Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi dan Akuntansi
Vol. 5 No. 1 Maret 2025
E-ISSN: 2809-7793 / P-ISSN: 2827-8119, Hal 63-77
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55606/jurimea.v5i1.878

An Experimental Study On The Effectiveness Of Peer Feedback Compared To Teacher-Written Corrective Feedback In Teaching Writing

Diemas Aditya Briansyah

English Language Education, Faculty of Languages And Arts,
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Singaraja

Alamat: Jl. Ahmad Yani No. 67, Kaliuntu, Banyuasri, Buleleng, Kaliuntu, Kec. Buleleng, Kabupaten Buleleng, Bali 81116, Indonesia
Korespondensi penulis: diemasbriansyah920@gmail.com

Abstract. *This study focuses on examining the effectiveness of peer feedback (PF) and teacher-written corrective feedback (TWCF) in improving the writing accuracy of eighth grade students at MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana, Bali. The main objective of this study was to determine which feedback method has a greater impact on students' ability to write accurately. A total of 40 students were divided into two groups: an experimental group that used peer feedback and a control group that received written feedback from the teacher. A quasi-experimental approach was used to measure students' writing ability before and after the intervention through a pre-test and post-test. The test was designed to assess vocabulary and grammar accuracy. The results obtained were analyzed using statistical methods, including independent sample t-test and paired test. The results showed a significant improvement in the experimental group, with the average score increasing from 66.25 in the pre-test to 82.75 in the post-test. In contrast, the control group showed a smaller increase, from a mean score of 67.25 in the pre-test to 74.50 in the post-test. Statistical analysis showed a p-value of 0.003, indicating a statistically significant difference between the two groups at the 5% level of significance. Based on these results, the study concluded that peer feedback was more effective than written corrective feedback from teachers in helping to improve students' writing accuracy.*

Keywords: *Peer Feedback, Corrective Feedback, Written by Teacher, Writing Accuracy.*

Abstrak. Penelitian ini berfokus pada mengkaji efektivitas umpan balik sejawat (Peer Feedback/PF) dan umpan balik korektif tertulis dari guru (Teacher-Written Corrective Feedback/TWCF) dalam meningkatkan akurasi menulis peserta didik kelas VIII di MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana, Bali. Tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menentukan metode umpan balik mana yang lebih berdampak pada kemampuan peserta didik dalam menulis secara akurat. Sebanyak 40 peserta didik dibagi menjadi dua kelompok: kelompok eksperimen yang menggunakan umpan balik sejawat dan kelompok kontrol yang menerima umpan balik tertulis dari guru. Pendekatan kuasi-eksperimen digunakan untuk mengukur kemampuan menulis peserta didik sebelum dan sesudah intervensi melalui pre-test dan post-test. Tes ini dirancang untuk menilai akurasi kosakata dan tata bahasa. Hasil yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan metode statistik, termasuk uji t sampel independen dan uji berpasangan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan peningkatan yang

Received Oktober 30, 2024; Revised November 30, 2024; Accepted Desember 30, 2024
* Diemas Aditya Briansyah, diemasbriansyah920@gmail.com

signifikan pada kelompok eksperimen, dengan skor rata-rata naik dari 66,25 pada pre-test menjadi 82,75 pada post-test. Sebaliknya, kelompok kontrol menunjukkan peningkatan yang lebih kecil, dari skor rata-rata 67,25 pada pre-test menjadi 74,50 pada post-test. Analisis statistik menunjukkan nilai p sebesar 0,003, yang mengindikasikan adanya perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik antara kedua kelompok pada tingkat signifikansi 5%. Berdasarkan hasil ini, penelitian menyimpulkan bahwa umpan balik sejawat lebih efektif dibandingkan dengan umpan balik korektif tertulis dari guru dalam membantu meningkatkan akurasi menulis peserta didik.

Kata kunci: Umpan Balik Teman Sebaya, Umpan Balik Korektif, Ditulis Oleh Guru, Akurasi Tulisan.

INTRODUCTION

For Junior High School (JHS) students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL), writing is among the most demanding skills to master. These students often encounter challenges in organizing their ideas, applying grammar correctly, and selecting appropriate vocabulary. Such struggles not only hinder their ability to produce quality written work but can also lead to anxiety and decreased motivation (Phuong & Nguyen, 2019; Valero Haro et al., 2023). Hidayati (2018) further notes that JHS students in EFL contexts often lack confidence in their writing abilities due to limited vocabulary, inadequate grammar skills, and difficulty organizing ideas coherently. Addressing these challenges is essential to fostering students' confidence and competence in writing, and feedback mechanisms play a pivotal role in this process.

Peer feedback has emerged as an influential strategy for improving students' writing abilities in EFL contexts. Through this process, students review and critique each other's work, providing constructive suggestions that encourage error identification, self-reflection, and revision. Research has consistently demonstrated the benefits of peer feedback in improving the quality of students' writing. For example, Novakovich (2016) highlights that peer feedback fosters a collaborative learning environment, where students actively engage in their learning by exchanging ideas and perspectives. Moreover, Kerman (2023) emphasizes that peer feedback creates an inclusive classroom culture, enabling students to take greater responsibility for their learning while also developing interpersonal and critical thinking skills.

The concept of peer feedback is deeply rooted in Vygotsky's social constructivism, which highlights the critical role of social interaction and collaboration in the learning process (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). Central to this theory is the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which suggests that students learn most effectively when supported by peers or instructors who provide the right level of guidance. Peer feedback embodies this idea by encouraging students to collaboratively construct knowledge, pinpoint areas for improvement, and enhance their writing abilities. Research has demonstrated that the interactive nature of peer feedback helps students internalize grammar, expand their vocabulary, and develop a stronger awareness of their audience (Latifi, Noroozi, & Talaee, 2021). These advantages are especially significant in EFL settings, where students often face linguistic and cultural challenges that hinder clear communication.

While peer feedback offers many benefits, teacher-written feedback (TWF) continues to play a pivotal role in writing instruction. Teachers provide detailed, authoritative feedback that addresses specific areas for improvement, such as grammar, organization, and coherence. Ferris (2018) argues that TWF is essential for guiding students in mastering complex writing conventions, as it draws on the teacher's expertise and experience. Additionally, TWF can address higher-order concerns, such as argumentation and critical analysis, which may be beyond the capacity of peer reviewers (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Montgomery & Baker, 2007).

However, TWF has certain limitations. Research by Cheng & Zhang (2022) suggests that students often adopt a passive role when receiving teacher feedback, relying on the corrections provided rather than actively engaging in the revision process. Similarly, Yu & Yang (2021) found that teacher-centered feedback does not foster the same level of student autonomy and critical thinking as peer feedback. These insights underline the importance of adopting a balanced approach that integrates both teacher and peer feedback to optimize learning outcomes.

Peer feedback, on the other hand, offers unique benefits that complement TWF. Firstly, it fosters active learning by involving students in the evaluation process, enhancing their critical thinking and analytical abilities (Cheng et al., 2023). Secondly, peer feedback is often more immediate and frequent than TWF, allowing students to make continuous improvements throughout the writing process. Latifi, Noroozi, & Talaee

(2021) note that the collaborative nature of peer feedback encourages open communication and fosters a supportive learning environment, which is particularly beneficial for EFL students who may lack confidence in their writing abilities. Furthermore, peer feedback has been found to reduce rule-based errors, enhance students' awareness of the relationship between meaning and form, and improve their sense of ownership and understanding of the audience (Diab & Awada, 2022; Tsui & Ng, 2000). By participating in peer feedback, students gain a deeper understanding of writing conventions while also developing important social and cognitive skills. However, to be effective, peer feedback must be guided by teachers to ensure it remains constructive and meaningful. Teachers play a crucial role in fostering a classroom environment that encourages respect and open communication, allowing students to confidently give and receive feedback (Fan & Xu, 2020). While much of the research on peer feedback focuses on higher education (Fan & Xu, 2020; Lee, 2016), there is limited empirical research on its effectiveness in junior high school EFL classrooms. This gap is significant, as JHS students often face unique challenges related to their developmental stage, linguistic proficiency, and academic needs. It is essential to understand how peer feedback affects writing outcomes at this level in order to create effective teaching strategies that address these specific challenges.

This research aims to address this gap by examining how peer feedback influences writing accuracy in junior high school students. Through a comparison of peer feedback and teacher-written feedback, the study seeks to determine which method more effectively enhances students' writing abilities. The results of this study will enrich the existing body of research on English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing instruction and provide actionable insights for educators interested in adopting more innovative, student-focused feedback strategies in their classrooms.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a quasi-experimental design with a pretest-posttest control group format. Both groups were assessed at the start and end of the study to evaluate any changes in their writing accuracy. The main goal is to determine whether there is a significant difference in writing accuracy between students who receive peer feedback (PF) and those who receive teacher-written

corrective feedback (TWCF). This study involves two groups of eighth-grade students: an experimental group using PF and a control group relying on TWCF. By analyzing the pretest and posttest scores, the study examines improvements in specific aspects of writing accuracy, including vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and spelling (Ary et al., 2018).

The study was conducted at MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana, located on Jl. Rajawali No. 10, Melaya, in Gilimanuk Regency, Bali. This school was selected due to observations showing that traditional methods, particularly teacher-written corrective feedback (TWCF), remain the primary approach in English instruction. This conventional method often limits student engagement and their ability to fully grasp and apply the material, which can negatively impact learning outcomes. The traditional TWCF process typically follows these steps, as outlined by Zheng & Yu (2018), where sssigning a writing task where students are asked to write an essay, students submit their first drafts for review, the teacher provides written feedback, mainly focusing on grammatical accuracy, students revise their drafts based on the feedback, the revised drafts are submitted for further review, and this cycle is repeated, allowing for gradual improvement through multiple drafts and revisions.

This research explores whether implementing peer feedback over a six-week period can enhance students' learning outcomes and foster greater classroom engagement compared to the traditional teacher-centered approach.

According to Creswell & Creswell (2017), a population refers to a group of individuals who share similar characteristics or represent the entire group of research subjects. In this study, the population consists of all eighth-grade students at MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana during the 2024/2025 academic year. The total population includes 80 students, distributed across four classes. The breakdown of the population is presented in the following table.

Table 1. Population of Research

Class	Total students
VIII A	20
VIII B	20
VIII C	20
VIII D	20

Source: School’s Administration from MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana

A sample represents a subset of the population that is the focus of the research. For this study, one class was selected to serve as the experimental group. The sampling technique used was cluster random sampling, where the researcher divided the population into distinct groups (classes) and randomly selected one group as the sample. Class VIII B, consisting of 20 students, was chosen to implement the peer feedback learning approach.

Table 2. Sample of Research

Class	Total students	Class
VIII B	20	Experimental

Source: School's Administration from MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana

This study utilized a pre-experimental design, specifically a non-equivalent control group design, to investigate the effectiveness of peer feedback (PF) in improving the writing skills of junior high school (JHS) students. This study compared two groups: the experimental group, which participated in peer feedback writing activities enhanced with peer feedback, and the control group, where students followed the traditional Teacher Written Corrective Feedback (TWCF) method. The structure of the non-equivalent control group design is outlined below:

Table 3. The Design of Nonequivalent Control Group Design

Class	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experiment	X	Peer Feedback	X
Control	X	Teacher Written Feedback	X

Source: School's Administration from MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana

The experimental group received peer feedback during their writing lessons, with the aim of analyzing its effect on their writing performance. Pretest and posttest assessments for both groups allowed for a clear comparison of the interventions' effectiveness.

According to (Sugiyono, 2013), research variables are defined as "objects with certain variations determined by the researcher to be studied and analyzed." This study includes two key variables:

The independent variable refers to "a factor that influences or causes changes in the dependent variable" (Birmingham & Wilkinson, 2003). In this study, peer feedback

represents the independent variable, as it involves students providing feedback on their peers' writing during the instructional process.

The dependent variable is the outcome influenced by the independent variable. Here, the dependent variable is the students' achievement in writing, measured through pretest and posttest assessments within the experimental group.

Data collection involved administering a series of written tests to evaluate the impact of peer feedback. These tests were designed to measure key aspects of writing in accuracy way, including organization, grammar, vocabulary, and overall proficiency. The pretest and posttest scores provided quantitative data to determine the effectiveness of peer feedback in enhancing writing skills.

According to (Birmingham & Wilkinson, 2003), a research instrument is a tool used to measure observed phenomena, such as variables of interest. For this study, the primary instrument was a set of written tests, comprising pretest and posttest assessments. These tests were specifically tailored to assess students' writing skills before and after implementing peer feedback within Think-Pair-Share-based writing instructions. The test prompts were carefully designed to evaluate essential components of writing, including accuracy and competence, ensuring alignment with the research objectives.

Prior to conducting the pilot test, the preparation process was guided by the first advisor, I Putu Ngurah Wage Myartawan, S.Pd., M.Pd., and the second advisor, Putu Eka Dambayana S., S.Pd., M.Pd. They provided direction for determining the indicators used in the instrument. The essay questions were further reviewed by evaluation experts, who assessed the suitability of the analytical rubric and indicators. These experts were two English Department lecturers: I Putu Ngurah Wage Myartawan, S.Pd., M.Pd., and Putu Eka Dambayana S., S.Pd., M.Pd. The pilot test was then conducted with students from Class VIII C at MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana to refine the instrument.

Before administering the treatment to the experimental and control classes, the researcher conducted pretests and posttests using an essay question in peer-feedback writing. To test the hypotheses, the researcher analyzed the data from the pretest and posttest of the essay question on students' achievement in writing using descriptive and inferential analysis techniques.

Descriptive analysis involves analyzing data by describing or depicting the collected data as they are, without intending to make generalizations from the research findings (Sugiyono, 2013). To determine the quality of the variables, the average scores (mean) of each variable are converted using ideal average criteria and standard deviation

(SD). The descriptive analysis include; Mean, Median, Mode, Maximum and Minimum Values, and Standard Deviation (SD)

The normality test is a procedure used to determine whether data is derived from a normally distributed population or within a normal range. The normality test is used to measure data on an ordinal, interval, or ratio scale. It is employed to determine whether the obtained data follows a normal distribution or not. In this research, the normality test uses the liliefors ( ) test with a significance level of 5%.

Research procedures conducted in this study consist of three stages: the preparation stage, implementation stage, and reporting stage.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This study was conducted at MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana, involving 80 students as the population. The sample consisted of two groups: 20 students from class VIII B, who were taught using peer feedback (PF), and 20 students from class VIII A, who received teacher-written corrective feedback (TWCF). Data collection was carried out through pre-tests and post-tests in both groups to evaluate improvements in writing accuracy, focusing on vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Before applying the assessment instrument to the experimental and control groups, an instrument trial was conducted to ensure its validity and reliability in measuring students' writing accuracy. The trial was carried out on September 23, 2024, with 20 students from class VIII C participating. The outcomes of this trial provided insights into the effectiveness of the rubric in evaluating the writing components targeted in the research.

1. Validity Test

The validity test aimed to confirm that each rubric component—vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and spelling—accurately measured students' writing accuracy in recount texts. Content validity was established by ensuring the rubric aligned with established writing accuracy standards, as outlined in Hyland (2007). For construct validity, the correlation between each rubric criterion and the total score was analyzed using Pearson's correlation coefficient in SPSS.

Table 4. Validity Test Result

Criterion	Validity Coefficient (r)	Validity Status
Vocabulary	0.914	Valid
Grammar	0.810	Valid
Punctuation	0.780	Valid
Spelling	0.838	Valid

Source: Research Results, 2024.

All validity coefficients were significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed), confirming the validity of each component in assessing writing accuracy.

2. Reliability Test

The reliability test ensured the scoring rubric's consistency across different assessments. Cronbach's alpha was used to evaluate the rubric's internal consistency in scoring students' writing.

Results: The Cronbach's alpha value was 0.89, surpassing the standard reliability threshold of 0.7. This indicates a high level of internal consistency, confirming that the rubric is a reliable tool for evaluating students' writing accuracy in recount texts.

Table 5. Reliability Test Result

Test	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Status
Writing Assessment Rubric	0.822	Reliable

Source: Research Results, 2024.

The Cronbach's alpha value of 0.822 for the post-test reinforces that the rubric is consistently reliable in evaluating writing components, including vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

3. Descriptive Statistical Analysis

The experimental class, VIII B, received peer feedback (PF) as the instructional intervention. This class included 20 students. Prior to treatment, students completed a pre-test, which was used to asses baseline writing accuracy.

Table 6. Recapitulation of Pre-Test Scores in the Experimental Class

Score Interval	Category	Number of Students	Percentage
81-100	Very High	0	0%
61-80	High	5	25%
41-60	Moderate	10	50%
21-40	Low	5	25%
0-20	Very Low	0	0%

Source: Research Results, 2024.

Based on the pre-test scores in the experimental class, we observe that no students scored in the "Very High" range, 25% scored in the "High" range, 50% scored in the "Moderate" range, 25% scored in the "Low" range, and no students scored in the "Very Low" range. The summary statistics for the pre-test scores in this class are presented in the following table:

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Pre-Test Scores

Statistic	Pre-Test Score (Experimental Class)
Mean	70.8
Median	71
Mode	71
Standard Deviation	2.7
Minimum	62
Maximum	79
Average Percentage	70.8%
Description	Moderate

Source: Research Results, 2024.

The pre-test data shows an average score of 70.8%, placing it in the "Moderate" category. To improve students' writing accuracy, a peer feedback intervention was introduced. After the intervention, a post-test was administered to evaluate any improvements.

4. Inferential Prerequisite Testing

To ensure the validity of the hypothesis tests, normality and homogeneity tests were conducted. The normality test was conducted to determine whether the obtained data are normally distributed. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used for normality testing. The data analyzed in this normality test comprises the pretest scores for writing accuracy from both the experimental class (peer feedback) and the control class (teacher-written corrective feedback).

Table 8. Normality Test Results for Pretest Scores in Experimental and Control Classes

No	Class	N	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic	p-value	Shapiro-Wilk Statistic	p-value	Conclusion
1	Control	20	0.157	0.200	0.948	0.335	Normally Distributed

2	Experiment	20	0.174	0.115	0.954	0.427	Normally Distributed

Source: Research Results, 2024.

The normality test results show that both the experimental and control classes have p-values greater than 0.05 for both the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests. This suggests that the pretest data for both groups are normally distributed.

Table 9. Posttest Scores for Experimental and Control Classes

Class	N	Mean	Std. Dev	t-Statistic	p-Value
Experiment	20	85.25	3.81	-12.538	0.000
Control	20	74.70	3.11		

Source: Research Results, 2024.

The posttest results reveal that the experimental class had a mean score of 85.25, while the control class had a mean of 74.70. The t-statistic is -12.538, with a p-value of 0.001. Since the p-value is significantly less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and accept the alternative hypothesis (H_1). This suggests that the peer feedback model had a positive effect on the writing accuracy of students in the experimental class compared to the traditional teacher-written corrective feedback method used in the control class.

Discussion

The findings of this study show clear improvements in both the experimental and control groups, though the differences between the two groups are striking. The experimental group, which used peer feedback, showed a significant improvement from the pretest to the posttest. The average score for the experimental group increased from 70.8 on the pretest to 85.25 on the posttest, highlighting a substantial enhancement in writing accuracy. In particular, the experimental group saw higher scores in all areas: vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. This supports the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving students' writing accuracy.

On the other hand, the control group, which did not use peer feedback but relied on traditional teacher feedback, showed a more modest improvement. Their pretest average was 66.55, and their posttest score increased to 74.7. This smaller improvement suggests that while traditional teacher feedback can be beneficial, it does not have as

strong an impact as the peer feedback model. The control group's improvement was less noticeable across the four areas of writing assessed.

These results suggest that peer feedback significantly enhances writing accuracy. This aligns with earlier studies that emphasize the value of peer feedback in improving student learning. For instance, Xu (2023) who showed that peer feedback significantly improved the writing quality of Indonesian EFL learners by actively involving them in the revision process. The study further found that peer feedback helped students achieve better organization and clarity in their writing, which directly contributed to the improvement in overall writing accuracy. In the present study, these same trends were observable, where students in the experimental group demonstrated enhanced writing accuracy due to their active participation in the peer review process.

Additionally, the experimental group's higher level of engagement with peer feedback likely contributed to their improved scores. Peer feedback encourages a collaborative learning environment, where students not only review and correct their own work but also provide constructive feedback to their peers. This collaborative aspect of the learning process helps deepen students' understanding of writing conventions and reinforces their own writing skills. As Tan & Chen (2022) argued, collaborative activities such as peer feedback provide students with opportunities to reflect on their own work, which can significantly enhance their writing abilities. By engaging in these discussions and critiques, students also develop critical thinking skills, which are essential for revising and refining written text.

Despite the clear success of the peer feedback model, some challenges were noted during the initial stages of its implementation. At first, students struggled to understand the peer feedback process, which led to confusion and hesitancy in giving and receiving feedback. These initial difficulties were overcome through continuous guidance from the teacher, who provided support and reassurance to help students feel more confident in participating in the peer feedback sessions. Over time, the students became more comfortable with the process, and the peer feedback sessions evolved into a productive and beneficial part of the learning experience.

Overall, the implementation of peer feedback in this study proved to be highly effective in enhancing writing accuracy and student engagement. The success of the

model highlights the importance of fostering collaborative learning environments, where students actively participate in the feedback process. Although some initial challenges were faced, the positive outcomes observed in the experimental group demonstrate the potential of peer feedback as a powerful tool for improving writing skills and motivating students to take a more active role in their learning. As the study shows, the benefits of peer feedback extend beyond writing accuracy to include increased student engagement, critical thinking, and peer collaboration, all of which contribute to the development of well-rounded, motivated learners.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the comparative effectiveness of Peer Feedback (PF) and Teacher-Written Corrective Feedback (TWCF) on improving writing accuracy in eighth-grade EFL students at MTs Negeri 1 Jembrana, Bali. The writing accuracy was assessed through pre-tests and post-tests, measuring aspects such as grammar and vocabulary, with the results analyzed using paired and independent samples t-tests. The primary aim was to identify which feedback method had a more substantial impact on students' writing performance. The statistical analysis revealed significant improvements in writing accuracy for both feedback methods, with PF demonstrating a notably greater effectiveness.

The results indicated that while both PF and TWCF contributed to increased writing accuracy, the PF group exhibited a more significant improvement. The PF group showed substantial progress in grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, and spelling, suggesting that the interactive and dynamic nature of peer feedback played a key role in enhancing students' writing. By engaging in peer feedback, students were able to collaboratively identify errors, provide constructive feedback, and develop a deeper understanding of linguistic structures, such as grammar rules and vocabulary usage. This finding is consistent with Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, which emphasizes the importance of social interaction and collaborative learning in cognitive development (Vygotsky & Cole, 1978).

DAFTAR REFERENSI

Artikel Jurnal

Al-Khasawneh, F. (2022). A systematic review of the eclectic approach application in language teaching. Saudi Journal of Language Studies, 2(1), 17–27.

Amalia, H., Abdullah, F., & Fatimah, A. S. (2021). Teaching writing to junior high school students: A focus on challenges and solutions. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(S2), 794–810.

Andriani, A., Yuniar, V. D., & Abdullah, F. (2021). Teaching English grammar in an Indonesian junior high school. Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan, 13(2), 1046–1056.

Bürgermeister, A., Glogger-Frey, I., & Saalbach, H. (2021). Supporting peer feedback on learning strategies: Effects on self-efficacy and feedback quality. Psychology Learning & Teaching, 20(3), 383–404.

Diab, N. M., & Awada, G. M. (2022). Effect of Language Learning Strategies and Teacher versus Peer Feedback on Reducing Lexical Errors of University Learners. International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IJAES), 22(1).

Dong, M. H., & Van Ut, N. (2024). The Effects Of Intensive Training Sessions of Peer Feedback on English-Majored Students'writing Achievement. European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 8(2).

Elfiyanto, S., & Fukazawa, S. (2020). Effect of teacher and peer written corrective feedback on writing components in EFL classrooms. JEES (Journal of English Educators Society), 5(2), 185–191. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v5i2.826

Fukuda, S. T., Lander, B. W., & Pope, C. J. (2022). Formative assessment for learning how to learn: Exploring university student learning experiences. RELC Journal, 53(1), 118–133.

García-Martín, J., & García-Sánchez, J.-N. (2018). The instructional effectiveness of two virtual approaches: processes and product. Revista de Psicodidáctica (English Ed.), 23(2), 117–127.

Graham, S. (2018). A revised writer (s)-within-community model of writing. Educational Psychologist, 53(4), 258–279.

Graham, S. (2019). Changing how writing is taught. Review of Research in Education, 43(1), 277–303.

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2013). Designing an effective writing program. Best Practices in Writing Instruction, 2, 3–25.

Guo, W., Bai, B., & Song, H. (2021). Influences of process-based instruction on students' use of self-regulated learning strategies in EFL writing. System, 101, 102578.

Kerman, N. T., Banihashem, S. K., & Noroozi, O. (2023). The Relationship Among Students' Attitude Towards Peer Feedback, Peer Feedback Performance, and Uptake. In The Power of Peer Learning: Fostering Students' Learning Processes and Outcomes (pp. 347–371). Springer International Publishing Cham.

Khaki, M., & Tabrizi, H. H. (2021). Assessing the Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback in Process-Based vs Product-Based Instruction on Learners' Writing. Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 21, n36-53.

Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., Hatami, J., & Biemans, H. J. A. (2021). How does online peer

feedback improve argumentative essay writing and learning? Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 58(2), 195–206.

Latifi, S., Noroozi, O., & Talaee, E. (2021). Peer feedback or peer feedforward? Enhancing students' argumentative peer learning processes and outcomes. British Journal of Educational Technology, 52(2), 768–784.

Lee, I., Luo, N., & Mak, P. (2021). Teachers' attempts at focused written corrective feedback in situ. Journal of Second Language Writing, 54, 100809.

Mallahi, O., & Saadat, M. (2020). Effects of Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' writing Development: Group Dynamic Assessment vs. Formative Assessment. Iranian Evolutionary Educational Psychology Journal, 2(4), 258–277.

Mazulfah, M., Faridi, A., Bharati, D. A. L., & Mujiyanto, J. (2021). The implementation of curriculum development in Indonesian context. International Conference on Science, Education, and Technology, 7, 817–820.

Nicol, D., & McCallum, S. (2022). Making internal feedback explicit: Exploiting the multiple comparisons that occur during peer review. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 47(3), 424–443.

Pangestu, M. H., Juniarta, P. A. K., & Mahendrayana, G. (2022). The Implementation of Process Based Approach in Teaching Writing on The Tenth Grade Students in Senior High School. Indonesian Journal of Educational Research and Review, 5(1), 100–110.

Pérez-Segura, J. J., Sánchez Ruiz, R., González-Calero, J. A., & Cózar-Gutiérrez, R. (2022). The effect of personalized feedback on listening and reading skills in the learning of EFL. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 35(3), 469–491.

Phuong, H. Y., Phan, Q. T., & Le, T. T. (2023). The effects of using analytical rubrics in peer and self-assessment on EFL students' writing proficiency: a Vietnamese contextual study. Language Testing in Asia, 13(1), 42.

Buku Teks

Anderson, J. (2023). Mechanically inclined: Building grammar, usage, and style into writer's workshop. Routledge.

Bazerman, C. (2023). Longtime Writing Teacher; Latecomer to ELA. In Leaders in English Language Arts Education Research (pp. 10–22). Brill

Hyland, K. (2019). Second language writing. Cambridge university press.