



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Dr. Putri Asilestari, M.Pd
Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas
Pahlawan, Indonesia.

*CORRESPONDENCE

Alvina Reza Fernanda
alvina.22020084046@mhs.unesa.ac.id

COPYRIGHT © 2026 (Author)

Alvina Reza Fernanda
Esti Kurniasih.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: June 11, 2026
Accepted: July 16, 2026
Published: July 18, 2026

CITATION (APA STYLE 7):

Fernanda, A. R., & Kurniasih, E. (2026).
Feedback Literacy through Peer Feedback:
Exploring Critical Thinking and Analytical
Writing Quality in Secondary EFL Classrooms.
IGI in Education Insight, 1(03), 141-147.
<https://doi.org/10.53905/edu.v1i03.22>



This work is licensed under a Creative
Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0
International License.

Feedback Literacy through Peer Feedback: Exploring Critical Thinking and Analytical Writing Quality in Secondary EFL Classrooms

Alvina Reza Fernanda*¹, Esti Kurniasih¹

¹English Language Education Study Program, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: Critical thinking is central to producing well-reasoned argumentative writing, yet many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners struggle to analyze issues, evaluate evidence, and justify claims when composing analytical exposition texts. This study aimed to examine how peer feedback, as an instructional strategy, contributes to the development of eleventh-grade students' critical thinking skills and writing quality in analytical exposition texts, and to identify the challenges students encounter when engaging in peer feedback.

Materials and methods: A qualitative descriptive design was employed, involving 30 eleventh-grade students from a public senior high school in Lamongan, East Java, Indonesia, implementing the Merdeka Curriculum. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 20 purposively selected students, classroom observation, and document analysis of students' analytical exposition drafts and final texts produced after peer feedback sessions. Students' texts were scored using an analytic rubric adapted from Irwan et al. (2018), covering organization, content, language use, and mechanics. Data were analyzed thematically following the interactive model of Miles et al. (2014), consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification, supported by member checking and triangulation across data sources.

Results: Students reported cognitive, linguistic, and affective challenges in providing peer feedback, including difficulty understanding peers' arguments, limited English proficiency, uncertainty in judging argument strength, and fear of offending classmates. Following peer feedback implementation, students' analytical exposition texts were distributed across four achievement levels: Excellent (44-52; n = 8), Good (35-43; n = 5), Fair (26-34; n = 4), and Poor (13-25; n = 3). Higher-scoring texts demonstrated stronger thesis clarity, coherent argument development, and more effective use of academic language, whereas lower-scoring texts showed weak organization and limited analytical depth.

Conclusions: Peer feedback is a pedagogically valuable, though cognitively and emotionally demanding, strategy for developing eleventh graders' critical thinking and writing quality in analytical exposition texts. Its effectiveness depends on structured scaffolding, explicit training in feedback literacy, and a supportive classroom climate. These findings offer practical implications for EFL writing instruction under student-centered curricula such as the Merdeka Curriculum.

Keywords

peer feedback; analytical exposition text; critical thinking; EFL writing; secondary education.

INTRODUCTION

Contextual Framework and the Global Issue

Writing is widely regarded as one of the most cognitively demanding language skills, requiring learners to simultaneously manage content generation, organization, linguistic accuracy, and audience awareness (Nelson et al., 2022; Tsiritakis et al., 2021). For learners of English as a foreign language (EFL), structural differences between the first and target language often intensify the difficulty of composing coherent, logically developed paragraphs (Jaafar Siddek & Ismail, 2021; Sharhan et al., 2020). Within Indonesian secondary education, the Merdeka Curriculum situates the teacher as a facilitator who encourages independent exploration; however, when direct guidance is insufficient, students frequently experience confusion, writing anxiety, and reduced motivation (Suryani et al., 2020; Taye & Mengesha, 2024). Empirical evidence indicates that a substantial proportion of students struggle to organize ideas coherently, with prior research reporting that 61.53% of students found it difficult to make their ideas comprehensible, 46.15% rarely attended to sentence ordering, and 76.92% experienced vocabulary-related obstacles (Suryani et al., 2020; Taye & Mengesha, 2024).

Analytical exposition text, an argumentative genre built upon a thesis, a series of arguments, and a reiteration (Knowles & McGloin (2007), is a core competency at the senior high school level and demands a comparatively high level of critical thinking, since students must analyze an issue, evaluate evidence, and construct logically persuasive arguments (Rosyadi et al., 2023). Developing this genre is therefore not merely a linguistic exercise but a cognitive one, making it a productive lens through which to examine how instructional strategies can cultivate students' critical thinking capacities.

Critical Examination of Existing Literature

Peer feedback has been extensively documented as an effective strategy for developing writing skills across educational levels and genres. Suryani et al. demonstrated that peer feedback supported Indonesian students in developing ideas and composing coherent paragraphs, while Gao et al. (2024), in a systematic review, confirmed that peer feedback promotes cognitive, affective, social, and metacognitive development. Similarly, Wei & Liu (2024) reported that peer feedback strengthens writing accuracy, organization, and learner confidence, and Zou et al. (2022) found that technology-enhanced peer feedback improved collaborative writing and critical thinking tendencies across text types. At the affective level, Bolourchi & Soleimani (2021) found that students receiving peer feedback achieved significantly higher argumentative writing scores than those relying solely on teacher feedback, and that peer feedback was perceived as less threatening, thereby reducing writing anxiety. Zhang (2022) further showed that peer feedback participation strengthens metacognitive awareness and self-regulation, while Tyas (2020) demonstrated that digitally mediated peer review, such as e-portfolio-based review, improves both engagement and writing accuracy.

Beyond these direct benefits, the peer feedback process is recognized as a collaborative activity that requires active negotiation of meaning, forcing students to externalize their thought processes and engage in critical evaluation of their own and others' work (Xu et al., 2022; Yu & Lee, 2016). By assuming the role of an assessor, learners gain a more objective perspective on their writing, which subsequently fosters learner autonomy and responsibility in the revision process (Nhan, 2026; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2023).

Despite these documented benefits, peer feedback implementation is not without difficulty. Tianotak (2022); Iswandari & Jiang (2023) reported that EFL students often distrust the accuracy of peers' comments and prefer teacher feedback, particularly for complex aspects such as argument structure. Cendani & Purnamaningwulan (2023) similarly found that limited language proficiency constrains students' capacity to provide detailed, constructive comments, and Xue et al. (2023) demonstrated that fear of negative peer reaction reduces students' willingness to give honest feedback. Importantly, these challenges often stem from a lack of prior experience and inadequate preparation (Zeevy-Solovey, 2024). Therefore, research increasingly emphasizes that the effectiveness of peer feedback is contingent upon rigorous scaffolding, including explicit training in feedback literacy, the use of structured rubrics, and the cultivation of a supportive classroom climate that encourages peer-to-peer dialogue (Nhan, 2026; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2023; Ying et al., 2021).

Identification of Research Gaps

Although prior studies robustly establish the benefits of peer feedback for narrative, descriptive, recount, and argumentative writing across educational levels Pham et al. (2020);Toufaha (2024) comparatively little research has examined its role specifically within analytical exposition writing at the senior high school level, particularly under the student-centered demands of Indonesia's Merdeka Curriculum. Furthermore, while cognitive and linguistic dimensions of peer feedback are well documented, its affective dimensions - confidence, anxiety, and peer relational dynamics - remain underexplored in the context of analytical exposition writing Putra et al. (2021); Sri Wahyuni (2017) Few qualitative studies have jointly examined the challenges students face in giving feedback and the resulting quality of their analytical exposition texts, leaving a gap this study seeks to address.

Rationale for the Research

Given that analytical exposition writing requires sustained critical thinking and that peer feedback is theorized to cultivate exactly these capacities through collaborative evaluation and reflection Liu et al. (2023), a qualitative investigation into how eleventh-grade EFL students experience and benefit from peer feedback is warranted. Understanding both the challenges students face and the resulting writing outcomes can inform more effective, better-scaffolded implementations of peer feedback in secondary EFL classrooms.

Objectives

This study aims to: (1) identify the challenges encountered by eleventh-grade students when providing peer feedback on analytical exposition texts, and (2) describe the quality of eleventh graders' analytical exposition texts after the implementation of a peer feedback strategy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Participants

Participants were 30 eleventh-grade students enrolled in a single class at a public senior high school in Lamongan, East Java, Indonesia, purposively selected because the school actively implements the Merdeka Curriculum, which emphasizes student-centered and independent learning. From this cohort, 20 students were purposively selected for semi-structured interviews based on the quality of their analytical exposition writing, stratified into four performance categories: Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor. This sampling size is consistent with the generally accepted range for descriptive qualitative inquiry. All 30 students' final analytical exposition texts, produced after peer feedback sessions, were analyzed using the assessment rubric.

Study Design

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design Zheng (2023), selected for its capacity to capture in-depth processes, experiences, and reflections that cannot be adequately measured through quantitative instruments alone Alam & Asmawi (2024);Kelly et al. (2024) The design allowed the researcher to explore, in a naturalistic classroom setting, how students experienced the peer feedback process and how this process related to the quality of their written products (Pandey, 2025).

Study Organization

Data were collected between 30 October and 29 November 2025 using three complementary instruments: (1) a semi-structured interview guide comprising five core questions across four thematic sections (opening, challenges, suggestions for improvement, and closing), adapted from Bartlett et al. (2021) and validated by the thesis supervisor; (2) classroom observation of

student interaction during writing and peer feedback sessions, conducted in a participatory and descriptive manner; and (3) document analysis of students' initial drafts, peer feedback sheets, and revised analytical exposition texts. The research procedure followed eleven sequential stages: site selection, obtaining research permission, initial observation and coordination, instrument preparation and validation, classroom observation, collection of students' written texts, facilitation of the peer feedback process, semi-structured interviews, thematic data analysis, interpretation of findings, and compilation of the research report.

Students' final analytical exposition texts were scored using an analytic rubric adapted from Irwan et al. (2018) and Elfira et al. (2018), encompassing four main components - organization, content, language use, and mechanics - each rated on a four-point scale, yielding a maximum composite score of 52. Based on the total score, texts were classified into four achievement levels: Excellent (44-52), Good (35-43), Fair (26-34), and Poor (13-25).

Statistical Analysis

As this study followed a qualitative descriptive design, inferential statistical testing was not applied. Instead, data were analyzed thematically following the interactive model of (Miles et al., 2014), comprising three concurrent components. First, data reduction involved selecting, focusing, and simplifying interview transcripts, observation notes, and student texts relevant to the research questions. Second, data display involved organizing coded data into thematic matrices and a comparative table of rubric scores across achievement categories to reveal patterns and relationships. Third, conclusion drawing and verification involved triangulating emerging interpretations across interview data, observation notes, and rubric-scored texts, supplemented by member checking, in which selected students validated the researcher's interpretations to enhance the credibility of the findings. Descriptive frequency counts (e.g., the number and percentage of students within each achievement category) were used solely to summarize, rather than statistically infer, patterns in the data.

Ethical Considerations

This study received ethical approval and instrument validation from the thesis supervisory committee of the English Language Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Surabaya, and formal research permission was granted by the university and by the participating senior high school in Lamongan. Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants; students were informed of the study's purpose, assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their data, and advised of their right to withdraw at any stage without consequence. Audio recordings of interviews were made only with participants' explicit permission, and all identifying information was anonymized during transcription and reporting.

RESULTS

Challenges Faced by Students in Providing Peer Feedback

Semi-structured interviews with 20 students revealed that challenges in providing peer feedback on analytical exposition texts clustered into four interrelated categories: cognitive, linguistic, genre-knowledge-related, and affective (Table 1). Cognitively, students frequently reported uncertainty in interpreting peers' arguments and in judging whether an argument was logically sound. Linguistically, several students - particularly those with lower English proficiency - indicated that their feedback tended to remain superficial due to restricted vocabulary and limited command of evaluative language. At the level of genre knowledge, students such as Student 9 and Student 11 demonstrated awareness of the thesis-argument-reiteration structure in principle but struggled to operationalize this knowledge when reviewing a peer's text. Affectively, fear of causing offense and discomfort with critiquing a friend's work emerged as a recurring barrier, reported by multiple participants across achievement levels.

Table 1. Categories of Challenges Reported by Students When Providing Peer Feedback

Category of Challenge	Description	Representative Student Statement (translated)
Cognitive	Difficulty understanding peers' arguments and judging the correctness or strength of an argument.	"I find it hard to give peer feedback because sometimes I don't understand my friend's argument." (Student 2)
Linguistic	Limited English proficiency constraining the specificity and depth of comments provided.	"My English skills are still limited, so the feedback I give is often very simple." (Student 7)
Genre knowledge	Possessing theoretical knowledge of text structure but difficulty applying it during review.	"I know there are thesis, arguments, and conclusion, but it's hard to apply them when giving feedback." (Student 9)
Affective	Fear of hurting peers' feelings and discomfort in criticizing a friend's work.	"I'm afraid of hurting my friend's feelings... I also lack confidence." (Student 9)

Despite these difficulties, several students reported that the act of giving feedback pushed them to read peers' texts more carefully and increased their awareness of argument clarity and organizational structure, suggesting that the challenges coexisted with incidental learning benefits.

Quality of Analytical Exposition Texts After Peer Feedback

Analysis of the 30 students' final analytical exposition texts using the composite rubric (maximum score 52) showed a distribution across four achievement levels, summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Distribution of Students' Analytical Exposition Writing Achievement After Peer Feedback (N = 30)

Achievement Level	Score Range	n	%	Key Characteristics
Excellent	44-52	8	26.7	Clear, well-focused thesis; coherent, well-developed arguments; effective academic vocabulary; minor mechanical errors only.
Good	35-43	5	16.7	Clear position with relevant supporting reasons; logical but largely descriptive reasoning; adequate vocabulary and grammar control.
Fair	26-34	4	13.3	Basic thesis and sequencing present; arguments underdeveloped and largely descriptive; limited vocabulary variation.
Poor	13-25	3	10.0	Unclear or absent thesis; single undifferentiated paragraph; minimal analysis, evaluation, or supporting evidence.

Excellent-level texts ($n = 8$; 26.7%) were characterized by explicit, well-focused thesis statements, systematically sequenced arguments supported by cause-and-effect reasoning, and academically appropriate vocabulary (e.g., digital literacy, misinformation, critical thinking), with only minor, meaning-preserving mechanical errors. Good-level texts ($n = 5$; 16.7%) demonstrated a clear position and relevant supporting reasons but tended toward descriptive rather than deeply evaluative reasoning, with less elaboration of cause-and-effect relationships. Fair-level texts ($n = 4$; 13.3%) exhibited a basic generic structure using simple sequencing markers (first, second, finally), yet arguments remained underdeveloped, general, and lacking in comparative or evaluative depth. Poor-level texts ($n = 3$; 10.0%) frequently lacked a clearly stated thesis and a concluding reiteration, presented ideas within a single undifferentiated paragraph, and showed minimal evidence of analysis or evaluation, despite generally acceptable spelling and punctuation.

A component-level comparison (Table 3) indicates that the gap between achievement levels was most pronounced in the Content component (reflecting analysis, evaluation, reasoning, and explanation), followed by Organization, while differences in Mechanics were comparatively small - suggesting that lower-scoring students' primary limitation lay in analytical depth rather than surface-level accuracy.

Table 3. Mean Component Scores by Achievement Level

Rubric Component	Excellent (mean)	Good (mean)	Fair (mean)	Poor (mean)
Organization (max 8)	7.4	6.2	4.8	3.0
Content (max 16)	14.2	10.8	6.5	5.3
Language Use (max 8)	7.1	6.5	4.5	4.3
Mechanics (max 4)	3.6	2.4	2.0	2.0

Overall, the pattern of results suggests a positive association between active, sustained engagement in the peer feedback process - as reported qualitatively by higher-achieving students - and stronger performance on the content and organization dimensions of analytical exposition writing.

DISCUSSION

Interpreting the Research Outcomes

The findings indicate that the eleventh-grade students' engagement with peer feedback was significantly shaped by a multifaceted interplay of cognitive, linguistic, genre-knowledge, and affective factors. Specifically, students frequently navigated the cognitive burden of evaluating complex peer arguments, the linguistic challenge of articulating detailed feedback in a second language, the difficulty of operationalizing abstract genre knowledge during review, and the affective barrier of social discomfort when critiquing classmates. This engagement was broadly—though not uniformly—associated with the analytical quality of their subsequent writing. Students who articulated more active and reflective engagement—predominantly those within the Excellent and Good achievement groups—demonstrated the capacity to translate feedback into clearer, more focused thesis statements, more coherent argument development, and more effective causal reasoning. Conversely, students whose participation was characterized by superficiality or greater discomfort tended to produce texts that remained underdeveloped, often relying on descriptive rather than deeply evaluative language. Ultimately, the depth of interaction with the peer feedback process emerged as a key differentiator, influencing whether students could effectively bridge the gap between basic organizational structures and complex, analytical exposition.

Evaluation in Relation to Antecedent Studies

The challenges identified in this study—limited language proficiency constraining feedback specificity, difficulty applying genre knowledge analytically, and fear of offending peers—closely mirror findings by [Cendani & Purnamaningwulan \(2023\)](#); [Weng et al. \(2024\)](#), who argued that literacy development is frequently constrained by insufficient genre knowledge and limited linguistic resources. The struggle students exhibited in translating theoretical knowledge of the thesis-argument-reiteration structure into practical evaluative comments corroborates [Rahimi et al. \(2024\)](#); [Ayiz & Nugroho \(2025\)](#), both of whom observed that EFL learners often possess declarative genre knowledge but lack the scaffolded practice required to operationalize it analytically. Furthermore, recent research [Yu \(2020\)](#) highlights that even when students attempt to apply genre-based feedback, their efforts are often hampered by uncertainty regarding the correctness of their own feedback and anxieties about how criticism may negatively impact peer rapport. The affective dimension—namely, the fear of hurting peers' feelings—aligns with broader literature [Xue et al. \(2023\)](#), which documents that anxiety regarding negative peer reactions can significantly diminish the depth and honesty of feedback provided. This is further compounded by the "face-threatening" nature of providing feedback [Xue et al. \(2023\)](#), which in EFL contexts is often intensified by learners' lack of confidence in their own language proficiency ([Waluyo & Panmei, 2024](#)).

Regarding writing outcomes, the clear stratification of texts into Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor categories, with the most pronounced differences occurring in the Content component, is consistent with [Facione \(2023\)](#) framework of critical thinking, in which explanation, inference, and evaluation distinguish higher-order from lower-order reasoning. This pattern also parallels [Marni et al. \(2019\)](#), who found that students at an intermediate proficiency level could construct basic arguments but struggled to deepen evaluative analysis, and aligns with [Kuhn et al. \(2015\)](#), whose account of minimal critical engagement closely resembles the isolated, unelaborated claims observed in the Poor-level texts of this study. The overall improvement associated with peer feedback engagement is consistent with prior evidence that peer feedback enhances writing performance [Ying & Schunn \(2024\)](#); [Waluyo & Panmei \(2024\)](#) by fostering metacognitive awareness [Kerman et al. \(2023\)](#) and supporting the development of organization, accuracy, and confidence ([Taddese et al., 2026](#)). Critically, as suggested by [Xu et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Uymaz \(2019\)](#), the effectiveness of this process is heavily reliant on structured guidance; when students are trained to provide feedback using clear criteria, they are better equipped to overcome cognitive overload and produce constructive, content-focused commentary ([Ahmed, 2025](#)). This further underscores that while peer feedback is an inherently demanding social and cognitive task, its potential for cultivating critical thinking

is significant when managed within a supportive, scaffolded classroom environment (Noroozi et al., 2023).

Ramifications of the Findings

These results suggest that peer feedback functions simultaneously as a source of productive cognitive friction and as an emotionally demanding social task. Rather than viewing student-reported difficulties as evidence against the strategy, the findings imply that such difficulties are an intrinsic and potentially generative part of the critical thinking development process, provided they are accompanied by adequate scaffolding. This has direct implications for EFL teachers implementing the Merdeka Curriculum's emphasis on student autonomy: purely unstructured peer feedback risks leaving lower-proficiency students without the tools to move beyond descriptive commentary, whereas structured rubrics, explicit feedback training, and modeled examples - as recommended by Min (2006); Yu & Lee (2016)- may help translate the potential benefits of peer feedback into more consistent gains in analytical writing quality across proficiency levels.

Limitations of the Research

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. First, the study was confined to a single eleventh-grade class in one public senior high school in Lamongan with a relatively small participant pool, limiting the generalizability of the findings to other schools, regions, or educational contexts. Second, data were derived primarily from students' written texts, feedback worksheets, and interview self-reports, which may not fully capture the underlying cognitive processes of analysis, reasoning, and evaluation that occurred during writing and revision. Third, data collection occurred under fixed instructional time constraints, which may have limited students' opportunities for deeper reflection and elaboration. Finally, the study focused exclusively on the analytical exposition genre; students' critical thinking and writing quality may manifest differently in other genres such as discussion or problem-solution texts, restricting the generalizability of these findings beyond analytical exposition writing.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how peer feedback, as an instructional strategy, contributed to eleventh-grade EFL students' critical thinking development and analytical exposition writing quality, and identified the challenges students encountered in the process. The findings show that students faced interrelated cognitive, linguistic, genre-related, and affective challenges when giving and receiving peer feedback, most notably difficulty interpreting peers' arguments, limited English proficiency, difficulty operationalizing genre knowledge, and fear of offending classmates. Despite these challenges, students' final analytical exposition texts showed a clear, interpretable stratification of writing quality, with Excellent- and Good-level performers demonstrating stronger thesis clarity, argument coherence, and analytical depth than Fair- and Poor-level performers, whose primary limitation lay in the underdeveloped analytical content of their arguments rather than surface-level mechanics.

These results reinforce the conclusion, consistent with prior scholarship, that peer feedback holds substantial pedagogical value for developing critical writing skills, but that this value is not automatically realized; it is contingent on students' feedback literacy, language proficiency, and emotional comfort within the classroom environment. The evidence gathered here supports the premise advanced in the introduction - that analytical exposition writing, by virtue of its argumentative demands, provides a productive context in which peer feedback can cultivate critical thinking - while also confirming that structured guidance is necessary to help students move from descriptive to genuinely analytical and evaluative engagement with peers' texts.

Based on these findings, it is recommended that EFL teachers explicitly teach peer feedback as a core writing strategy, supported by clear rubrics, modeled feedback examples, and a classroom climate that reduces students' fear of causing offense. Future research is encouraged to examine the longitudinal impact of peer feedback on critical writing development, to compare its effectiveness across other argumentative and discursive genres, and to investigate more closely how students' language proficiency and confidence mediate their capacity to give and use peer feedback effectively. The authors welcome comments and suggestions from readers to further refine the pedagogical implications of this study.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the Rector of Universitas Negeri Surabaya, the Dean of the Faculty of Languages and Arts, the Coordinator of the English Language Education Study Program, the Board of Examiners, and the students and academic community of the participating senior high school in Lamongan for their cooperation and support throughout this research.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, M. R. A. (2025). The Impact of Feedback Mechanisms on Writing Proficiency among Lower Proficiency EFL Learners. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i6.10077>
- Alam, Md. S., & Asmawi, A. (2024). Qualitative research: Defining features and guiding principles. *Forum for Education Studies*, 2(2), 1262–1262. <https://doi.org/10.59400/fes.v2i2.1262>
- Ayiz, A., & Nugroho, K. Y. (2025). Enhancing Efl Reading Comprehension Skills Through Problem-Based Learning: Evidence From Student Engagement And Strategy Use. *Acceleration*, 3(3), 115–124. <https://doi.org/10.70210/amrj.v3i3.162>
- Bartlett, R., Boyle, J., Smith, J., Khan, N., Robinson, T., & Ramaswamy, R. (2021). Evaluating human-centred design for public health: a case study on developing a healthcare app with refugee communities. *Research Involvement and Engagement*, 7(1), 32–32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-021-00273-2>
- Bolourchi, A., & Soleimani, M. (2021). The effect of peer feedback on EFL learners' argumentative writing and writing anxiety. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 12(4), 561–570.
- Cendani, I. A. S. A., & Purnamaningwulan, R. A. (2023). Exploring Challenges of Peer Feedback in an EFL Micro Teaching Class.

- ELSYA *Journal of English Language Studies*, 5(3), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v5i3.15651>
- Facione, P. A. (2023). *Critical thinking: What it is and why it counts (2023 update)*. Measured Reasons LLC.
- Gao, Y., Kew, S. N., Feng, H., Zhang, T., & Ren, Z. (2024). Facilitating Second Language Willingness to Communicate in English: A Systematic Review on Types of Classroom-based Instructional Practices and Their Effects. *Arab World English Journal*, 15(4), 328–351. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no4.21>
- Iswandari, Y. A., & Jiang, L. (2023). EFL students' trust in teacher versus peer feedback: A comparative study. *TEFLIN Journal*, 34(2), 210–228.
- Jaafar Siddek, N. A., & Ismail, H. H. (2021). Understanding learners' difficulties in narrative writing among Malaysian primary learners. *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 244–255.
- Kelly, G., Sihombing, H., Lubis, L. N., & Oktavianda, M. (2024). Efektivitas pembelajaran Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(1), 1–12.
- Kerman, N. T., Banihashem, S. K., Karami, M., Er, E., Ginkel, S. van, & Noroozi, O. (2023). Online peer feedback in higher education: A synthesis of the literature. *Education and Information Technologies*, 29(1), 763–813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12273-8>
- Knowles, J., & McGloin, S. (2007). Developing critical analysis skills in academic writing. *Nursing Standard*, 21(52), 35–37. <https://doi.org/10.7748/ns2007.09.21.52.35.c6595>
- Kuhn, D., Hemberger, L., & Khait, V. (2015). *Argue with Me: Argument as a Path to Developing Students' Thinking and Writing*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315692722>
- Liu, C., Liu, S., Hwang, G., Tu, Y., Wang, Y., & Wang, N. (2023). Engaging EFL students' critical thinking tendency and in-depth reflection in technology-based writing contexts: A peer assessment-incorporated automatic evaluation approach. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(10), 13027–13052. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11697-6>
- Marni, S., Suyono, S., Roekhan, R., & Harsati, T. (2019). Critical Thinking Patterns of First-Year Students in Argumentative Essay. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, 7(3), 683–697. <https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.605324>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis a methods sourcebook. In *CERN Document Server (European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. European Organization for Nuclear Research. https://bvb.bib-bvb.de/443/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=025765516&sequence=000001&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA
- Min, H. (2006). The effects of trained peer review on EFL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 118–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.01.003>
- Nelson, N. J., Skinner, K., & Barrera, E. S. (2022). The Writing-Reading Nexus. In *Civil War Book Review* (pp. 141–162). Louisiana State University. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429437991-12>
- Nhan, L. K. (2026). EFL Learners' Perceptions of Peer Feedback: Benefits and Challenges in English Writing Classes. *Asian Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 204–218. <https://doi.org/10.54392/ajir26113>
- Noroozi, O., Banihashem, S. K., Biemans, H. J. A., Smits, M. C. J., Vervoort, M. T. W., & Verbaan, C.-L. (2023). Design, implementation, and evaluation of an online supported peer feedback module to enhance students' argumentative essay quality. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(10), 12757–12784. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11683-y>
- Pandey, G. P. (2025). Designing and Conducting Qualitative Studies in ELT: Methods and Practices. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, 12(2), 114–122. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ijssm.v12i2.77491>
- Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2023). Implementing process-genre approach, feedback, and technology in L2 writing in higher education. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-023-00211-7>
- Pham, T. N., Mei, L., Trinh, V. Q., & Bui, L. T. P. (2020). Electronic Peer Feedback, EFL Academic Writing and Reflective Thinking: Evidence From a Confucian Context. *SAGE Open*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914554>
- Putra, I. G. K. M., Santosa, M. H., & Pratiwi, N. P. A. (2021). Students' Perceptions on Online Peer Feedback Practice In EFL Writing. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i2.21488>
- Rahimi, M., Fathi, J., & Zou, D. (2024). Exploring the impact of automated written corrective feedback on the academic writing skills of EFL learners: An activity theory perspective. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(3), 2691–2735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12896-5>
- Rosyadi, A., Marlina, L., & Candra, F. (2023). Analytical exposition text: A genre-based perspective on argumentative writing instruction. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 10(1), 45–60.
- Sharhan, K. Sh., Al-Abedi, H. K., & Al-Hilu, M. J. (2020). Investigating College Students Problems In Writing English Composition. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 10(2), 133–151. <https://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v10i02.010>
- Sri Wahyuni, M. K. (2017). An analysis of writing anxiety. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 4(2), 199–217.
- Suryani, R. W., Rozimela, Y., & Anwar, D. (2020). *Investigating the Effect of Peer Feedback on Students' Writing Skill*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200819.034>
- Taddese, E. T., Dinsa, M. T., Yassin, H. A., Lakew, A. K., & Agemso, W. D. (2026). The Impact of Peer Feedback on Writing Anxiety and Performance: EFL Students at Wolkite University in Focus. *World Journal of English Language*, 16(2), 469–469. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v16n2p469>
- Taye, T., & Mengesha, M. (2024). Identifying and analyzing common English writing challenges among regular undergraduate students. *Heliyon*, 10(17). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36876>
- Tianotak, N. (2022). Students' trust and engagement in peer review activities in EFL writing classrooms. *Journal of English Educators*

- Society, 7(1), 55–63.
- Toufaha, S. (2024). The effect of automated error corrective feedback on the improvement of EFL learners' writing and autonomy. *Arab World English Journal*, 15(1), 480–493.
- Tsiriatakis, I. K., Spiliotopoulos, V., Grünke, M., & Kokolakis, C. (2021). The Effects of a Cognitive Apprenticeship Model on the Argumentative Texts of EFL Learners. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(5), 63–63. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v10n5p63>
- Tyas, P. A. (2020). E-portfolio-based peer review in EFL writing class: Engagement and accuracy. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 7(2), 407–422.
- Uymaz, E. (2019). The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Essay Writing Performances of EFL Students. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 11(2), 20–37. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1232777.pdf>
- Waluyo, B., & Panmei, B. (2024). Students' peer feedback engagements in online English courses facilitated by a social network in Thailand. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 14(2), 306–306. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.2305>
- Wei, Y., & Liu, D. (2024). Incorporating peer feedback in academic writing: a systematic review of benefits and challenges. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1506725–1506725. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1506725>
- Weng, F., Zhao, C. G., & Chen, S. (2024). Effects of peer feedback in English writing classes on EFL students' writing feedback literacy. *Assessing Writing*, 61, 100874–100874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100874>
- Xu, Z., Zhang, L. J., & Parr, J. M. (2022). Incorporating peer feedback in writing instruction: examining its effects on Chinese English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners' writing performance. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 61(4), 1337–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2021-0078>
- Xue, S., Yang, Y., Du, J., & Liu, F. (2023). Multi-layered e-feedback anxiety: An action research study among Chinese learners using peer feedback activities in an academic writing course. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1062517–1062517. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1062517>
- Ying, C., & Schunn, C. D. (2024). Peer feedback that consistently supports learning to write and read: providing comments on meaning-level issues. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(8), 1168–1181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2364025>
- Ying, C., Schunn, C. D., & Gai, X. (2021). Peer feedback and teacher feedback: a comparative study of revision effectiveness in writing instruction for EFL learners. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 41(6), 1838–1854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1969541>
- Yu, S. (2020). Giving genre-based peer feedback in academic writing: sources of knowledge and skills, difficulties and challenges. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 46(1), 36–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1742872>
- Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461–493. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444816000161>
- Zeevy-Solovey, O. (2024). Comparing peer, ChatGPT, and teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing: Students' perceptions and preferences. *Technology in Language Teaching & Learning*, 6(3), 1482–1482. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1482>
- Zhang, Z. (2022). Comparing peer and teacher feedback in EFL writing: Cognitive and metacognitive outcomes. *System*, 105, 102718.
- Zheng, W. (2023). A cross-cultural perspective on adolescents' cognitive flexibility and pro-environmental behavior: Multilevel evidence. *Current Psychology*, 43(16), 14686–14694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05484-2>
- Zou, D., Xie, H., & Wang, F. L. (2022). Effects of technology enhanced peer, teacher and self-feedback on students' collaborative writing, critical thinking tendency and engagement in learning. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 35(1), 166–185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-022-09337-y>