



# International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

*(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)*



**Impact Factor: 9.864**

**Volume 9, Issue 5, May 2026**



# Fostering Essay Writing Skills Development through Group Discussions and Process-Oriented Approach

**Krishnamuraju P B Simhula, Dr. Radha Devi Vadapalli, Ramakrishna Veeramalla, P. Mercy Miriam**

Research Scholar, AU College of Engineering(A), Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh & Asst. Professor of English,  
Dept. of English, Gayatri Vidya Parishad College of Engineering(A), Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Research Supervisor, AU College of Engineering(A), Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh & Professor of English, Dr.  
Lankapalli Bullayya College of Engineering(A), Vishakapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Research Scholar, AU College of Engineering(A), Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh & Asst. Professor of English,  
Dept. of English, Shri Vishnu College of Pharmacy, Bhimavaram, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Research Scholar, AU College of Engineering(A), Andhra University, Andhra Pradesh & Asst. Professor of English,  
Dept. of English, Dr. Lankapalli Bullayya College, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.

**ABSTRACT:** The study explores the students' experience of a well-planned group discussion and the use of process approach in writing. The study employed a case study approach with a qualitative analysis to investigate the relationship of group discussion and process approach. This study aimed at understanding how the learner makes experience and sense participation in group discussion and process approach in different stages of essay writing. In addition, the research investigated how using process approach together with carefully structured group discussion can enhance teaching writing. Data was generated from 10 participants who were involved in group discussion for essay writing and use of process approach in writing such as planning, writing first draft, peer feedback and revising draft through critical oriented interview. The students utilize the discussion space to explore, clarify, and negotiate their ideas and understanding. They have an opportunity to express and listen to the opinions of others. These all process help the students to become more conscious and critical toward the topic. The process approach aided learners in altering their perspective of writing. This also reduces their fear and anxiety when writing a difficult essay in one go. It provided them an idea that revision is a tool to rethink not correct. By employing the process approach, students have developed confidence. They also learn to become more critical, got motivated to write and developed ownership over their text. The research results showed that the group. By advancing our understanding how social interaction and recursive writing processes sustain essay writing development, this study on voices of learners adds invaluable insight.

**KEYWORDS:** Essay writing development; group discussion; process-oriented writing; qualitative research; peer interaction.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In a tightly argued article, Murray (1984) draws attention to the discrepancy between what student essay writing is often assumed to involve on the one hand, namely thinking and learning, and on the other, students' actual classroom experience, which is often one of 'powerless isolation' (p.17). Consequently, Murray presents the group as a form of work which may produce a stronger ideal of academic writing in advanced secondary and tertiary contexts. Diagnosing Murray may seem in the first instance both outdated and irrelevant to UK and international contexts in ELT. With their longstanding, broad-spectrum support for writing as a process, UK and international ELT writing materials have widely endorsed the notion of writing as a process (Aljasir, 2025). Many other academic disciplines have long promoted student group discussion in essay writing contexts. Furthermore, Murray's analysis mostly overlooks the usefulness and relevance of peer feedback, which is a good adjunct to group peer discussion, but has shown to become established



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

in many writing classrooms. The support of materials writers for process writing could be due to the conventional approach, not based on field research assessments (Mushtaq et al., 2021).

When placed within a process approach to writing whereby planning, drafting, revising and reflecting become common concerns, these discussions stop being mere pre-writing activities. They become constant scaffolds of intellectual engagement across a broad range of compositional episodes (Graham & Perin, 2007). Similar to other researchers' findings, talk enables negotiation and articulation of rhetorical choices and audience awareness, and maintaining a critical stance towards these during composing and before committing to writing. Research into the nature of writing appraisal shows that feedback conversation can lower anxiety by politicizing authority and thus depersonalizing judgment. It normalizes struggle (as everyone faces one before succeeding) This encourages the emotional engagement of participants in the review process, which makes use of revision, rejection and defence (Bruffee, 1984). To sum it up, essay writing can never be theorized outside the social interaction in which the meaning of what is to be written are generated. In spite of their acceptance, the combined potential of the collaborative and process-based pedagogies of writing to facilitate the development of essay writing has not been widely investigated.

In circumstances where the conditions of writing pedagogy are mainly textbook-centric, the feedback is basically a one-way interaction student and teacher, and examination-driven imperatives continues to rule the roost, this is so (El Ouidani & Madaoui, 2024). According to the cognitive theories of writing that gained popularity in the 1970s and 1980s, writing is a process that is not always linear (Flower and Hayes 1981). Basically, a writer often moves between the different operations to compose. Nonetheless, when processes are used in isolation, there is no real interaction which risks busywork routines; clear at each point to writers what is to be achieved, this cannot always be done without help. Group conversations acknowledge the socially interactive character of learning (Feng, 2025). Sociocultural situations are guiding a lot of research into educational dialogue classroom interaction. Through this perspective, learning is defined as taking part in a process of making meaning where all parties have status and work to negotiate understandings (Vygotsky, 1978). Conceptual conflict or dissonance could trigger learning which is achieved through notion of participation in interaction.

Whenever students write, they don't simply take on other people's revision of a text; they come to reconstitute how they might think about writing from a private and isolated struggle to a shared and distributed practice (Edwards & Mercer, 1987). Group discussions help students realize the gap in their knowledge. They help them borrow and build perspectives that they cannot verbalize by themselves. Besides, students learn to articulate in specialized terms otherwise unreachable by them (Mercer & Littleton, 2007; Moussaoui, 2024). A process-oriented approach aids student in reconceptualising revision involving reconsideration instead of correction so as to reinforce in them a tendency to go back to a text to consider new or more profound ideas generated in the discussion (Robillos & Namwong, 2021). Prior research often characterizes collaborative discussion and process writing as contrasting intervention options that are complementary but not combined or deliberately merged, and their impact on the further development of essay writing in real-life teaching settings involves skill, which is not studied much, however. The objective of this study is to find out how collaborative group discussions and a process-oriented approach contribute to the purposeful blending of both on school students' academic essay development.

### II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND GAP

Research on teaching essay writing has increasingly challenged product-oriented pedagogy for obscuring the processes by which expertise develops. Important early cognitive models of writing are responsible for a sea change in writing research. Psycholinguists made a key conjecture that the writing is not purely an act of transcription and the Flower and Hayes (1981), in particular, will be re-conceptualising it. Writing includes various other processes: "Planning" to include the writing of ideas upon paper; "Revising". The impact of the characterization of cognitive processes in writing, as formerly realised by Hayes, has served as a major cornerstone for the process writing pedagogy. This process writing pedagogy has made drafting, giving feedback and re-drafting the key activities when teaching students to write (Chan, 2025). Subsequent research has greatly broadened this view to emphasize the role of metacognition. The monitoring and controlling of strategies are always on the mind of competent writers, as per Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987). The strategies that less proficient writers use, however, demonstrate purely surface level concerns.



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Writing instruction based on process along with the instructional context of class room has been cognizant of theological of the classroom context. When students are offered extensive writing opportunities, their engagement with the content in the classroom increases. Moreover, they gain many other benefits from these opportunities. Students are willing to change their writing in a process-oriented environment that shows a better coherence in their essays (Irgin & Bilki, 2024). This is because there is a considerable amount of research evidence that the process approach to writing is an important one in classrooms. Turago et al. (2023) discusses the different kinds of writing processes and how doing things in the right order can help you achieve success. Types of non-linear fundamental writing processes. whether writing a complex mass communication essay or just some text on the mobile phone, people engage in various non-linear processes. The specific writing genre will influence the strategies and techniques we use to approach this 'pre-writing' or planning process (Chen, 2024).

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework that was developed to help people in teaching and learning. It is a model based on scientific studies and proven facts of how different humans learn. While the expression has always applied to everything – school design; playgrounds; computers; teaching – in this context, it is curriculum design. Demonstration is when an observer sees the instructor perform the task so that the observer learns to perform the task himself. Thus, this technique bridges the gap between a novice and an expert (Din et al., 2021). It is possible for an instructor to complete the task in an untidy manner and in no efficient way such that the observer may emulate it. This is the reason that writing is a cognitive process. More than 20 years ago, somewhere Hayes and Flower proposed their model of the writing process. It is essentially saying that the writing process consists of a set of three processes i.e. planning, translating and reviewing. As per them, the events take place in the mind of the writer; it involves countless processes (Rahimi, 2024; Khayrullayeva, 2025).

Collaborative learning is an important new vocabulary in literacy education (Gonzalez, 2002). According to Bruffee (1984), when students participate in collaborative learning, they are participating in the conversation of mankind. This means that instead of just learning to write in a vacuum through isolated disconnected pieces of writing, students develop writing knowledge and skills by responding to the ideas and arguments of others. Furthermore, additional research has confirmed Bruffee's assertion empirically (Wang, 2024). When students engage in interactions with their peers, as opposed to the teacher, while planning and revising more complex arguments about their topics or text organization, their writing skills are superior (Storch, 2013). Thus, in Donato's (1994) notion of collective scaffolding, learners together perform a task that they currently cannot do independently. Students' discussions of writing during discussion processes illustrates this clearly. In other words, students who feedback may benefit just as much, if not more, as the students who receive, and this is in regard to heightened awareness of their own writing and better critical judgement (Storch, 2013). When it comes to writing, there has been considerable literature on the group discussion process and process approaches to writing. Nonetheless, many seem to be independent interventions occurring concurrently. Research concerning the investigation is relatively scarce (Rakhimova, 2025).

This study answers calls for coding schemes to help investigate writing development as both a cognitive and a social process. It does this by bringing together knowledge from cognitive process theory and sociocultural dialogue research and applying it to the analysis of writing data. Recent views on what effective essay writing instruction entails support this integrative approach. The instruction of essay writing must be conceived as dialogic spaces over top strategies and stages. Within the spaces of knowledge, thinking, questioning and revising can be actively negotiated.

### III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### Research Design

The research employs a qualitative research design and relies on interpretive paradigm. The selection of the design is on account of the fact that the investigation deals with essay writing and group discussions as a teaching practice process. Comprehending the process of teaching practice will aid the learners in essay writing. We cannot consider the essay writing process under any score or rubrics. Thus, this research design is more appropriate because researchers are interested in meaning and perception. The reason writing is largely considered a non-linear activity is that it is an evolving cognitive and social event. A qualitative design is the most appropriate for a question considering how learners interpret their engagement with talk in the group, how cycles of revision feedback exert towards effects over time and how learners come to make sense of this over time. According to Denzin and Lincoln, a qualitative approach is suitable since it allows the researcher to consider nuance, contradiction and change.



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Semi-structured interviews are the main method of this design. The reason for choosing this method will help the interviewee get some sort of guidance from this set of questions. At the same time, the use of these questions allows them to express their own views in their own terms. The design construction is heavily reliant on the mind in society. Learning does not signify mental activity. Instead, it is a process which makes it possible for us to interact and communicate with the environment. In turn, we learn to solve problems through this process. This is the key learning theory.

### Research Approach

The qualitative research approach was chiefly drawn from more interpretivist and constructivist traditions, which require the researcher to “get inside the other person’s mind” and look at the world in the way they do. Due to the nature of the problem under examination, a qualitative approach was warranted in the current study; how learners construe and negotiate the development of essay writing, through group-discussion and process-genre pedagogy. One more reason is the foregrounding of writing as an activity with meaning, on which individual and interactional, prior and contextual expectations are brought to bear (Hyland, 2003, p. 9). Engaging in writing means using writing not as a neutral and decontextualized skill for the production of texts, but as a meaning-making activity for knowledge construction. Thus, this method of research gives priority to the words of participants and prevents limiting the context of the study. It is an effective way of determining how learners take up, resist or rewrite pedagogical practices. The information gathered through interviews and document analysis reveals how participants become enmeshed in institutional and discursive practices without being simple vehicles of governmental and pedagogical logic. The interviews gave the students opportunities to work together in order to reflect on the teamwork and discuss their goals and expectations. This collaborative work helped the students to experience teamwork. It is a crucial component of essay writing assignments.

The qualitative approach allows the researcher to focus on processual change, whereby changes in participants’ views and strategies can be documented throughout the entire process, rather than ‘freezing’ developments at one moment in time. This sensitivity to temporality aligns well with process-oriented writing pedagogy, which embodies a recursive and developmental conception of writing (Flower & Hayes, 1981). Through utilizing this approach, the present study is not claiming to generalize statistically; rather, it seeks to develop insights that are rich in analytic force, which may be used subsequently in the generation of theory and practice. The necessity of one must be highly studied through the collaborative dialogue and essay writing development that is transferable that process approach brings about.

### Sample Size

The qualitative research is undertaken on a small sample, which is deliberate, and which indicates a study unit rather than a large sample. Due to participant selection for ongoing analysis, the study involved a small sample size. Creswell (2013) mentions that the sample is adequate not on the basis of numbers but on the basis of generation of appropriate data. To attempt to pursue a large sample for a qualitative investigation would be to endanger the study itself. The small and focused number of respondents is appropriate even in-depth interviews. The study is focused on the small sample size and selection of subjects helps to analyse the in-depth data.

The ten participants who were selected to implement the study were first-year engineering students. When a research study is carried out in educational contexts, this is required. On the whole, the working number will be between 12-20 learners. Choosing a limited number of subjects will complicate the process of categorizing those who share similar experiences, and it will also impede the investigation of a phenomenon. Thus, the combination is appropriate in selecting specific numbers of research constructed so as to group persons with similar experiences and to not group together dissimilar ones. Ultimately, the choice of individuals from this number is correct to conduct an analysis in the group and between the groups.

Process-oriented writing research takes a long time to unfold, which requires a sample setup with longitudinal sensitivity. The sample guide focuses on a restricted number of subjects, while still permitting sufficient variation for solid interpretations. The research provides scope for significant levels of depth of analysis but not to the extent to render the findings unworthy of legitimacy, owing to the provision of detailed accounts by the participants instead of partial.



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

### Data Collection

The main method used for data collection was semi structured interviews. Interviews are opted because they are capable of bringing detailed and reflective accounts that are more elaborate and conversational in nature. The interviews were structured to elicit narrative accounts of participants' essay writing experiences. Likewise, interviews were developed to extract information pertaining to the various stages of the essay-writing process. Through interviews, the researcher asked about instances in group discussion that helped come up with the ideas and also help in making and modification of organizational decisions. The conversations also permitted the respondents to stray from their prepared statements and voice the unanticipated doubt or tension. Perhaps this is one of the prominent reasons due to which qualitative interviewing is so widely used (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

The interviews were conducted after the participants had experienced process writing many times because one-off activity can hinder insightful multi-stage reflection. There were several occasions whereby I also administered follow-up prompts to ask a participant. Frequent conversations were held with the participants about how they felt or what they thought of peer talk, how they managed to negotiate disagreement, or how talk did.

### Data Analysis

The researcher implemented thematic analysis framework to analyse the data. This inductive method generates meaning patterns from the interviews that are also informed by existing theory or dominant discourse. First, the transcripts were read multiple times to become familiar. The researchers made notes at the start. Following the open reading, coding was carried out in a defined and systematic but flexible manner. There were noted sections of text relating to collaboration to the writing process, affect and felt learning outcomes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). As analysis proceeded and themes began to form, however, the codes were modified and refined rather than being restricted by these broad issue areas. This thematic choice was particularly apt in view of the dynamic and reciprocal relation between talk and individual writing. A similar nonlinear dimensional shift of understanding and use was described by many members, which could not be simply classified. Upon analysis, the themes were refined for internal consistency and conceptual clarity. It was observed that on occasion some terms would drift from their original meaning. The ideas were developed further by means of a process-oriented theory of writing (Flower & Hayes, 1981) as well as a socio-cultural perspective on learning (Vygotsky, 1978). These theoretical frameworks did not restrict codes or themes but rather heightened theoretical sensitivity and prompted developing interpretations. Recognize Your Own Bias as a Researcher It was necessary to be mindful of how assumptions concerning effective writing pedagogy might shape the interpretation of the participants' responses.

## IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Findings of Interview

#### 1. How did you initially perceive essay writing before participating in group discussions and a process-oriented writing approach?

Many of the respondents described the writing of an essay as a daunting task, something that is focused and solitary, before they experienced group discussions and a process-oriented approach. The common belief is that the "perfect" final draft can be completed in one sitting. A majority of people agreed that this 'performance' was often done in a rush with little scaffolding and feedback on grammar and spelling only. Numerous connected essays indicate writing is feared, not intellectual. R3(Respondent 3) said: "I always felt essay writing was a like a right or wrong thing, I was only thinking about getting the grammar right and not what I was actually thinking." R7 said: "It felt lonely to write essays and I didn't get to know if my thoughts were good or not until the teacher gave it a mark." The phrases here allude to writing as performance and not a process. A great many respondents spoke of uncertainty with respect to structure, argument and academic tone, suggesting a lack of metacognitive knowledge about essay writing. As stated by one respondent R1, "I would just start writing without planning or anything like that because I didn't know what planning was in writing." The absence of a collaborative space caused students to internalize confusion, self-doubt, and helplessness. Similarly, many also saw feedback as evaluative and summative, which reinforces a fixed view of writing ability. According to R9, the marking of the essay concluded everything. The statement "it was not more successful" shows how conceptualization was restricted due to product-oriented teaching. In other words, students may not perceive their improvement as feasible. In essence, we argue that before the intervention, essay writing was the individual's sole domain that carried high stakes. The task was planned which stressed correctness over meaning which poses an important psychological barrier for students. According to R9's quotation above, essay writing was a them-



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

and-me exercise. Despite investing effort, R9 was wise to the fact he was being judged and not praised. Moreover, it is essential to obtain.

### 2. How did group discussions influence your understanding of essay topics and ideas?

Group discussions transformed the respondents' interpretation of essay topics and aided in the creation of ideas for essays. Through discussion, respondents were able to form rich and critical interpretations of essay topics rather than surface-level interpretations. For instance, R5 mentioned, "When I heard others explain the same thing in a completely different way, I realised how wrong I was." Further, many of the respondents said that they were able to notice different angles of the topic they could argue for or against. "I used to imagine abstract things about the topic and had some idea of what I wanted to write but never knew what to write precisely," she explains. "The discussions helped clarify that." (R2) The participants were given clearer ideas to argue on. A few respondents cited another significant result was that these discussions possess no pressure of rightness or wrongness. The majority of ideas were perceived as drafts that could be rejected or improved on during the discussion so nobody felt anxious about offering the 'wrong' idea (R8). This transparency and flexibility aided better involvement and idea generation. Another response on the survey was '281 respondents said hearing people out is also essential', this was written by a lot of respondents. One respondent especially mentioned the clarity of ideas that listening could provide. She mentioned that listening gave her idea of what to write even if she did not participate (R10). As a whole group discussion fostered exploratory thinking and gave the respondents a deeper understanding of the essay topics. This indicates that one became able to see the abstract character of thinking, reasoning and negotiating. An additional advantage of discussions stems from what participant R6 stated: "When my answer was challenged, I thought I did not have a strong enough reason". This entails that the learner became aware of being unaware of something, thus I questioned that person too in another.

### 3. In what ways did group discussions affect your confidence as an essay writer?

There was a noticeable increase in confidence of respondents during group discussions. When more deeply probed, respondents explained that reluctant writers gained legitimacy for their ideas through peer feedback, agreement, and disagreement. As R4 explains, 'when people were responding well, I thought, okay maybe my writing does matter.' This process indicates how the legitimisation of one's work engenders confidence, and that confidence is socially constructed rather than only an internal process. The foregoing remark indicates affirmation from the first-person internal to the other-person external. Participants found that the group discussions made struggle and ignorance normal, which helped to de-stigmatise these feelings and ideas. R1 suggested this by saying that "no one really knew the answer – it wasn't just me getting confused". From a first-person internal perspective, this legitimises an individual's own confusion and struggle through other-person external reassurance. According to the respondents, the group discussion enabled them to voice their ideas before writing, and this helped to lessen their anxiety. According to R7: "After saying my ideas out loud, I was less afraid to write them down." This suggests more analytically that oral rehearsal is an anxiety reduction strategy that builds confidence through a lesser demand on working memory in the writing task. Participants observed that during group discussion, the feedback obtained from peers was less intimidating than the written feedback from the teacher. R9 explained, "The extent to which peers asked me to clarify my ideas was less intimidating as they were not judging me". Essay writing is quite a broad name which covers a variety of processes. It has been observed that the essays which engage the readers are those which are able to show some evidence and emotions. Additionally, essays can also be made with different types and forms. Essay writing is also a process that needs continuous practice and revision. It can be tedious. It.

### 4. How did the process-oriented approach change the way you planned your essays?

When approached in a very unplanned manner, initially, writing would mean the mere act of putting pen to paper, which in turn became difficult to do as they struggled to look for ideas to write. Their writing planning was fundamentally changed by process approach. Planning was no longer a mere activity that in which people participate just to satisfy the evaluators. Earlier, they used to plan the essay "on the fly." But now, they use visible planning to organize thinking. The majority of respondents mentioned that either they don't plan or their planning is very low level for essays. As previously mentioned, "Being an planning means writing an introduction in my head itself by not making notes or writing it down." The planning of the respondents would hardly be too elaborate. Nonetheless, the clear planning stage of a process approach completely changed the situation. The manifestation of planning in the visible realm is brought to focus through the different sub-stages of planning like brainstorming, organizing ideas in an outline, and discussing a plan with peers. R8 expressed that they now take time to write an outline or run the ideas by their friend so that they do not have to put in an extra effort later on while writing. Besides making the planning a



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

visible affair, the sub-stage of G.D enhanced the planning activity. Through the discussion with others regarding the outline and strength of the arguments, the writer gets instant feedback. R5 mentioned, "I get to know which points are weak or strong simply by telling them my plan and without even writing the essay."

### 5. How did drafting change when writing was treated as a process rather than a one-time task?

When we see drafting as a process and not as a product, we change drafting significantly. The respondents described their writing processes differently than before. There is less pressure to get the first draft right. R6 explained saying, "My first draft doesn't have to be perfect anymore." There are strategies to cope with anxiety which separates ideas from form or presentation. Numerous participants stated they write to get the ideas down and worry about the form afterwards. "I concentrate initially on the ideas, before concentrating on the language". R1. This is a good rhetorical approach. – R3 Participating in groups expects a change and revision process at each stage. Consequently, the meaning of drafting for performers was reframed as that of stage, and not a performance or summary. R4 described that, "I can always edit, so drafting does not feel that important anymore." I also started drafting when discussed. According to R9, "Discussions clear things up for me and I know where to start drafting from." The same view that helped start drafting also helped sustain drafting over a period of time. Participants mentioned gaining more stamina over time and not giving up halfway if they were unhappy with the draft. R7 said, "There is no way I am giving up mid-way with drafting now."

### 6. What role did peer feedback play during the revision stage?

The most dominant theme that was implicated in affecting revision was peer feedback, which gave rise to a range of angles regarding how this type of input changes writers' conception of improvement. Many respondents that were concentrating on text repair were faced with complicated feedback that went in all directions. R5 claimed, "They had pointed out where my argument wasn't clear." In a single sentence, the peer elevated and complexified the concerns of revising the text and revising the argument. Classmates aided researchers in understanding revision is not limited to grammar. Respondents found their peers' input to be timely and appropriate. According to R2, they give their explanation in a way I can understand. R6 added that I wouldn't wait for the teacher. The responses were also interactive. According to R8, the peer's confusion could be probed into. On an analytical dimension, the respondents did not just accept feedback passively. They automatically responded and deliberated its correctness. Fellow students' feedback aroused awe. As per R10, "It made me realise how my stuff sounds to others." A typical outcome of feedback is the metacognitive awareness of the audience. On an important note, providing feedback.

### 7. How did the approach influence your understanding of revision?

The concept of revision changed from correcting to rethinking ideas. According to some participants, correcting language and grammar happens at revision stage after being graded. In the opinion of R3, "earlier revision was just correcting all the red marks." Through the process writing approach, subsequently, revision became purposeful or iterative. R7 remarked, "Currently, I am revising my paper to improve meaning, not just language." Group discussions triggered conceptual revisions. R1 said, "I rewrote my whole essay after having one discussion." Participants then engaged in analytical deconstruction and rethinking of content or argumentation. There were no penalizing attempts, they were all with the view of empowering. R9 said, "Revision is like growing up." Participants became more patient and resilient as they normalised of going through several drafts. R5 stated, "I don't have a problem with re-writing now." The results underscore the fundamental shifts necessary for revision literacy for Longitudinal writing development.

### 8. Did group discussions help you develop critical thinking in essay writing?

Most of the respondents associated it with critical thinking. Hearing the views of other people made them doubt their beliefs. R4 mentions that he thought the ideas he had were obvious but others questioned him on them. This questioning by others helped them justify their own views. R6 states, "I learnt to better support up my points." Also, they used comparative thinking before judging. As R8 points out, "We looked at the arguments and picked the best one." This shows the development of critical literacy as meaning is no longer accepted but negotiated.

### 9. How did these practices affect your motivation to write essays?

The motivation of the stimulating increased acting as if it were the treatment's result lowering anxiety decreasing agency text-process. According to the respondents, they described writing as more 'engaging than chore'. R2 clearly expresses "I think writing now has meaning." The respondent no longer sees writing as a chore but as an activity with



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

purpose. There seems also to be joint responsibility for a co-created work. The remark that R7 gives is “Now that it is a group activity and my name is in the piece, I want to put in something good in the piece”. When you carry out a value creating process or an activity, you can see the progress of your action. The final products are not of its concern.

### 10. Overall, how would you describe your development as an essay writer through this approach?

Native speakers of a language will use it in a variety of circumstances, bringing their own cultural context to the experience. So, we can certainly involve Isabel from the spectacular Mexican tradition of Day of the Dead. R6 indicated that “I didn’t emerge better, overnight, just better, steadily”. Members felt that group discussion and process writing complemented one another. As per participant R10, “Discussions shaped ideas; the process shaped writing.” On the analytical level, it is integrated learning on the one hand, as social interaction and cognitive strategies reinforce each other. Conversely, a systematic approach helps instil confidence in learners at all levels. Students were willing to transfer skills beyond the classroom.

## V. DISCUSSIONS

According to the interview findings, the implementation of group discussions and a process approach to writing has changed the learners’ view of essay writing remarkably. Perhaps the most prominent theme is the movement from writing as an isolated fear activity toward something socially negotiated and exploratory. Participants frequently characterized previous encounters with writing as being silent, secret, and final. Ideas originated in one mind and on paper the teacher and marker discovered it only later. In contrast, group discussions provided an interruption to isolation; they made thinking public and provisional. Propositions were regarded as ground for questioning, building on, and revising, not finished articles. Furthermore, public conversation reduced emotional danger. Speaking an idea aloud in a group helped to normalize and destigmatize incompleteness. It further made uncertainty acceptable and reduced peer judgement. In effect, the emotion politics should be an integral part of the writing development mechanism, rather than a lucky by-product. With reduction of emotional risk, participants gained confidence through peer affirmation and non-support to try out essay structure, argument and voice. Participants also often attributed to discussion the role of cognitive rehearsal.

Putting ideas into words was believed to help with organizing thinking and drafting would also be easier and less demanding. A participant stated that it becomes easier to draft something that has been said out loud. This broadens the idea of writing competence as a textual object to a more multimodal process concerning speech, listening and reflection. The focus was not on how to generate ideas through group work but on developing critical dispositions. Through discussions and dialogues, learners learned to question, anticipate counterargument and justify claims and later transfer. Consequently, because learners took part in a discussion, discussion was not simply an addition to writing but was part of the writing process. More importantly, learners derived subsequent understanding of writing and its processes through discussion.

Participants’ willingness to tolerate imperfection seemed to change when writing was not treated as terminal but recursive. Within the classroom, drafting was no longer a moment of judgment. As a result, argument gaps and rough language would become legitimate starting points for a productive struggle with a critical issue. Repeatedly mentioned in interviews and focus groups was the fact that as an ecosystem, the process-oriented approach reconfigured learners’ relationship with time, effort and attention towards continuous improvement. the changing of relevant practices appears to cascade down to revision practices. Revision was not seen as mechanical, imposed error correction but rather an opportunity to rethink meaning, reorganize and strengthen claims. It seems likely that peer feedback practices play an especially key role in that they serve as a bridge between discussion and revision; through peer feedback individuals encounter reader-based viewpoints they can negotiate and filter rather than be judged or served the “correct” answers. According to one study, the act giving feedback is as effective as receiving feedback. According to a learner, checking coherence, logic, and clarity issues on other learners’ drafts helped her notice coherence, logic and clarity issues in her draft. Reciprocity essentially refers to the mutual relationship between individuals. This powerful reciprocity hints at a growing community of practice for which responsibility for learning is not outsourced but actively shared. Further, motivation also seemed to be a significant consequence of this pedagogical ecology.



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

### Scope for future research

Analysing dialogue and process writing across different disciplines will be significant in understanding their success. We may make strong claims about the usefulness of group discussion and a process approach to writing. We can only claim this with regard to the classroom situation mentioned above. As a result, the findings cannot be generalised elsewhere. Each of the humanities, the sciences, and professional programmes has different expectations of argument, evidence and voice. A comparative design might shed light on this diversity. Longitudinal research on dialogue writing in the future. Tracking of the writing growth of learners can take place over semesters. Consequently, it would examine if the initial improvements in confidence, critical thinking, and revisions instigated in this study are permanent. Consequently, for a more extended period, a longitudinal research design can monitor learners' development journeys.

Investigate inequalities of power, participation and silence in group discussion. This will, thus, examine how unequal participation works through various grouping patterns. The study would also look at how cultural makeup and language mediate these interactions. In the current or past studies, all participants were not always seen to participate equally. When monolingual and bilingual or multilingual learners are brought together, achieving equal participation proves difficult. A significant future study, therefore, might look into enduring power relations in a group discussion among different grouping formats. Integrating digital spaces in research design.

The aforementioned paragraph can be considered as an appeal towards an increase in longitudinal studies taking on a more social and process-oriented perspective to the development of writing. Using a longitudinal panel design in research would enable rich insights into the interactional, textual, and affective development of collaborative writing over time. I would also like to explore research that combines qualitative interviews with text analysis of students' evolving drafts at stages. This would allow closer insight into the relationship of talk to text in terms of situated textual changes. Also, interesting would be research on teacher mediation of group talk, like how teacher questioning, intervention or assessment practices mediate collaborative talk, to better inform pedagogical design.

### REFERENCES

1. Aljasir, N. (2025). Empowering Adult EFL Learners: A Self-Directed, Process-Oriented Writing Program. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 16(1), 197-209.
2. Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). *The psychology of written composition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
4. Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." *College English*, 46(7), 635-652.
5. Chan, S. Y. C. (2025). "Writing is re-writing": Developing language awareness through a process-oriented approach in an EFL academic writing course. In *English for Academic and Specific Purposes in the Classroom* (pp. 172-190). Routledge.
6. Chen, M. (2024). Discussion on the Application of Process Teaching Method in High School English Writing Teaching. *The Educational Review, USA*, 8(8).
7. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.
8. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Sage.
9. Din, W. A., Swanto, S., Abd Latip, N. A., & Ismail, I. H. (2021). The process approach to the teaching of writing: Focus on process rather than product. *Journal of Information System and Technology Management*, 6(23), 63-71.
10. Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research* (pp. 33-56). Ablex.
11. El Ouidani, Y., & Madaoui, R. (2024). Enhancing L2 Learners' writing: Impact of Product and Process Approaches. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 8(1).
12. Feng, X. (2025). A Review of The Effectiveness of Process-Oriented English Writing Strategies in Higher Education.
13. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
14. Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). A meta-analysis of writing instruction for adolescent students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(3), 445-476.
15. Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? *Field Methods*, 18(1), 59-82.
16. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.



## International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

17. Khayrullayeva, N. (2025). The Methodologies of Improving Writing Skills in English. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(4), 1283-1286.
18. Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Sage.
19. Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge.
20. Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking*. Routledge.
21. Moussaoui, S. (2024). Enhancing writing quality and self-efficacy beliefs through process-oriented task-based instruction and multiple feedback forms. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 18(1), 96-116.
22. Mushtaq, R., Taseer, N. A., & Ghori, U. K. (2021). Effectiveness of process-oriented approach in the development of English writing skills of undergraduate students. *Global Educational Studies Review*, 6(4), 186-194.
23. Rahimi, M. (2024). Effects of integrating motivational instructional strategies into a process-genre writing instructional approach on students' engagement and argumentative writing. *System*, 121, 103261.
24. Rakhimova, S. (2025). The Role of Process Writing Approach in Enhancing Student Writing Performance. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(5), 1035-1038.
25. Robillos, R. J., & Namwong, O. (2021). Thai tertiary learners' composition writing performance and self-regulation towards EFL writing using process-oriented approach. *TESOL International Journal*, 16(7), 87-103.
26. Irgin, P., & Bilki, Z. (2024). Students' perceptions of online peer feedback in process-oriented L2 writing: A qualitative inquiry. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 83, 101403.
27. Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. *Multilingual Matters*.
28. Turago, A. A., Hussen, J. W., Tsegaye, A. G., & Endashew, A. A. (2023). Challenge of integrating writing aspects in process-oriented approach classroom and their roles to students' writing ability. *JETT*, 14(1), 334-347.
29. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
30. Wang, R. (2024). Study on the application of the process approach in senior high school continuation writing task in the context of large-unit theme teaching. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 12(2), 295-298.



INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD  
SERIAL  
NUMBER  
INDIA



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

| Mobile No: +91-6381907438 | Whatsapp: +91-6381907438 | [ijmrset@gmail.com](mailto:ijmrset@gmail.com) |

[www.ijmrset.com](http://www.ijmrset.com)