A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics

p-ISSN 2356-0401, e-ISSN 2621-9158
Vol. 12 No. 2 December 2025, pp. 793-810

The effectiveness of peer-assessment in increasing students' ability in writing descriptive text

Faradila Nursamsi[1*], Nur Sehang Thamrin[2], Moh. Abraham Akbar Eisenring[3], Sriati Usman[4]

[1*2,3,4] English Education, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Tadulako University, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: faradilanursamsi@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted: 2 September 2025
Revised: 26 October 2025
Accepted: 29 October 2025
Published: 1 November 2025

Keywords:
Descriptive Text, EFL Students, Peer Assessment, Writing Skill

ABSTRACT

This study aims to prove whether Peer Assessment can improve students' ability in writing descriptive text. This study investigates peer assessment (PA) as a learning strategy, focusing on students' ability to apply writing knowledge to descriptive texts. To address this, the researchers used a quasi-experimental design. The population of this study was eleventh-grade students at Untad Palu Lab School. The researchers took class XI MIPA 1 (18 students in the experimental group) and XI MIPA 3 (18 students in the control group) as samples by using the purposive sampling technique. This study utilized a pre-test and post-test, with data analysis conducted using the Mann-Whitney test (SPSS 24). The Mann-Whitney test was employed to compare two independent groups with ordinal or interval data that were not normally distributed. The results showed that the test statistic was 0.000, which is less than 0.05, which indicates that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. The findings suggest a significant difference in learning outcomes between the experimental and control groups. It was concluded that PA had a significant influence on students' learning outcomes in writing descriptive text with correct English grammar. The results of this study provide valuable insights for students, teachers, and future researchers, highlighting the potential of PA to improve students' language skill in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings.

How to cite:
Nursamsi, F., Thamrin, N. S., Eisenring, M. 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

INTRODUCTION

Writing skills are essential for students to develop effective communication skills, which are increasingly recognized as critical components of 21st-century skills. In today's fast-paced, interconnected world, the ability to communicate clearly and persuasively through writing is critical to academic, professional, and personal success. Writing is very important in the academic process. Students need to master good writing skills to complete their education (Astuti et al., 2019). Mastering writing techniques is not an easy thing (Fathimatuzahro & Rizkiyah, 2025). In the contemporary communication landscape, Mehr (2017) states, writing can be considered as an essential ability in the context of modern communication. The cognitive effort involved in creating meaningful and expressive sentences is encapsulated in the skill of writing. Recognized as a fundamental competency, writing serves not only as a mode of communication but also as a mechanism for constructing knowledge.

Furthermore, there are a couple of reasons why language learners should master how to write in a good text. First, writing skills are very helpful for students in doing several tasks. Second, writing has become a part of everyday human life, by taking notes, making instructions, doing campus assignments, and as a means of communication (Sari et al., 2023). Globalization era makes all compete fiercely in the fields of business and education. By mastering writing, someone could express their feelings more comfortably rather than express it verbally. Rajesh (2017) argues that writing skills are a way to express one's thinking and feeling on paper. That is why every text in medicine, engineering, and international education primarily uses English as their language. In other words, writing skills are becoming an essential subject for students to study. Therefore, *Kurikulum Merdeka* highlights the importance of teaching writing. The type of text suggested by the curriculum to learn are descriptive, narrative, recount, report, and procedure writing. In this present study, the researchers focuses on developing students' ability in writing a descriptive text.

A descriptive text is a text in which a writer tries to imagine what they are describing. Descriptions are used to describe a particular thing or object, place, or person. Descriptive texts follow a generic structure for identification. The first paragraph introduces what will be described (Zhao et al., 2020). Descriptive paragraphs can include physical characteristics, values, uses, and functions (Alam et al., 2020). Descriptive text writing serves various purposes and using appropriate details can reinforce the main idea (Abu Saa et al., 2019). Therefore, the students should pay attention to many aspects.

However, writing descriptive texts in the EFL context was challenging for most of the students (Yuniar & Siswana, 2024; Marsevani et al, 2025; Mulyasin et al., 2022). If a

student has a proficient vocabulary, the student will be proficient in writing as well. Yet many students struggle with using precise vocabulary and developing engaging writing styles, leading to monotonous texts. Vocabulary mastery plays a critical role in addressing these challenges, providing students with the tools to express themselves clearly and creatively. Alqahtani (2015) highlighted that vocabulary knowledge is essential for language competence and directly influences writing fluency and accuracy. Similarly, Schmitt (2010) emphasizes that learners with broader lexical resources are more capable of producing cohesive and meaningful written texts, as vocabulary serves as the foundation for both comprehension and production in EFL learning.

In addition to vocabulary, self-confidence significantly influences students' writing performance, empowering them to express ideas without fear of judgment. According to Pajares (2003), self-belief and confidence determine students' willingness to take linguistic risks, affecting both the quality and quantity of their writing output. Both vocabulary mastery and self-confidence are key factors that contribute to the development of writing skills, making them important areas for research and pedagogical focus (Hastuti et al., 2024).

Although the teacher implements Project-Based Learning (PjBL), which encourages students to collaborate in groups, the interactions among students are often ineffective. In many cases, there is often one student who takes over the tasks and decisions in a group. As a result, the opportunity for discussion and exchange of ideas is very limited. Students do not correct each other or give feedback, which should be an important part of cooperative learning. If students do not help and correct each other, their understanding of the material learned becomes uneven. Interactive writing also helps students see how other people prefer to think, translate their ideas and review their written work (Dean, 2010). Students frequently struggled with using present tense and distinguishing between generic structures in descriptive text (Cao et al., 2020). In summary, there were some problems that the students faced in writing skill such as writing sentences incorrectly, lack of ideas, poor of vocabulary and mechanics

Therefore, searching for effective teaching way to address problems in writing is necessary. One of the ways in engaging with this problem is through the implementation of peer-assessment process. Puegprom (2011) and Sotoudehnama and Pilehvari (2016) have applied PA as solution to some problems of writing such as lack of practice and absence of helpful feedback. Peer assessment in language learning is a valuable pedagogical practice that has gained significant attention in recent research. Peer assessment has also been acknowledged as an approach to delivering feedback to students in an efficient and effective manner (Topping, 1998; Van Zundert et al., 2010). A substantial amount of research has been conducted on

the role and benefits of peer assessment from various aspects, including its influence on students' writing self-efficacy (e.g., Fathi et al., 2019; Lee & Evans, 2019), autonomous motivation (e.g., Yousefifard & Fathi, 2021), and writing performance (e.g., Nelson & Schunn, 2009). Overall, peer assessment plays a crucial role in language learning by fostering collaborative interactions, improving writing skills, and promoting self-reflection and autonomy among learners.

Several studies show the effectiveness of the peer assessment in learning writing. The Studies conducted by Candra (2017), Mahdiyyah et al. (2020), Nachalia et al. (2024) reported that the use of peer assessment can improve students' writing skills. The similarity between those studies and this research is the use of peer assessment as a pedagogical strategy with the objective of enhancing students' writing and knowledge acquisition. The three studies show that peer assessment effectively improves students' writing performance across different samples and subjects. Moreover, their findings validate that the peer assessment method is a cooperative learning strategy that can be effectively applied to improve students' writing skills.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The researchers are conducting quantitative research employing a quasi-experimental design. According to Andrade (2021), Quasi-experimental study compares outcomes between intervention groups where, for reasons related to ethics or feasibility, participants are not randomized to their respective interventions. The design included a pre-test, treatment, and post-test. It aims to examine teaching writing through peer-assessment in descriptive text, focusing on the elements of writing: organization, content, grammar use, and mechanics. The objects of the research have been divided into two groups: one experimental group that will receive the treatment and one control group. Before the treatment is applied, both groups were given a pre-test to determine the students' writing ability before the treatment is given. After the experimental group receives the treatment, they were given the same post-test as the control group. The purpose of the post-test is to determine if there is an improvement in the students' writing ability after the treatment. The results of these two tests showed the difference in achievement between the two groups. The following is the most commonly used quasi-experimental design in educational research (Cohen et al., 2007):

Experimental	Pre-Test	Treatment	Post-test
Control	Pre-Test		Post-test

Explanation:
01: Pre-test for experimental group.
02: Post-test for experimental group.
03: Pre-test for control group.
04: Post-test for control group.
X: Treatment

Research Participants

The population refers to the entire group of people or objects to which the researchers generalized the study findings (Knechel, 2019). The population of this research was eleventh-grade students at SMA Lab School Untad Palu, comprising 76 students divided into 4 classes.

Table 1. Class Distribution

No	Classes	Students
1	Mipa 1	18
2	Mipa 2	20
3	Mipa 3	18
4	Ips	20
	Total	**76**

The researchers used purposive sampling to select participants, a non-probability technique where cases are chosen based on specific traits and research goals. Cohen (2007) explains that in purposive sampling, researchers select participants they consider representative. In this study, students in the experimental and control groups had comparable background knowledge. Therefore, class MIPA 1 was chosen as the experimental group and class MIPA 3 as the control group, each consisting of 18 students. These classes were selected because only MIPA 1 and MIPA 3 met the study criteria: students were more complete in attendance compared to MIPA 2, and both studied English in the morning on different days. Additionally, the researchers aimed to investigate why MIPA 1 students showed lower English understanding than those in MIPA 3.

Data Collecting Technique

The data in this study were collected through three stages: pre-test, treatment, and post-test. In the first stage, the pre-test was administered to both the experimental and control classes to measure the students' initial ability in writing descriptive texts. The students were instructed to write a descriptive paragraph based on a given topic within a specific time limit. The purpose of this stage was to obtain baseline data regarding their writing competence before the implementation of the peer-assessment strategy.

After the pre-test, the experimental group received six treatment sessions applying the peer-assessment technique, while the control group was taught using conventional teacher-centered instruction. Each treatment session followed a structured lesson plan focusing on key components of descriptive writing, including content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. During each session, students in the experimental group were encouraged to exchange their writing drafts with peers, assess each other's work using a scoring rubric, and provide constructive feedback based on guided criteria. This procedure aimed to help students develop critical awareness of their writing performance and learn collaboratively from their peers' strengths and weaknesses.

The post-test was conducted at the end of the treatment phase for both groups. It used similar writing tasks and evaluation criteria as the pre-test to ensure consistency. The post-test data were collected to determine whether the implementation of peer assessment significantly improved the students' descriptive writing ability compared to the control group. This data collection process aligns with the quasi-experimental procedure recommended by Creswell (2012), where pre-tests and post-tests are used to measure the effect of an instructional intervention on a dependent variable. Furthermore, the use of peer assessment as an instructional technique is supported by Hyland and Hyland (2019), who argue that peer feedback in writing enhances learners' engagement, self-regulation, and awareness of writing quality through collaborative reflection. The researchers provided corrections and feedback on the assessed tasks and discussed the assessment results with the students collectively.

Table 2. Teaching outline activities

Teacher	Students	Time allotment
1. The teacher greets the students, invites them to pray, and checks the attendance of students. 2. The teacher explains the learning objectives. 3. The teacher gives an initial assessment with questions based on the material. 4. The teacher introduces the topic and explains the material to the students. 5. The teacher gives examples of describing something in relation to the topic. 6. Teacher guides the students to peer assess through PA guideline. 7. The teacher gives a writing exercise to describe something.	1. The students greet the teacher and pray together. 2. The students listen carefully to the teacher. 3. The students answer questions from the initial assessment based on the material. 4. The students pay attention to the teacher explanation. 5. The students pay attention to the teacher examples. 6. The students pay attention to the teacher explanation. 7. The students work on their own tasks. 8. The students check peers' work with the guideline.	Pre-activities 10 minutes While Activities 70 minutes

Teacher	Students	Time allotment
8. The teacher assigns students to peer assess. 9. The teacher monitors the peer assessment students while peer assessing. 10. The teacher evaluates the students' work.	9. The students implement peer assessment. 10. The students conduct formative evaluations.	
11. Teacher and students do reflection. 12. Teacher ends the meeting by saying "Alhamdulillah"	11. The students do reflection.	Post activities 10 minutes

In conducting the treatment with peer assessment, the researchers used a guideline as a standardization of assessment. This ensures that all students in the treatment class have the same understanding of what is being assessed. For more clarity, here is the guideline table:

Table 3. Guideline

Writing Elements	Yes	No	Suggestions for Improvement
Organizations - The text consists of a title, introduction, and body paragraphs. - The title describes the content concisely and attracts the reader's interest. - The introductory paragraph explains the subject by mentioning general identifying information such as name and location. - The body consists of one paragraph. - The body explains in detail the information about the subject being discussed.			
Content Relevance The content of the text is in accordance with the instructions given.			
Coherence - Each paragraph has one main idea. - The ideas in each sentence and paragraph are presented logically and coherently.			
Paragraph Length The text is 125-150 words long.			
Language Use **1. Grammar**			

Writing Elements	Yes	No	Suggestions for Improvement
- Each sentence has a subject and a verb. - The writer can distinguish between singular and plural nouns. 2. Vocabulary - The vocabulary used is appropriate for the topic being discussed. - The vocabulary used is varied. Mechanics - There are no spelling errors. - There are no errors in the use of upper and lower case letters. - There are no errors in the use of punctuation.			

(*Adapted from* Derewianka and Jones (2012)

Data Analysis Technique

Inferential analysis

Inferential analysis is a statistical approach used to draw conclusions about a population based on data collected from a sample. It goes beyond merely describing the observed data, aiming instead to determine whether the patterns or differences found are statistically significant and can be generalized to a wider context (Marshall & Jonker, 2011). In this study, inferential analysis is applied to answer the research question: *Can the implementation of peer-assessment promote students' writing skills of descriptive text?* To achieve this, several statistical tools are employed, including the normality test, homogeneity test, and hypothesis test, which together help to verify the validity of the data and determine whether peer-assessment has a significant effect on students' writing performance.

RESULTS

In this section, the researchers would like to elaborate on the results of the data collection conducted from July 15 to August 16, 2025. The data were analyzed from the pre-test and post-test research results from both experimental and control groups.

Result of Pre-test Experimental and Control Group

Before applying the treatment, the researchers conducted a pre-test to both research samples, the experimental group and control group. Two classes from the same program were selected using purposive sampling and assigned as the experimental group and the control group (Latjupu et al., 2025). This was conducted to measure the students' basic understanding of their writing skills, especially on descriptive text

writing tests. In presenting the data, the researchers divided it into two parts, the first being the pre-test results in the experimental group and the second being the pre-test results in the control group. Based on the results, the data can be described in terms of the mean score, maximum score, minimum score and standard deviation, all calculated using SPSS 24. The complete results can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. Descriptives statistics of pre-test result

No	Group	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
1	Experimental	16	35,31	10	65	15,755
2	Control	16	48,75	20	75	18,394

The Pre-test result in Table 4 shows that the mean score of the pre-test for experimental group was 35,31 with the highest score 65 and the lowest score was 10. The standard deviation for this group was 15,755. Meanwhile the data results from the control group showed that the mean score was 48,75 with highest score was 75 and the lowest score was 20. The standard deviation for the control group is 18,394. Overall, the control group had a better mean score on the pre-test compared to the experimental group. However, the experimental group showed more variation in their scores, meaning that some individuals performed much better than average, while others performed much worse. These differences in performance and variability may help explain the effects of the different conditions or interventions applied to each group and could be useful for further investigations into the factors that influence student learning outcomes.

The post-test for both the control and experimental group was administered shortly after the treatment was implemented to the students. Similar to the pre-test, the post-test involved a writing test. Based on the results, the data can be described regarding the mean score, maximum score, minimum score and standard deviation, all of which were calculated using SPSS 24. The complete results can be seen in the following table:

Table 5. Descriptive of post-test

No	Group	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
1	Experimental	16	87,50	60	95	10,488
2	Control	16	70,63	65	90	8,732

Based on Table 5, the mean score of the post-test in experimental group was 87,50. The maximum score of the experimental groups was 95 and the minimum score was 60. Then the standard deviation of the group was 10,488. While the mean score of the control group was 70,63. The maximum score of post-tests in control group was

90 and the minimum score was 65. Then the standard deviation of control group was 8,732.

Overall, the experimental group performs significantly better than the control group on the post-test, with the higher mean scores. This suggests that the experimental intervention may have had a positive impact on student performance. In addition, the higher mean score in the experimental group suggests the most students in this group showed marked improvement compared to their pre-test results, while the control group did not make significant progress. The variation in scores in the experimental group further supports the idea that this peer-assessment method is effective, as it most likely helped more students achieve higher levels of success.

Normality

The normality test was needed to determine whether the data obtained from each learning media in this study were normally distributed or not. If the data were normally distributed, they could be processed using t-test statistics. If the data were not normally distributed, one approach commonly used for analysis was non-parametric statistical tests. One method that can be used in this case was the Mann-Whitney U test. The normality test used the Shapiro-wilk formula in calculations using the SPSS 24 program. To determine whether the data were normal or not, if the sig value was > 0,05 the data were considered normal, and if the sig value was < 0,05 then the data is not normal. This normality test was carried out with the help of the SPSS 24 program. The following table shows the calculation results obtained:

Table 6. Test of normality

No	Group	P-value (Sig.)	Description
1	Pre-Test Experimental	0,104	Normal
2	Post-Test Experimental	0,000	Abnormal
3	Pre-Test Control	0,141	Normal
4	Pre-Test Control	0,448	Normal

The normality test results in the table above used the Shapiro-Wilk method because the sample in this study was small (<50). From the normality test, different results were obtained from the pre-test and post-test data both experimental group and control group. The results were shown by the experimental group where the significance value in the pre-test was 0,104 and the post-test was 0,000, this indicated that post-test in the experimental group was not normally distributed due to the significance value <0,05. Meanwhile, the results obtained from the control group showed that the data were normally distributed, this was because the significance value of pre-test was 0,141 and the post-test was 0,448 which prove that the significance value of both were >0,05. Since there was group of data that was

not normally distributed, the next statistical analysis used a non parametric statistical test, a Mann-Whitney U test.

Homogeneity

After getting the results of the normality test, the researchers conducted a homogeneity test. In this study, the homogeneity test was carried out to determine whether the variants of the experimental group data and the control group data were homogeneous or not. This test was conducted using Levene statistic which if the significance value > 0,05 then the data distribution of the two groups is considered the same (homogeneous). The results of the homogeneity test can be seen in the following table:

Table 7. Test of homogeneity

No	Group	Sig.	Status
1	Post-Test of Experimental Group and Control Group	0.764	Homogen

Consequently, Table 7 shows that both experimental group and control group obtained a significance value of 0.764 which ws greater than the significance criteria value of 0,05 (0,764 > 0,05). Therefore, it can be said that the data variance is homogeneous. In other words, these two groups have equivalent data variation characteristics.

Result of the Hypothesis Testing

Based on the result of testing normality and homogeneity, the data didn't reach the normality and homogeneity index, so the researchers used non-parametric tests. Non-parametric tests constitute a subset of statistical analysis techniques that are utilized to examine differences or relationships between variables without making any assumptions regarding the distribution of the data. In this study, the researchers employed a data retrieval method based on the Mann-Whitney test. The Mann-Whitney test is a statistical method employed for the purpose of comparing two independent groups of ordinal or interval data that are not normally distributed. The results of the Mann-Whitney test can be seen in the following table:

Table 8. Test statistic

No	Class	Indicator	Asymp. 2 Sig (2 Tailed)
1	Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class	Sig. < 0.05	0.00

Table 8 elucidates the test statistics output in the Mann-Whitney was 0.000, which was less than 0.05. It meant that the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Since there is significant effect, the formulation of the research question can also be answered, namely "There is significant effect of peer assessment in writing descriptive text of grade eleventh at SMA Lab School Untad Palu".

DISCUSSION

The results of the data analysis showed that peer assessment in writing effectively improved students' descriptive text achievement among eleventh-grade students of SMA Lab School Untad Palu. This finding aligns with recent studies confirming the positive impact of peer feedback on students' writing skills. For instance, Suaib et al. (2025) found that applying the peer feedback technique significantly improved students' descriptive writing performance at MAN Insan Cendekia Palu compared to the control group. In the present study, the mean post-test score of the experimental class was 87.50, higher than the control class, which obtained a mean score of 70.63, indicating a substantial difference. The maximum scores in the experimental class ranged from 65 to 95, while the control class ranged from 75 to 90 on the post-test. The Mann–Whitney analysis revealed a Sig. value of 0.000, which is smaller than 0.05, indicating that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. This means that there was a significant difference in students' writing performance before and after the treatment using the peer assessment method. This result is consistent with the findings of Oktavianti and Pratiwi (2024) who reported that students who received peer review sessions showed a significant increase in their descriptive writing scores compared to those in the control group. Therefore, it can be concluded that peer assessment has a significant and positive influence on students' writing achievement in descriptive text.

The findings of this study are consistent with several previous studies that have demonstrated the effectiveness of peer assessment or peer feedback techniques in enhancing students' writing abilities. Research by Maharani et al. (2022) revealed that peer feedback significantly improved students' performance in writing descriptive texts, where the experimental group achieved a higher mean post-test score (81.55) compared to the control group (71.96). Similarly, Suaib et al. (2021) found that students exposed to peer feedback strategies showed notable improvements in their descriptive writing performance. These studies reinforce the present finding that peer assessment provides students with opportunities to reflect on their peers' work, leading to deeper understanding and greater awareness of writing conventions and structure.

This study also showed that peer assessment is effective in increasing the descriptive writing skills of 11th-grade students at SMA Lab School Untad Palu. The implementation of peer assessment enabled students to acquire knowledge not only from their own mistakes but also from those of their peers, fostering opportunities for more interactive and collaborative learning. Receiving feedback from their classmates provided students with different perspectives, helping them address problems in their writing more effectively using established guidelines. As a result, the quality of students' descriptive writing improved, which in turn enhanced their overall writing knowledge and confidence in the learning process. This result is consistent with findings by Mahdiyyah et al. (2020) which emphasized that peer assessment promotes active engagement and self-reflection, enabling learners to internalize language forms and writing strategies more effectively.

However, the researchers also faced several challenges during the study. One of the main issues encountered was that students took longer to provide feedback to their classmates, as they were not yet accustomed to the peer-assessment process. Further training and scaffolding were therefore needed to ensure that the feedback given was aligned with the assessment guidelines. In addition, some students in the experimental class became passive and occasionally requested permission to leave the classroom. When the researchers were physically present and monitoring closely, students were more active in asking questions; however, in the absence of close supervision, some students remained silent or disengaged. A few students even appeared inattentive or confused during instruction, indicating the need for more consistent motivation and clearer modeling of peer-assessment procedures.

Based on these findings, the researchers linked them to previous studies. The studies conducted by Candra (2017), Mahdiyyah et al. (2020), and Nachalia et al. (2024) reported that the use of peer assessment can improve students' writing skills. This study also proves that the use of peer assessment is effective in improving the descriptive writing skills of 11th grade students at Lab School Untad Palu High School. From these findings, it can be concluded that peer assessment is effective in the process of learning to write descriptive texts.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that the findings of this study reveal that Peer assessment (PA) shows significant effectiveness in descriptive text writing among eleventh-grade students at SMA Lab School Untad Palu. In addition, the use of PA helps the students learn from their own mistakes as well as those of their peers, thus encouraging a more interactive and collaborative learning experience. It allows students to give and receive feedback, which improves their understanding of the material. Referring to the results of the Mann-Whitney test in the previous chapter, it was concluded that

the significance value was 0.000 < 0.05. This indicated that writing was better when using the peer assessment method, especially for eleventh-grade students of SMA Lab School Untad Palu.

However, while research shows PA can improve writing knowledge, there were also some challenges. One of the difficulties encountered during the research was that students took time to give feedback to their peers as they were unfamiliar with the process. Therefore, further training or guidance is needed to ensure that the feedback provided is aligned with the guidelines.

Based on this study's results, several suggestions can be considered to improve the quality of writing learning, particularly in the context of descriptive text learning through Peer-Assessment. First, students are advised to participate more actively in the PA process, both as feedback givers and feedback receivers. Then, for the teachers, they should train students in reviewing and provide clear, detailed feedback to students after the PA process, in order that students know which areas need improvement and how to improve. And for the future researchers, they can provide deeper insights into how peer assessment can be optimized to effectively improve students' writing comprehension such as by exploring the use of technology to support peer assessment.

The researchers found shortcomings in this study, namely in the peer assessment process, not all of the students have the ability to check their friends' work well. To overcome this, the researchers suggested that training or clear instructions on how to use the checking guide should be given. This guide should include important aspects that need to be checked in a peer's work, such as completeness of information and conformity to the set criteria. By following this guide, students can provide more constructive feedback. In addition, to ensure that the work meets the required standard, the results can be reviewed by the teacher or the next researchers to provide clarification or correction if necessary, ensuring that all aspects of the work can be checked carefully and objectively.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

AUTHOR (S) CONTRIBUTION

Faradila Nursamsi was responsible for the study design, data collection and processing, analysis, interpretation of results, and securing funding. She was also responsible for writing the initial draft of the manuscript and revising it based on her supervisor's input. Nur Sehang Thamrin provided guidance and advice in designing

the research methodology and conducting a critical review. She ensured the scientific quality of the work by supervising the manuscript. Moh. Abraham Akbar Eisenring's contributions included providing input and advice regarding analysis, data processing, and interpretation of results. He also assisted in reviewing the content of the manuscript and developing more in-depth arguments. Furthermore, Sriati Usman provided scientific contributions, constructive input, and recommendations to improve the completeness and readiness of the manuscript for publication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank SMA Lab School Untad Palu for their support in providing permission, resources, and facilities necessary during the data collection process for this study. Furthermore, the authors express their deep gratitude to Tadulako University for their academic guidance and invaluable support during the manuscript preparation process. It is important to acknowledge that the subjects' identities include both genders, so that accurate and inclusive language can be ensured. In addition, gratitude is also extended to family, friends, and colleagues who have contributed to the research process through their support, motivation, and assistance.

REFERENCES

Abu Saa, A., Al-Emran, M., & Shaalan, K. (2019). Factors affecting students' performance in higher education: A systematic review of predictive data mining techniques. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, *24*(4), 567–598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-019-09408-7

Alam, F., Ofli, F., & Imran, M. (2020). Descriptive and visual summaries of disaster events using artificial intelligence techniques: Case studies of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *39*(3), 288–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1610908

Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, *3*(3), 21–34. https://doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002

Andrade, C. (2021). The limitations of quasi-experimental studies, and methods for data analysis when a quasi-experimental research design is unavoidable. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine*, *43*(5), 451–452. https://doi.org/10.1177/02537176211034707

Astuti, W., Maghfiroh, A., & Palupi, R. E. A. (2020). Enhancing students writing ability by implementing Problem-Based Learning method at the English department students in Muhammadiyah University of Ponorogo in academic year 2019/2020. *Edupedia*, *4*(2), 155-161.

Candra, K. D. P. (2017). The application of pictures and peer assessment for teaching descriptive text in writing class. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, *3*(2),

271–280. https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.3.2.342.271-280

Cao, T., Huang, X., Wang, L., Li, B., Dong, X., Lu, H., Wan, Q., & Shang, S. (2020). Effects of organisational justice, work engagement and nurses' perception of care quality on turnover intention among newly licensed registered nurses: A structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, *29*(13–14), 2626–2637. https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15285

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). Routledge

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Dean, D. (2010). What works in writing instruction. *Urbana, IL: NCTE*.

Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2012). *Teaching language in context.* Oxford University Press. Https://ukcatalogue.oup.com/product/9780195575330.do

Fathi, J., Nejati, M., & Doosti, M. (2019). The impact of peer feedback on writing self-efficacy of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 48*(5), 1153–1170. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-019-09651-6

Fathimatuzahro, M., & Rizkiyah, F. (2025). AI-driven feedback in EFL students' writing: Does it enhance their skills? *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *12*(1), 637–657. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v12i1.40594

Hastuti, S., Supadi, & Rais, R. (2024). The effects of vocabulary mastery and self-confidence towards the students' writing skills of English descriptive text at private junior high school. *Inference: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 157. http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/inference.v7i2

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.

Knechel, N. (2019). What's in a sample? Why selecting the right research participants matters. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, *45*(3), 332–334. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0099-1767(00)70045-6

Latjupu, H. S. S., Mahdy, D. I., Wulyani, A. N., & El Khoiri, N. (2025). Enhancing argumentative essay writing through questioning strategies: A study on informatics engineering students in ESP context. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, *12*(1), 516–532.

Lee, I., & Evans, T. (2019). The effects of peer feedback on EFL learners' writing performances and self-efficacy beliefs. *Language Teaching Research, 23*(5), 668–687. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817749694

Maharani, F., Rofiqoh, R., Afrilia Anggreni, A., & Budi, B. (2022). Peer feedback technique in writing descriptive text: Is it effective? *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 10*(1). https://pba.ftik.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/ideas/article/view/5792

Mahdiyyah, K., Herawati, A., & Halira Vonti, L. (2020). The use of peer feedback to

enhance students' ability to write descriptive text. *Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics Studies (JET Li), 2(2), 48-56.* https://doi.org/10.55215/jetli.v1i2

Marshall, G., & Jonker, L. (2011). An introduction to inferential statistics: A review and practical guide. *Radiography, 17*(1), e1-e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radi.2010.09.001

Marsevani, M., Yeo, F., & Nurlaily. (2025). University-level students' difficulties in descriptive writing. *English Journal, 19*(1), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.32832/english.v19i1.18166

Mehr, H. S. (2017). The impact of product and process approach on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability and their attitudes toward writing skill. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(2), 158–166.

Mulyasin, M. A., Zamzam, A., Putera, L. J., Amin, M., & Arfah, H. (2022). The challenges and strategies in writing descriptive text on local places in the EFL essay writing course. *Jurnal Educatio FKIP UNMA*. https://ejournal.unma.ac.id/index.php/educatio/article/view/6017

Nachalia, Mujiyanto, J., & Widhiyanto. (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

Nelson, M. J., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science, 37*(4), 375–401. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x

Oktavianti, D., & Pratiwi, A. (2024). Applying peer review to improve students' descriptive writing text. *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, *3*(2), 83–91. https://doi.org/10.32923/eedj.v3i2.3943

Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading &Writing Quarterly*, *19*(2), 139-158.

Rajesh, D. (2017). Teaching writing: The problems encountered by the rural students. *Research Journal of English (RJOE), 2*(3), 134–137.

Sari, E. R. D. R., Inayah, A., & Dwi Lestari, S. (2023). An analysis of students' difficulties in writing argumentative essays at the sixth semester of English educational department. *LUNAR (Language and Art), 7*(2), 15-27. https://ejournal.unibabwi.ac.id/index.php/lunar/article/download/3110/1999

Schmitt, N. (2010). *Researching vocabulary: A vocabulary research manual*. Springer.

Sotoudehnama, Y., & Pilehvari, A. (2016). The effect of peer-assessment on writing skill and its sub-skills of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 11*(2), 106–118.

Suaib, S., Suriaman, A., Budi, & Jamil, J. (2025). The effect of peer feedback technique in improving students' writing skill in descriptive text. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture, 10*(2), 316–

327. https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v10i2.4033

Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. *Review of educational Research*, *68*(3), 249-276.

Yousefifard, M., & Fathi, J. (2021). Peer assessment and autonomous motivation: Examining the effects in EFL writing classes. *TESOL Quarterly, 55*(2), 497–520. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.290

Yuniar, D., & Siswana, S. (2024). Exploring the difficulties in writing descriptive text: Islamic high school students'voice. *Eltin Journal: Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, *12*(2), 273-280. https://www.e-journal.stkipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/eltin/article/view/4828

Zhao, Y., Guo, Y., Xiao, Y., Zhu, R., Sun, W., Huang, W., Liang, D., Tang, L., Zhang, F., Zhu, D., & Wu, J.-L. (2020). The effects of online homeschooling on children, parents, and teachers of grades 1–9 during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Medical Science Monitor*, 26. https://doi.org/10.12659/MSM.925591