ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

PEER FEEDBACK, SELF-EVALUATION, AND THEIR IMPACT ON WRITING PROFICIENCY OF PAKISTANI ESL STUDENTS

Midhat Maroof
Lecturer, Muhammad Ali Jinnah University, Karachi, Pakistan
Email: midhat.maroof@jinnah.edu
Warisha Khan
MPhil Linguistics
Email: warikhan11@gmail.com
Faiza Abdul Wahid
English teacher, Cambridge/Olevel, Happy Home School, Karachi, Pakistan
Email: faizaq588@gmail.com
Asifa Haroon Narejo
Content Specialist, Intersys Ltd., Karachi, Pakistan
Email: asifaharoonbusiness@gmail.com

Abstract
This study examines how structured peer feedback and guided self-correction affect the essay writing proficiency of Pakistani ESL undergraduates. A quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design was employed with 90 sophomore students enrolled in a Functional English course at a private university in Karachi, Pakistan. Participants were divided into three intact groups of 30: a peer feedback group (Group A), a self-correction group (Group B), and a control group (Group C) using conventional unguided editing. Both experimental groups used guideline manuals, which included instructions for content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanical corrections. Students' essays were scored using the ESL Composition Profile by Jacobs et al. (1981). Post-intervention analysis indicated that both Group A (average = 81.06) and Group B (average = 80.83) outperformed the control group (average = 73.86), whereas there was no statistically significant difference between the two experimental groups (p = .985).
Keywords: *Peer Feedback, Self-Correction, ESL Writing, Pakistani Students, Guideline Manuals, Writing Proficiency, Quasi-Experimental Design*

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing has been widely considered as one of the most cognitively challenging abilities in L2 learning. Creating a good, grammatical and coherent essay poses new challenges for ESL learners who need to manage vocabulary, syntactic structure, discourse organization, audience awareness, etc. In practice, these demands work against each other. For example, a student struggling with paragraph structure may also lose control at the level of grammar within sentences. Likewise, a student unsure about range of vocabulary may settle for simplified language that undermines the overall argument. Pakistani ESL learners face these problems in a difficult institutional environment consisting of large classes and less attention from the instructor, and have less exposure to English during the day other than the formal teaching of the university.

The literature has broadly contended that feedback is one of the most powerful tools available to improve student writing (Hyland, 2000; Ferris, 2003). In many classrooms at Pakistani universities, it is practically impossible to deliver sustained formative feedback. For teachers who are working with classes of 30 or more students, reviewing every draft in any meaningful depth is

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

often not feasible. They also have to manage multiple sections at the same time. Typically, students receive surface-level correction which does nothing for different writing considerations such as structure, organization and argumentation. Due to this, the students do not know how to improve their essays in any other sense.

Process-based writing kind of writing instruction emphasizes planning, drafting, revising and editing as cyclical and recursive stages (Flower and Hayes, 1981; Raimes, 1983). Thus, offering a structural-level solution to this problem. Within this model, feedback is not an end assessment, but serves as a guiding tool to help learners improve upon their learning through iterations. Feedback from fellow learners and self-correction are two applications of a learner-centered trend. The students themselves must internally evaluate their progress, which transfers responsibility for evaluation away from the teacher. This makes either approach quite feasible in situations where the teacher-to-student ratio undermines truly individualized instruction. Besides being plausible options, both actions have recorded cognitive and emotional benefits that go beyond writing performance. They also help in developing metacognition, reduced writing anxiety, and increased learner autonomy.

Despite increasing international evidence to support peer feedback and self-correction as effective pedagogical tools, limited research on these approaches in the context of Pakistan's higher education exists. Even fewer studies utilize structured guidance tools to put these feedback approaches into practice or compare their effectiveness within the same experimental design. The present study addresses these gaps by investigating whether Pakistani ESL undergraduates using structured guideline manuals for peer feedback or self-correction show greater improvement in essay writing proficiency than students using conventional editing approaches.

Three research questions guide the study. First, do students who receive structured peer feedback through a guideline manual outperform students who receive no such feedback? Second, do students who conduct structured self-correction through a guideline manual outperform students who do not? Third, which of the two structured methods produces greater writing improvement? By answering these questions, the study aims to provide both theoretical insights into the mechanisms of feedback-driven writing development and practical guidance for ESL instructors working in large-class South Asian university settings.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical case for peer feedback and self-correction in writing instruction is grounded in several converging frameworks. Constructivist learning theory (Piaget, 1972; Vygotsky, 1978) holds that knowledge is not passively received but actively constructed through engagement with the environment. Applied to writing, this means that students develop not through one-way transmission of grammatical rules but through active engagement with texts, including the texts produced by peers. Vygotsky's concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is directly relevant: peer interaction allows learners to accomplish tasks that they could not yet accomplish independently, because a peer provides scaffolding within the learner's current developmental zone.

Sociocultural theory extends this framework by emphasizing that cognition is fundamentally social and that higher-order mental functions develop through mediated interaction (Vygotsky, 1978). When students evaluate peer essays, they engage in the kind of social mediation that sociocultural theory identifies as central to cognitive development. They internalize discourse

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

norms, practice analytical reasoning, and develop critical language awareness through sustained dialogue about writing quality. Self-correction similarly cultivates metacognitive awareness by requiring students to adopt an evaluative stance toward their own work, a habit of mind that is difficult to develop without deliberate and repeated practice.

Self-regulated learning theory (Zimmerman, 2002) provides additional support for self-correction as a pedagogical practice. Self-regulation involves three iterative phases: forethought, during which learners set goals and plan strategies; performance, during which they implement strategies and monitor progress; and self-reflection, during which they evaluate outcomes and adjust future behavior accordingly. Structured self-correction, supported by explicit criteria, engages students in all three phases: the guideline criteria serve as performance goals, the correction process constitutes active monitoring, and subsequent revision represents adaptive self-reflection.

Feedback theory in writing research (Hyland, 2000; Ferris, 2003) identifies higher-order concerns including organization, coherence, argument development, and idea elaboration as more productively addressed through feedback than surface-level errors such as punctuation or spelling. Students who receive feedback focused on these higher-order concerns are better positioned to revise substantively and to internalize principles that transfer across writing tasks and genres. The guideline instrument used in this study was specifically designed to balance attention to both higher-order and lower-order writing concerns through its five-dimensional structure.

2.2 Peer Feedback in ESL Writing

Research on peer feedback in ESL writing has consistently demonstrated its effectiveness as a formative instructional tool. Villamil and Guerrero (1998) found that the majority of suggestions offered during structured peer review sessions were incorporated into students' final drafts, producing measurable quality gains. Porto (2001) reported that structured group response sessions in which students shared drafts and exchanged comments increased both the depth of critical thinking and the quality of final essays. More recently, Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021) demonstrated that peer feedback improved writing performance and significantly reduced writing anxiety among EFL learners, suggesting dual benefits that span both cognitive and affective dimensions.

A recurrent finding across studies is that unstructured peer review produces inconsistent and often superficial feedback, with students tending to focus on easily identifiable surface errors while neglecting more substantive concerns such as argument coherence, paragraph unity, and thesis development (Fellag, 2010; Sebranek, Kemper, and Meyer, 1999). Structured peer feedback instruments, by contrast, direct student attention systematically across multiple dimensions of writing quality. Ganji (2009) found that structured peer correction produced the largest writing gains among Iranian ESL students, outperforming teacher-only feedback when students were provided with clearly defined evaluative criteria. This finding is consistent with the argument that it is structure, rather than the peer relationship itself, that drives the effectiveness of peer feedback.

Dheram (1995) demonstrated that students make substantial revisions to both style and content when given feedback support, and Liu (2008) confirmed that students use peer and teacher comments as active guides for revision rather than passively noting corrections. Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, and Huang (1998) reported that many students prefer peer feedback to teacher feedback because classmates offer fresh perspectives and identify problems that writers, too close to their own work, tend to overlook. Meletiadou (2021) and Vuogan and Li (2022) have more recently

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

added to this evidence base through large-scale studies confirming positive effects of peer assessment on EFL writing proficiency across diverse institutional contexts.

2.3 Self-Correction in ESL Writing

Self-correction is a well-established component of process writing pedagogy. Nation (2008) describes it as a critical metacognitive practice in which students examine their own writing, identify errors and weaknesses, and resolve them through independent reasoning. Andrade and Du (2007) characterize self-assessment as a reflective exercise in which learners evaluate their work against predetermined standards and use the resulting comparisons to direct targeted revision. Harmer (2004) argues that self-correction positions students as active and responsible participants in their own learning, producing deeper engagement with the revision process than reactive external correction alone can achieve.

Hajimohammadi and Mukundan (2011) found that self-correction produced significant writing quality improvements in a study comparing multiple feedback conditions, and noted differential effects based on student personality type, with introverted learners showing particular benefit from structured self-review. Wakabayashi (2013) demonstrated that EFL learners who engaged in guided self-feedback produced substantially improved final drafts compared to their initial submissions. Srichanyachon (2014) found that stronger ESL students used self-revision strategies more frequently, and that this difference partially explained variation in writing proficiency, suggesting a mutually reinforcing relationship between self-monitoring habits and language competence.

Maftoon and Shirazi (2010) describe a commonly used variant of self-correction in which teachers provide indirect cues indicating error location without specifying the nature of the error, requiring students to diagnose and correct independently. This approach preserves student agency while providing sufficient scaffolding for learners who struggle to locate mistakes unaided. Spiller (2012) identifies broader benefits of self-correction beyond writing quality improvement, including increased academic independence, stronger decision-making confidence, and deeper ownership of learning outcomes, all of which are important developmental goals for undergraduate ESL learners navigating their first years of academic writing.

2.4 Structured Guideline Instruments

A consistent finding across both the peer feedback and self-correction literatures is that structured instruments substantially improve the quality and focus of student evaluative activity. Without explicit criteria, both peer reviewers and self-correcting students tend to concentrate on surface-level grammar and spelling while neglecting the organizational, conceptual, and rhetorical dimensions that most strongly influence holistic writing quality. Structured instruments redirect attention toward these higher-order concerns by specifying in advance the evaluative categories students should apply. Porto (2001) argued that peer feedback should center on meaning and ideas rather than grammar alone, and that structured instruments play an important role in achieving this shift.

The guideline manual used in this study was developed by synthesizing the editing and proofreading checklists of Fellag (2010) and Sebranek, Kemper, and Meyer (1999) with the five-dimensional scoring framework of Jacobs et al. (1981) and Weigle (2002). The five dimensions addressed are content (30% scoring weight), language use and grammar (25%), organization (20%), vocabulary (20%), and mechanics (5%). Rather than restricting students to binary responses, the manual offered three options: Mentioned, Not Mentioned, and Not Sure, together

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

with an open-ended comment section. Separate versions were produced for peer evaluation and self-correction. The instrument was piloted and refined before main use, and its internal reliability, assessed using Cronbach's alpha, was 0.92, indicating excellent consistency.

Phuong, Phan, and Le (2023) have provided supporting evidence for this design approach, finding that analytical rubrics improve outcomes in both self-assessment and peer assessment among EFL students, particularly when rubrics address the full range of relevant writing criteria rather than focusing narrowly on grammar or mechanics. Yukio (1998) similarly found that structured guidance sheets substantially improved the consistency and depth of self-correction in EFL writing courses, reinforcing the rationale for the instrument-centered design adopted in this study.

2.5 Gaps in the Literature

Despite the breadth of existing research on feedback in ESL writing, several important gaps remain. Most published studies have been conducted in Western, East Asian, or Middle Eastern educational contexts, and their generalizability to South Asian settings with large class sizes, variable student preparation levels, and distinctive institutional cultures remains unclear. Pakistan presents a particularly important and underrepresented case, given that a substantial share of its tertiary population is educated through the medium of English yet faces significant challenges in developing academic writing proficiency. Few studies have directly compared structured peer feedback and structured self-correction within the same experimental framework, making systematic assessment of their relative effectiveness difficult. The present study addresses all three of these gaps.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study employed a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design with three intact classes assigned to distinct treatment conditions. Group A received structured peer feedback via a guideline manual, Group B conducted structured self-correction using the same manual adapted for individual use, and Group C served as the control group using conventional unguided editing. Quasi-experimental methods are well suited to educational research settings where random assignment of individual participants is neither logistically feasible nor pedagogically appropriate, as they allow researchers to exploit naturally occurring group structures while maintaining controlled comparability (Cresswell, 2000). The control condition reflected standard product-focused editing practice as typically found in Pakistani ESL writing classrooms, providing a realistic and contextually grounded baseline for comparison.

3.2 Participants and Sampling

Ninety sophomore students enrolled in a Functional English course at a private university in Karachi, Pakistan, participated in the study. Participants were drawn from three intact classes and distributed equally across groups (n = 30 per group). All participants followed an identical course curriculum using the same textbook and instructional materials. Students who demonstrated prior familiarity with the essay topics used in the study, or who displayed markedly superior writing ability in initial course assignments, were excluded to ensure baseline comparability. A pretest was administered to all groups and statistically verified for equivalence before the intervention began. Purposive sampling of intact classes preserved the ecological validity of the natural classroom environment and is consistent with the design logic of quasi-experimental educational research.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

3.3 Instruments

Three instruments were used in data collection: the structured guideline manual, a pretest essay task, and a posttest essay task. The guideline manual was developed in two parallel versions, one for peer evaluation and one for self-correction. Both addressed the same five dimensions of writing quality from Jacobs et al. (1981) and Weigle (2002): content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Response options included Mentioned, Not Mentioned, and Not Sure, with an open-ended comment space for additional observations. The manual was piloted with ten students of comparable background and revised based on usability feedback. Its Cronbach's alpha was 0.92. The pretest required a compare-and-contrast essay completed within 50 minutes, and the posttest required a classification essay. Both were scored using the ESL Composition Profile (Jacobs et al., 1981). Two independent raters scored all essays and resolved disagreements through discussion, with agreement defined as a maximum total discrepancy of five points or one point per dimension.

3.4 Procedure

All three groups participated in identical writing instruction covering classification, comparison-and-contrast, and exemplification essay types during the four sessions preceding the pretest. Instruction followed a process writing approach encompassing brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revision, and editing stages. Lesson plans were collected at the end of each session to ensure no group received supplementary instructional material. A questionnaire identified students who had practiced essay writing outside class; essays from these students were excluded from analysis. On the fifth day, all groups completed the pretest. Following the pretest, Group A engaged in structured peer review sessions, reading partner essays and completing the peer evaluation guideline manual for 40 minutes before revising their own drafts. Group B followed the same 40-minute protocol using the self-correction version of the manual. Group C reviewed their drafts without any structured instrument, using prior knowledge to identify errors within the same window. On the sixth day, all groups completed the posttest. Both original and revised drafts were submitted by Groups A and B for assessment.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Pretest Homogeneity

Before comparing posttest scores, the comparability of pretest scores across groups was verified using descriptive statistics and a one-way ANOVA. Table 1 presents descriptive data for pretest scores, and Table 2 presents the ANOVA results.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Pretest Scores by Group

Group	N	Mean	SD	SE	95% CI LB	95% CI UB	Min	Max
A	30	71.47	8.08	1.47	68.44	74.48	54	88
B	30	71.40	6.20	1.13	69.08	73.71	59	80
C	30	75.00	5.48	1.00	72.95	77.04	64	87
Total	90	72.62	6.82	0.72	71.19	74.05	54	88

Note. Group A = Peer Feedback; Group B = Self-Correction; Group C = Control. SD = Standard Deviation; SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Table 2
One-Way ANOVA for Pretest Scores

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	254.49	2	127.24	2.851	.060
Within Groups	3882.67	87	44.63		
Total	4137.16	89			

Note. The non-significant result (p = .060) confirms baseline equivalence across the three groups prior to intervention.

Group A had a pretest mean of 71.47 (SD = 8.08), Group B had a mean of 71.40 (SD = 6.20), and Group C had a mean of 75.00 (SD = 5.48). The ANOVA returned a non-significant result (F = 2.851, p = .060), confirming no statistically meaningful difference among groups at baseline. This equivalence is a prerequisite for valid posttest comparison, as it rules out pre-existing ability differences as a potential confounding variable.

4.2 Posttest Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA

Following the intervention, posttest scores were collected and analyzed. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for posttest scores, and Table 4 presents the ANOVA results.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Posttest Scores by Group

Group	N	Mean	SD	SE	95% CI LB	95% CI UB	Min	Max
A	30	81.06	5.61	1.02	78.97	83.16	62	89
B	30	80.83	4.53	0.83	79.14	82.52	71	89
C	30	73.86	6.34	1.16	71.50	76.23	62	87
Total	90	78.59	6.43	0.68	77.24	79.93	62	89

Note. Group A = Peer Feedback; Group B = Self-Correction; Group C = Control. SD = Standard Deviation; SE = Standard Error; CI = Confidence Interval.

Table 4
One-Way ANOVA for Posttest Scores

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1005.23	2	502.62	16.367	.000*
Within Groups	2671.68	87	30.71		
Total	3676.92	89			

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Note. * Statistically significant at $p < .001$. The significant F value (16.367) indicates substantial differences in posttest writing proficiency across the three groups.

Group A achieved a posttest mean of 81.06 (SD = 5.61), Group B achieved 80.83 (SD = 4.53), and Group C achieved 73.86 (SD = 6.34). The ANOVA returned a highly significant overall effect ($F = 16.367$, $p = .000$), confirming that the three groups differed substantially in posttest writing performance. A test for homogeneity of variances on posttest scores returned a significant result ($p = .042$), indicating that the assumption of equal variances across groups could not be met, an observation that informed the choice of post hoc test.

4.3 Post Hoc Analysis

Because the ANOVA indicated a significant overall group difference, post hoc comparisons were conducted to identify the specific group pairs responsible for that difference. Table 5 presents the full post hoc results.

Table 5
Post Hoc Analysis of Posttest Mean Scores (Tukey HSD)

Class (I)	Class (J)	Mean Diff (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% CI LB	95% CI UB
A	B	0.233	1.431	.985	-3.645	3.718
A	C	7.720*	1.404	.000	3.792	10.615
B	A	-0.233	1.431	.985	-3.718	3.645
B	C	6.970*	1.431	.000	3.558	10.382
C	A	-7.203*	1.431	.000	-10.615	-3.792
C	B	-6.960*	1.431	.000	-10.382	-3.558

Note. * The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. Group A = Peer Feedback; Group B = Self-Correction; Group C = Control.

The post hoc analysis revealed that Group A differed significantly from Group C (mean difference = 7.720, $p = .000$), and that Group B differed significantly from Group C (mean difference = 6.970, $p = .000$). By contrast, Group A and Group B did not differ significantly from each other (mean difference = 0.233, $p = .985$). These results indicate that both structured methods produced greater writing improvement than conventional unguided editing, and that the two structured approaches were equally effective as vehicles for writing development.

4.4 Findings by Research Question

In response to Research Question 1, students who received structured peer feedback (Group A) significantly outperformed control group students (Group C) on the posttest ($p = .000$). Group A improved from a pretest mean of 71.47 to a posttest mean of 81.06, a gain of approximately 9.6 points, compared to a negligible decline of approximately 1.1 points in Group C. In response to Research Question 2, students who conducted structured self-correction (Group B) similarly and significantly outperformed Group C ($p = .000$), improving from 71.40 to 80.83, a gain of approximately 9.4 points. In response to Research Question 3, no significant difference was found between Group A and Group B ($p = .985$), indicating that structured peer feedback and structured self-correction are equally effective when both are supported by detailed instructional guideline manuals.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Effectiveness of Structured Peer Feedback

The significant gains achieved by Group A relative to Group C confirm the effectiveness of structured peer feedback in improving Pakistani ESL students' essay writing proficiency. These findings align with Ganji (2009), who found peer correction to be the most effective feedback condition among Iranian IELTS candidates. They also align with Villamil and Guerrero (1998), who showed that structured peer suggestions were incorporated into final drafts. The results support Vygotsky's sociocultural framework. Students review peer essays against shared criteria. This process creates socially mediated learning. It strengthens understanding of essay organization. It improves idea development. It also improves language use for communicative purposes.

The structured guideline manual played a central mediating role. It specified evaluative categories for content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. This structure reduced superficial and inconsistent peer review, as noted by Fellag (2010). Students did not decide independently which areas to focus on. The instrument directed attention to all key dimensions of essay quality. This scaffolding likely explains why the gains in this study match or exceed those in studies using less structured approaches. The open-ended comment section also supported richer input. Students recorded observations that did not fit fixed categories. This preserved the depth of evaluative thinking.

The motivational and affective dimension also requires attention. Bolourchi and Soleimani (2021) found that peer feedback reduces writing anxiety and improves performance. This effect is especially relevant in Pakistan. Many students experience high anxiety in English academic writing. Peer evaluation reduces hierarchy in assessment. It lowers perceived pressure and increases willingness to engage with criticism. It also supports revision and encourages deeper engagement with feedback.

5.2 Effectiveness of Structured Self-Correction

The significant improvement achieved by Group B relative to Group C confirms the effectiveness of structured self-correction in improving writing proficiency when guided by a detailed instructional manual. These findings align with Hajimohammadi and Mukundan (2011), Wakabayashi (2013), and Srichanyachon (2014). Each study reports improved writing quality through structured self-assessment in EFL contexts. The self-regulated learning framework (Zimmerman, 2002) explains these results. The guideline criteria functioned as performance goals. The review process enabled self-monitoring. The revision stage supported reflection and adjustment of writing behavior.

Structured self-correction also supports metacognitive development. Students identify recurring error patterns in their own writing. They recognize stylistic habits. They also detect organizational weaknesses. Peer feedback highlights external problems. Self-correction requires internal detection of issues. This process increases cognitive engagement. Repeated cycles strengthen awareness across writing tasks. This awareness supports long-term improvement. Spiller (2012) also reports gains in academic independence and ownership of learning. These outcomes are especially important for undergraduate writers developing academic competence.

5.3 Comparative Effectiveness and Instructional Implications

One key finding is the lack of significant difference between Group A and Group B ($p = .985$). Both methods produce similar improvements when supported by structured guideline tools. This suggests that peer feedback and self-correction are equally effective under guided conditions.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Instructional choice therefore depends on contextual factors. These include class size, time allocation, student readiness, and course objectives.

Peer feedback suits large classrooms. It enables collaborative learning. It exposes students to alternative writing strategies. It also increases motivation through social interaction. Self-correction suits contexts where peer pairing is difficult. It also suits situations where independent reflection is prioritized. It strengthens autonomous revision skills. Instructors can also combine both methods across a course. This supports both collaboration skills and independent evaluative ability.

The lack of improvement in Group C is also significant. Students in this group received time for revision. Their performance remained largely unchanged. This shows that revision time alone does not ensure improvement. The structured guideline manual was the key factor. Without clear criteria, students focused on surface level edits. They did not engage in substantive revision. Time on task alone does not guarantee learning gains.

5.4 Contextual Considerations for Pakistani ESL Instruction

The Pakistani ESL context presents distinctive characteristics that make these findings particularly relevant and practically actionable. Large class enrollments in Functional English courses make individualized teacher feedback difficult to sustain across multiple drafts for all students. Peer feedback and self-correction offer scalable alternatives that distribute evaluative activity across the student body while simultaneously developing learners' metacognitive and analytical capacities. The guideline manuals used in this study were designed to be accessible and user-friendly, requiring no specialized training beyond a brief classroom introduction, which substantially enhances their feasibility for routine implementation within standard course structures.

The finding that structured feedback tools significantly outperform unguided editing in this context also has implications for teacher professional development and curriculum design. Many Pakistani ESL instructors have been trained primarily in product-focused approaches to writing assessment and may be unfamiliar with process-based pedagogies that embed feedback cycles within iterative drafting sequences. Pre-service and in-service teacher education programs could usefully incorporate instruction on the design, implementation, and evaluation of structured feedback instruments, equipping teachers to deploy both peer feedback and self-correction more effectively in their writing courses. At the curriculum level, guideline-based feedback activities could be formalized as assessed course components rather than optional supplements, ensuring that all students receive structured evaluative practice regardless of individual instructor preferences.

6. CONCLUSION

This study provides strong experimental evidence that structured peer feedback and structured self-correction improve the essay writing proficiency of Pakistani ESL undergraduates. These interventions operate through detailed guideline manuals. They outperform conventional unguided editing in measurable terms. The findings demonstrate clear gains in writing performance. These gains are consistent across structured instructional conditions. Both intervention methods produce equivalent and substantial improvements. Posttest means reach approximately 81 in both experimental groups. The control group records a mean of approximately 74. The difference between groups is statistically significant at the .001 level. The results also

represent meaningful improvements in essay writing quality. These improvements appear across the five dimensions assessed by the ESL Composition Profile.

For ESL practitioners working in Pakistan and comparable large-class university contexts, the findings offer a clear recommendation. They also provide a practical instructional resource. The structured guideline manual functions as the central enabling instrument. Revision activity without such structure produces minimal measurable improvement. This limitation appears even when students show motivation to improve their work. Teachers should integrate guideline based feedback cycles into writing curricula as a core instructional practice. They should not treat these cycles as optional enrichment activities. Teachers should also prepare students explicitly for the use of these instruments. Instruction in their application increases their effectiveness. Peer feedback and self-correction both remain viable instructional methods. Teachers can select between them based on contextual factors. These factors include class size, available instructional time, and learning objectives. Institutional conditions also shape this decision.

Several limitations of the study require acknowledgement. The sample comes from a single private university in Karachi. This limits the generalisability of findings to other institutional types. It also limits application to other geographic regions and student populations in Pakistan. The study measures short term writing gains across a single intervention cycle. It does not establish whether improvements persist over time. It does not determine whether gains transfer to other writing genres or tasks. It also does not confirm whether the gap between intervention and control groups remains stable or expands with continued practice. The study excludes students with very low baseline proficiency. This exclusion limits the applicability of findings to beginner level learners. Future research should extend investigation to a wider range of proficiency levels. It should also include diverse writing genres and instructional settings. Researchers should examine whether combining peer feedback and self-correction within a single drafting cycle produces additive or synergistic effects. Such effects may exceed those observed when either method is used alone.

REFERENCES

Andrade, H., and Du, Y. (2007). Student responses to criteria-referenced self-assessment. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 32(2), 159-181.

Bolourchi, M., and Soleimani, H. (2021). The impact of peer feedback on EFL learners' writing performance and writing anxiety. International Journal of Research in English Education, 6(1), 1-12.

Cresswell, A. (2000). Self-monitoring in student writing: Developing learner responsibility. ELT Journal, 54(3), 235-244.

Dheram, P. (1995). Feedback as a two-bullock cart: A case study of teaching writing. ELT Journal, 49(2), 160-168.

Fellag, L. R. (2010). Write ahead: From paragraph to essay. Pearson Education.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Flower, L., and Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365-387.

Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction, peer-correction and self-correction: Their impacts on Iranian students' IELTS essay writing performance. The Journal of Asia TEFL, 6, 117-139.

Hajimohammadi, R., and Mukundan, J. (2011). Impact of self-correction on extrovert and introvert students in EFL writing progress. English Language Teaching, 4(2), 161-168.

ISSN E: 2709-8273
ISSN P:2709-8265
JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND TESOL
JALT

Harmer, J. (2004). How to teach writing. Pearson Education.
Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7(3), 255-286.
Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. Language Teaching Research, 4(1), 33-54.
Jacobs, G., Curtis, A., Braine, G., and Huang, S.-Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7(3), 307-317.
Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., and Hughey, J. B. (1981). Testing ESL composition: A practical approach. Newbury House.
Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. Second Language Writing, 15, 65-79.
Maftoon, P., and Shirazi, M. A. (2010). The effect of focused vs. unfocused written corrective feedback on the use of conjunctions in EFL learners' writing. The Journal of Language Learning and Teaching, 1(1), 57-72.
Meletiadou, E. (2021). Exploring the impact of peer assessment on EFL students' writing performance. IAFOR Journal of Education, 9(3), 77-95.
Nation, I. S. P. (2008). Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing. Routledge.
Phuong, H. Y., Phan, Q. T., and Le, T. T. (2023). The effects of using analytical rubrics in peer and self-assessment on EFL students' writing proficiency. Language Testing in Asia, 13(1), 1-20.
Piaget, J. (1972). The psychology of the child. Basic Books.
Porto, M. (2001). Cooperative writing response groups and self-evaluation. ELT Journal, 55(1), 38-46.
Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. Oxford University Press.
Sebranek, P., Kemper, D., and Meyer, V. (1999). Writers Inc.: A student handbook for writing and learning. Great Source Education Group.
Spiller, D. (2012). Assessment matters: Self-assessment and peer assessment. The University of Waikato.
Srichanyachon, N. (2011). A comparative study of three revision methods in EFL writing. Journal of College Teaching and Learning, 8(9), 1-10.
Srichanyachon, N. (2014). EFL learners' perceptions and needs in developing English writing. Journal of Education and Practice, 5(9), 87-96.
Villamil, O. S., and Guerrero, M. C. M. (1998). Assessing the impact of peer revision on L2 writing. Applied Linguistics, 19(4), 491-514.
Vuogan, J., and Li, M. (2022). Examining the effectiveness of peer feedback in second language writing: A meta-analysis. Journal of Second Language Writing, 58, 100827.
Wakabayashi, R. (2013). The effects of peer feedback on the improvement of Japanese university students' English writing and motivation. Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 3(2), 251-281.
Weigle, S. C. (2002). Assessing writing. Cambridge University Press.
Yukio, T. (1998). Using guided self-correction in EFL writing classes. JALT Journal, 20(1), 24-38.
Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(2), 64-70.