

AI-BASED PEER ASSESSMENT ON EFL STUDENTS' WRITING

Winda Shofia Marwan¹, Taufiqulloh², Masfuad Edy Santoso³

¹²³English Education Department, Universitas Pancasakti Tegal (INDONESIA)

*Corresponding author: windashofia23@gmail.com

Abstract

Assessment is a fundamental component of education, serving not only to evaluate students' learning achievement but also to provide meaningful feedback that fosters continuous improvement. Writing is often seen as one of the most difficult language skills in an EFL environment since it needs constant revision backed by excellent feedback. Although peer assessment has been widely implemented to promote collaborative learning and reflective practice, students often struggle to provide accurate, objective, and constructive feedback. The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) offers new opportunities to enhance this process by assisting learners in generating more immediate and meaningful feedback during peer assessment. Therefore, this study was to ascertain how students' writing performance was affected by AI-Based Peer Assessment. 72 tenth-grade students were divided into an experimental group and a control group for a quantitative study using a quasi-experimental design. Pre-test and post-test writing assignments were used to assess students' writing proficiency. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) to establish inter-rater reliability, normality and homogeneity tests, paired-samples and independent-samples *t*-tests, and Cohen's *d* effect size analysis. The findings revealed that students who participated in AI-Based Peer Assessment demonstrated significantly greater improvement than those receiving conventional peer assessment. Moreover, the large effect size indicated substantial practical benefits. These findings suggest that integrating AI into peer assessment is an effective strategy for enhancing students' writing achievement through more accurate, timely, and constructive feedback.

Keywords: assessment; peer assessment; artificial intelligence; students' writing;

1 INTRODUCTION

Assessment constitutes an essential component of the teaching and learning process because it extends beyond measuring students' academic achievement to providing meaningful information that guides learning improvement. Rather than functioning solely as an evaluative tool at the end of instruction, assessment serves as an ongoing process through which teachers and students identify learning progress, recognize existing challenges, and determine appropriate strategies for further development. Consequently, well-designed assessment practices play an indispensable role in creating learning environments that promote continuous improvement and student-centered instruction.

Among various assessment approaches, peer assessment has gained increasing attention as an instructional strategy that actively engages students in evaluating one another's work according to predetermined criteria. Through this collaborative practice, students are encouraged not only to provide feedback on their peers' writing but also to critically reflect on their own work. Such activities foster greater learner autonomy, strengthen critical thinking skills, and encourage students to assume greater responsibility for their own learning. Despite these educational benefits, the effectiveness of peer assessment is frequently constrained by students' limited ability to identify writing problems accurately and provide constructive suggestions. Many learners lack sufficient confidence and experience in evaluating their peers' work, resulting in feedback that is often superficial, inconsistent, or insufficient to support meaningful revision.

New opportunities to overcome these constraints have been made possible by recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI), especially generative AI technologies. AI systems are capable of generating immediate, structured, and language-focused feedback that assists students in identifying grammatical inaccuracies, organizational weaknesses, vocabulary misuse, and other writing-related issues. Within the context of writing instruction, AI is not intended to replace either teachers or peer reviewers. Instead, it functions as a complementary learning tool that supports students in producing higher-quality feedback while preserving the collaborative nature of peer assessment.

One of the most basic yet difficult language skills in English language instruction is still writing. It necessitates that students come up with concepts, arrange data rationally, and effectively convey meaning

through cohesive writing. Beyond linguistic accuracy, successful writing also involves critical thinking, appropriate text organization, and the ability to express ideas clearly according to communicative purposes. Many EFL students still struggle to acquire excellent writing abilities as a result of these multifaceted demands. According to previous studies, students frequently struggle with word selection, concept organization, grammatical precision, and text coherence—all of which have an impact on the overall caliber of their written work.

To address this need, peer assessment has been widely implemented as an instructional strategy that enables students to provide and receive feedback on each other's writing. Through this process, students actively evaluate their peers' work, identify strengths and weaknesses, and reflect on their own writing practices. This approach is rooted in Vygotsky's socialcultural theory, according to (Vygotsky et al., 2003) learning occurs through social interaction and collaboration. By participating in discussion and feedback activities, students actively construct knowledge and improve their understanding through meaningful collaboration.

A growing body of research has demonstrated that peer assessment contributes positively to the development of students' writing skills. Nachalia et al. (2024) and Setiani and Kotabumi (2022) reported that peer assessment significantly enhanced students' writing achievement across several aspects, including content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics. Their studies also indicated that the intervention was particularly beneficial for students with lower writing proficiency. Similar findings were reported by Muin and Mustika (2023), who observed significant improvements in students' writing scores following the implementation of peer feedback. Furthermore, Gaffar et al. (2024) demonstrated that peer assessment integrated into genre-based writing instruction enhanced students' writing performance, while Habiburrohman et al. (2024) found that technology-supported peer assessment improved both writing skills and students' learning motivation. In addition to improving writing achievement, Nursamsi et al. (2025) reported that peer assessment fostered collaboration, self-reflection, and students' self-confidence throughout the writing process.

Despite the growing body of literature supporting peer assessment and technology-enhanced feedback, several gaps remain. The majority of previous studies has looked at AI-assisted writing assistance and peer evaluation as distinct teaching strategies, with little focus on how AI is incorporated into the peer assessment process itself. Moreover, empirical evidence concerning the implementation of AI-Based Peer Assessment in Indonesian vocational high schools remains scarce. Consequently, further investigation is required to determine whether combining collaborative peer assessment with AI-generated feedback can provide greater benefits for students' writing development.

The present study addresses these gaps by integrating Artificial Intelligence into peer assessment while maintaining students' active roles as reviewers and decision-makers throughout the feedback process. Rather than allowing AI to replace peer interaction, this study positions AI as a supporting tool that enhances the quality, accuracy, and timeliness of peer-generated feedback. Therefore, this research offers a novel contribution by examining the effectiveness of AI-Based Peer Assessment within the context of vocational high school English instruction.

Based on this background, this study addresses three research questions: (1) Does AI-Based Peer Assessment significantly affect students' writing performance? and (2) To what extent do students' writing skills improve following the implementation of AI-Based Peer Assessment? Therefore, the purpose of this study is to assess the impact of AI-Based Peer Assessment on students' writing performance, ascertain its statistical significance, and assess the extent to which students' writing has improved following the instructional intervention.

2 METHODOLOGY

To attempt to examine the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Based Peer Assessment on students' writing performance, this study used a quantitative research technique with a quasi-experimental design. Specifically, a pre-test–post-test non-equivalent control group design was adopted to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. The study involved two intact classes assigned as an experimental group and a control group. Students in the experimental group participated in AI-supported peer assessment activities, whereas those in the control group engaged in conventional peer assessment without AI assistance. This design enabled a systematic comparison of the effectiveness of AI-assisted and traditional peer assessment in enhancing students' writing achievement while maintaining comparable instructional conditions for both groups.

The research was conducted at SMK Negeri 1 Dukuhuri during the 2025/2026 academic year. The participants consisted of 72 tenth-grade students, with 36 students assigned to the experimental group and 36 students to the control group. Participants were selected using purposive sampling because the selected classes satisfied the predetermined research criteria and exhibited comparable academic

characteristics, thereby ensuring their suitability for addressing the objectives of the study. Prior to the intervention, both groups demonstrated relatively similar levels of writing proficiency based on the pre-test results.

Students' writing achievement was measured through writing tests administered before and after the instructional intervention. The pre-test was conducted to establish participants' baseline writing proficiency, whereas the post-test evaluated the extent of improvement following the implementation of the intervention. In both assessments, students were required to produce written compositions based on identical writing objectives and assessment criteria, ensuring consistency, comparability, and validity in measuring learning outcomes. The gathered data served as the foundation for evaluating how well AI-Based Peer Assessment improved students' writing performance.

The ESL Composition Profile, created by Jacobs et al. (1981), which evaluates five crucial aspects of writing—content, structure, vocabulary, language usage, and mechanics—was used to evaluate the students' written compositions. To enhance the objectivity and consistency of the scoring process, each writing script was independently assessed by two raters using the same analytic scoring rubric. The level of agreement between the raters was subsequently examined through the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC), following the reliability guidelines proposed by Koo and Li (2016).

The implementation of the study consisted of eight instructional meetings, including one pre-test session, six treatment sessions, and one post-test session. During the treatment period, both groups received the same instructional materials, learning objectives, writing topics, and classroom activities. The primary distinction between the two groups lay in the assessment procedure implemented during peer feedback activities.

Students in the experimental group participated in AI-Based Peer Assessment, in which Artificial Intelligence was incorporated as a supporting tool to assist students in reviewing their peers' writing. AI provided immediate suggestions regarding grammatical accuracy, vocabulary choice, text organization, coherence, and other language-related aspects to help students identify strengths, weaknesses, and possible revisions in the written texts. Nevertheless, AI functioned solely as an assistive tool throughout the assessment process. Students remained responsible for critically evaluating the AI-generated feedback and independently deciding whether the suggested revisions should be accepted, modified, or rejected. Consequently, the peer assessment process continued to emphasize students' active participation, critical reflection, and collaborative learning rather than relying exclusively on AI-generated responses.

In contrast, students in the control group carried out peer assessment through conventional classroom procedures without the assistance of Artificial Intelligence. They reviewed and commented on their peers' writing based solely on the assessment rubric and their own understanding of the writing criteria. Apart from the integration of AI during the feedback stage, both groups experienced identical instructional procedures to ensure that any observed differences in learning outcomes could reasonably be attributed to the implementation of AI-Based Peer Assessment.

Following data collection, the students' writing scores were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. Descriptive statistical analysis was first conducted to summarize students' writing performance by calculating the pre-test and post-test. This preliminary analysis provided an overall description of students' writing achievement before and after the instructional intervention.

Prior to conducting the inferential analyses, several prerequisite tests were performed to verify whether the dataset satisfied the assumptions required for parametric statistical procedures. The homogeneity of variance between the experimental and control groups was evaluated using Levene's test, and the normality of the score distribution was examined using the Shapiro-Wilk test. The purpose of these studies was to ascertain if using parametric statistical tests on the gathered data was appropriate.

After verifying that all assumptions required for parametric statistical analysis had been satisfied, the collected data were subjected to a series of inferential statistical procedures to address the research questions and evaluate the proposed hypotheses. These analyses were conducted to determine not only whether the instructional intervention led to significant improvements in students' writing performance but also whether differences existed between the two instructional approaches. The analysis commenced with a paired-samples *t*-test, which was performed to examine changes in students' writing achievement within each group by comparing the pre-test and post-test scores. This analysis provided evidence regarding the effectiveness of each instructional approach in improving students' writing skills over the course of the intervention. Subsequently, an independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare the post-test performance of the experimental and control groups in order to determine whether AI-Based Peer Assessment produced significantly different learning outcomes from those achieved through conventional peer assessment. To provide a more comprehensive interpretation of the findings, the statistical analyses were complemented by an effect size analysis using Cohen's *d*. Unlike hypothesis testing, which primarily determines the presence of statistically significant differences, Cohen's *d*

quantifies the magnitude of the treatment effect, thereby offering additional evidence regarding the practical and educational significance of implementing AI-Based Peer Assessment in enhancing students' writing skills.

3 RESULTS

The empirical results of the statistical studies carried out to examine how well AI-Based Peer Assessment improves students' writing abilities are presented in this section. To enable a thorough understanding of the gathered data, the results are presented in a methodical analytical order. First, descriptive statistical analysis is used to show how well students wrote both before and after the educational intervention was put into place. The dataset's appropriateness for parametric statistical techniques is then confirmed by necessary assumption tests, and the suggested research hypotheses are then assessed by inferential statistical analysis. An impact size analysis is also included to ascertain the extent of the intervention effect in addition to the interpretation of statistical significance. Collectively, these analytical findings provide robust empirical evidence regarding the extent to which AI-Based Peer Assessment contributes to improving students' writing performance when compared with peer assessment without AI.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
Experimental	36	46.18 (11.01)	79.17 (8.57)	32.99
Control	36	48.26 (12.24)	70.00 (8.44)	21.74

Students' writing performance both before and after the educational intervention is summarized by the descriptive data shown in Table 1. Students' writing abilities increased after the instructional interventions were put into place, as seen by the experimental and control groups' overall higher mean scores on the post-test compared to the pre-test. These results imply that both conventional peer evaluation and AI-assisted peer evaluation are beneficial to the growth of students' writing classes.

Nevertheless, the magnitude of improvement differed considerably between the two groups. Students who participated in the AI-Based Peer Assessment achieved a substantially larger increase in their writing scores than those who experienced conventional peer assessment. The experimental group recorded a mean gain of 32.99 points, whereas the control group demonstrated an average improvement of 21.74 points. This difference suggests that incorporating Artificial Intelligence into the peer assessment process provided additional instructional support that enabled students to revise and refine their writing more effectively.

Beyond the increase in mean scores, the descriptive findings also indicate that students receiving AI-supported peer assessment demonstrated more consistent progress across the assessed writing components. The immediate and structured feedback generated during peer assessment may have assisted students in recognizing weaknesses in their writing more efficiently, thereby facilitating more meaningful revisions. Although descriptive statistics alone cannot establish statistical significance, these preliminary findings provide initial evidence that the integration of AI into peer assessment was associated with greater improvements in students' writing performance than conventional peer assessment.

As an initial step in the statistical analysis, assumption testing was undertaken to evaluate the suitability of the dataset for parametric inferential procedures. These prerequisite tests were intended to confirm that the data fulfilled the essential assumptions required for subsequent hypothesis testing.

Table 2. Result of Normality Test

	Test	Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Experimental Group	Pretest	0.950	0.075	Normally distributed
Experimental Group	Posttest	0.949	0.085	Normally distributed
Control Group	Pretest	0.947	0.063	Normally distributed
Control Group	Posttest	0.978	0.682	Normally distributed

To confirm adherence to the normality assumption that underpins parametric statistical processes, the Shapiro-Wilk normality test was used to analyze the distributional features of the dataset. The significant values for the pre-test and post-test scores in both the experimental and control groups were consistently higher than the predefined significance level of 0.05, as shown in Table 2. These findings show that there were no statistically significant deviations from a normal distribution, proving that the observed data sufficiently met the normality assumption. Since the validity of future hypothesis testing

depends on the degree to which the underlying assumptions are met, establishing this precondition offers a solid statistical basis for the application of parametric inferential procedures. Therefore, the dataset was considered appropriate for further inferential analyses, including the comparison of students' writing performance using parametric statistical tests.

Table 3. Homogeneity Test

Variable	Levene Statistic	Sig.	Interpretation
Pre-test	1.410	0.239	Homogeneous
Post-test	3.455	0.067	Homogeneous

Levene's test was used to assess the assumption of normality as well as the homogeneity of variance between the experimental and control groups. No statistically significant variations were found in the variances between the two groups, according to the study, which produced significance values above the predefined alpha threshold of 0.05. These results show that the homogeneity of variance assumption was well met, indicating that the variability distribution was sufficiently comparable among the research groups. When considered alongside the results of the normality assessment, the overall findings confirm that the dataset met all fundamental assumptions required for the application of parametric inferential statistical techniques. A solid statistical foundation for moving on with hypothesis testing was supplied by the satisfaction of these basic requirements. In order to determine if students' writing performance increased significantly within each group, a paired-samples t-test was used to compare the pre-test and post-test results. To ascertain whether the use of AI-Based Peer Assessment produced noticeably better learning outcomes than those attained through conventional peer assessment, an independent-samples t-test was then used to assess differences in post-test performance between the experimental and control groups.

Both the paired-samples t-test and the independent-samples t-test were used in inferential statistical studies to investigate the study hypotheses. The effectiveness of AI-Based Peer Assessment in comparison to conventional peer assessment was assessed by comparing the post-test results of the experimental and control groups using the independent-samples t-test, while the paired-samples t-test was utilized to ascertain whether students' writing performance improved significantly within each group after the instructional intervention.

Table 4. Hypothesis Testing

Analysis		Sig.
Paired t-test (Experimental)	t = -21.798	0.000
Paired t-test (Control)	t = -14.994	0.000
Independent t-test	t = 4.568	0.000
Sig. (2 tailed)	< 0.001	

As presented in Table 2, the results of the paired-samples t-test revealed statistically significant improvements in writing performance for both the experimental and control groups. The significance values obtained for both groups were below the established alpha level ($p < 0.05$), indicating that the instructional treatments successfully enhanced students' writing skills. These findings suggest that both AI-supported and conventional peer assessment positively contributed to students' writing development throughout the intervention.

Although significant improvement was observed in both groups, the independent-samples t-test demonstrated that the degree of improvement differed significantly between the two instructional approaches. The analysis identified a statistically significant difference in the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups ($p < 0.001$). Students who participated in AI-Based Peer Assessment achieved significantly higher writing scores than those who completed conventional peer assessment without AI assistance. This finding indicates that the integration of Artificial Intelligence into the peer assessment process produced greater learning gains than the conventional approach.

The results of both statistical analyses provide complementary evidence regarding the effectiveness of the intervention. While the paired-samples t-test confirmed that students in each group experienced significant improvement after the instructional treatment, the independent-samples t-test demonstrated that AI-Based Peer Assessment resulted in significantly better writing performance than conventional peer assessment. Collectively, these findings support the hypothesis that integrating Artificial Intelligence into peer assessment enhances students' writing achievement more effectively than peer assessment conducted without AI support.

Although analyzed separately, the paired-samples and independent-samples t-test findings offer empirical proof of the efficacy of AI-Based Peer Assessment in raising students' writing proficiency. However, the practical extent of the observed difference between the two teaching techniques cannot be inferred from statistical significance alone. To ascertain the degree to which the intervention enhanced students' writing, an effect size analysis was carried out.

Table 5. Result of Effect Size

Analysis	Score	Increase
Cohen's d	1.08	Large effect

According to Cohen (1988), the study produced a Cohen's d value of 1.08, which is classified as a substantial influence. This outcome shows that the use of AI-Based Peer Assessment resulted in both statistically significant gains and considerable educational advantages. The significant influence of incorporating AI into the peer evaluation process on students' writing accomplishment is indicated by the large effect size, indicating that the intervention was very successful in fostering the growth of students' writing abilities.

This outcome suggests that students' writing performance was much enhanced by the use of AI-Based Peer Assessment. Following the intervention, the experimental group's writing achievement increased more than that of the control group, indicating that incorporating AI into the peer evaluation process successfully aided students' writing skill development. This improvement might be explained by the fact that AI-assisted feedback made it easier for students to recognize their grammatical, vocabulary, organization, and concept development deficiencies throughout the revision process. As a result, students were able to revise their writing more systematically and produce better-quality written texts. This result is supported by Nachalia et al. (2024), who reported that peer assessment improved students' performance across multiple writing components, including organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Similarly, Rahmah Muin and Mustika (2023) found that students' writing achievement significantly improved after receiving peer feedback. Earlier, Setiani and Kotabumi (2022) also demonstrated that peer assessment effectively enhanced students' writing performance by encouraging meaningful revision based on constructive feedback.

The improvement in students' writing performance can also be explained through Vygotsky's social constructivist theory, which argues that learning is developed through interaction, collaboration, and the co-construction of knowledge Vygotsky et al., (2003). Throughout the implementation of AI-Based Peer Assessment, students actively reviewed their peers' work, exchanged ideas, discussed writing problems, and reflected on the feedback they received. These collaborative learning activities enabled students to develop a deeper understanding of effective writing while simultaneously improving their own writing performance. This interpretation is reinforced by Nursamsi et al. (2025), who found that peer assessment promotes collaboration, self-reflection, and active engagement throughout the writing process. These learning experiences encourage students not only to evaluate their peers' writing critically but also to reflect on and improve their own writing.

The findings also support the perspective of Hyland and Richards (2010), who emphasize that feedback is an essential component of writing instruction because it enables learners to identify weaknesses, revise their drafts, and progressively improve the quality of their writing. In the present study, AI served as a complementary tool that provided immediate language-related suggestions while maintaining students' active participation in peer assessment. Rather than replacing peer interaction, AI appeared to strengthen the revision process by helping students recognize writing problems more accurately before producing their final drafts. A similar pattern was reported by Habiburrohman et al. (2024), who found that technology-supported peer assessment improved students' writing performance while increasing their learning motivation. Likewise, Gaffar et al. (2024) demonstrated that integrating technology into peer assessment enhanced students' engagement and contributed to better writing achievement.

Overall, the findings suggest that AI-Based Peer Assessment is an effective instructional strategy for improving students' writing performance in EFL classrooms. The integration of AI into peer assessment provides students with additional support during the revision process while preserving the collaborative interaction that characterizes peer assessment. Consequently, students benefit from both collaborative learning and AI-assisted feedback, creating greater opportunities to refine their writing and achieve better writing performance.

4 CONCLUSIONS

In the context of English language acquisition, this study examined how well AI-Based Peer Assessment improved students' writing abilities. The findings demonstrate that the integration of Artificial Intelligence into the peer assessment process contributed to greater improvements in students' writing performance compared with conventional peer assessment. Although both instructional approaches resulted in significant progress, students who participated in AI-assisted peer assessment achieved superior learning outcomes, indicating that AI can effectively complement collaborative assessment practices by facilitating more accurate, timely, and constructive feedback.

The findings also provide empirical support for the theoretical perspectives underpinning this study. Consistent with Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory, the integration of AI did not replace collaborative learning but instead strengthened students' interactions during the peer assessment process by supporting meaningful feedback and reflective learning. Likewise, the results align with Hyland's writing theory, emphasizing that continuous feedback and revision are essential components of writing development. By combining collaborative peer interaction with AI-generated feedback, students were provided with greater opportunities to identify weaknesses, revise their writing, and improve multiple aspects of writing performance.

The findings of this study also contribute to the growing body of research on technology-enhanced assessment in EFL writing instruction. Rather than replacing students' roles in the assessment process, AI functions as a complementary learning tool that supports collaborative peer assessment. By combining peer interaction with AI-assisted feedback, students remain actively engaged in evaluating their peers' work while receiving additional guidance that facilitates more effective writing revision.

Despite the meaningful contributions of the present study, several limitations should be taken into consideration when interpreting the findings. First, the research was conducted exclusively with tenth-grade students from a single vocational high school, which may restrict the broader applicability of the results to other educational settings or student populations. Consequently, caution should be exercised when generalizing these findings beyond the context in which the study was undertaken. Second, the intervention was implemented within a relatively limited timeframe, preventing a comprehensive evaluation of the long-term impact of AI-Based Peer Assessment on students' writing development and the sustainability of the observed learning gains over time.

Given these limitations, further research is warranted to extend and validate the findings of the present study. Future investigations are encouraged to examine the implementation of AI-Based Peer Assessment across a wider range of educational contexts, grade levels, and language learning environments in order to determine its effectiveness under diverse instructional conditions. Moreover, subsequent studies may broaden the scope of investigation by exploring additional dimensions, including students' perceptions and attitudes toward AI-assisted peer assessment, the quality and characteristics of peer-generated feedback, learners' cognitive and behavioral engagement throughout the writing process, and the long-term sustainability of integrating Artificial Intelligence into writing instruction. Such investigations would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the pedagogical value of AI-Based Peer Assessment and contribute to the continued advancement of technology-enhanced language learning practices.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the invaluable guidance, encouragement, and constructive feedback provided by the research supervisor throughout the completion of this study. Sincere appreciation is also extended to Universitas Pancasakti Tegal for providing academic support and facilities that contributed to the successful completion of this research. The author further expresses gratitude to the principal, English teacher in SMK Negeri 1 Dukuhturi, and tenth-grade students especially the class of X MPLB 2 and X MPLB 3 for their cooperation and active participation during the research process.

REFERENCES

- Bora, P. (2023). Importance of Writing Skill to Develop Students' Communication Skill. *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, 7(35).
<https://doi.org/10.54850/jrspelt.7.35.009>

- Gaffar, M. A., Fadilah, D. F., & Nopita, D. (2024). Influence of Peer Corrective Feedback (PCF) on Students' Writing Skills in Hortatory Exposition Text. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 11(2), 557–578. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v11i2.3364>
- Habiburrohman, H., Supartini, E., & Onchera, P. O. (2024). The Effect of Peer Assessment through Twitter on Students' Writing the Analytical Exposition Text Ability. *Journal of Language, Literature, and Educational Research*, 1(1), 18–24. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jolle.v1i1.997>
- Hamdani, M. H., & Abid, N. (2025). INDONESIAN EFL STUDENTS' WRITING CHALLENGES: A QUALITATIVE META-ANALYSIS. *Getsempena English Education Journal (GEEJ)*, 12(1), 14–36. <https://ejournal.bbg.ac.id/geej>
- Hyland, Ken., & Richards, J. C. . (2010). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Jacob, Zinkgraf, Wormuth, Hartfiel, & Hughey. (1981). *Testing ESL Composition a Practical Approach*.
- Khudaverdiyeva, T. (2025). The Importance of Writing in Language Acquisition: A Cognitive, Communicative, and Pedagogical Perspective. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities*, 2(3), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.0203025014>
- Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A Guideline of Selecting and Reporting Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for Reliability Research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 15(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
- Nachalia, Mujiyanto, J., & . W. (2024). The Effectiveness of Peer Assessment in Improving Writing Skills of Students with Different Grammatical Competencies at SMA Negeri 3 Palangka Raya Kalimantan Tengah. *International Journal of Research and Review*, 11(6), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20240607>
- Nursamsi, F., Thamrin, N. S., Eisenring, Moh. A. A., & Usman, S. (2025). The effectiveness of peer-assessment in increasing students' ability in writing descriptive text. *Celtic : A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 12(2), 793–810. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v12i2.42146>
- Rahmah Muin, F., & Mustika, R. (2023). *PEER REVIEW TECHNIQUE IN TEACHING EFL WRITING SKILLS FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS* (Vol. 4, Number 2).
- Setiani, R., & Kotabumi, U. M. (n.d.). *PEER ASSESSMENT EFFECT ON STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE*.
- Vygotsky, L. S., Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., & Souberman, E. (n.d.). *Mind in Society The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*.
- Wang, J. (2024). A Study of Peer Assessment of English Writing in High School. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 10(4). <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijlt.10.4.505-509>