

# Peer Feedback in Developing Writing in Tertiary EFL/ESL Education: A Review of Related Research

Md. Nurullah Patwary

Assistant Professor, Dept. of English, World University of Bangladesh, Bangladesh  
nurullah.patwary@english.wub.edu.bd | ORCID 0000-0001-7485-164X

## Abstract

English language teachers and practitioners always look for effective methods to understand the strengths and weaknesses of students' writing. One of the effective methods is collecting the comments of students through the process of peer feedback, which can provide critical views and constructive suggestions about the strengths students have and challenges they experience in their writing classes. Peer feedback has gathered growing interest among tertiary ELT practitioners and researchers over the last few decades. In this paper, peer-reviewed research articles published mainly in the last three decades have been studied critically with a view to exploring the benefits and challenges of the use of peer feedback in the tertiary EFL/ESL writing classroom. In order to have a clear picture of the benefits and challenges of the use of peer feedback in the tertiary EFL/ESL writing classroom, the results and implications of relevant scientific studies have been presented categorically. This study offers the concerned stakeholders valuable insights into the impacts of peer feedback on developing tertiary EFL/ESL students' writing abilities. Towards the end, some recommendations for further research have also been offered.

**Keywords:** peer feedback, tertiary EFL/ESL writing, learner autonomy, formative assessment, process writing

## Introduction

Peer feedback, often mentioned as peer assessment or peer review, is a category of formative assessment that allows writers to discuss different aspects of each other's written products and collect their peers' explanations of them (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). In other words, peer feedback is peer-to-peer collaboration that enables individuals to obtain constructive criticism on their work. In process-writing, peer feedback is considered an imperative task in developing writing and thus "is strongly recommended by many researchers and instructors" (Kangni, 2015, p. 480). Peer feedback permits fellow students to see actual examples of the strengths and weaknesses of their written texts and also offers an opportunity to give feedback to their peers as their audience (James, 2017). In formative assessments of contemporary higher education, there has been a growing interest in the practice of peer assessment or peer feedback (Topping, 2009). Fry (1990) observes that through peer feedback, students gain a greater understanding of formal and institutional assessment procedures. Topping (1998) further adds that if there are not enough formal assessment procedures in any institute, greater consciousness of peer assistance and peer feedback among students could create a "positive press toward improvement" (p. 285).



During the last three decades, a great deal of research has been conducted on peer feedback, and most of the results demonstrate that there is a significant positive correlation between peer feedback and students' writing development (Bolourchi & Soleimani, 2021; Min, 2005; Zhao, 2014). In summary, it can be said that by going through the process of peer feedback, students become more self-regulated and develop more audience awareness that consequently helps them increase their "awareness of their own learning" (Hansson, 2014, p. 1). However, some studies demonstrate that the tertiary EFL classroom encounters challenging contexts while implementing the peer feedback process. This paper highlights the impacts of peer feedback in writing classes at the tertiary level where English is taught in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) or ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts.

Topping (2009) maintains that peer feedback activities can vary in different ways. First, it can vary in terms of the variety products like writing, portfolios, test performances, etc. The participant patterns can also vary. The feedback providers and receivers may be pairs or groups. Finally, it can vary in terms of directionality too. Peer feedback can be a one-way or reciprocal process.

### Method

The current study is a review-based study that involves only secondary research data. This paper critically studied a good number of peer reviewed research articles published mainly in the last three decades. The sources of these papers include databases such as JSTOR, Google Scholar, Science Direct, ERIC, Springer, Atlantis Press, *AJAP (Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics)*, *PsycINFO*, ResearchGate, core.ac.uk, ijreeonline.com, and the *European Journal of Teaching and Education*. Peer-reviewed journals based on keywords such as peer feedback, peer assessment, types of feedback, types of assessment, formative assessment, summative assessment, etc., were also surveyed to collect the required data. The sources of all the secondary data have been appropriately acknowledged in this article.

### Using Peer Feedback in the Writing Class: Different Aspects

While studying the usefulness of peer feedback in the assessment of students' writing assignments, both advantages and challenges suggested by different scholars have been explored. Some of those significant findings are presented and discussed below.

#### Advantages of using peer feedback

##### *Positive impact on students' writing quality development*

Topping (2009) observes that peer feedback in writing involves providing "either general feedback or very specific feedback about possible improvements" (p. 23). He also maintains that peer feedback can help develop writing in many ways, as it can cover the entire text or different steps of the writing process, such as "planning, drafting, or editing" (p. 23). Zundert et al. (2010) studied 27 peer feedback studies conducted with tertiary-level EFL students from different countries. From the results, he concluded that peer feedback has a positive correlation with the development of students' writing skills. Another significant finding was that there were gains for both the assessor and the assessee. Topping (2009) observes that as the principal goal of peer assessment is to provide "confirmatory, and suggestive, or corrective feedback" (p. 22), that could lead to a reduction in errors and

have positive effects on the development of writing. He further adds that the quality of writing gets better if and when the learner responds thoughtfully and positively to the peer feedback offered. In addition, Mangelsdorf (1992) observes that as peer feedback allows students an opportunity to scrutinize their peers' writings critically, it contributes to the development of their higher-order thinking ability. Zhao (2010) also finds that students' writing quality improves when peer feedback is reflected in revisions of their writing.

Wanchid (2020) reports the results of a study conducted with tertiary level EFL writing course students of Thailand. The sample of this study comprised 72 Thai undergraduate engineering students studying at King Mongkut's University of Technology. The study revealed that peer feedback made a great deal of contribution to EFL students' writing development.

Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021) conducted another study to investigate the influence of peer feedback on tertiary students' writing abilities. The sample of this study consisted of 48 Iranian undergraduate students doing a writing course at the Iran Language Institute (ILI). The study also revealed that peer feedback contributed to a great extent to EFL students' writing development (Bolourchi & Soleimani, 2021).

#### ***Impact on students' cognitive development and critical thinking stimulus***

According to Berg et al. (2006), checking one another's writing products enables students to become familiar with the writing standard set by the teachers and empowers them to grade the texts better. This process of assessment generally has a positive impact on students' intellectual development (Fredricks et al., 2004). The learners, whose assignments are peer reviewed, usually benefit from the feedback and their critical thinking ability is stimulated (Rukanuddin et al., 2021). Likewise, the peer reviewers also benefit, as during the peer feedback process they gain insights into the strengths and weaknesses of their peers' writings. In this regard, Wessa and De Rycker (2010) maintain that in the peer feedback process, the reviewer benefits more than the receiver, as the writing of a peer review report usually entails "cognitive processes that encourage deep learning" (p. 409). The results from the study by Cheng and Warren (2005) also support the idea.

#### ***Improvement in overall and global aspects of writing***

In terms of developing writing in the formative stages, peer assessment or peer feedback has been observed to be "as effective as teacher assessment and sometimes more effective" (O'Donnell & Topping, 1998, p. 259). The study also reports that peer feedback on writing can involve giving either general feedback or very particular feedback about possible improvements. Lundstrom and Baker (2009) conducted another similar study involving 91 ESL students. The participants in this study were the students of nine writing courses at Brigham Young University, USA. The researchers divided the participants into two groups. One group was given the role of giving peer feedback and the other of receiving peer feedback. The researchers selected an essay written by a student of a similar proficiency level and gave it to both groups. The results of the study revealed that the students who gave peer feedback improved their writing more than the students who received peer feedback. The students were able to enhance their overall and global aspects of writing, such as ideas,

focus, organization, development, clarity of purpose, cohesion, and awareness of audience. Regarding the benefits of giving peer feedback, Lundstrom and Baker (2009) say:

The findings of this study suggest that L2 writing students can improve their own writing by transferring abilities they learn when reviewing peer texts. In addition, these findings also suggest that students taught to give peer feedback improve in their own writing abilities more than students taught to use peer feedback (p. 38).

### ***Generating new ideas and overcoming errors in sentence structures***

Zhao (2014) conducted a study in an English writing class at a Chinese university and reported some benefits of peer feedback. The sample consisted of 18 second-year English majors and the study lasted over four months. The results of the study demonstrated that students were able to minimize their grammatical errors and enrich themselves with new ideas while reading their peers' writing products. The study also revealed that the congenial peer feedback environment allowed students to discuss the feedback comfortably with their peers, encouraged more intense discussions among themselves, and ultimately contributed to further improvement in their writing. In a similar vein, Min (2005) conducted a study on 18 students in an EFL writing class at a Taiwanese university. The findings of the study suggested that students gained more awareness of their own writing difficulties while scanning their peers' papers and found solutions to their own writing problems while looking at solutions to the writing problems of their peers. On the use of peer feedback, Hansson (2014) suggests that through peer work, students can gain ideas reciprocally, share suggestions and ideas regarding ways to improve their peers' writing, and also develop their own writing. These benefits accrue from instances of both written and oral interactions (Hansson, 2014). In another similar study that compared the impacts of peer feedback and self-assessment with 40 Lebanese tertiary EFL students, Mawlawi Diab (2010) found that the students in the peer feedback group were able to correct more errors than the self-assessment group. The errors in focus involved subject-verb agreement errors, pronoun agreement errors, wrong word choice, and awkward sentence structure errors.

### ***Peer feedback providers become more audience-conscious***

Hu (2005) carried out a three-year study on some of his Chinese ESL students studying at Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. The students, at the end of the study, claimed that they had learned a great deal about writing by "reading each other's writing and by giving each other advice" (p. 339). Villamil and de Guerrero (1998) reported similar findings after conducting a study with some Malaysian EFL students. In this connection, Rollison (2005) suggests that to make their writing more real, writers need audiences that can give instant advice or feedback. For the students, the best audience can be their peers as their peers can give instant feedback to help improve their texts. This leads students to become more aware of their audience during writing and allows them to produce better and more audience friendly assignments (Rollison, 2005).

### ***Peer feedback helps improve vocabulary and, hence, writing***

Rothschild and Klingenberg (1990) studied the effect of peer feedback training on tertiary students. They conducted a survey with some students at a Canadian community college.

The results of the study showed that the experimental group, the students who had training in using peer feedback, developed more positive attitudes towards writing than the control group, the participants who did not have any training. The study also found that the grammar and vocabulary of the experimental group improved more than those of the control group.

### ***Students provide scaffolding in peer feedback sessions***

Tang and Tithecott (1999) conducted a study with some Asian ESL students studying in writing classes at a university college in Western Canada to investigate the effects of using peer feedback. The results demonstrated several benefits of using peer feedback. One of the benefits was “students provided scaffolding in peer response sessions” (Tang & Tithecott, 1999, p. 33) and it helped the writers use different techniques to overcome writing errors and develop their writing. They also added that the most common scaffolding strategies used by students were: “Instructing, Announcing, Justifying, Restating, Giving directives, Requesting clarification, Clarifying, Eliciting, Responding to elicitation, and Reacting” (p. 33).

### ***Peer feedback helps students become confident autonomous learners***

Liu and Carless (2006), regarding the benefits of peer feedback, suggest that peer feedback empowers students “to take an active role in the management of their own learning” (p. 280). Villamil and de Guerrero, in another similar study, found that the students became autonomous writers by giving and receiving feedback from their peers (Villamil & de Guerrero, 1998). Topping’s (1998) study also found a similar result. He found that during the peer feedback process, students get actively involved in the learning process and “promote a sense of ownership, personal responsibility, and motivation” (Topping, 1998, p. 256).

### **Challenges of using peer feedback in the writing class**

Thus far, a significant number of studies have been investigated relating to peer feedback and its benefits in tertiary EFL/ESL writing classes. However, scholars and academics have identified a number of challenges with implementing the peer feedback process. Some of them are discussed below.

### ***Friendship bias***

In a study conducted by Cheng and Warren (2005), friendship bias was found to exist in the students providing peer feedback. The sample of the study was 51 Chinese undergraduate EFL students, and the objective of the study was to see the impact of peer feedback on students’ both spoken and written English proficiency. The qualitative data revealed that the peer reviewers felt uncomfortable and lacked confidence “to assess the language proficiency of their peers” (Cheng & Warren, 2005, p. 110). In addition, most of the respondents felt it challenging to grade their close friends’ writing entirely fairly. Similar results were also obtained in Tang and Tithecott’s (1999) study with some ESL students at a Canadian university. Regarding the challenges of giving fair peer feedback to the written products of close friends, they observed that most of the students found it very challenging to give exact comments and suggestions “about something negative” (p. 32). In addition,

the student participants also believed that they had neither enough assessment skills nor adequate knowledge of the English language to conduct such a task.

### ***Students' preference to teacher feedback and prejudice against peer editing***

To explore tertiary EFL students' perceptions of teacher feedback and peer feedback in developing their writing, Hu and Lam (2009) conducted a study with 20 Chinese tertiary EFL learners. The learners were taking an academic writing course at a university in Singapore. The results of the study demonstrated that regarding assessing their writing products the participants showed "a strong preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback" (Hu & Lam, 2009, p. 387). A similar finding was revealed by Zaman and Azad (2012), who conducted a study with 12 Bangladeshi tertiary EFL teachers and 120 EFL learners. The survey results indicated that Bangladeshi EFL learners in the study also showed a preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback.

### ***Poor reliability of peer feedback***

Nilson (2010) reviewed a dozen research articles and concluded that students' concerns regarding the reliability of peer feedback are a major issue in implementing peer feedback. In his review, he found that many students considered their language teacher their lone audience and the most important person to keep happy. They also considered that peer evaluation or peer feedback was much more liberal than teacher feedback, and among the peer feedback providers "inter-rater reliability (that is, consensus) is low" (Nilson, 2010, p. 320). Hu (2005) also conducted a study among some tertiary ESL learners to understand the reliability of peer feedback. He ran the study with some Chinese tertiary ESL learners involved in an academic writing course at a Singaporean university. The results of the study showed that the student participants did not have trust in their peers' comments, as they thought their peers lacked adequate skills and knowledge to distinguish between "valid and invalid peer feedback" (Hu, 2005, p. 325).

### ***Lack of positive feedback in the peer feedback reports***

Yeung (2019) observes that among the popular approaches to teaching and learning writing, the process approach offers the highest potential for "encouraging the development in learner autonomy" (p. 43). Like teacher feedback and self-evaluation, peer feedback is also considered a vital facet of the process approach of writing (Hyland, 2000). However, Kangni (2015) observes that in the process writing approach, while giving feedback, peer editors mainly focus on the limitations and errors of their peers' writings, and often their feedback contains corrections and criticism. This negativity often causes "lack of encouragement" (p. 480) in the learners and hence affects the development of writing through peer feedback (Kangni, 2015).

### ***Potential solutions to the challenges***

The realistic implementation of peer feedback is a multifaceted task that requires a comprehensive understanding "of the goals of the task and the criteria for success, and the ability to make judgments about the relationship of the product or performance to these goals" (Topping, 2017, p. 25). The following section will present some possible solutions to some major challenges and difficulties that come with the implementation of peer feedback.

### ***Training the peer feedback providers and receivers***

Many researchers suggest that training the students of a writing class going through the peer feedback process is imperative to prepare them as confident peer feedback givers and receivers (Min, 2005; Rollinson, 2005; Topping, 2009; Zhao, 2014). According to Sadler and Good (2006, p. 28), the peer feedback process requires recurrent practice for students to become competent assessors. Brookhart (2017) suggests that the learners should be given proper training on how to provide peer feedback and be provided with peer editing 'ground rules' as guidelines. In this regard, she suggests seven guidelines. The guidelines she suggests are: reading a peer's work carefully; comparing the work against the set rubric; discussing the work, not the writer; not providing judgmental comments (e.g., don't write, "That's bad"); rather, describing the positive aspects of the work and mentioning what's missing; making specific recommendations; and sharing each other's views on the development of the work.

One method of conducting such training is described in Zhao's (2014) study. The study involved 18 Chinese tertiary EFL students. According to Zhao (2014), the teachers checked the students' writings and explained what to improve and how. They also shared their feedback-giving process with the students so that they could gain some practical ideas. Min (2005) used a similar approach in another study conducted with 18 Taiwanese tertiary students. The students were the first year students in the researcher's EFL writing class at a university in Taiwan. They were given the opportunity to scan the essays written by former students and study the strategies their instructor would use in providing feedback in their scripts. Min (2005) suggests that at the very beginning of their training in providing feedback, students can be given texts written by other students, not their peers, and learn how to give appropriate comments. This training will help them assess writing texts neutrally, avoiding friendship bias. Min further suggests that, the feedback providers should also be taught that they are to comment on their peers' products not as teachers but as readers, and this orientation will gradually help them learn to give feedback in a more considerate way.

### ***Forming mixed ability peer feedback groups***

The Zone of Proximal Development Theory suggests that peers' or teachers' support and guidance can help students reach a proficiency level that they cannot reach on their own (Vygotsky, 1978). The theory also infers that, for the low-competence learners, teachers should apply cooperative learning strategies in the classroom and seek out assistance from "more competent peers in the zone of proximal development" (Main, 2023). This concept of peer or pairing guidance is usually termed as scaffolding. According to Wood et al. (1976), scaffolding is the support and supervision that aid a student or novice to solve a problem or carry out a task that "would be beyond his unassisted efforts" (p. 90). From the overall discussion on ZPD and scaffolding, it can be deduced that peer feedback becomes successful when a less skilled peer and a more skilled peer work together.

### ***Monitoring and evaluating peer assessors' performance***

Topping (2017) observes that in order to have a better performance in peer feedback,

students require intense training and practice before full implementation of the process, and this whole process should feature “monitoring and moderation” (p. 13). He also suggests that during students’ peer feedback process, teachers should “keep a low profile and circulate among them, giving feedback and coaching as necessary” (p. 12).

Zundert et al. (2010) reviewed 27 relevant papers. They found that the quality of the peer feedback process improved with “training and experience” (p. 278). In this regard, Topping (2017) suggests that peer assessors should work in small group sizes, be given specific peer feedback formats, and be allowed sufficient time for assessment and providing feedback.

In the Bangladesh context, Chowdhury and Akteruzzaman (2021) conducted a small-scale action research project with tertiary EFL students. The participants in the study were undergraduate students at two universities in Bangladesh. They were doing foundation courses in English (ENG 101). Their study demonstrated how Bangladeshi tertiary learners’ perceptions of peer feedback changed by training. The study also showed that peer feedback can harvest productive outcomes in EFL writing classrooms “if applied correctly” (Chowdhury & Akteruzzaman, 2021, p. 184).

#### ***Creating a congenial environment for peer feedback providers***

For making peer feedback easier and more effective, Hansen and Liu (2005) suggest that the writing classroom environment should be made congenial and engaging. Such an environment will encourage the feedback providers to work together at ease and to exchange “linguistic content, and rhetorical expressions and knowledge (i.e. scaffolding) when necessary” (Hansen & Liu, 2005, p. 33).

#### ***Guiding students to design their own peer feedback materials***

A common concern regarding peer feedback exposed by many researchers is that students usually lack confidence in giving feedback to their peers. To overcome this concern, Hansen and Liu (2005) suggest students should be encouraged to devise their peer feedback sheets and assessment criteria on their own so that they can assess their peers’ papers and give feedback confidently.

#### ***Making peer feedback available in greater amount than teacher feedback***

Regarding the questions raised about the reliability and validity of peer feedback, Topping (2017) observes, the reliability and validity of peer feedback are as high as those of teacher feedback and sometimes higher. For greater reliability and validity, Topping (2017) suggests that the practice of peer feedback should be made available in greater volume than teacher feedback. For doing so, “a positive, encouraging, and collaborative workshop environment” (Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 168) should be established in the writing classroom, where students can work with ease with their peers. In this regard, Rollinson (2005) observes that many students may not accept that “their peers are qualified to act as substitutes for the teacher, and critique their writing” (p. 26), and so they will need substantial amounts of understanding of the value of peer feedback.

### **Discussion**

The reports presented above suggest that peer feedback is very helpful for tertiary learners



to improve their writing abilities. Although some practitioners face some challenges in implementing the peer feedback process, the reliability and validity of peer feedback are found to be as high as, and often higher than, teacher feedback (Topping, 1998). He adds that when teachers are involved and there is adequate training, support, and resources available, peer feedback can be of higher quality and more reliable.

Peer feedback is a practical assessment technique that can improve the teaching and learning environment in the classroom in a number of ways. First, peer feedback encourages students to take an active role in regulating their own learning, helping them to develop into self-assured, independent learners (Liu and Carless, 2006). Second, it can make a significant contribution by increasing the range of formative assessment in the classroom and lightening the load on instructors if used in accordance with the right standards. According to Rukanuddin et al. (2021), tertiary EFL instructors are frequently overworked and unable to provide students with appropriate feedback on their work. Hattie and Timperley (2007) further note that in the writing classroom, rather than providing genuine, educationally beneficial feedback to students, teachers frequently assign grades and marks. Peer feedback is a very effective remedy for this issue. Peer review in this situation has the potential to increase student feedback while also empowering learner autonomy. Peer feedback can be strengthened in the writing classroom by maintaining the custom of forming mixed-ability peer feedback groups of students and encouraging them to work together (Main, 2023).

Researchers have also identified two major obstacles that hinder the environment that gives importance to peer feedback. One obstacle is some students' lack of confidence in participating in the peer feedback process, and the other is its lack of reliability and validity. In addition, for different social reasons, "both assessors and assessees can experience initial anxiety about the peer assessment process" (Topping, 2017, p. 13). As a remedy to the first kind of obstacle, scholars involved in the research in this area suggest that tertiary EFL/ESL students require adequate training and practice prior to the initiation of the process, and the process should be accompanied by intensive monitoring and control.

The peer feedback team should then move on to the development stage. As a result, the peer feedback process will be more frequent, which will assist students in identifying their writing-related strengths and limitations and in building "meta-cognitive and other personal and professional skills" (Topping, 2009, p. 27). Another idea that can also add value is that the feedback providers should highlight positive feedback first in order to give the feedback receiver confidence and comfortability. Teachers should also emphasize how peer feedback fosters "activity and interactivity, identification and bonding, self-confidence, and empathy with others" (Topping, 2017, p. 13) as well as diversity and interest.

Regarding the other questions raised about the reliability and validity of peer feedback, Topping (1998) observes that the reliability and validity of peer feedback are as high as those of teacher feedback and sometimes higher. For greater reliability and validity, Topping (2017) suggests that the practice of peer feedback should be made available in greater volume than teacher feedback. To do this, teachers should create "a positive,

encouraging, and collaborative workshop environment” (Tsui & Ng, 2000, p. 168) in the writing classroom so that students may easily collaborate with their peers. According to Rollinson (2005), many students might not believe that “their peers are qualified to act as substitutes for the teacher and critique their writing” (p. 26), so they will need a deep knowledge of the importance of peer evaluation.

### Conclusion

This article has explored the scopes of a non-traditional form of feedback, namely peer feedback. Insights from the literature discussed here show that peer feedback is significantly helpful in developing writing in tertiary EFL education. Although some practitioners face some challenges in implementing the peer feedback process, Topping (2017) suggests that the quality of peer feedback can enhance “when supported by training, checklists, exemplification, teacher assistance, and monitoring” (p. 13). For its strength in developing writing, peer feedback process is being increasingly used in tertiary EFL teaching, in many ways (van den Berg et al., 2006, p. 35), and it can also be a valid and reliable system of assessment in the tertiary EFL education of Bangladesh.

Tertiary students should also be involved in developing their own peer feedback checklists, sheets, and grading rubrics in order to improve the results of the peer feedback process. Through this position, they will have the chance to become familiar with the evaluation criteria applied to the written texts. They will be able to create their own writing method with the use of this knowledge. In order for all students to be positively and confidently involved in collaborative learning, teachers of tertiary EFL/ESL writing must establish a stress-free and welcoming learning atmosphere (Liu & Carless, 2006). Additionally, in the tertiary EFL writing classroom, peer feedback should be encouraged and made more readily available than teacher feedback in terms of volume and promptness. (Topping, 2009, p. 25).

Tertiary students should also be involved in developing their own peer feedback checklists, sheets, and grading rubrics in order to improve the results of the peer feedback process. Through this position, they will have the chance to become familiar with the evaluation criteria applied to the written texts. They will be able to create their own writing method with this knowledge. In order for all students to be positively and confidently involved in collaborative learning, teachers of tertiary EFL/ESL writing must establish a stress-free and welcoming learning atmosphere (Liu & Carless, 2006). Additionally, in the tertiary EFL writing classroom, peer feedback should be encouraged and made more readily available than teacher feedback in terms of volume and promptness.

For making peer feedback well-operative in the tertiary EFL writing class, “training the students is very crucial” (Bolourchi & Soleimani, 2021, p. 13). Students should be familiarized with their objectives and ways of accomplishing their assessment tasks. In this course of action, EFL teachers must consider different realities and limitations of their teaching contexts, such as students’ English proficiency levels, cultural contexts, and education facilities, “before exploiting these activities in their writing classes” (Wanchid, 2020, p. 33).

Peer feedback is not likely to ever replace teacher feedback as the main form of assessment (Topping, 2017) for the limited time of their working week in the classroom. However, it is acknowledged that peer feedback can make a significant contribution to raising standard of writing instruction and strengthening students' critical-thinking abilities (Topping, 2003b, 2009). Additionally, it is expected that the incorporation of peer feedback in the tertiary EFL classroom would have a significant positive impact on students' capacity to write, as well as their ability to become independent learners and acquire other life skills.

Finally, a suggestion for further research is offered. As a significant number of studies concerning peer feedback have already been carried out and their implications have also been uttered, it would be rewarding to see some research findings in this field from a South Asian context, preferably from a Bangladeshi tertiary EFL education context. It will be useful since there is a big scarcity of required data in the relevant field in this particular context. Given the varied responses to trusting the value and status of peers' feedback shown in some of the studies, it may also be found that cultural and other factors play a part in a particular context. The impact of these factors on the quality of the peer feedback process and the development of tertiary students' writing can also be an interesting area for further research.

## References

- Berg, I.V.D., Admiraal, W., & Pilot, A. (2006). Peer assessment in university teaching: Evaluating seven course designs. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31(1), 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930500262346>
- Bolourchi, A., & Soleimani, M. (2021). The impact of peer feedback on EFL learners' writing performance and writing anxiety. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 6(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.52547/ijree.6.1.1>
- Brookhart, S.M. (2017). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. ASCD.
- Cheng, W., & Warren, M. (2005). Peer assessment of language proficiency. *Language Testing*, 22(1), 93-121. <http://doi.org/10.1191/0265532205lt298oa>
- Chowdhury, M.A.U., & Akteruzzaman, M. (2021). The application of guided peer feedback in facilitating L2 writing: Action research with tertiary-level language learners in Bangladesh. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7(2), 171-185. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359299979>
- Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P.C. & Paris, A.H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 74(1), 59-109. doi:10.3102/00346543074001059.
- Fry, S.A. (1990). Implementation and evaluation of peer marking in higher education. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 15(3), 177-189. <http://doi:10.1080/0260293900150301>
- Hansen, J.G., & Liu, J. (2005). Guiding principles for effective peer response. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 31-38. doi:10.1093/elt/cci004.
- Hansson, S. (2014). Benefits and difficulties in using peer response for writing in the EFL classroom. [Online]. Goteborg Universitet. Retrieved June 17, 2022, from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/43558389.pdf>
- Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 321-342. <http://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr169oa>

- Hu, G., & Lam, S.T.E. (2009). Issues of cultural appropriateness and pedagogical efficacy: Exploring peer review in a second language writing class. *Instructional Science*, 38, 371-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9086-1>
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL Writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 33-54. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400103>
- Hyland, K. and Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83-101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- James, K. (2017). Giving peer feedback helps writers grow. *Edutopia*. Retrieved July 17, 2022, from <https://www.edutopia.org/article/giving-peer-feedback-helps-writers-grow/#:~:text=Giving%20good%20feedback%20takes%20practice,success%20in%20giving%20a%20checklist>
- Kangni, W. (2015, October 10-11). Problems and tactics in peer feedback in EFL writing teaching. *Proceedings 2nd International Conference on Education, Management and Information Technology*, [conference session], Jinan, China. <https://www.atlantispress.com/proceedings/icemit-15>
- Lantolf, J., & Thorne, S.L. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford University Press.
- Liu, N.-F., & Carless, D. (2006). Peer feedback: The learning element of peer assessment. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 279-290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- Lundstrom, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 30-43. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2008.06.002.
- Main, P. (2023, April 30). The Zone of Proximal Development: A teachers' guide. *Structural Learning*. <https://www.structural-learning.com/post/the-zone-of-proximal-development-a-teachers-guide>
- Mangelsdorf, K. (1992). Peer reviews in the ESL composition classroom: What do the students think? *ELT Journal*, 46(3), 274-285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.3.274>
- Mawlawi Diab, N. (2010). Effects of peer- versus self-editing on students' revision of language errors in revised drafts. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 38(1), 85-95. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/61800725?accountid=11162>
- Min, H. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 33(2), 293-308. <http://doi:10.1016/j.system.2004.11.003>.
- Nilson, L.B. (2010). Evaluating and documenting teaching effectiveness. *Teaching at Its Best*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Wiley & Sons, Inc. San Francisco.
- O'Donnell, A.M., & Topping, K.J. (1998). Peers assessing peers: Possibilities and problems. In K.J. Topping & S. Ehly (Eds.), *Peer-assisted Learning* (pp. 255-278). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. doi:10.1093/elt/cci003.
- Rothschild, D., & Klingenberg, F. (1990). Self and peer evaluation of writing in the interactive ESL classroom: An exploratory study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 8(1), 52-65. doi:10.18806/tesl.v8i1.578.
- Rukanuddin, M., Rahman, K.A., Ibna Seraj, P.M., & Hafiz, K.D. (2021). Feedback to student-works: Lifeline of learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 565-574. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.38>

- Sadler, P.M., & Good, E. (2006). The impact of self- and peer-grading on student learning. *Educational Assessment, 11*(1), 1-31. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326977ea1101\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326977ea1101_1)
- Tang, G.M., & Tithcott, J. (1999). Peer response in ESL writing. *TESL Canada Journal, 16*(2), 20-38. doi:10.18806/tesl.v16i2.716.
- The Zone of Proximal Development: A Teacher's Guide. (n.d.). RSS, [www.structural-learning.com/post/the-zone-of-proximal-development-a-teachers-guide](http://www.structural-learning.com/post/the-zone-of-proximal-development-a-teachers-guide)
- Topping, K.J. (1998). Peer assessment between students in college and university. *Review of Educational Research, 68*, 249-276. doi:10.3102/00346543068003249.
- Topping, K.J. (2009). Peer assessment. *Theory into Practice, 48*(1), 20-27. doi:10.1080/00405840802577569.
- Topping, K.J. (2017). Peer assessment: Learning by judging and discussing the work of other learners. *Interdisciplinary Education and Psychology, 1*(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.31532/InterdiscipEducPsychol.1.1.007>
- Tsui, A.B.M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(2), 147-170. doi:10.1016/s1060-3743(00)00022-9
- van Zundert, M., Sluijsmans, D., & van Merriënboer, J. (2010). Effective peer assessment processes: Research findings and future directions. *Learning and Instruction 20*, 270-279. doi:10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.08.004
- Villamil, O.S., & de Guerrero, M.C. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(4), 491-514. doi:10.1093/applin/19.4.491
- Vygotskii, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wanchid, R. (2020). The effects of different types of feedback in the EFL writing class: A study of efficiency, affective and cognitive aspects, and Thai cultural dimensions. *European Journal of Teaching and Education, 2* (2), 24-34. doi:10.33422/ejte.v2i2.197
- Wessa, P. & De Rycker, A. (2010). Reviewing peer reviews - A rule-based approach. *Proceedings of 5th International Conference on e-Learning*. (pp. 408-418). Penang: ICEL. Retrieved July 3, 2022, from <https://www.wessa.net/download/icel10.pdf>
- Wood, D., Jeremy, S., & Bruner, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 12*(2), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>
- Yeung, M. (2019). Exploring the strength of the process writing approach as a pedagogy for fostering learner autonomy in writing among young learners. *English Language Teaching:12* (9), 42-54. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n9p42>
- Zaman, M.M., & Azad, A.K. (2012). Feedback in EFL writing at tertiary level: Teachers' and learners' perceptions. *ASA University Review, 6* (1), 139-156.
- Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing Writing, 15*(1), 3-17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.01.002>
- Zhao, H. (2014). Investigating teacher-supported peer assessment for EFL writing. *ELT Journal, 68*(2), 155-168. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct068>