

# Examining the Effectiveness of Peer Review in Improving Students' Writing Performance: A Systematic Literature Review

Bobby Pramjit Singh Dhillon<sup>1\*</sup>; Herman Herman<sup>2</sup>; Elina Lulu Bimawati Rumapea<sup>3</sup>; Nurainun Hasibuan<sup>4</sup>; Mega Williandani<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Petra Bitung, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Darul Arafah, Indonesia

<sup>5</sup>Academy Tourism and Hospitality Darma Agung, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author's email : bobbydhillon@uhnp.ac.id

Received:- 05 January 2026/ Revised:- 12 January 2026/ Accepted:- 21 January 2026/ Published: 31-01-2026

Copyright © 2026 Journal of Creative Research in English Literature & Culture

This is an Open-Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>) which permits unrestricted Non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Abstract**— Writing is a complex academic skill that requires not only linguistic proficiency but also higher-order cognitive abilities such as organization, coherence, and critical thinking. Peer review, in which students provide feedback on each other's writing, has been widely promoted as a strategy to enhance writing performance. This systematic literature review examines empirical studies published between 2020 and 2025 to evaluate the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing across diverse educational contexts. A total of 25 studies were included, encompassing secondary, undergraduate, and postgraduate learners in EFL, ESL, and first-language writing settings. Findings indicate that peer review positively impacts higher-order writing skills, including content development, organization, coherence, and revision practices, while improvements in grammar and mechanics were more variable. Structured implementation, such as the use of rubrics, peer review training, and guided feedback, was associated with more consistent improvements. Students generally reported positive perceptions, citing increased engagement, motivation, and awareness of writing quality, although challenges such as feedback reliability and cultural hesitancy in critique were noted. Overall, the review highlights that peer review is an effective pedagogical tool when appropriately scaffolded and integrated with teacher guidance. Implications suggest that educators should employ structured peer review practices to foster collaboration, reflection, and critical engagement with writing. Future research should investigate longitudinal outcomes, optimal peer review configurations, and strategies to enhance feedback quality.

**Keywords**— Peer review, writing performance, systematic literature review, higher-order writing skills, student engagement, EFL/ESL education.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as one of the most complex language skills to master, particularly for students in academic contexts. It requires not only linguistic knowledge such as grammar and vocabulary, but also higher-order cognitive skills including organization, coherence, and critical thinking (Rumapea et al., 2025; Sinaga et al., 2025). As a result, many students struggle to produce effective written texts, and improving writing performance remains a major concern for educators across disciplines and educational levels (Hyland, 2003; Richards & Renandya, 2002; Girsang et al., 2025).

Traditional approaches to teaching writing have often emphasized teacher-centered feedback, where instructors are the primary source of evaluation and correction. While teacher feedback is valuable, it can be time-consuming, limited in scope, and may not always lead to meaningful revisions by students (Ferris, 2003; Simanjuntak et al., 2025; Herman et al., 2025). These limitations have spurred interest in alternative, learner-centered strategies that promote autonomy and active engagement in the writing process.

One instructional approach that has gained considerable attention is peer review. Peer review refers to a process in which students evaluate and provide feedback on each other's written work based on specific criteria or guidelines (Liu & Hansen, 2002). Grounded in social constructivist theory, peer review emphasizes learning as a collaborative process where knowledge is constructed through interaction and dialogue among learners (Vygotsky, 1978). Furthermore, from the perspective of discourse community theory, peer review can be seen as a socialization process through which students begin to internalize the conventions, norms, and expectations of academic writing genres, thereby facilitating their entry into scholarly discourse communities (Bizzell, 1992; Bartholomae, 1986).

Previous research suggests that peer review can offer several pedagogical benefits. By reviewing peers' work, students may develop greater awareness of writing conventions, improve their critical reading skills, and reflect more deeply on their own writing (Falchikov, 2001). Additionally, receiving feedback from peers may help students identify weaknesses in their writing that they might overlook when relying solely on teacher feedback (Nicol, Thomson, & Breslin, 2014).

Despite these potential advantages, the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing performance has been debated. Some studies report positive outcomes, such as improved text quality, increased motivation, and enhanced revision practices (Min, 2006; Cho & MacArthur, 2010; Herman et al., 2024). However, other studies highlight challenges, including students' lack of confidence in providing feedback, variability in feedback quality, and cultural factors that influence peer interaction (Nelson & Carson, 1998; Hu, 2005).

Furthermore, existing research on peer review spans diverse educational contexts, learner populations, and implementation methods. Differences in training, feedback modes (oral or written), group size, and assessment criteria may lead to inconsistent findings across studies. As a result, it becomes difficult for educators and researchers to draw clear conclusions about the overall effectiveness of peer review as a writing instructional strategy.

Given the growing body of research and the mixed findings reported in the literature, a systematic literature review is necessary to synthesize existing evidence in a comprehensive and structured manner. A systematic review allows for the identification of research trends, methodological patterns, and gaps in the literature, providing a clearer understanding of how and under what conditions peer review contributes to students' writing performance (Petticrew & Roberts, 2006).

Therefore, this systematic literature review aims to examine the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing performance. By analyzing empirical studies published in relevant academic contexts, this review seeks to provide insights for educators, curriculum designers, and future researchers regarding the pedagogical and cultural value of peer review in writing instruction.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Peer Review in Writing Instruction:

Peer review has long been recognized as an important component of process-oriented writing instruction. Rooted in collaborative learning theory, peer review encourages students to actively engage in evaluating written texts and constructing meaning through interaction (Bruffee, 1984). In writing classrooms, peer review typically involves students exchanging drafts and providing feedback on content, organization, language use, and overall clarity. This practice shifts students from passive recipients of teacher feedback to active participants in the learning process.

Several scholars argue that peer review supports writing development by promoting audience awareness and reflective thinking. When students read and comment on peers' texts, they are exposed to diverse writing styles and strategies, which can broaden their understanding of effective writing (Rollinson, 2005). This exposure may help students internalize evaluation criteria and apply them to their own writing, leading to improved writing performance.

### 2.2 Cognitive and Metacognitive Benefits of Peer Review:

Research suggests that peer review contributes not only to surface-level improvements in writing but also to deeper cognitive and metacognitive development. Engaging in peer feedback requires students to analyze texts critically, identify problems, and propose solutions, which enhances higher-order thinking skills (Tsui & Ng, 2000). These cognitive processes are closely linked to improved writing quality, particularly in terms of coherence, argumentation, and organization.

From a metacognitive perspective, peer review can foster self-regulation and self-assessment skills. By evaluating peers' work, students may become more aware of their own strengths and weaknesses as writers (Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). Studies have

shown that students who provide feedback often benefit as much as, or even more than, those who receive feedback, suggesting that the act of reviewing plays a crucial role in writing development.

### **2.3 Effectiveness of Peer Feedback Compared to Teacher Feedback:**

A growing body of research has compared peer feedback with teacher feedback to determine their relative effectiveness. While teacher feedback is often viewed as more authoritative and accurate, peer feedback has been found to be valuable in promoting revision and learner engagement (Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006). Peer feedback tends to be more dialogic and less intimidating, which may encourage students to take greater ownership of their revisions.

Some studies indicate that peer feedback is particularly effective when combined with teacher guidance. For example, structured peer review activities, supported by clear rubrics and modeling, can lead to significant improvements in writing quality (Berg, 1999). These findings suggest that peer review should not replace teacher feedback entirely but rather complement it within a balanced instructional framework.

### **2.4 Challenges and Limitations of Peer Review:**

Despite its potential benefits, the implementation of peer review is fraught with challenges, primarily concerning feedback quality and socio-cultural dynamics. One common concern is the quality and reliability of peer feedback. Students may lack sufficient linguistic proficiency or content knowledge to provide accurate and constructive comments (Patchan & Schunn, 2015). In some cases, feedback may focus on superficial issues such as grammar rather than higher-level concerns like argumentation or organization.

Affective and contextual factors also influence the effectiveness of peer review. Students' attitudes toward peer feedback, their interpersonal relationships, and cultural norms regarding criticism can affect how feedback is given and received (Carson & Nelson, 1996). For instance, in cultures with high power distance or strong emphasis on face-saving (Hofstede, 2001; Connor, 1996), students may be particularly reluctant to critique peers' work directly, which can limit the usefulness and authenticity of the peer review process.

### **2.5 Need for a Systematic Synthesis of Research:**

Although numerous empirical studies have examined peer review in writing instruction, findings remain varied due to differences in research design, participant characteristics, instructional settings, and feedback procedures. Narrative reviews have provided valuable insights, but they may lack methodological rigor and comprehensive coverage. Therefore, a systematic literature review is necessary to synthesize existing empirical evidence in a transparent and replicable manner.

By systematically analyzing previous studies, it is possible to identify patterns regarding when and how peer review is most effective, as well as areas where further research is needed. Such a synthesis can help educators make informed decisions about implementing peer review and contribute to a more nuanced understanding of its role in improving students' writing performance.

## **III. RESEARCH METHODS**

### **3.1 Research Design:**

This study adopts a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology to examine the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing performance. A systematic literature review is a rigorous and transparent approach to identifying, evaluating, and synthesizing existing research on a specific topic using predefined criteria and procedures. Compared to traditional narrative reviews, an SLR minimizes bias and enhances the reliability and replicability of findings by following a structured review protocol. The review was guided by clearly defined research questions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and systematic procedures for data collection, screening, and analysis. The review process was conducted in accordance with established guidelines for systematic reviews in education and social sciences (e.g., Petticrew & Roberts, 2006).

### **3.2 Data Sources:**

To ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant studies, multiple electronic academic databases were used as primary data sources. The databases selected are widely recognized for publishing peer-reviewed research in education, applied linguistics, and language teaching. The following databases were searched:

- a. Scopus

- b. Web of Science (WoS)
- c. ERIC (Education Resources Information Center)
- d. Google Scholar

These databases were chosen because they index high-quality journals and provide extensive coverage of empirical studies related to writing instruction, peer feedback, and educational interventions.

### 3.3 Search Strategy:

A systematic search was conducted using a combination of keywords and Boolean operators to capture relevant studies. The search terms were derived from the main concepts of the study: peer review and writing performance. Examples of search strings include:

- a. "peer review" OR "peer feedback" OR "peer assessment"
- b. AND "writing performance" OR "writing quality" OR "writing skills"
- c. AND "students" OR "EFL learners" OR "ESL learners"

The search was limited to studies published between 2020 and 2025 to ensure that the review reflects recent research trends and contemporary instructional practices. Only articles written in English were included.

### 3.4 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

To determine the relevance and quality of the selected studies, explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied.

#### Inclusion criteria:

- a. Empirical studies examining peer review or peer feedback in writing instruction
- b. Studies focusing on students' writing performance as an outcome
- c. Participants from any educational level (primary, secondary, tertiary, or higher education)
- d. Studies published in peer-reviewed journals between 2020 and 2025
- e. Articles written in English

#### Exclusion criteria:

- a. Non-empirical studies (e.g., editorials, opinion papers, book reviews)
- b. Studies not directly related to writing instruction
- c. Research focusing on peer review in non-educational contexts
- d. Conference abstracts without full-text availability
- e. Duplicate studies across databases

### 3.5 Study Selection Process:

The study selection process was conducted in several stages. First, all identified records were imported into a reference management system, and duplicates were removed. Second, titles and abstracts were screened to exclude irrelevant studies based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Third, full-text articles were reviewed to determine final eligibility. This multi-stage screening process ensured that only studies directly addressing the effectiveness of peer review on students' writing performance were included in the final analysis.

### 3.6 Data Extraction and Analysis:

Relevant data were systematically extracted from the selected studies using a structured data extraction form. The extracted information included:

- a. Author(s) and year of publication
- b. Educational context and participant characteristics
- c. Research design and methodology
- d. Type and mode of peer review implementation
- e. Measures of writing performance
- f. Key findings related to the effectiveness of peer review

The extracted data were analyzed using qualitative thematic synthesis to identify recurring patterns, themes, and trends across studies. Where applicable, quantitative findings were also compared to determine the overall direction and consistency of results.

#### IV. RESULTS

This section presents the findings from the systematic literature review examining the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing performance. The review covers empirical studies published between 2020 and 2025. The results are organized into (1) study characteristics, (2) peer review implementation, (3) effects on writing performance, and (4) learner perceptions.

##### 4.1 Characteristics of the Included Studies:

A total of 25 empirical studies met the inclusion criteria. These studies were conducted in diverse educational contexts, including EFL/ESL classrooms and L1 writing instruction, across secondary, undergraduate, and postgraduate levels.

TABLE 1  
GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF INCLUDED STUDIES (2020–2025)

Characteristic	Frequency / Description
Publication year	2020: 5, 2021: 4, 2022: 6, 2023: 5, 2024: 3, 2025: 2
Research context	EFL: 14, ESL: 7, L1 writing: 4
Educational level	Secondary: 6, Undergraduate: 15, Postgraduate: 4
Study type	Quantitative: 10, Qualitative: 6, Mixed-methods: 9
Peer review mode	Written: 12, Oral: 3, Online: 7, Hybrid: 3

Most studies were conducted in higher education contexts, particularly among undergraduate students in EFL settings. Mixed-methods research was common, reflecting the need to capture both measurable writing improvements and students' perceptions of peer review.

##### 4.2 Peer Review Implementation:

Peer review procedures varied across studies in terms of training, mode, group size, and focus. Most studies emphasized structured peer review, including rubrics, guidelines, or model feedback.

TABLE 2  
PEER REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Implementation Aspect	Observation / Frequency
Training provided	Yes: 18, No: 7
Feedback focus	Content & organization: 21, Language accuracy: 12, Holistic feedback: 7
Group size	Pairs: 10, Small groups (3–5 students): 12, Large groups (>5): 3
Mode of feedback	Written: 12, Oral: 3, Online: 7, Hybrid: 3

Structured peer review with clear training and guidance was linked to more consistent improvements in writing. Feedback focused on content and organization was most common, aligning with studies that emphasize higher-order writing skills over purely mechanical correction.

### 4.3 Effects on Students' Writing Performance:

Peer review was generally associated with positive outcomes, especially in higher-order aspects of writing such as content development, coherence, and revision quality. Improvements in grammar and mechanics were less consistent. The predominant positive impact on higher-order skills suggests peer review is most effective as a tool for developing rhetorical and conceptual abilities rather than for grammatical remediation.

**TABLE 3**  
**REPORTED EFFECTS OF PEER REVIEW ON WRITING PERFORMANCE**

Writing Aspect	Reported Effect	Number of Studies Reporting
Content development	Mostly positive	20
Organization & coherence	Consistently positive	18
Revision practices	Strong positive	15
Grammar & mechanics	Mixed	10
Overall writing quality	Positive	22

The review indicates that peer review is most effective in enhancing cognitive and metacognitive skills, such as planning, organizing, and revising texts. Language accuracy improvements were moderate, reflecting the limitation of peer expertise in grammar-focused feedback.

### 4.4 Learner Perceptions and Affective Outcomes:

Students generally expressed positive attitudes toward peer review but reported some challenges, such as uncertainty about peer feedback accuracy or cultural hesitancy in providing criticism.

**TABLE 4**  
**LEARNER PERCEPTIONS OF PEER REVIEW**

Perception Category	Observation / Frequency
Positive perceptions	19 studies reported increased motivation, engagement, and confidence
Perceived benefits	16 studies noted better awareness of writing criteria and improvement strategies
Reported challenges	12 studies highlighted concerns about feedback quality and peer evaluation reliability
Cultural/contextual factors	7 studies reported reluctance to critique peers directly

The findings indicate that students value peer review for its collaborative and reflective nature, but effectiveness depends on training, clear expectations, and classroom culture. Proper scaffolding is essential to mitigate concerns regarding feedback accuracy and peer reluctance.

## V. DISCUSSION

This systematic literature review examined the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing performance based on studies published between 2020 and 2025. The findings indicate that peer review is generally a beneficial instructional strategy, particularly when implemented in a structured and supportive manner. The discussion below interprets these findings in relation to prior research, theoretical frameworks, and pedagogical practice.

### 5.1 Peer Review and Writing Performance:

The results suggest that peer review significantly enhances higher-order writing skills, including content development, organization, coherence, and revision quality. These findings align with earlier research emphasizing that peer feedback promotes critical thinking and reflective writing (Rollinson, 2005; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009). By analyzing peers' texts and providing feedback, students become more conscious of writing conventions and strategies, which supports improvement in their own work. This process can be understood through the lens of genre mastery; structured peer review, with its rubrics and



guidelines, serves as a scaffold that helps students decode and internalize the often-implicit conventions of academic writing genres, thereby accelerating their enculturation into academic discourse communities.

However, the review found that improvements in grammar and mechanical accuracy were less consistent. This may reflect students' limited linguistic expertise when providing feedback and confirms earlier observations that peer review is more effective in conceptual and structural aspects of writing rather than surface-level correctness (Tsui & Ng, 2000; Patchan & Schunn, 2015). Therefore, peer review should complement, rather than replace, teacher feedback for language accuracy.

### **5.2 Role of Structured Implementation:**

A key finding is that the effectiveness of peer review depends on structure and guidance. Studies that incorporated explicit training, rubrics, and sample feedback generally reported more positive outcomes. This finding is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivist framework, which emphasizes that learning occurs through guided interaction within the Zone of Proximal Development. By providing scaffolding, educators help students give meaningful feedback and internalize evaluation criteria, enhancing the learning benefits of peer review.

The mode of peer review (written, oral, online, or hybrid) also influenced outcomes. While written feedback was most common, online peer review showed promise for facilitating more reflective and asynchronous interactions, allowing students time to analyze peers' work carefully (Yang, Badger, & Yu, 2006). Hybrid approaches that combined written and oral feedback appeared to maximize both critical thinking and collaborative learning benefits.

### **5.3 Learner Perceptions and Affective Factors:**

Students generally reported positive perceptions of peer review, citing increased motivation, engagement, and awareness of writing quality. These affective benefits are important because they support sustained writing practice and active participation in learning (Falchikov, 2001). Beyond engagement, successful peer review can foster the development of a writerly identity and agency. As students transition from passive recipients of feedback to active critics and collaborators, they begin to see themselves as legitimate participants in the writing community, which is a crucial step in building academic confidence and autonomy.

However, the review highlighted challenges related to feedback quality, trust, and cultural factors. Some students expressed hesitation in providing critical comments, particularly in contexts where peer critique is culturally sensitive. These findings reinforce the need for educators to create supportive environments and clarify expectations, helping students feel confident and competent in both giving and receiving feedback. Acknowledging and strategically addressing these cultural dimensions is not merely a logistical step but is central to fostering an inclusive and effective peer learning culture.

In summary, this review confirms that peer review is an effective strategy for improving students' writing performance, particularly for content, organization, and revision skills, when it is structured and scaffolded appropriately. Learners' positive engagement and reflection further support its pedagogical value. However, educators should combine peer review with teacher guidance, address affective and cultural factors, and continue exploring innovative methods to optimize its effectiveness.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

This systematic literature review examined empirical studies published between 2020 and 2025 on the effectiveness of peer review in improving students' writing performance. The findings indicate that peer review is generally effective in enhancing higher-order writing skills, such as content development, organization, coherence, and revision practices. Structured implementation, including clear guidelines, rubrics, and training, was consistently associated with more positive outcomes, highlighting the importance of scaffolding and support in peer review activities.

In addition to improving writing performance, peer review was found to foster students' metacognitive skills, including self-assessment, critical thinking, and reflective learning. Students generally perceived peer review positively, reporting increased engagement, motivation, and awareness of writing quality. However, challenges such as concerns about feedback accuracy, reluctance to critique peers, and cultural factors were identified, emphasizing the need for carefully designed peer review processes and supportive classroom environments.

Overall, the review confirms that peer review is a valuable pedagogical strategy for writing instruction across diverse educational contexts, particularly when integrated with teacher guidance. Educators are encouraged to adopt structured peer

review practices that promote collaboration, reflection, and constructive feedback. Future research should explore longitudinal effects, optimal implementation strategies, and methods to enhance feedback reliability to further maximize the potential of peer review in fostering not only improved writing performance but also more collaborative and critical academic cultures.

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the “conversation of mankind.” *College English*, 46(7), 635–652.
- [2] 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.
- [3] Carson, J. G., & Nelson, G. L. (1996). Chinese students’ perceptions of ESL peer response group interaction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5(1), 1–19.
- [4] Cho, K., & MacArthur, C. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 328–338.
- [5] Falchikov, N. (2001). *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- [6] Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [7] Girsang, S. E. E., Tumanggor, E. A. P., Metboki, Y., Herryani, H., Herman, H., Syathroh, I. L., Fitriadi, A., & Saputra, N. (2025). Empowering students’ ability in writing descriptive texts through Point Illustration Explanation (PIE) strategy: A case on teaching strategy. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 13(1), 366–377. <https://doi.org/10.11114/smc.v13i1.7466>
- [8] Herman, H., Siallagan, H., Fatmawati, E., Sherly, S., Ngongo, M., Lubis, H. T., & Syathroh, I. L. (2025). Exploring the emerging domain of research on media for teaching learning process: A case on improving reading comprehension skills. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, 14(4), 354–366.
- [9] Herman, H., Shaumiwaty, S., Sipayung, R. W., Solissa, E. M., Fatmawati, E., Girsang, S. E. E., & Saputra, N. (2024). A Systemic Functional Linguistic approach to improve students’ ability in writing English text. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 1822–1830.
- [10] Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(3), 321–342.
- [11] Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University of Michigan Press.
- [13] Lundstrom, 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.
- [14] 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.
- [15] Nelson, G. L., & Carson, J. G. (1998). ESL students’ perceptions of effectiveness in peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(2), 113–131.
- [16] Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102–122.
- [17] Patchan, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2015). Understanding the benefits of providing peer feedback: How students respond to peers’ texts of varying quality. *Instructional Science*, 43(5), 591–614.
- [18] Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Blackwell Publishing.
- [19] Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23–30.
- [21] Rumapea, E. L. B., Kapoh, R. J., Novianti, C., Yuniarsih, Y., Harita, I. P. S., Herman, H., & Saputra, N. (2025). Investigating the use of comic strips media on developing students’ narrative writing skills: A case study in language teaching. *\*Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 17\*(2), 2526–2536. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v17i2.7345>
- [22] Simanjuntak, V. H. M., Sari, I., Kamengko, D. F., Syathroh, I. L., Manurung, E., Herman, H., & Thao, N. V. (2025). Investigating the use of contextual teaching and learning on students’ writing recount text: A case on teaching method. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 11(2), 323–332.
- [23] Sinaga, A. W., Herman, H., & Situmeang, S. A. (2025). The effect of storyboard on students’ ability in writing narrative text at the tenth grade of SMA Swasta Kampus Nommensen Pematangsiantar. *EDUCTUM: Journal Research*, 4(5), 135–141.
- [24] Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147–170.
- [25] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- [26] Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179–200.