



Exploring Peer Teaching Practices among EFL/ESL Teachers

Faeza Adnan Salih 

Department of scholarships and cultural relations, Presidency of the University of Baghdad, Iraq

faezasalih@uobaghdad.edu.iq

<https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v36i4.1888>

Received: 1 Sept 2024; **Accepted:** 18 Oct 2024; **Published:** December 30, 2025

Abstract

This This paper defines peer teaching as a teaching methodology in the context of ESL/EFL. It aims to demonstrate the relationship between the teacher and language learners in the classroom by overviewing the advantages, disadvantages, and challenges that washout peer teaching method effectively. The research study addresses Arthurson's themes, which include teaching skills, learning skills, student engagement and motivation, communication skills, preparation, and group work activities. The qualitative study hypothesizes whether or not the themes of peer teaching are statistically significant. The research instrument conducts a questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale to diagnose the descriptive data of peer teaching themes. Sixty-five EFL teachers from the University of Baghdad, University of Tikrit, and University of Soran in Iraq responded randomly. The findings of the quantitative research are of direct practical relevance. The peer teaching method applies to teaching skills ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.027$) and communication skills ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.967$) compared to the other themes. One-way ANOVA determines the statistical significance of the mean scores in the themes of peer teaching. Given this evidence, EFL teachers can track peer teaching because of its successful teaching outcome in teaching and communication skills to create a convenient environment for student interaction. The study suggests that novice teachers need to participate in extensive training courses in the future to ensure peer-teaching experience. It is crucial to investigate the learners' viewpoints towards this teaching method to reach valuable outcomes regarding students' experiences in EFL classrooms.

Keywords: communication skills, group work activities, learning skills, peer teaching, preparation, student engagement and motivation, teaching skills



استكشاف ممارسات التعليم بين الأقران لدى أساتذة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية أو كلغة ثانية

فائزة عدنان صالح 

قسم البعثات والعلاقات الثقافية، رئاسة جامعة بغداد، العراق

faezasalih@uobaghdad.edu.iq

<https://doi.org/10.36231/coedw.v36i4.1888>

تاريخ الإستلام: ٢٠٢٤/٩/١١، تاريخ القبول: ٢٠٢٤/١٠/١٨، تاريخ النشر الإلكتروني: ٢٠٢٥/١٢/٣٠

المستخلص:

يتناول هذا البحث مفهوم التعليم بين الأقران كمنهج تدريس في تخصص اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية أو كلغة ثانية ويهدف البحث إلى توضيح العلاقة بين المعلم ومتعلمي اللغة في الفصل الدراسي من خلال إلقاء نظرة عامة على المزايا والعيوب والتحديات التي تعترض طريقة التعليم بين الأقران بشكل فعال. تتناول الدراسة البحثية موضوعات أثرسون التي تتألف من مهارات التدريس ومهارات التعلم وإشراك الطلبة وتحفيزهم ومهارات الاتصال والإعداد وأنشطة العمل الجماعي. تفترض الدراسة النوعية ما إذا كانت موضوعات التعليم بين الأقران ذات دلالة إحصائية أم لا. أجريت الدراسة باستخدام الاستبانة كأداة للبحث من خلال مقياس ليكرت الخماسي لتحليل البيانات الوصفية لموضوعات التعليم بين الأقران. شملت عينة الدراسة خمسة وستون استاذاً ممن يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من جامعة بغداد وجامعة تكريت وجامعة سوران في العراق بشكل عشوائي. كما استخدم التباين الأحادي الاتجاه الأهمية الإحصائية لمتوسط الدرجات في موضوعات التعليم بين الأقران. أظهرت نتائج البحث وجود صلة مباشرة بين تطبيق طريقة التعليم بين الأقران ومهارات التدريس ومهارات الاتصال بالمقارنة مع الموضوعات الأخرى. كما بينت النتائج إن بإمكان معلم اللغة الإنجليزية لغة أجنبية مواكبة التطورات في طريقة التعليم بين الأقران بسبب نتائجها التعليمية الناجحة في مهارات التدريس ومهارات الاتصال لخلق بيئة ملائمة للتفاعل بين الطلبة. توصي الدراسة إلى أن المعلمين المبتدئين بحاجة إلى المشاركة في دورات تدريبية مكثفة في المستقبل القريب لضمان نجاح طريقة التعليم بين الأقران. بإمكان الباحثين إلى استقصاء وجهات نظر المتعلمين لمعرفة ردود فعلهم أراء تجربة هذه الطريقة للوصول إلى نتائج قيمة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: مهارات التواصل، فعاليات العمل الجماعي، مهارات التعلم، تعليم الأقران، التهيئة، مشاركة الطالب وتحفيزه، مهارات التدريس

1. Introduction

Peer teaching is a teaching method that aims to assess various notions through one-on-one interaction to enable language production. Peer teaching is also a set of procedures directed by the learners to negotiate with each other for meaningful communication (Bradford-Watts, 2011). Peer teaching is considered a learner-centered activity at public and private institutions. Peer teaching has been applied more extensively in schools rather than universities

(Lim, 2014). The teacher in peer teaching activities plays significant roles, such as listener, questioner, feedback provider, model, encourager and confidence-builder, motivator, referrer, team player, co-learner, thinker, and navigator. In most peer work classes, teachers divide learners into groups, move around to check learners' answers, and rarely intervene except when necessary (Baltzersen, 2024).

In developing learners' metacognitive skills, peer teaching consists of five phases: self-monitoring, self-evaluation, self-assessment, self-teaching, and teaching others. In addition, the dimensions of peer teaching are formal and informal. Formal peer teaching demands the teacher to use a lesson plan and state the order by specifying the roles and instructions for learners to work interactively in groups. On the other hand, informal peer teaching only requires the teacher to explain the roles and instructions to the peers while working simultaneously (Baltzersen, 2024).

Kalkowski (2001) specifies eight indications for peer teaching in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom: peer tutoring, cross-age tutoring, peer education, partner learning, peer learning, child-teach-child, learning through teaching, and mutual instruction. The advantages of peer teaching regarding study areas are improving competence, facilitating learning, developing learning skills separately, providing opportunities for improving communication, strengthening self-esteem, and enhancing the skills of group members and leadership (as cited in Bradford-Watts, 2011). On the contrary, the disadvantages of peer teaching include distraction and disrespect. Distraction is for peers who focus on something other than group work and lose interest in language. Disrespect stands for learners' feedback that the group members do not consider, whereas teachers' feedback is essential (Hensen, 2024). Corral (2018) recommended that group members in peer learning should participate equally in language production.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Key Words

2.1.1 The Significance of Peer Teaching

The primary purpose of teachers is to educate learners instead of following standardized school instructions. According to Wagner's perspective of peer teaching, the teacher empowers, arranges, and guides the course while learners are teaching each other using communication situations in formal and informal language (Ahmed, 2002). Furthermore, the improvement of one-on-one peer teaching is in pronunciation and fluency. Nevertheless, the improvement would likely increase academic achievement in higher education. Second, it is crucial to select the right and experienced teachers who are experts operating the classroom primarily by leaders of learners (Galullo, 2023).

Peer teachers need to comprehend first before delivering learning activities to the learners. The Vygotskian approach theorizes peer teaching by setting a comfortable environment to interact using language meaningfully. Bradford-Watts clarified that some EFL teachers or teachers of different study areas at colleges and universities have assisted learners in meeting the benefits of peer teaching. One mode applied in the first semester of English classes at universities is researching and instructing other learners about what is happening in a foreign country (2011).

Three main issues hinder the effectiveness of peer teaching: lack of language proficiency, presentation skills, and code-switching to the first language in EFL classrooms (Ahmed, 2002). Therefore, the role of the teacher is not only to provide information to the learners but also to get experience that affects learners' memory in action. In this case, the teacher must encourage learners to be involved in peer work (Baltzersen, 2024). In addition, Bradford-Watts (2011) indicated that the teacher's accountability is to make learners flexible in the class by selecting an exciting unit that has never been studied before and, at the same time, planning for the activities and tasks. Therefore, it is convenient to resume teachers and peer group practices outside the classroom because peer teaching does not represent teacher-student interaction.

The evaluation process of peer teaching involves the scores, the teacher, the group members, and self-reflection reports. Some learners favor teacher's feedback over learners' feedback. Other learners look for their responses. Long and Dougherty (2009) stated that training peers by giving feedback on lesson content and organization is crucial. In other cases, learners need help understanding the teacher's feedback or why they need to review. Peer teachers must be attentive to their peers' performative assessment (Ahmed, 2002).

In order to conceptualize peer teaching, it is essential to explore the following six themes specified by Arthurson (2021) that empower EFL educators to run through it:

2.1.2 Teaching Skills (TS)

Most teachers are likely to boast skills and expertise through setting the principles and methods from school instruction that address lesson planning, the learners' needs, and the elevation of teaching outcomes. The core skills need to be met with the objectives of the teaching-learning process. Rafeedalie (2003) stated that teachers function skills when they introduce lessons, explain or illustrate language skills with examples, or use school boards to solve problems.

2.1.3 Learning Skills (LS)

Teachers also stimulate learners to participate in group activities, discussions, and lectures, improve productive language fluency, or manage the classroom with positive reinforcement. The purpose of these skills is to build learners'

self-confidence and decision-making. Learning language skills is wider than developing language proficiency. Learners must adapt to everyday communication situations and understand that learning with peer's results in better knowledge and belonging (Rafeedalie, 2003).

2.1.4 Student Engagement and Motivation (SEM)

The success of peer teaching depends on the capacity to engage with others in the learning community. All students differ in the degree of motivation while learning the language. Gass, Behney, and Plonsky (2013) contended that unequal motivation does not affect the extent of failure or success of language learning. However, great interest in the literature research increased with motivation as a socio-psychological factor and a second predictor of language learning success. Motivation could be more straightforward. Gardner stated motivation into four manifestations: "goal, effortful behavior, a desire to attain the goal and favorable attitudes toward the activity in question." (1985, p. 50)

2.1.5 Communication Skills (CS)

The priority of peer teachers is to construct successful communication skills for EFL learners. What is the use of receiving information only from teachers without producing language skills effectively? Peer teaching improves communicative skills and builds learners' dependency. Peers must understand teachers' instructed language in speaking or writing to follow the directions. Learning in groups may be passive if few or no questions are asked, eventually leading to failure in developing communication skills between the teacher and the learners and vice versa.

2.1.6 Preparation (P)

Peer teachers must manage the class efforts and time that they need in shaping language lessons in the EFL context. It is crucial to consider the availability of knowledge, resources, and the implementation of toolkits or teaching aids that support peer teaching. Furthermore, learners have to be prepared for what the teachers assign to them, and they must pay special attention to their variety of background knowledge and social status.

2.1.7 Group Work Activities (GWA)

Group work activities allow EFL learners to play different roles, such as cooperators, leaders, and monitors. The teacher ensures that all the group members at different levels participate in the receptive and productive activities. Sharing knowledge is noteworthy in practicing language for active learning. If learners do not understand the teacher or their peers in assigned activities, they will ask for an explanation or restatement of what has been produced (Peregoy & Boyle, 2013).

Based on the literature review mentioned earlier in this section, the claims the following hypotheses:

H_0 : There is no statistically significant difference in the themes of peer teaching.

H_1 : There is a statistically significant difference in the themes of peer teaching.

2.2 Related Works

Andrew Bell founded peer teaching and originally structured a framework for peer tutoring in 1789. Next, Joseph Lancaster adapted peer teaching for the children learning at his school in 1801. Although he had suffered a sharp drop in financial assets, he treated it by constructing a system that replenished his school with teachers. Lancaster's system includes separated groups of learners and a teacher who provides instruction. Each group contains a general monitor who assesses his or her peers' performance in learning. The system has become successful when groups of learners respond to each other when learning mathematics.

In 1951, the Free University of Berlin defined "peer" as interaction between two learners of the same age and educational background. Conversely, Falchikov (2001) defined "peers" as interaction between two learners sharing similar social status and highlighted how this influences their interaction. Great attention has been paid to the peer teaching method from the 1960s till now. Not all schools were interested in Lancaster's system of peer teaching. Therefore, another system was established in 1969 to address learners' interests. Consequently, this system expanded to address the issue of low

achievement among learners and provided solutions for them (Ahmed, 2002). The negligence in teaching was present in Comenius's view of pedagogical learning. Baltzersen (2024) contends that rejecting that view is for two purposes. First of all, not all peer learners who reside in country-side schools share the exact learning needs due to the disparity of age. For instance, the older learner will lead the peers in learning groups, similar to the older son or daughter of a typical family who leads the other siblings, excluding the parents. However, urban school teachers select the most experienced learners to surpass learning conflicts. Second, the roles may switch for the teachers to be learners and learners to be teachers. Exchanging ideas between experienced teachers and learners would benefit if roles were directed from teacher-centered to learner-centered learning. Hattie (2009) clarified that it is significant to illuminate the experience for effective learning (as cited in Baltzersen, 2024).

Bradford-Watts (2024) stated three challenges when implementing the peer teaching method. The initial challenge would be time management and lesson planning. Members of the groups should plan their lessons efficiently. Therefore, the teacher must act as a monitor to treat any problem that may affect the learners' work tasks. The second challenge would be the changes in the members of the groups to be increased or decreased. Besides, reflections must be written by all the peers in the groups who are present. The third challenge would be that novice teachers may not support the success of peer teaching in the classroom—inexperienced teachers model peer teaching to gain knowledge from experienced teachers.

(Brady, Holt, and Welt, 2003). Although EFL learners provide various estimations for class planning, the role of an experienced teacher is significant in modifying the lesson, adjusting the time during practice, and supplying peers with what they need to know (Bradford-Watts, 2024).

3. The Analytical Part

3.1 Methodology of the Study

This study employed random sampling to collect data from sixty-five Iraqi teachers enrolled at the College of Education for Women and College of Education for Human Sciences/ Ibn Rushd at the University of Baghdad, College of Education for Human Sciences at the University of Tikrit, and College of Arts at the University of Soran. All native teachers have been teaching EFL at the English Department.

The research instrument conducted a questionnaire on a 5-point Likert scale including (1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= neutral, 4=agree, and 5=strongly agree). The items of each theme were tested in the quantitative experimental studies of Ahmed (2002), Rafeedalie (2003), Bradford-Watts (2011), Gass, Behney, and Plonsky (2013), Peregoy & Boyle (2013), Corral

(2018), (Galullo, 2023), Bradford-Watts (2024), and Hensen (2024) to investigate the concept of peer teaching as a teaching methodology.

The adapted items of the above-mentioned studies in the questionnaire involved the views of the targeted participants who responded voluntarily. In order to check whether or not the content of research instrument is relevant and valid, it is important to ensure that the items within Arthurson's themes (2021) conceptualize peer teaching. Thirty-three items of peer teaching were distributed in six themes: teaching skills, learning skills, student engagement and motivation, communication skills, preparation, and group work activities. Each theme consisted of five to seven items arranged in order of importance. The themes were counterbalanced, and the duration of data collection lasted three months, starting in June 2024. IBM Statistical Package for Social Software (SPSS) version 24 calculated the statements of the experimental study.

3.2 Data Analysis

The demographic data of the sample in Table 1 shows that the majority of respondents were aged between 35 to 44 years. On the other hand, it showed that the female group peaked compared to the male group. As for academic degree and rank, most respondents were Assistant Instructors and Instructors holding MA degrees in English Language and literature. An increase in teaching experience of responses ranged between six to ten years.

Table (1)

Demographic data of Respondents at the Universities of Baghdad, Tikrit, and Soran

Demographic	Group	Frequency	Percentage
Age	25-34	20	30.8
	35-44	25	38.5
	More than 45	20	30.7
Gender	Male	25	38.5
	Female	40	61.5
Academic Degree	MA	50	23.1
	PhD	15	76.9
Academic Rank	Assistant Instructor	30	46.1
	Instructor	20	30.7
	Associate Professor	10	15.3
	Professor	5	7.9
Years of Experience	1-5	10	15.4
	6-10	30	46.2
	11-15	5	7.7
	16-20	15	23.1
	More than 21	5	7.6
Total		65	100%

Moreover, measuring the internal consistency of the items in each category is critical. Table 2 demonstrates the coefficient scale of themes of peer teaching abbreviated from the initials (TS), (LS), (SEM), (CS), (P), and (GWP). The reliability coefficient is acceptable when it is higher than 0.70. According to Tavakol and Dennick (2011) and Statistical Methods and Data Analytics at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) (2024), the number of items increases the average of Cronbach's Alpha for it shows the positive correlation towards each other and vice versa. Thus, the overall average of all items resulted in 0.972, which is significantly reliable.

Table (2)
Reliability Resolution of Peer Teaching

Theme	Abbreviation	Number of Items	Validity
Teaching Skills	TS	7	0.896
Learning Skills	LS	5	0.829
Student Engagement and Motivation	SEM	5	0.890
Communication Skills	CS	5	0.860
Preparation	P	6	0.904
Group Work Activities	GWA	5	0.789
Reliability Resolution		33	0.972

Table 3 shows the statistical values of the seven items of TS. The first item (peer teaching is a beneficial teaching method) ranked tremendously high ($M=3.85$, $SD= 0.775$), followed by the third item (peer teaching facilitates the process of language teaching) ($M=3.77$, $SD= 0.702$). Relative results occurred between the fourth item (peer teaching gives me different pedagogical options in their education) ($M=3.46$, $SD= 1.226$) and the fifth item (Practicing peer teaching promotes my professional development) ($M=3.46$, $SD= 1.017$). Concerning the Sixth item (It is easy for me to learn how to work with students in separate groups), it dropped off extremely ($M=3.38$, $SD= 1.454$).

Table (3)
Descriptive Statistics of Teaching Skills (n=65)

N	Items	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Peer teaching is a beneficial teaching method.	25	3.85	0.775
2	Knowing peer teaching is very important.	40	3.69	0.727
3	Peer teaching facilitates the process of language teaching.	45	3.77	0.702
4	Peer teaching gives me different pedagogical options in their	30	3.46	1.226

	education.			
5	Practicing peer teaching promotes my professional development.	35	3.46	1.017
6	It is easy for me to learn how to work with students in separate groups.	20	3.38	1.454
7	I am willing to learn how to implement peer teaching in my lessons.	20	3.46	1.288

The statistical values of LS in Table 4 indicate that the first item (peer teaching allows my students to learn subject content) reached a peak ($M=3.46$, $SD= 1.091$) and aligned with the second item (peer teaching helps my students to solve problems in language learning) relatively ($M=3.46$, $SD= 1.017$). Concerning the third item (peer teaching puts students' work first rather than the teacher's practice), it rose steadily ($M=3.15$, $SD= 1.240$), unlike the fourth item (selected students as leaders are chosen based on their age), it decreased sharply ($M=2.31$, $SD= 0.999$).

Table (4)

Descriptive Statistics of Learning Skills (n=65)

N	Items	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alternative Percentage	Rank
1	Peer teaching allows my students to learn subject content.	25	3.46	1.091	84.6	First
2	Peer teaching helps my students to solve problems in language learning.	35	3.46	1.017	92.3	Second
3	Peer teaching puts students' work first rather than the teacher's practice.	25	3.15	1.240	84.6	Third
4	Selected students as leaders are chosen based on their age.	25	2.31	0.999	84.6	Fifth
5	Selected students as monitors are chosen based on their high achievement of language Proficiency.	25	3.15	1.107	92.3	Fourth

As can be seen from Table 5 in the analysis of SEM, the fifth item (my

students admit their uncertainty about the organization of lesson planning) reached an upward trend ($M=3.69$, $SD= 0.917$) in comparison with the third item (peer teaching is more engaging and interactive for my learners)

($M=3.46$, $SD= 0.502$) and the second item (peer teaching encourages my students to ask questions and participate in my lessons) ($M=3.38$, $SD= 1.085$). Moreover, a dramatic fall leveled in the fourth item (my students feel comfortable in the classroom) ($M=2.92$, $SD= 1.005$).

Table (5)

Descriptive Statistics of Student Engagement and Motivation (n=65)

N	Items	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alternative Percentage	Rank
1	Peer teaching addresses my students' learning needs.	25	3.15	1.107	84.6	Fourth
2	Peer teaching encourages my students to ask questions and participate in my lessons.	25	3.38	1.085	92.3	Third
3	Peer teaching is more engaging and interactive for my learners.	25	3.46	0.502	84.6	Second
4	My students feel comfortable in the classroom.	35	2.92	1.005	53.8	Fifth
5	My students admit their uncertainty about the organization of lesson planning.	25	3.69	0.917	88.9	First

Regarding the statistical analysis of CS in Table 6, the third item (peer teaching helps my students to improve their English language skills) is increasingly marked ($M=3.69$, $SD= 0.999$), which is relative to the first item (peer teaching improves my students' communication skills) ($M=3.69$, $SD= 0.917$). In addition, a noticeable decrease reached the fifth item (my students understand the feedback provided to them) ($M=3.23$, $SD= 0.897$).

Table (6)*Descriptive Statistics of Communication Skills (n=65)*

N	Items	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alternative Percentage	Rank
1	Peer teaching improves my students' communication skills.	45	3.69	0.917	92.3	Second
2	Peer teaching enhances my student's meta-cognitive skills.	25	3.46	0.937	84.6	Fourth
3	Peer teaching helps my students to improve their English language skills.	35	3.69	0.999	84.6	First
4	Peer teaching is effective when asking my students questions.	35	3.62	1.085	84.6	Third
5	My students understand the feedback provided to them.	30	3.23	0.897	53.8	Fifth

P can be calculated from Table 7 that the fourth item (peer teaching is effective when dividing my students into groups) increased ($M=3.54$, $SD=1.017$), which is relative to the sixth item (leaders of the group may prioritize my instructions) ($M=3.54$, $SD=0.937$). A gradual drop occurred in the second item (I usually move around the groups without discussing with my students) ($M=2.92$, $SD=0.835$).

Table (7)*Descriptive Statistics of Preparation (n=65)*

N	Items	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alternative Percentage	Rank
1	Peer teaching saves my time and energy.	35	3.31	1.211	92.3	Fifth
2	I usually move around	35	2.92	0.835	76.9	Sixth

	the groups without discussing with my students.					
3	I explain the roles of my students in peer teaching.	40	3.46	0.849	38.5	Fourth
4	Peer teaching is effective when dividing my students into groups.	40	3.54	1.017	92.3	First
5	Peer teaching is effective when giving them instructions to work together.	40	3.46	1.160	92.3	Third
6	Leaders of the group may prioritize my instructions.	35	3.54	0.937	92.3	Second

The statistical value of GWA in Table 8 showed a slight increase in the third item (I supervise my students directly when working in groups) ($M=3.46$, $SD= 1.057$) and the first item (All students participate equally in my lessons) ($M=3.23$, $SD= 0.981$). On the contrary, the second item (My students are flexible enough to work with each other inside and outside the classroom) declined sharply ($M=2.92$, $SD= 0.835$), unlike the fourth item (my students can exchange their knowledge after training with their leaders) ($M= 3.00$, $SD= 0.968$).

Table (8)

Descriptive Statistics of Group Work Activities (n=65)

N	Items	Frequency	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alternative Percentage	Rank
1	All students participate equally in my lessons.	30	3.23	0.981	84.6	Second
2	My students are flexible enough to work with each other inside and outside the classroom.	35	2.92	0.835	76.9	Fifth

3	I supervise my students directly when working in groups.	25	3.23	1.057	92.3	First
4	My students can exchange their knowledge after training with their leaders.	25	3.00	0.968	61.5	Fourth
5	I usually provide feedback to my students at the end of the course about lesson planning and organization of subject material.	35	3.15	1.361	92.3	Third

Concerning whether or not themes of peer teaching significantly differ in mean scores, it is essential to check the overall means of its group items. As indicated in Table 9, the mean score of TS escalated tremendously ($M=3.58$, $SD= 1.027$), followed by CS ($M=3.53$, $SD= 0.967$), whereas a gradual decrease estimated in the other mean scores of P, SEM, GWA, and LS.

Table (9)
Overall Means of Peer Teaching themes

Abbreviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
TS	3.58	1.027
LS	3.10	1.090
SEM	3.24	0.982
CS	3.53	0.967
P	3.37	1.001
GWA	3.10	1.040

Thompson and Kim (2024) indicated that the linear model of One-Way ANOVA to English medium instruction, specific EFL and ESL learners, determines whether all means of the same population are distributed normally. Table 10 shows a statistically significant difference at the $p<0.05$ level (Sig. =0.012). Furthermore, the actual difference in mean scores between groups ($M= 241$) and within groups ($M= 0.066$) was apparent. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected because there is a statistically significant difference in the themes of peer teaching, and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Table (10)*ANOVA of Peer Teaching themes (n=65)*

Abbreviation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Between Groups	1.204	5	241	3.635	0.012
Within Groups	1.788	27	0.066		
Total	2.992	32			

4. Discussion

The study has explored EFL teaching practice within the concept of peer teaching. The hypothesis addressed in this paper is whether the concept of peer teaching shows statistically significant differences in the mean scores. The findings provide valuable insights derived from Arthurson's themes for testing the advantages (Kalkowski, 2001; Bradford-Watts, 2011; Baltzerrsn, 2024), disadvantages (Corral, 2018; Hensen, 2024), and challenges (Ahmed, 2002; Bradly et al., 2003; Bradford-Watts, 2024) of peer teaching. They also raise essential statements for further investigation.

Although Iraqi EFL instructors conveyed different levels of scientific ranking within TS, they contend that lessons learned from peer teaching shift their focus to training learners to work in groups rather than individually. It also supports the views of Ahmed (2002) and Rafeedalie (2003) that the teacher's responsibility is to facilitate the language-teaching process. However, it is challenging because the diversity of teaching experiences may not reach successful peer teaching, particularly novice teachers (Bradly et al., 2003; Bradford Watts, 2024). Only 25 respondents out of Sixty-Five believe that peer teaching is beneficial. The study suggests extensive training courses for future teachers to experience peer teaching.

While studies emphasize the teacher's objective for educating learners rather than following learning standards and instructions, the literature provides evidence in LS as to Arthurson (2021) that teaching is notably demanding in learning subject content and solving language problems. The research findings should foster learners' active participation in language learning in the first place but not gaining teaching expertise (Rafeedalie, 2003). Moreover, leadership skills strengthen learners' personal development through peer-to-peer learning (Kalkowski, 2001; Galullo, 2023). From educators' perspectives, age and achievement of language proficiency are not their primary concerns in implementing units of peer teaching. This

means that they contradict Falchikov's school system of peer teaching, because learners' age and developmental cognition do affect interaction.

Concerning the lesson planning structure of peer teaching, most SEM respondents wonder if all lessons achieve the same status as English language learning. The most important findings on learners' motivation are also compatible with the studies of Baltzersen (2024) and Gass, Behney, and Plonsky (2013), who regard motivation as a second priority and an essential component of peer teaching. The findings of learners' interaction from the perspective of educators contradict Baltzersen's view (2024) that more than interaction is needed for learners to meet their needs. The teacher should also indirectly encourage them to work together to sustain successful peer learning. Regardless of the inequality of motivation, it is significant to mention that interaction is separated into groups, where each group includes one leader or monitor, and other peers may exchange their comprehensive knowledge of subject content, skills, and experience in the classroom. This approach would center learners as teachers (Kalkowski, 2001; Lim, 2014) and not involve language instructors directly participating in peer learning (Ahmed, 2002).

Considering the results of CS, EFL teachers in Iraq prioritize peer teaching to improve learners' language and communication skills. Kalkowski (2001) highlighted that interactive communication necessitates improving language skills in listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Rafeedalie (2003) believed that learners' communication ability depends on increasing proficiency beyond language skills. Bradford-Watts (2011) corresponded with these perspectives, contending that a failure to produce meaningful communication could occur without these characteristics. The effectiveness of ongoing language use depends on how learners understand their language teacher in maintaining written and spoken instructions and their peers asking questions or stating responses for group discussion. Moreover, less than half of teachers' responses are consistent with Long and Doughtry's (2009) notion that language learners understand teachers' feedback about the content and organization of the lesson. By addressing that aspect, the research suggests investigating the impact of teacher's feedback on peer learners and increasing training for the effectiveness of peer feedback.

Concerning the teacher's role as a peer teacher, the outcomes of P confirm that the main principle for the effectiveness of peer teaching is to divide learners into groups of peers, and all peer groups work

together as a result of the leader's instruction (Baltzersen, 2024). Several limitations need addressing. The results do not indicate whether a teacher's discussion with leaders and peers affects his or her preparation for achieving learning outcomes. Besides, more than half of the respondents need to consider time management, stress management, the teachers' movement inside the classroom, and teaching efforts in maintaining peer teaching, which is incompatible with the challenges stated by Bradford-Watts (2011). Implementing peer teaching can face several limitations.

The findings of GWA highlight teachers' supervision and learners' equal participation in the first place. This notion corresponds with Corral's recommendation (2018) of involving peer learners in the GWA language learning process. Hence, the effectiveness of peer teaching demands a teacher's supervision in the classroom to involve all learners of different language proficiency, communicative skills, and background knowledge (Ahmed, 2002). Moreover, further studies must be conducted to train leaders to monitor their peer groups to process knowledge exchange. In addition, not all learners agree to work with peers, whether learning takes place inside or outside the classroom. Most respondents oppose the idea that learners feel flexible towards GWA.

Lastly, the comprehensive results of data analysis using One-Way ANOVA show that the difference in the mean scores of TS and CS are highly associated with peer teaching among the other themes. Besides, the results confirmed the alternative hypothesis that the difference in the themes of peer teaching was statistically significant.

5. Conclusion

Peer teaching supports teachers' practice in exploring students' language skills and makes the teaching technique more productive. Regarding peer-to-peer interaction, communication is meaningful when it is reachable among learners. By exploring the themes of Arthurson to conceptualize peer teaching as a schooling practice among Iraqi EFL teachers in the classroom, this study established that highly TS, LS, SEM, CS, P, and GWP do indeed have a significant difference in the mean scores of peer teaching, with an increase in the mean scores of TS and CS. The results suggest that it would be interesting to investigate the learners' perceptions and attitudes towards peer teaching in EFL classrooms. It is also essential to consider the feasible challenges that may hinder the power of implementing peer teaching. Future studies must explore how peer teaching affects student interaction and empowers learning skills.

References

- Ahmad, B. E. (2002). Peer teaching as a methodology to teach grammar: A case study. *Gading Jurnal Akademik*, 1(7). 168-182. Retrieved from <https://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/37992/1/37992.PDF>
- Arthurson, D. (2021). Student's opinions about peer teaching. *Journal of multilingual pedagogy and practice*, 1, 29-43. https://rikkyo.repo.nii.ac.jp/record/20567/files/JMPP_01_07.pdf
- Baltzersen, R.K. (2024). *Effective use of collective peer teaching in teacher education: maximizing student learning* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003403586>
- Bradford-Watts, K. (2011). Students teaching students? Peer teaching in the EFL classroom in Japan. *The Language Teacher*, 35(5), 31–35. <https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTTLT35.5-3>
- Brady, E. M., Holt, S. R., & Welt, B. (2003). Peer teaching in lifelong learning institutes. *Educational Gerontology*, 29(10), 851–868. <https://doi.org/10.1080/716100364>
- Corral, J. (2018). *The impact of a peer- teaching instructional approach on a student's self- confidence*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4926>
- Falchikov, N., (2001) *Peer Tutoring in Higher Education*, Routledge: Falmer. London.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social Psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold London.
- Gass, S. M., Behney, B. & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second Language Acquisition*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Hansen, J. (2024). *Peer Learning: Overview, benefits, and models: Western Governors University*. <https://www.wgu.edu/blog/peer-learning2208.html>
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge
- Kalkowski, P. (2001). *Peer and cross-age tutoring. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory School Improvement Research Series*. <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/9/c018.html>
- Lim, L. L. (2014). A case study on Peer-Teaching. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 2, 35-40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/jss.2014.28006>

- Long, M. H. & Doughty, C. J. (2009). *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics, *John Wiley & Sons*. West Sussex: UK.
- Peregoy, S. F. & Boyle, O. F. (2013). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL*. Pearson Education Inc.: New Jersey.
- Rafeedalie, E. A. (2003). *Teaching Skills for Effective Teaching & learning*. *E-resource Committee*. Retrieved from <https://manuu.edu.in/sites/default/files/202304/Teaching%20Skills%20for%20Effective%20Teaching%20%26%20Learning.pdf>
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International journal of medical education*, 2, 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
- Thompson G., & Kim, V. (2024). Investigating differences between groups: Using ANOVA in EMI research. In S. M. Curle & J. Pun (Eds.), *Researching English Medium instruction: Quantitative methods for students and researchers* (pp. 27-39). Cambridge University press.
- UCLA: *Advanced research computing*. (2024). Retrieved from <https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/sas/modules/introduction-to-the-features-of-sas>