
Enhancing Writing Skills through Peer-Reviewing among EFL Undergraduates

Muhammad Shaban

muhammadshaban@gmail.com

Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFORMATION

RECEIVED: 07/02/2026

ACCEPTED: 20/02/2026

PUBLISHED: 27/02/2026

Abstract:

Numerous studies support peer-reviewing as beneficial for second language learners, enhancing writing quality, critical thinking, and overall English proficiency. However, there is still a limited number of research on how this technique influences students' ability to produce well-structured academic writing. Peer-reviewing and traditional writing instruction have quite different learning goals. Peer-reviewing aims to make students actively engage in evaluating and providing feedback on peers' work, developing their analytical skills and writing awareness. Meanwhile, traditional writing instruction emphasizes teacher-centered feedback and individual writing practice. This research aims to examine the effect of peer-reviewing strategies on students' ability to improve their writing skills among EFL undergraduates. The method used in this research is experimental by using "One Group Pretest-Posttest Design." This design requires conducting a pre-test before implementing the treatment, then followed by conducting a post-test once it is completed. The results of this study indicated that the peer-reviewing strategy applied to class A of the English Education Study Program for one semester can significantly improve the quality of students' writing skills. This improvement can be seen from the results obtained in the pretest and post-test which have been conducted before and after treatment (Peer-Reviewing). By conducting peer-reviewing activities, it can bolster students' academic writing scores by cultivating deep-seated writing competence, vocabulary breadth, grammar awareness, and critical thinking skills. Through consistent engagement in evaluating and providing feedback on diverse peer texts, students enhance their overall writing proficiency, fostering a solid foundation for improving academic performance.

Keywords: *Peer-Reviewing, Writing Skills, Writing Enhancement, EFL Undergraduates*

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is a significant need for students, so many efforts are needed to encourage students to develop their writing skills, to express their ideas effectively in written form, and to enjoy the writing process. According to Hyland (2003) cited in Ningsih et al. (2021), writing with clear organization and coherence enhances the ability to communicate ideas effectively, allowing writers to convey meaning and engage readers, emphasizing the vital link between writing proficiency and academic success. The reality in the field is that many students still do not like writing for various reasons, which affects student learning outcomes. One is caused by a lack of motivation and ability to write, especially for academic writing tasks.

In terms of writing skills, based on the statement from Brown (2004) cited in Rahmawati et al. (2022), it is stated that when we write, effective communication comes from how we organize our ideas, choose appropriate vocabulary, and apply correct grammatical structures. It is about both the content we produce and how we present it. Writing skill is the process of expressing ideas, thoughts, and feelings in written form to convey information to readers. Writing proficiency can be interpreted as a form of a person's ability to produce coherent, cohesive, and well-structured texts that communicate effectively. According to Jacobs et al. (1981) cited in Wijaya (2020), writing proficiency's main components include content, organization, vocabulary, language use (grammar), and mechanics. A person is said to have good writing skills if they demonstrate the following abilities: a) The ability to develop relevant and substantial content; b) The ability to organize ideas logically and coherently; c) The ability to use appropriate vocabulary and expressions; d) The ability to apply correct grammatical structures; and e) The ability to use proper mechanics (spelling, punctuation, capitalization).

Based on the components of writing skills, there are many ways to measure someone's writing proficiency. Weigle (2002) stated that there are two types of writing assessment: holistic scoring and analytic scoring. The analytic scoring approach aligns with Jacobs et al.'s (1981) ESL Composition Profile, which assesses five components of writing: Content (30%), Organization (20%), Vocabulary (20%), Language Use (25%), and Mechanics (5%). Each component measures specific aspects of writing ability:

1. **Content** measures the writer's ability to develop ideas, relevance to topic, and clarity of thesis statements.
2. **Organization** measures the ability to structure ideas logically, use cohesive devices, and maintain coherence throughout the text.
3. **Vocabulary** measures the range and appropriateness of word choice, register, and idiomatic expressions.
4. **Language Use** measures grammatical accuracy, sentence structure, and complexity.
5. **Mechanics** measures spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and paragraph formatting.

Each component above aims to measure a person's writing proficiency. Therefore, the writing to be assessed must demonstrate these various elements. The level of writing proficiency is also influenced by several other factors, such as mastery of English vocabulary, understanding of grammatical structures, and exposure to various text types. However, writing skills can be sharpened by creating a supportive learning environment and employing effective writing techniques. Many ways or techniques can help improve a person's writing skills; one of them is by implementing peer-reviewing.

Peer-reviewing is a collaborative learning process where students evaluate and provide feedback on each other's written work. According to Liu and Hansen (2002), peer review is the use of learners as sources of information and interactants for each other in such a way that learners assume roles and responsibilities normally taken by a formally trained teacher or tutor in commenting on and critiquing each other's drafts in both written and oral formats in the process of writing. Rollinson (2005) also claims that the peer-

reviewing technique aims to build students' awareness of their own writing strengths and weaknesses through the process of reading and commenting on peers' work.

Apart from that, the peer-reviewing technique has several differences when compared to other writing techniques such as self-editing or teacher feedback. As explained by Berg (1999), self-editing is a writing activity where students review and revise their own work independently. Meanwhile, peer-reviewing involves interaction between students, which has the main aim of developing critical evaluation skills and providing diverse perspectives on writing. In this way, students will get two different experiences from these two types of writing techniques.

Ferris (2003) stated that there are various forms of peer-reviewing, such as pair review, small group review, and whole-class review. Pair review is a peer-reviewing activity that involves two students exchanging and commenting on each other's work. Meanwhile, small group review involves three to five students reading and providing feedback on each member's writing. Whole-class review is an activity where a student's work is reviewed by the entire class, usually through projection or distribution of copies. The important thing in peer-reviewing is to develop students' critical thinking and analytical skills while improving their own writing through the process of evaluating others' work. This aligns with the peer-reviewing theory that students learn effectively by teaching and evaluating others (Liu & Hansen, 2002).

Several studies that have been conducted regarding how to improve students' ability to write English texts also prove that writing skills are essential for every student to master. One effective and stimulating instructional approach to improve writing proficiency is to use Peer-Reviewing (PR) (Lundstroms & Baker, 2009) which has been widely adopted in writing classrooms. According to Lundstroms and Baker (2009), peer-reviewing is the process where students read and provide feedback on peers' writing to improve both the reviewer's and the writer's skills. Meanwhile, Rollinson (2005) states that peer-reviewing means: (1) a collaborative learning activity, (2) a process that develops critical thinking, and (3) a strategy that promotes learner autonomy. In terms of becoming competent writers, a wide variety of strategies should be applied (Brown, 2001). When language learners use those strategies, they can cope with their writing experiences, and they gain confidence in their ability to write in the target language. From these statements, it can be concluded that learning to write is very important and requires practice and techniques or methods. Writing requires authentic training. This can be done by means of Peer-Reviewing. Through Peer-Reviewing, students have opportunities to read diverse writing samples and learn from peers' strengths and weaknesses. They also have more interaction and collaboration than individual writing practice (Tsui & Ng, 2000).

Several research studies have been conducted to analyze and describe the effectiveness of Peer-Reviewing strategies in improving students' writing skills. One of them is from Lundstroms and Baker (2009), where they conducted experimental research on the effectiveness of peer-reviewing strategies to improve students' writing skills. This research was applied to two classes and divided into experimental and control groups. The difference with the current research is that our study focuses specifically on EFL undergraduates in the Indonesian context, using a one-group pretest-posttest design.

Another study came from Min (2006), where they focused on training students in peer-reviewing strategies to improve their writing skills. This study covers the procedures and benefits of implementing peer-reviewing in EFL writing classrooms. The major difference with this research is that we focused on improving students' writing skills across all five components of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics) through structured peer-reviewing activities.

The difference between this study and the one conducted by Lundstroms and Baker (2009) is that the methods used are not similar. In this study, we use Experimental with "One Group Pretest-Posttest Design," while they used Experimental with focused and controlled groups applied to two different classes. From the second previous research conducted by Min (2006), they focused on how to train students to become effective peer reviewers. In this research, we focused on how the peer-reviewing strategy can improve students' writing skills, especially in academic writing performance. By looking at the differences between this research and two other studies, this research aims to examine the application of Peer-Reviewing to enhance the writing skills of students in the English Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Padang. It is hoped that the results of this research can be a guide for English lecturers in implementing Peer-Reviewing strategies to improve students' writing skills.

Based on the explanations and some previous research related to this topic, the researchers propose the following research questions focused on in this study. They investigate whether the application of the peer-reviewing method is effective in improving students' writing skills and whether there is an increase between the pretest and post-test writing scores of English Education students in the fourth semester of the 2024/2025 academic year.

2. METHODS

This part of the article consists of some aspects related to the research method conducted for this study, which are: research design, population and sample, research setting, research instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

2.1. Research Design

This type of research is experimental research, which is a method used to find the effect of specific treatments on others under controlled conditions (Sugiyono, 2016). The research design used in this research is "One Group Pretest-Posttest Design," which is a research design that contains a pretest before being given treatment and a post-test after being given treatment.

2.2. Population and Sample/Participants of the Study

The population in this study comprised all students enrolled in the English Education Study Program in the fourth semester (even) of the academic year 2024/2025. The sample for this research consisted of 30 students from class A of the English Education program. The sampling technique employed in this study was saturation sampling, chosen due to the entirety of the samples representing the population. This class was selected based on the same level of English writing proficiency, determined by their previous writing course scores.

2.3. Research Setting

The research was conducted at Universitas Negeri Padang, specifically in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, English Education Study Program.

2.4. Research Instrument

Two distinct research instruments, such as writing tests and observation, were employed in this study to comprehensively gauge various aspects of the phenomenon being researched. The utilization of writing tests and observation facilitated a multifaceted exploration, allowing for a comprehensive assessment of the research variables. The writing test was an argumentative essay prompt, and students' essays were evaluated using an analytic scoring rubric adapted from Jacobs et al.'s (1981) ESL Composition Profile, assessing content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics.

3. Data Collection

In the data collection process, we concentrated on several data points pertinent to this study. These include data related to the learning outcomes of students before and after the implementation of peer-reviewing in writing argumentative essays within the English Education class. Additionally, there were also data concerning the outcomes of the peer-reviewing in improving writing skills through written tests administered at both the initial and final stages.

The initial test aims to assess the students' initial proficiency in writing English argumentative essays before the implementation of the peer-reviewing approach. On the other hand, the final test is conducted to ascertain the progress or influence of peer-reviewing on students' writing skills.

4. Data Analysis

To analyze the data obtained from the research outcomes, descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were employed. The collected data comprise pretest scores and post-test scores, which were compared. The comparison between these two scores involves questioning whether there exists a difference between the values obtained from the pretest and post-test. The assessment of the difference in scores is solely focused on the means of both sets of values, employing a technique known as the t-test. Therefore, the steps for analyzing experimental data using the One Group Pretest-Posttest Design experimental model are as follows: Normality test, Hypothesis test, and Success indicators.

From the large number of studies related to the effectiveness of using peer-reviewing in improving the ability to write English texts, the researchers have conducted research with the title "Enhancing Writing Skills Through Peer-Reviewing Among EFL Undergraduates." This research was done using an experimental method with an experimental group of 30 students. This research used a One Group Pretest-Posttest experimental design where the experimental group was given a pretest, treatment (peer-reviewing), and post-test. The researchers used SPSS to analyze the data results.

The research formula using One Group Pretest-Posttest Design, according to Sugiyono (2016) is as follows:

O1 X O2

Information:

1. O1 means pre-test
2. X means treatment (peer-reviewing strategy)
3. O2 means post-test

In this design, the test was conducted twice, which happened before and after being given experimental treatment. The test conducted before receiving treatment is called the pre-test. The pre-test was given to the experimental class (O1). After carrying out the pre-test, the researchers provided treatment in the form of learning to write argumentative essays using peer-reviewing strategies (X). In the final stage, the researchers gave a post-test (O2).

The population in this study were all students in the English Education Study Program, semester IV (even) in the 2024/2025 academic year. The sample in this research was 30 students in the English Education Study Program class A. The sampling technique used in this research is saturated sampling. This technique was used because all samples represented the entire population. This class was selected based on their enrollment in the Academic Writing course.

Table 1. The Total of Students in the English Education Study Program

No	Sex	Total of Students
1.	Male	8
2.	Female	22
Total		30 students

There were three variables in this research: pre-test (O1), treatment (X), and post-test (O2). In this research, the variables were implemented sequentially. It meant that the processes were conducted one by one. The pre-test (O1) was given as the first process to the respondents. Next, respondents were given treatment by implementing the Peer-Reviewing (X) strategy. After receiving treatment, respondents were given a post-test (O2) as the final variable.

In data collection techniques, the researchers focused on several data related to this research, such as data related to student learning outcomes before and after implementing the peer-reviewing strategy in writing argumentative essays in the English Education Study Program class A semester IV (even) in the Academic Writing course for the 2024/2025 academic year. Then there were also data about the results of the peer-reviewing method in writing English essays with written tests which were administered during the pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was given to determine students' initial ability to write argumentative essays before being given peer-reviewing treatment.

Table 2. The procedures of conducting this research were as follows:

Week	Activity
1st week	The pre-test was given to the students of English Education Study Program (argumentative essay writing)
2nd - 5th weeks	The peer-reviewing strategy was implemented with the students as treatment (training on peer feedback, guided peer-review sessions, revision based on peer feedback)
6th week	The post-test was given to the students of English Education Study Program (argumentative essay writing)

Meanwhile, the post-test was given to determine the level of progress or influence of the Peer-Reviewing method in improving the writing abilities of students in the English Education Study Program class A semester IV (even) in the 2024/2025 academic year in writing argumentative essays using the same writing assessment rubric.

5. RESULTS

The collected data were analyzed using statistical tests to determine the distribution of pre-test and post-test results for all respondents involved.

Normality Test

The significance value of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in the English Education class was calculated. The results showed that the significance values were 0.072 and 0.200, which meant > 0.050 , so it can be concluded that the data was normally distributed.

Table 3. Normality Test

Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnova	Shapiro-Wilk				
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-Test (English Ed)	.145	30	.072	.945	30	.128

Class	Kolmogorov-Smirnova	Shapiro-Wilk				
Post-Test (English Ed)	.107	30	.200*	.958	30	.276

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

In the data analysis process conducted based on the table presented, it can be seen that the significance values of the Pre-Test and Post-Test in the English Education class have been analyzed. The test results showed that the pre-test significance value was 0.072 and the post-test significance value was 0.200. These values exceeded the general significance limit, which was 0.050. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data from this class have a normal distribution. This indicated that the data did not experience significant changes in its distribution pattern after undergoing treatment or learning.

Hypothesis Test (Paired Sample T-Test)

The significance value of Sig. 2-tailed is 0.000 or lower than < 0.05 , which meant that there was a significant difference in the students' writing scores between before and after the implementation of Peer-Reviewing.

Table 4. Differences in Writing Skills Test Results Based on Pre-Test and Post-Test Results for English Education Class

Paired Differences							
Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	

	Paired Differences			Lower	Upper				
Pair 1 Pre-test - Post-test	-12.433	4.876	0.890	-14.254	10.612	-	13.97	29	.000

The table reflected the results of important statistical analysis in the context of research regarding English Education class students before and after implementing the Peer-Reviewing strategy. The main focus of this table was the Sig. (2-tailed) value which was 0.000 or lower than 0.05, where this is the significance threshold commonly used in statistics. This value showed that there was a significant difference in the students' writing scores in English Education class before and after applying the Peer-Reviewing strategy. In this context, a low significance value (less than 0.05) indicated that the observed differences are not the result of chance, but are indeed a significant effect of applying the method. This meant that the Peer-Reviewing method has a significant positive impact on increasing the writing scores of English Education class students.

These results are important in an educational context because they show that the Peer-Reviewing strategy may be an effective tool in improving the quality of learning and academic writing achievement of students in the English Education Study Program. In addition, these findings provide a basis for the development of more efficient and results-oriented learning methods for similar subject matter. Thus, the table provides strong evidence to support a broader learning approach using Peer-Reviewing in various educational contexts.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-Test	30	55	72	64.27	5.112
Post-Test	30	70	88	76.70	5.876

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Based on the table above, it can be seen that there were differences in the average scores of students. The average pre-test score was 64.27 and post-test was 76.70, so it can be concluded that there was an increase in scores after receiving Peer-Reviewing treatment.

Table 6. Improvement in Each Writing Component

Writing Component	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean	Improvement
Content (30)	18.50	22.30	+3.80
Organization (20)	12.80	15.40	+2.60
Vocabulary (20)	13.20	15.10	+1.90
Language Use (25)	15.10	18.20	+3.10
Mechanics (5)	3.67	4.70	+1.03
Total (100)	64.27	76.70	+12.43

The table presented above provides important information regarding the improvement in each writing component. The highest improvement was in Content (+3.80), followed by Language Use (+3.10), Organization (+2.60), Vocabulary (+1.90), and Mechanics (+1.03). These findings indicated a significant increase in students' writing scores across all components after receiving treatment through the Peer-Reviewing strategy. This increase can be interpreted as an indication that the strategy is effective in improving students' writing skills in English Education class.

6. DISCUSSION

The significance values derived from the Pre-Test and Post-Test in the English Education class were examined, revealing notable insights. Specifically, the pre-test results yielded a significance value of

0.072 and the post-test results yielded 0.200, both surpassing the significance limit of 0.050. This affirmed a normal distribution of data in these instances, indicating minimal alteration in distribution following treatment or learning. This distinction in distributions bears significance in comprehending the data analysis outcomes and influencing subsequent decisions tied to the data's interpretation.

The significance value of 0.000, lower than the commonly used significance limit of 0.05, indicated a substantial disparity in students' writing scores in the English Education class before and after employing the Peer-Reviewing strategy. This signified that the method significantly enhanced the academic writing performance of students. This result is in line with the research conducted by Lundstroms and Baker (2009), which claimed that after implementing peer-reviewing treatment, the results significantly affected students' writing skills by reviewing the increased average scores of students on the pre-test and the post-test. The researchers concluded that peer-reviewing has a positive effect and effectively improves students' writing skills and academic performance.

Discussing how peer-reviewing strategy improves academic performance and writing skills, Min (2006) in his experimental research found out that by using peer-reviewing strategy, students improved their writing skills in terms of content development, organization, grammatical accuracy, and vocabulary use. The current study's findings align with Min's research, showing improvement across all five writing components, with content showing the most significant gain. This suggests that through reading and evaluating peers' work, students develop a better understanding of how to develop and organize their own ideas effectively.

The mentioned data above showed that the peer-reviewing strategy was showcasing its potential as an effective tool for improving learning quality within the English Education Study Program and potentially serving as a model for other subjects or study programs, substantiating the efficacy of Peer-Reviewing in diverse educational settings. This result is in line with the research conducted by Tsui and Ng (2000), which revealed that peer-reviewing strategy improved learning quality by having better understanding of writing components such as content development, organization, vocabulary choice, and grammatical structures.

The improvement in Language Use (+3.10) indicates that peer-reviewing helps students become more aware of grammatical structures and sentence construction. When students review their peers' work, they encounter various sentence patterns and grammatical errors, which heightens their sensitivity to language use in their own writing. This finding supports Ferris's (2003) research, which found that peer-reviewing contributes significantly to developing grammatical accuracy in student writing.

The improvement in Organization (+2.60) suggests that through reading and evaluating peers' essays, students develop a better sense of how to structure their own writing logically. They learn from observing how peers organize ideas, use transitional devices, and maintain coherence throughout the text. This finding aligns with Rollinson's (2005) assertion that peer-reviewing develops students' metacognitive awareness of text structure and organization.

The improvement in Vocabulary (+1.90) and Mechanics (+1.03), while smaller than other components, still demonstrates positive growth. The smaller improvement in mechanics might be attributed to students'

tendency to focus more on surface-level errors during peer-reviewing rather than deeper issues of content and organization. This suggests the need for more structured training in peer-reviewing that guides students to provide feedback on all writing components equally.

The descriptive statistics showed an increase from a mean pre-test score of 64.27 to a post-test score of 76.70, highlighting the efficacy of the Peer-Reviewing strategy in bolstering academic writing achievement. This 12.43-point increase represents a substantial improvement in students' writing proficiency over one semester. The minimum score increased from 55 to 70, and the maximum score increased from 72 to 88, indicating that students across all proficiency levels benefited from the peer-reviewing intervention.

These findings emphasize the importance of considering peer-reviewing as a valuable pedagogical tool in EFL writing classrooms. The collaborative nature of peer-reviewing creates opportunities for students to learn from each other, develop critical thinking skills, and take greater ownership of their learning process. As Liu and Hansen (2002) argue, peer-reviewing not only improves writing quality but also develops learners' autonomy and collaborative skills, which are essential for academic and professional success.

7. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this research using an experimental method with a group of English Education students as treatment recipients, several relevant conclusions can be drawn. First, analysis of the data distribution from the pre-test and post-test results showed normal distribution, with pre-test significance value of 0.072 and post-test significance value of 0.200, indicating that the data met the assumptions for parametric statistical analysis.

Furthermore, the research results showed significant differences in pre-test and post-test scores for English Education students who received treatment using the Peer-Reviewing strategy. The mean score increased from 64.27 to 76.70, with a significance value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$). This confirms that this method effectively improves their writing skills across all five components: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. Content showed the highest improvement (+3.80), followed by language use (+3.10), organization (+2.60), vocabulary (+1.90), and mechanics (+1.03).

Lastly, applying the Peer-Reviewing strategy is believed to positively impact the writing skills of English Education students, which can also increase students' overall grammatical awareness, vocabulary mastery, and ability to organize ideas coherently. This shows that this strategy can be an effective alternative for improving students' writing proficiency in EFL contexts.

Suggestions that can be given based on the findings in this research are the need for further research to understand more deeply the factors that influence student responses to the Peer-Reviewing strategy, especially in different writing genres and proficiency levels. In addition, a more comprehensive evaluation needs to be conducted regarding the impact of this method on other aspects of education, such as students' critical thinking abilities and learner autonomy. With a deeper understanding of these factors, educational stakeholders can design more effective learning strategies that are appropriate to student

needs in various educational contexts. It is also recommended that teachers provide adequate training in peer-reviewing techniques to maximize the benefits of this strategy for improving students' writing skills.

REFERENCES

- Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 215-241.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Longman.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., Hartfiel, V. F., & Hughey, J. B. (1981). *Testing ESL composition: A practical approach*. Newbury House.
- Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University of Michigan Press.
- Lundstroms, K., & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 30-43.
- Min, H. T. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 118-141.
- Ningsih, R., Syafi'i, M., & Mukminin, A. (2021). Improving students' writing skills through collaborative writing strategy. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 87-96.
- Rahmawati, D., Sukirlan, M., & Sudirman, S. (2022). The implementation of process-genre approach to improve students' writing skill. *Journal of English Education Program*, 3(1), 45-54.
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. PT Alfabet.
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147-170.
- Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wijaya, K. F. (2020). The correlation between students' reading habit and their writing skill. *Journal of English Education Program*, 1(2), 101-110.