impacts of classroom dynamics of peer feedback would be enhanced collaborative learning. The practice of peer review cultivates collaboration among students since they work together to analyse and improve their writing."

Furthermore, T1 proposed a similar notion, stating that collaborative learning is stimulated during peer feedback sessions, and it fosters a positive bond among learners. They communicate with one another and form bonds, allowing weaker learners to talk about and analyse their concerns.

Moreover, participants also added that peer feedback sessions are designed with learned-centeredness in mind. They further opined that peer feedback stimulates active participation since students take on the roles of both providers and recipients of feedback. This engagement transfers the emphasis from the instructor as the exclusive authority to the students actively engaging in the learning process. Learners reflect on their own and their peers' work, which fosters a sense of ownership over their learning. By examining comments, individuals become more aware of their strengths and areas for progress, actively customising their learning experience. For example, during classroom observations, it was discovered that children enjoy providing feedback to their peers. This finding was constant throughout three distinct class sessions. In each lesson, students actively participated in delivering quick feedback to their peers, demonstrating that they took the feedback process seriously.

T2 stated a similar concept as T1 previously, "Peer feedback-oriented classrooms are very dynamic and participative. It is a learner-oriented session in which peers promote mutual

respect by listening to each other's opinions and working to improve their writing. It leads to better peer relationships." Furthermore, peer feedback introduces learners to a range of experiences and preferences and methodologies. This range of feedback allows them to appreciate other points of view, improving their grasp of the subject and establishing a more inclusive learning environment. T1 asserted that students gradually become more accepting of peer review sessions and become comfortable accepting feedback from their peers. As students get accustomed to their peers' feedback, they attempt to integrate it into their current drafts, improving them before submitting final versions.

4.1.2 Enhancing learner autonomy

Autonomy entails accepting responsibility for one's learning. Since peer assessment requires learners to actively participate in learning and evaluating the language skills of others and themselves, engaging in collaborative writing, providing feedback on peers' scripts, and reflecting on one's writing promotes participation in group activities while improving individualised learning. The favourable effect of peer assessment considerably improves learner autonomy. As an illustration, T1 pointed out that when students usually give feedback to each other, it happens on multiple levels. Firstly, they follow a certain pattern provided by the teachers to assess the initial draft; gradually, they review each other's writing in other segments, which significantly polishes their final version. When they go through these stages of reviewing sessions, it aids both the provider and the receiver. Moreover, T3 asserted similarly to T1 and said, "When a student reviews a peer's work, he kind of analyses their writing to provide accurate feedback. It enhances his critical thinking and enforces diverse conceptions to affect his ideas, bringing out a positive outcome."

It was also mentioned that the learners are always given a particular rubric to use while they assess each other's writings thoroughly. It makes their feedback reliable and valid,

allowing the learners to reflect upon their learning. They take responsibility for assessing the writing following the prescribed rubric. It enhances their autonomy since they have the structure to follow and do not need to justify their comments to the teachers. They do not provide the feedback randomly; rather they are getting certain criteria to focus on and learning how to incorporate it in their work.

4.1.3 Teacher's Experienced Advantages of Peer Review Feedback

The teachers talked about how most students accept the reviews provided by their peers with lots of enthusiasm. To be more specific, almost all participants asserted that students enjoy engaging in peer review sessions since it gives them the flexibility to find their mistakes with less stress. One of the teachers said that peer feedback sessions improve peer relationships and develop mutual respect, encouraging them to participate more. Moreover, he said his students often share their positive remarks regarding peer review sessions since they feel comfortable sharing their flaws with their classmates or friends. They feel less intimidated when they go through extensive peer feedback segments. Another participant shared a similar thought: "Students generally view this process of receiving feedback from their classmates very positively, and in every semester, the group of learners provides an affirmative response on this." Finally, the third interviewee conveyed that students feel confident and responsible when providing each other with constructive feedback.

Most students indicated interest in this activity throughout the classroom observation and following the question-and-answer session. They expressed a strong desire for additional such sessions, noting several ways it dramatically improves their writing. However, one or two learners disagreed with the majority.

4.1.4 Drawbacks of Peer Review from the Experience of Teachers

From the teacher's viewpoint, students have varying perceptions about including peer review. Although most students prefer peer feedback sessions, few believe instructor feedback is more accurate. For instance, T1 mentioned, "Students do not want to get feedback from the other students because they think they share the same level. When their peers share reviews on their writings, they refuse to accept it since they think those are inappropriate." T3 shared a similar thought by asserting, "The main drawback that I have noticed is that students in few cases prefer their teacher's feedback over peer's since they are on a similar level. This is a common scenario in the basic level courses rather than the advanced level courses."

Students perceive instructors to possess a more profound comprehension of the subject matter and to be more proficient at precisely identifying their areas of proficiency and areas for improvement. Peer feedback is frequently questioned for its accuracy and dependability, especially in introductory courses where students perceive their peers to possess a comparable level of comprehension. Individuals might perceive their peers as lacking the knowledge and skills to offer constructive or beneficial criticism. On the other hand, they perceive the feedback provided by educators to be more precise and wise, which enhances their assurance in implementing the recommended enhancements. Educators deliver standardised and consistent feedback on the course's learning objectives and evaluation criteria. This consistency may reassure students, as it corresponds with their comprehension of the requirements for their assignments. Fear of being judged or humiliated may cause students to experience unease when receiving critical feedback from their classmates.

On the other hand, T2 highlighted an alternative rationale for students' unwillingness to participate in peer evaluations. According to this viewpoint, students with lower language abilities prefer to avoid constructive feedback from their classmates since they sometimes need

help comprehending the remarks made. Furthermore, some students treat their classmates' reviews with less significance, resulting in a lack of acceptance and productivity in the feedback sessions.

4.2 Semi-structured Interview: Student's Experience and Preference

4.2.1 Enhancement of the writing skill

Participating in peer feedback activities appears to be an excellent approach for improving learners' writing skills and supporting ongoing progress in writing ability. S1 demonstrated a thorough understanding of this claim by stating, "I was satisfied after witnessing the frequency of peer review sessions. Sharing my work with peers and receiving constructive criticism helped me identify areas for growth." S1 explained how his friends gave positive critiques of his work, which significantly benefited his writing classes. He stated that during peer feedback sessions, his peers would analyse his works, such as opinion paragraphs, and identify areas for improvement. Furthermore, if he mistakenly omitted ideas or included less than necessary, they would bring attention to the errors, allowing him to correct them promptly.

Likewise, S2 asserted, "During peer feedback sessions, when I used to review or recheck my peer's works, I learned about different patterns of writing a sentence. When I noticed that I could write a sentence that way as well, I started to attempt different experiments with my writing, which was beneficial for me. It helped me to improve a lot." S2 further pointed out something similar to the teachers mentioned above. When the students are done checking and highlighting their strengths and weaknesses, the students revise their writing to work on those given feedbacks. When they polished their final drafts, they were submitted to the teacher for the final check, and the teacher graded them. Due to previous extensive peer feedback sessions, the final drafts were quite reliable and well-groomed.

On the other hand, S3 highlighted a different factor: when peer feedback is used, students benefit immensely since the input is from their peers. This procedure runs well since peers have ideas comparable to those of other students and can detect understandable mistakes. As a result, it dramatically aids learners since it allows them to understand their faults clearly. Furthermore, S3 stated that peer feedback improved their speaking abilities by encouraging them to build sentences utilising different patterns. As a result, their speaking skills improved, especially given the modest amount of peer feedback they got during speaking sessions, which raised their verbal expressions to a higher level.

4.2.2 Drawbacks: Inconsistency and Biases

Several factors raise questions about the credibility of peer feedback. To begin, student reviewers may lack subject-area competence and discipline-specific writing norms. Second, students may need more expertise in evaluating the quality of disciplinary writing. Finally, friendship can influence the objectivity of peer feedback. For example, S1 asserted that peer feedback sessions can be difficult and time-consuming, especially when the peer does not have sufficient expertise on the issue. This can render the feedback untrustworthy for certain people.

Furthermore, because ideas can have many meanings, peers may comment from their viewpoints, resulting in the detection of preventable errors in the work. Then again, S2 stated something very similar, "In my case, at the beginning, I was not willing to go through this process of providing peer review since I found it unnecessary. All of us came from a similar background, more or less; hence, I pondered initially how they could give me feedback that could help me. However, as time passed, I began to understand how effective peer review sessions are."

On the other hand, S3 pointed out something different regarding this issue. He said that sometimes, students become immensely biased during the peer review sessions. They do not

want to disappoint their friends, which ends up disadvantageous for the learner. T3, while giving an interview, posed a similar opinion and said that students do this often to save their friendships. They do not understand how they are disadvantageous to their friends.

4.3 Class Observation

This section provides a complete description of the results acquired from the researcher's three offline class observations. As previously stated, this study aimed to analyze the usefulness of peer feedback in ESL environments from the experiences and preferences of both instructors and learners, as well as to determine its efficacy in improving learners' writing abilities. With the study objectives in mind, the primary focus of these class observations was on watching how peer criticism is used to improve and enable a constructive writing classroom environment, as well as learning how teachers and students react to it.

The observation checklist used during each class session includes several components, such as an introduction to the content, a discussion of the topic, clear instructions for conducting peer feedback, the goals of incorporating peer feedback, student preparation for the session, student participation and acceptance of peer feedback, the teacher's role during the session, and the effectiveness of the rubric. Continuous evaluation of these aspects was carried out to assess how peer feedback sessions were integrated into writing classes, the organisation of content and tasks, the impact on students' reflection on each other's work, teachers' adaptation to diverse learner needs, and ongoing monitoring of student progress throughout the sessions. Overall, the analysis of the observation checklist demonstrated regular use of peer review based on content and assessment criteria, which was consistent across all three observed writing courses concentrating on opinion paragraphs. The researcher believes that implementing peer review was critical in increasing student engagement, continuation, and passion in each course.

4.3.1 Student's Acceptance and Enhancement of Learner Autonomy

The researcher became aware of a particularly noteworthy practice during the classroom observations. The students were engaged in their projects after thoroughly examining their peers' submissions. The individuals attentively observed the students as they discussed the feedback they had received, diligently endeavouring to identify any errors present in their compositions. The aforementioned statement highlights the efficacy of peer feedback in fostering student engagement in self-assessment and cultivating learner autonomy.

In addition, it was evident that the students displayed notable enthusiasm towards the peer feedback session across all three observed classes. The participants indicated a high level of commitment and diligently adhered to the instructions provided by the instructor throughout the session.

The educators also played a crucial role in providing guidance to the students, instructing them on the necessary steps and methods to follow, and emphasising the importance of adhering to the rubric outlined in their designated handbook. In addition, a table was utilised by two instructors to facilitate the students' comprehension of the process for providing feedback on the scripts.

Finally, the students were randomly selected to present the feedback they had received, which proved to be engaging and valuable for the data collection process.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The present study investigates the application of peer review in an English as a Second Language (ESL) writing course in Bangladesh, focusing on the Sociocultural theory proposed by Vygotsky. The primary objective of this study is to examine the effectiveness of implementing peer feedback sessions and to assess their impact on students' writing skills. Moreover, this study examines the experiences and preferences of educators and learners regarding peer review's influence on improving students' writing abilities in ESL settings.

After reviewing the qualitative data, the researcher found that peer feedback sessions were effectively integrated into ESP writing lessons. Surprisingly, teachers routinely included peer review sessions in their classrooms, with favourable results for student learning. Despite identifying one or two downsides, students exhibited a strong interest in the peer review process. Interviews and classroom observations indicated that peer input is highly beneficial in improving students' writing skills.

5.1 Teacher's Experienced benefits and drawbacks of peer review in an ESL writing classroom

According to Saka (2019), peer review is essential in helping students appreciate varied viewpoints and find inspiration in their peers' work. Students found it advantageous to evaluate their friends' work, recognising how much easier it is to find problems through others' work than on their own. This technique promotes the development of fresh views and stimulates students via collaborative learning (Saka, 2019). The current study also highlights how peer feedback supports cooperative learning, where students not only get reviewed by their peers rather they become the feedback providers. It develops collaborative learning, where students interact with each other in each session to understand different perceptions of an individual

topic, which gradually enhances their writing skills. This approach is founded on the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which states that individuals benefit from collaborative activities and getting support from peers or adults with more expertise (Vygotsky, 1978).

The incorporation of peer feedback not only facilitates the process of peer learning but also contributes to the development of enhanced writing proficiency, as substantiated by implementing the collaborative writing strategy (López-Pellisa et al., 2021). The instructors interviewed for the study expressed their belief that peer review sessions elicit significant levels of student engagement and participation. Peer feedback sessions foster the development of students' writing skills and cultivate a sense of mutual respect among participants as they collaborate on shared tasks. Moreover, it facilitates the student's comprehension of the topic by synthesising diverse experiences and preferences shared by participants within the class. As an illustration, when tasked with discussing the 11 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), individuals can gain insight into these goals' profound impact on our daily existence through reading and analysing each other's written works. As a result, the students become more receptive to the peer review sessions and willingly integrate the feedback into their draft development.

Peer feedback is a learner-centred activity where students assess their peers' work requirements and give feedback (Wu & Schunn, 2021). Peer evaluation can promote social connection among students by providing and receiving comments. Peer feedback can help students improve higher-order thinking by assessing numerous viewpoints when comparing their writing with peers. Su and Huang (2022) emphasise the importance of higher-order thinking skills in the modern day. When students participate in peer review, they enter into each other's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), offering structured assistance and direction. Peers with diverse degrees of experience can provide a range of experiences and

preferences, assisting the writer in advancing their writing skills beyond their current ability level (Mercer and Littleton, 2007).

Peer assessment of academic writing affects students' independent learning skills. It promotes student autonomy (Topping, 2017). Peer assessment promotes learner autonomy by delegating instructor responsibilities to students. According to Jin et al. (2022), offering specific criticism helps students improve their writing abilities and performance. According to the participants of this current study, students participate in multi-level feedback sessions, which are first directed by teacher-provided patterns for evaluating drafts. This technique eventually improves their writing by doing recurrent critiques of distinct portions. These phases assist providers and receivers since examining peers' work improves critical thinking and encourages varied viewpoints, which leads to beneficial results.

When students engage in peer review, they enter each other's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and offer organised support and direction. Peers with varied degrees of expertise provide diverse insights that help authors improve beyond their current talents. Peer feedback sessions encourage social engagement and learning by facilitating collaborative conversations and knowledge-building about successful writing strategies. In this dynamic learning environment, classmates act as proximal, More Knowledgeable Others (MKOs), providing valuable insights and constructive feedback. Drawing on Vygotsky's scaffolding notion, peer feedback provides a constructive framework in which peers encourage one another's writing growth by offering guidance, exhibiting practical approaches, and delivering constructive criticism within the ZPD. According to the responses of the participants (teachers), in peer feedback sessions, all students act as More Knowledgeable Others (MKOs) for one another, which eventually enhances their writing skills and effectively facilitates diverse opinions.

Despite multiple possible advantages, peer feedback's practicality and effectiveness have been questioned. A presumed constraint is that L2 learners lack confidence in the reliability of feedback provided by peers with equivalent proficiency levels (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). In the current study, the participants (teachers) asserted that students reject accepting comments from classmates because they believe they are on comparable levels, rendering the input unsuitable. Furthermore, they noted that some students prefer instructor input over peer feedback, especially in introductory-level courses. This tendency is more common in basic courses than in advanced ones. Studies have indicated that the quality of peer evaluations and peer feedback is not always sufficient, similar to previous work exploring the nature and quality of self-regulated learning (Misiejuk and Wasson, 2021; Xiong and Schunn, 2023; Yuan et al., 2016). Lower-quality evaluations may result from a lack of responsibility (Patchan et al., 2018) or a misunderstanding of criteria (Könings et al., 2019).

5.2 ESL writing learners' experience of peer review as a feedback system

In the context of L2 writing courses, students' critical thinking abilities, motivation, self-assurance, and creativity are all improved by positive attitudes toward peer feedback (Farah, 2012). Students' experiences of this type of strategy influence the effectiveness of an instructional plan for writing that includes peer feedback as a crucial phase in the writing process (Amores, 1997; Carson & Nelson, 1996; Hu, 2005; Liu & Hansen, 2005; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Tsui & Ng, 2000). The participants (S) also pointed out how beneficial peer feedback sessions are for them and asserted that they want these sessions to happen frequently.

One of the participants discussed the process of having his opinion paragraph evaluated by a classmate. The individual perceived this as a valuable occasion to enhance their writing skills. Furthermore, the reviewer astutely highlighted various facets of their writing that were previously overlooked but are indeed significant and can be considered errors. Moreover, he

asserted that this practice facilitated substantial improvement, as his peers could identify errors he had overlooked. It proved to be highly beneficial in facilitating his progress while working on the second iteration of the paragraph.

Jacobs, Curtis, Brain & Huang (1998) stated that peer feedback can serve as a distinctive form of support. By engaging with their classmates, students can acquire valuable insights for their revisions and foster self-reflection in their own writing (Lan, 2009). The peer review process significantly enhanced the students' learning experience by providing them with structured support. De Guerrero and Villamil (2000) conducted a study in the field of L2 writing, which focuses on peer scaffolding. They observed two ESL learners revising a written piece and discovered signs of growth in both the student writer and the student reader. The student writer demonstrated the development of self-regulation skills and progressed towards being a more autonomous writer and reviser. Meanwhile, the student reader exhibited growth in L2 writing, revision, strategic support, and collaboration.

Despite the numerous potential benefits, the feasibility and efficacy of peer feedback have been questioned. One hypothesised restriction is that L2 learners lack trust in the dependability of feedback offered by peers with comparable levels of competence (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). While this issue may appear rational initially, its basis requires empirical assessment. This raises two questions: (1) if learners have a negative perspective of peer input and (2) whether the feedback supplied by peers is accurate. Regarding the prior query, the study reveals that kids value instructor input more than peer feedback. The participants (s) stated that peer feedback sessions can be challenging and time-consuming, particularly when the peer lacks significant competence. This can make the feedback untrustworthy for certain people.

Furthermore, because concepts can have several interpretations, peers may provide feedback from their experiences and preferences, leading to the identification of avoidable

faults in the work. Moreover, the students said, "In my case, at first, I was unwilling to go through this process of providing peer review because I thought it was unnecessary. We all came from comparable backgrounds, so I wondered how they could provide me with useful comments."

According to certain experts, L2 learners have a lack of trust in their friends when it comes to language proficiency (Zhang, 1995; 1999). Additionally, students may not have the ability to accurately assess their peers' writing due to their own ineffective linguistic skills (Saito and Fujita, 2004). Furthermore, the traditional role of a teacher has strongly influenced students' thinking (Sengupta, 1998). When scaffolding is separated from the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), it transforms into a type of direct instruction. This hinders the collaborative process of constructing knowledge through interaction and discourse (Donovan and Smolkin, 2002). Within the sociocultural domain, Vygotsky consistently emphasizes the significance of discourse, both in terms of its process and its outcomes, in giving meaning to scaffolding.

5.3 Class Observation

Based on the data collected from classroom observation, the researcher found a fascinating fact. After the peer feedback session, the learners were randomly selected to share the feedback they received. Surprisingly although certain students provided feedback, others concentrated on their work and enhanced their writing based on the criticisms, as observed by the researcher through the interview data. This factor portrays that students were involved in this evaluation process to discover issues in their writing, and it impacts the learner's autonomy. Unlike the interview result of students providing inconsistent feedback to the peers, it demonstrated how encouraged and enthusiastic the students were during the whole session. Peer feedback motivates students to thoroughly assess their peers' writing to create a

composition that is comprehensive to audiences with limited knowledge (Zhu & Mitchell, 2012). It is beneficial for students to provide and receive peer feedback (Rouhi et al., 2020).

In conclusion, the researcher aims to highlight the parallels and differences between the data obtained from semi-structured interviews and class observations in this chapter.

Based on interviews and observations, the researcher discovered that the implementation of peer feedback sessions is enhancing the writing skills of students. They are receiving comments from their peers, which is motivating them to improve their drafts and ultimately create a successful final paper. In addition, the integration of peer feedback enhances learners' autonomy and fosters collaborative learning, ensuring that students are consistently involved in communicative tasks. Thus, the utilisation of peer feedback allows students to derive several benefits. In addition, teachers are experiencing reduced stress and duties in terms of script evaluation and feedback provision.

However, the researcher has discovered from the interview data sets that students occasionally give inconsistent feedback, which can be unreliable for learners at times. During the class observation, the researcher did not uncover any instances where the students exhibited unreliability or bias when giving feedback. Instead, they derived pleasure from it and shown unwavering excitement.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

Many participants recognized the significance of integrating peer feedback for fostering collaborative learning, engaging in communicative activities, and promoting learner autonomy. Conversely, students have articulated how it has served as a guiding force in facilitating their growth and honing their writing abilities. The individuals involved highly appreciate receiving

constructive feedback from their peers regarding their written work. Despite particular challenges, such as the potential for biased input and lack of reliability, students and teachers have widely embraced peer feedback as a valuable tool.

Furthermore, the findings from classroom observations indicate that peer feedback sessions positively impact learner autonomy, self-dependency, and the ability to engage in deep critical assessment of their own work. The students demonstrated a strong enthusiasm for engaging in feedback sessions, as they recognized the potential impact of providing constructive criticism on their peers' work in fostering personal growth and development. Based on sociocultural theory, the acquisition of knowledge among learners is facilitated by peer feedback, with teachers assuming a crucial role in this process. Under certain circumstances, there is a notable enhancement in students' comprehension of the subject matter, resulting in a corresponding improvement in the caliber of their written work.

6.1 Implications and Recommendations

Based on the current literature review, the researcher found that insufficient studies addressed the issue of understanding teachers' and students' perceptions of adopting peer feedback in the ESL writing setting of Bangladesh. The findings of this study would provide researchers with useful information and motivation to do more research in the same subject, taking into account varied educational levels. The appropriate actions to improve the learning environment might be implemented depending on the findings.

6.1.1 Implication

The primary discoveries of this investigation could provide guidance to policymakers regarding the advantages and disadvantages of integrating peer feedback in language learning classes. Therefore, policymakers have the potential to enhance or create regulations that

promote the training and implementation of peer feedback methods in schools throughout Bangladesh.

The findings of this study highlight the potential of peer feedback as a pedagogical tool. According to the results, teachers can create activities that focus more on the needs and participation of the learners. In addition, they would enhance the writing sessions to make them more captivating. According to Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, students can enhance their writing skills through collaborative learning and frequent interactions by adding peer feedback sessions.

During the teacher training programs, the instructors should be effectively guided on how to incorporate peer feedback and apply it during the ESL writing classes. Moreover, there should be a separate teacher training program entirely based on the methodologies of peer feedback so that the teachers become knowledgeable about it. They should possess the skills and expertise to incorporate peer feedback in their classes.

Finally, the curriculum developers should consider sociocultural theory while designing the ESL writing classes. Enhancing the learner's writing ability can be achieved by developing and designing resources that promote peer feedback and interaction. The materials should provide explicit rules and a precise rubric that will assist students in comprehending the methods of delivering peer criticism.

6.1.2 Recommendation

Teachers should receive comprehensive training to enhance their ability to provide peer feedback using effective methodologies. By implementing this, educators would have the capacity to effectively incorporate peer feedback into their instructional practices. Teachers should also be acquainted with the principles of sociocultural theory in order to

understand the significance of creating dynamic and interesting sessions, such as peer feedback, in their classes.

However, it is important for curriculum writers to consider the importance of peer collaboration and criticism while building the curriculum. The provision of materials and instructions to teachers would enable them to effectively integrate these activities.

Policymakers should prioritise the development of policies that use peer input as a prominent method of assessment. There should be a dedicated budget for teachers to receive comprehensive training, while students should be educated on the need of employing peer input.

6.2 Limitations

Even though this work has given us vital information about the whole scenario of peer feedback, it is also significant to acknowledge some of the study's limitations.

To begin with, since the study is focused on ESL writing courses in Bangladesh, the applicability of the findings is restricted in other contexts. This individuality is very important since educational practices and the effectiveness of peer feedback can differ greatly among multiple cultures and language contexts. It can influence attitudes towards peer feedback, the methods of implementing it in a writing classroom, and communicative dynamics among learners. Hence, even though the results offer a significant perception of implementing peer feedback in Bangladeshi ESL writing classes, they may not entirely apply to multiple educational environments characterized by diverse cultural norms and classroom dynamics.

Moreover, the study is based on qualitative data obtained from interviews and classroom observations. Therefore, it may not capture the full extent of the impact of peer feedback or facilitate the generalization of conclusions. It chiefly focused on the interviews

with the instructors and learners and their perception, and it looked forward to the classroom practice of peer feedback through observations.

Our third and final point is the limitation regarding the sample size since there was limited time limitation and the unavailability of the participants because mostly the participants were instructors and students who had demanding academic schedules, which restricted their availability for participating in this study. At the beginning of the data collection process, the researcher contacted multiple participants to conduct the interview. However, their lack of interest and unwillingness to participate in this data collection process is another reason for the limited sample size.

In conclusion, peer feedback has the potential to be a significant tool to enhance ESL writing teaching. It encourages students to participate in collaborative learning and increases learner autonomy. By acknowledging the problems and utilizing the theoretical framework, instructors may use peer feedback to enhance and empower students and their writing outcomes in ESL classes.

References

Ahmed, I., Iqbal, I., & Abbasi, P. K. (2018). *Private Universities in Bangladesh: Possibilities and Challenges* (2nd ed.).

Ajmal, M. & Kumar, T. (2020). Using DIALANG in assessing foreign language proficiency:

The interface between learning and assessment. *Asian ESP Journal, 16* (2.2), 335 -362.

Al-Hammadi, F. & Sidek, H. M. (2014). An analytical framework for analyzing secondary EFL

writing curriculum: Approaches for writing and preparation for higher education.

International Education Studies, 8(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n1p59.

Ali, M. M. (2010).'Revisiting the English Language Teaching (ELT) curriculum design: How

appropriate is Bangladesh's higher secondary level national ELT curriculum as a learner-

centred one?' *IIUC Studies,7*(1), 283–96.

Ali, M. M., & Walker, A. L. (2014). Bogged Down ELT in Bangladesh: Problem and Policy. *English

Today, 30*, 33-38. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078414000108

Alvi, T., Kouros, C. D., Lee, J., Fulford, D., & Tabak, B. A. (2020). Social anxiety is negatively

associated with theory of mind and empathic accuracy. *Journal of abnormal psychology*,

129(1), 108.

Amores, M. (1997). A new perspective on peer editing. *Foreign Language Annals, 30,* 513–522.

Bradley, L., & Thouësny, S. (2017). Students collaborative peer reviewing in an online writing

environment. *Themes in Science and Technology Education, 2* (10), 69-83.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). (Mis) conceptualising themes, thematic analysis, and other problems

with Fugard and Potts'(2015) sample-size tool for thematic analysis. *International Journal of

social research methodology*, *19*(6), 739-743.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). Teaching thematic analysis: Overcoming challenges and developing

strategies for effective learning. *The psychologist*, *26*(2), 120-123.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson
Education.

Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students' perceptions of ESL peer feedback group
interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 5*, 1–19

Chang, C. C., Tseng, K. H., & Lou, S. J. (2012). A comparative analysis of the consistency and
difference among teacher-assessment, student self-assessment and peer-assessment in a Web-
based portfolio assessment environment for high school students. *Computers & Education,
58*(1), 303-320.

Cheng, K. H., Liang, J. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2015). Examining the role of feedback messages in
undergraduate students' writing performance during an online peer assessment activity. *The
internet and higher education*, *25*, 78-84.

Chen, P., & Lin, Y. (2008). *The effect of peer-review and teacher-review in young NNS learners'
guided writing instruction*. Retrieved from
http://ord.npue.edu.tw/ezcatfiles/b008/img/img/1300/E32- 10.pdf

Chou, L. (2011). An investigation of Taiwanese doctoral students' academic writing at a U.S.
University. *Higher Education Studies, 1*(2), 47-60.

Chowdhury, M. A. U., & Akteruzzaman, M. (2015). Teaching the structures of academic writing
through peer review: A study on the beginners of English language courses at BRAC
University. *GSTF Journal on Education (JEd)*, *3*, 1-7.

Chowdhury, M. A. U., & Akteruzzaman, M. (2021). Teaching the structures of academic writing
through peer review: A study on the beginners of English language courses at BRAC
University. *GSTF Journal on Education (JEd)*, *3*, 1-7.

Chowdhury, T. A., & Haider, M. Z. (2012). A Need-based Evaluation of the EAP Courses for the Pharmacy Students in the University of Asia Pacific (UAP), Bangladesh. Asian Social Science, 8 (15), 93–107. https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n15p93

Chowdhury, R., & Kabir, A. H. (2014). Language wars: English education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Multilingual Education, 4*(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-014-0021-2.

Cohen, L. Manion, L and Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education.* (8 ed.). Routledge: New York

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2007). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2010). Mapping the developing landscape of mixed methods research. *SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral Research, 2*, 45–68. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2011). Controversies in mixed methods research. *The SAGE handbook on qualitative research, 4*, 269–284. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daly III, E. J., Martens, B. K., Witt, J. C., & Dool, E. J. (1997). A model for conducting a functional analysis of academic performance problems. *School Psychology Review*, *26*(4), 554-574.

Dignen, B. (2014). *Five reasons why feedback may be the most important skill.* http://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2014/03/fivereasons-feedback-may-important-skill/

Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 83-107.

Ellis, R. (2009). "Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development". *L2 Journal 1*(1), 3-18.

Falchikov, N. (2003). *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. Routledge.

Farrah, M. (2012). The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron university students. *An-Najah Uni.J. Res. (Humanities) 1*(26), 180-210.

Fatimah, S., & Suharto, G. (2017). Using Peer feedback technique to improve student writing skills: A quasi-experimental study among secondary students. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching (JELLT)*, *2*(1), 40-48.

Ferris, D.R (2010). Second Language Writing Research and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 181-202.

Fong, C. J., Schallert, D. L., Williams, K. M., Williamson, Z. H., Lin, S., Kim, Y. W., & Chen, L. H. (2021). Making feedback constructive: the interplay of undergraduates' motivation with perceptions of feedback specificity and friendliness. *Educational Psychology, 41*(10), 1241-1259.

Gass, S. (1997). Input, interaction, and the second language learner. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum

Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 224-255.

Giorgi, A. (2009). The descriptive phenomenological method in psychology. *A modified Husserlian approach.* Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Haider, G. (2012). An insight into difficulties faced by Pakistani student writers: Implications for teaching of writing. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 2* (3), 17–27.

Hamid, M. O., & Honan, E. (2012). Communicative English in the primary classroom: Implications for English-in-education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *25*(2), 139-156.

Hamid, M. O., Jahan, I., & Islam, M. M. (2013). Medium of instruction policies and language practices, ideologies and institutional divides: voices of teachers and students in a private university in Bangladesh. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, *14*(1), 144–163. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2013.771417.

Hansen, J. G., & Liu, J. (2018). *Peer response in second language writing classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Hayes, N. (1997). Theory-led thematic analysis: social identification in small companies. *Doing Qualitative Analysis in Psychology.* Hove, UK: Psychology Press

Hyland, K. (2000). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University [DOI:10.1017/CBO9780511667251]

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. Lang. *Teach., 39*, 77-95. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399

Hu, G. (2005). Using peer feedback with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research, 9*, 321–342.

Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method-interviewing and observation. *J Basic Clin Pharm, 5*(4), 87-8. doi: 10.4103/0976-0105.141942.

Jin, T., Jiang, Y., Gu, M. M., & Chen, J. (2022). "Their encouragement makes me feel more confident": Exploring peer effects on learner engagement in collaborative reading of academic texts. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *60*, 101177.

Kaya, F. (2021). Exploring the role of training in promoting students' peer-feedback including critical peer-feedback. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice, 10*(1), 377-392. https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2020.10.1.24

Khalil, E. (2018). The efficacy of peer feedback in Turkish EFL students' writing performance. *Journal of Literature and Art Studies, 8*(6), 920-931. https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5836/2018.06.011.

Kline, S., Letofsky, K., & Woodard, R. (2013). Democratizing classroom discourse: The challenge for online writing environments. *E-Learning and Digital Media, 10*(4), 378-394.

Kollar, I., & Fischer, F. (2010). Peer assessment as collaborative learning: A cognitive perspective. *Learning and instruction*, *20*(4), 344-348.

Könings, K. D. (2019). Scaffolding peer-assessment skills: Risk of interference with learning domain-specific skills?. *Learning and Instruction*, *60*, 85-94.

Krashen, S. (1981a). *Second language acquisition and language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1981b). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lambert, B., & Clyde, M. (2000). *Re-Thinking Early Childhood theory and Practice*. Australia: Social Science Press.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*, 1-26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lei, Z. (2017). Salience of student written feedback by peer-revision in EFL writing class. *English Language Teaching, 10*(12), 151-157. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n12p151

Liu, J., & Hansen, J. (2005). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

López-Pellisa, T., Rotger, N., & Rodríguez-Gallego, F. (2021). Collaborative writing at work: Peer feedback in a blended learning environment. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*(1), 1293-1310.

Mahboob, A. (2014). *Epilogue: Understanding language variation: Implications for eil pedagogy*. Springer, Switzerland.

Mansoor, S. (2005). Language planning in higher education: *A case study of Pakistan*. Oxford University Press Karachi.

Marlina, R., & Giri, R. (2014). *The pedagogy of English as an international language: Experiences and preferences from scholars, teachers, and students* (1). Springer.

McArthur, T. (1996). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language (abridged edition),* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Mendonca, C. O., & Johnson, K. E. (1994). Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction. *TESOL quarterly*, *28*(4), 745-769.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. Routledge.

Ministry of Education. (2023). *CPD: Training on Secondary English: Learners' Materials*. Ministry of Education: Bangladesh.

Misiejuk, K., & Wasson, B. (2021). Backward evaluation in peer assessment: A scoping review. *Computers & Education*, *175*, 104319.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories* (2nd ed.). London: Arnold. Cambridge University Press.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Muir-Cochrane, E., Fereday, J., Jureidini, J., Drummond, A., & Darbyshire, P. (2006). Self-management of medication for mental health problems by homeless young people. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, *15*(3), 163-170.

Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students' perceptions of effectiveness in peer feedback groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 113–131.

Nguyen, H, T. (2016). Peer Feedback Practice in EFL Tertiary Writing Classes. *English Language Teaching, 9*(6), 76-91. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p76

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). *Recasts as feedback to language learners. Language Learning, 51*, 719-758.

Nik, Y. A., Hamzah, A., & Rafidee, H. (2010). A comparative study on the factors affecting the writing performance among Bachelor students. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology, 1* (1), 54–59.

Nunan, D., & Carter, R. (Eds.). (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge university press.

Nyimbili, F., & Nyimbili, L. (2024). Types of Purposive Sampling Techniques with Their Examples and Application in Qualitative Research Studies, British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies: English Lang. *Teaching, Literature, Linguistics & Communication, 5*(1), 90-99

Obilor, E. I. (2023). Convenience and purposive sampling techniques: Are they the same. *International Journal of Innovative Social & Science Education Research*, *11*(1), 1-7.

Patchan, M. M., Schunn, C. D., & Clark, R. J. (2018). Accountability in peer assessment: Examining the effects of reviewing grades on peer ratings and peer feedback. *Studies in Higher Education*, *43*(12), 2263-2278.

Paulus, T. M (1999). "The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing". *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3). 265-289.

Penaflorida, A. H. (2002). Nontraditional forms of assessment and response to student writing: A step toward learner autonomy. *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*, 344-353.

Quintero, L. M. (2008). Blogging: A way to foster EFL writing. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 10* (1), 7–49.

Rahimi, M., and Fathi, J. (2021). *Exploring the Impact of Wiki-mediated Collaborative Writing on EFL Students' Writing Performance, Writing Self-regulation, and Writing Self-efficacy: a Mixed Methods Study.* UK: Taylor & Francis. 1–48. doi: 10.1080/09588221.2021.1888753

Rahman, T. (2002). *Language, ideology and power*, 1. Oxford University Press,

United Kingdom.

Ramani, S., Könings, K. D., Ginsburg, S., & van der Vleuten, C. P. (2019). Twelve tips to promote a feedback culture with a growth mind-set: Swinging the feedback pendulum from recipes to relationships. *Medical teacher*, *41*(6), 625-631.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 23-30.

https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003

Rosairo, H. S. (2023). Thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences – Sri Lanka*, *18*(3). https://doi.org/10.4038/jas.v18i3.10526

Rubin, H. J., and Rubin, C.S. (2005). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (2nd Ed.). California: Sage Publications.

Ruegg, R. (2018). Providing effective feedback on L2 academic writing. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, 13*, 161-178.

Rouhi-Balasi, L., Elahi, N., Ebadi, A., Jahani, S., & Hazrati, M. (2020). Professional autonomy of nurses: A qualitative meta-synthesis study. *Iranian journal of nursing and midwifery research*, *25*(4), 273-281.

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6*(1), 21-31.

Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research, 7,* 80-102.

Selvaraj, M., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). Systematic review: Approaches in teaching writing skill in ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *8*(4), 450-473.

Shayer, M. (2002). Not just Piaget, not just Vygotsky, and certainly not Vygotsky as an alternative to Piaget. *Learning intelligence, cognitive acceleration across the curriculum from 5 to 15 years.* UK: Open University Press

Shin, M., and Johnson, Z. D. (2021). From student-to-student confirmation to students' self-determination: an integrated peer-centered model of self-determination theory in the classroom. *Commun. Educ. 70*, 365–383. doi: 10.1080/03634523.2021.1912372

Sultana, S. (2014). English as a medium of instruction in Bangladesh's higher education: Empowering or disadvantaging students?. *EAP*

Sultana, S. (2018). Language practices and performances of identity of young adults within spaces of a private university in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh English Language Teachers Association Journal, 2*(1), 1-28.

Su, W., & Huang, A. (2022). More enjoyable to give or to receive? Exploring students' emotional status in their peer feedback of academic writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *47*(7), 1005-1015.

Tang, G. M., & Tithecott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL CANADA JOURNAL, 16,* 20-38. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v16i2.716

Tehrani, F. A. (2018). Feedback for writing or writing for feedback? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14* (4), 162-178.

Topping, K. (2017). Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology*, *1*(1), 1-17.

Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*, 147–170

Ugwu, J. N., & Eze, C. E. (2023). Revitalizing Nigeria: Imperative Restructuring for Inclusive Federalism. *EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (EEJHSS)*, *4*(2), 1-4.

Uprichard, E. (2013). Sampling: bridging probability and non- Probability Designs. *International Journal of a Social Research Methodology, 16* (1), pp. 1–11.

Van Gennip, N. A. E., Segers, M. S. R., & Tillema, H. H. (2010). Peer assessment as a collaborative learning activity: the role of interpersonal variables and conceptions. *Learning and Instruction, 20* (4), 280-290.

Van Zundert, M., Sluijsmans, D., & Van Merriënboer, J. (2010). Effective peer assessment processes: Research findings and future directions. *Learning and Instruction, 20,* 270-279. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.004

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2021). From plans to actions: A process model for why feedback features influence feedback implementation. *Instructional Science*, *49*(3), 365-394.

Yuan, A., Luther, K., Krause, M., Vennix, S. I., Dow, S. P., & Hartmann, B. (2016). Almost an expert: The effects of rubrics and expertise on perceived value of crowdsourced design critiques. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*, 1005-1017.

Zhang, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2023). Self-regulation of peer feedback quality aspects through different dimensions of experience within prior peer feedback assignments. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *74*, 102210.

Zhu, W., & Mitchell, D. A. (2012). Participation in peer response as activity: An examination of peer response stances from an activity theory perspective. *TESOL quarterly*, *46*(2), 362-386.

Appendices

Appendix I

Interview Questions

Background information

- What is your educational and professional background?
- How long have you been attending/teaching these ESL (ENG 091, ENG 101) courses?
- Have you noticed any distinctions between the courses you previously learnt/taught and those you are learning/teaching now?

Interview Questions

1. How often are peer review sessions integrated into your ESL writing classes, and what strategies are used to ensure their seamless inclusion?
2. From your perspective, what positive changes have you noticed in writing skills as a result of peer review sessions?
3. What challenges or drawbacks have you encountered when incorporating peer review activities into ESL writing classes?
4. How do participants generally view the peer review process, and have there been any observable shifts in attitudes over time?
5. In what ways do you believe peer review contributes to improving writing skills, especially when compared to traditional teacher-led feedback?
6. Is there any specific training or guidance provided to participants before engaging in peer review sessions, and if so, what is the rationale behind it?
7. How does peer review impact classroom dynamics and interactions among participants during writing activities, and have there been any noticeable effects on collaborative learning or peer relationships?
8. Drawing from your experiences, what advice or recommendations would you offer others about effectively implementing peer review in ESL writing classrooms?

Appendix II

Semi-structured Classroom Observation Protocol

Eng101

Teacher	
Observation no	
Date	
Time	

Class size	
Topics/ Contents	

Observation Description	
Segments	Notes
1. Introducing a topic or a content	
2. Discussing a topic	
3. Clear instruction to conduct the peer feedback and the objective for incorporating peer feedback	
4. The preparation of students to conduct the session	
5. Student's participation and acceptance of the peer feedback session	
6. The teacher's role during the session (was he/she monitoring the session or not)	
7. The usefulness of the rubric	