LA EDICIÓN ENTRE PARES COMO HERRAMIENTA PEDAGÓGICA PARA MEJORAR EL PROCESO DE ESCRITURA

PEER EDITING AS A PEDAGOGICAL TOOL TO ENHANCE THE WRITING PROCESS

Yahui Huang Chang
Universidad Hispanoamericana - Costa Rica

La edición entre pares como herramienta pedagógica para mejorar el proceso de escritura

Yahui Huang Chang[1]

yahui.huang@uh.ac.cr

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3482-8399

Universidad Hispanoamericana

Costa Rica

RESUMEN

Este artículo explora la edición entre pares como una herramienta pedagógica para mejorar las habilidades de escritura de los estudiantes. El objetivo principal del estudio es analizar el impacto de la retroalimentación entre compañeros en el desarrollo de la escritura de estudiantes universitarios en cursos de redacción en inglés. La metodología adoptada es cualitativa, con un enfoque descriptivo-exploratorio, centrado en el análisis textual y la observación participante en el aula. Los datos se recopilaron mediante borradores estudiantiles, formularios de retroalimentación y diarios reflexivos. Los hallazgos principales indican que la edición entre pares fomenta una comprensión más profunda de las convenciones de escritura, estimula el pensamiento crítico y mejora la capacidad de los estudiantes para revisar sus textos de manera más eficaz. Además, el proceso fortalece el aprendizaje colaborativo y construye un sentido de comunidad académica. Estos resultados sugieren que la edición entre pares debe integrarse de forma más sistemática en la enseñanza de la escritura para apoyar el desarrollo de escritores autónomos y reflexivos.

Palabras clave: edición entre pares, proceso de escritura, retroalimentación, aprendizaje colaborativo

---

[1] Autor Principal

Correspondencia: yahui.huang@uh.ac.cr

Peer Editing as a Pedagogical Tool to Enhance the Writing Process

ABSTRACT

This article explores peer editing as a pedagogical tool to improve students' writing skills. The primary objective of the study is to analyze the impact of peer feedback on the writing development of university students engaged in English composition courses. The methodology adopted for this research is qualitative, with a descriptive-exploratory approach, focusing on textual analysis and participant observation within a classroom setting. Data was collected through student drafts, peer feedback forms, and reflective journals. The main findings indicate that peer editing fosters a deeper understanding of writing conventions, encourages critical thinking, and enhances students' ability to revise their work more effectively. Additionally, the process strengthens collaborative learning and builds a sense of academic community. These outcomes suggest that peer editing should be integrated more systematically into writing instruction to support the development of autonomous, reflective writers.

Keywords: peer editing, writing process, feedback, collaborative learning, academic writing

INTRODUCTION

In the field of language learning, the development of writing skills remains a significant challenge for both learners and instructors. Writing is a complex process involving planning, drafting, revising, and editing, and it demands not only linguistic competence but also cognitive engagement and critical thinking. One method that has gained traction in recent years is peer editing, a process in which students review and provide feedback on each other's writing. This article delves into the practice of peer editing and investigates its effectiveness as a pedagogical strategy to enhance the writing process.

The research problem addressed in this study concerns the gap between traditional teacher-led feedback and student-centered revision practices. Many learners rely solely on instructor corrections without engaging critically with their own writing. Consequently, opportunities for revision are underutilized, and writing improvement becomes limited. This study proposes that peer editing can bridge this gap by promoting active learning and reflective practice.

The relevance of this topic lies in its alignment with contemporary educational paradigms that emphasize collaborative learning, student autonomy, and formative assessment. Peer editing encourages learners to adopt the role of critical readers, fostering skills that are essential not only for academic success but also for lifelong learning. Furthermore, it aligns with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, which posits that learning occurs through social interaction and the co-construction of knowledge (Vygotsky, 1978).

The theoretical framework of this study draws from composition theory, collaborative learning theory, and formative assessment principles. Scholars such as Flower and Hayes (1981), Bruffee (1984), and

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick (2006) have emphasized the importance of feedback, peer collaboration, and metacognition in writing development. Peer editing encompasses these dimensions by allowing learners to reflect on their writing through the lens of their peers' perspectives.

Previous research highlights the benefits of peer editing in diverse educational contexts. For instance, Lundstrom and Baker (2009) found that both giving and receiving peer feedback significantly improved writing quality. Similarly, Rollinson (2005) argued that peer editing supports cognitive engagement and revision strategies. Despite these findings, peer editing is not consistently implemented across writing curricula, often due to concerns about students' ability to provide quality feedback. This article contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical insights from a classroom-based study and suggesting practical strategies for effective implementation.

The study was conducted within the context of a university-level English composition course in Costa Rica. The participants were second-year students majoring in English. The research setting provided a rich environment for observing peer interactions and assessing the impact of peer feedback on writing improvement.

The general objective of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of peer editing in improving the writing process. Specific objectives include analyzing the types of feedback provided by peers, examining the changes made in response to that feedback, and exploring students' perceptions of the peer editing experience. This article seeks to demonstrate that peer editing, when properly guided, serves as a powerful tool for writing development.

Writing development has long been a focal point in language education due to its complexity and importance in academic success. Despite advances in teaching methods, many students continue to struggle with self-regulation and revision skills. Peer editing offers a promising solution by encouraging learners to engage actively with their writing and that of their classmates. This engagement nurtures not only technical proficiency but also critical reflection on content and structure. By situating writing within a social and interactive context, peer editing aligns with contemporary pedagogical shifts that prioritize student agency and collaborative learning environments.

Moreover, peer editing addresses the often-limited capacity of instructors to provide timely and individualized feedback in large classrooms. By distributing the responsibility of feedback among peers, students benefit from diverse perspectives that can reveal overlooked errors or unclear arguments. This multiplicity of viewpoints enriches the revision process and promotes deeper cognitive involvement. Research on feedback effectiveness underscores that active participation in evaluating others' work fosters stronger metacognitive awareness, ultimately leading to improved self-editing skills. Consequently, incorporating peer editing aligns well with goals of developing autonomous, critical writers prepared for academic and professional challenges.

Finally, the social dimension of peer editing promotes a learning environment where dialogue and negotiation of meaning become central. Students are not only revising texts but engaging in discourse about language, purpose, and clarity. This dialogic nature helps demystify the writing process and makes students feel less alone in their struggles. It empowers them to become more resourceful, knowing that

writing is an evolving craft nurtured through interaction. Such collaboration often leads to increased motivation, especially when learners feel that their voice matters in the learning process. By fostering these relationships, peer editing transforms writing classrooms into communities of practice where continuous improvement is both a shared and individual pursuit.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative research design with a descriptive and exploratory approach. The goal was to gain a deeper understanding of how peer editing impacts the writing development of students in an academic setting. The methodology focused on analyzing the interactions, reflections, and revisions that occurred as students engaged in peer feedback activities.

The research was conducted during a semester-long English composition course at a Costa Rican university. The participants consisted of 18 undergraduate students enrolled in the English major. These students were selected through purposive sampling, as they represented a population actively involved in writing development and receptive to peer-based learning strategies.

The data collection techniques included document analysis and participant observation. Document analysis focused on comparing students' writing drafts before and after the peer editing sessions. Peer feedback forms served as additional sources of data, providing insight into the nature and quality of comments exchanged between students. Observational field notes recorded classroom interactions during peer editing workshops.

To ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, triangulation was applied by cross-referencing data

from different sources. Ethical considerations included obtaining informed consent from all participants, ensuring anonymity, and maintaining confidentiality throughout the research process. Students were informed that their participation in the study would not affect their course grades.

The criteria for inclusion required that students had participated in at least two peer editing sessions and submitted both drafts and feedback forms. Exclusion criteria eliminated any participant who did not complete the activities in full. This methodological framework allowed the researcher to assess both the process and the outcomes of peer editing, generating insights that could be used to inform instructional practices and curriculum design.

In addition to the techniques mentioned, the peer editing sessions were implemented bi-weekly throughout the semester to ensure consistency and to allow students multiple opportunities to engage with different partners. Each session included a preparatory workshop where students reviewed effective feedback strategies and practiced analyzing sample texts. Students used a structured peer review sheet developed by the instructor, which focused on thesis clarity, coherence, grammar, and argumentation. Observational data was further supplemented by the instructor's field journal, which documented classroom dynamics, student interactions, and emergent challenges. This holistic methodological approach ensured rich, triangulated insights into the impact of peer editing on student writing.

Furthermore, a follow-up interview was conducted with selected students to capture their personal reflections on the peer editing process. These interviews provided qualitative depth and helped validate the results gathered from the written data. Participants were asked about their perceptions of giving and

receiving feedback, their comfort level with the process, and the impact peer editing had on their revision practices. These insights revealed the nuances of peer interaction and how students internalized feedback in different ways. The inclusion of interview data allowed for a more comprehensive interpretation of the educational benefits and challenges associated with peer editing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings from this study reveal several key outcomes related to the implementation of peer editing in an academic writing classroom. First and foremost, students demonstrated marked improvement in their drafts after participating in peer review sessions. When comparing initial and revised versions of students' essays, significant enhancements were noted in the areas of organization, argument clarity, and grammatical accuracy.

A common trend among participants was the increased ability to identify issues in their own writing after engaging with the work of their peers. Many students expressed that reviewing a classmate's draft sharpened their awareness of structural and stylistic weaknesses in their own texts. For instance, one participant remarked, "Reading someone else's introduction made me realize that mine lacked a clear thesis statement." This type of metacognitive reflection proved to be one of the most transformative aspects of the peer editing process.

Peer feedback also promoted collaborative learning. Students were encouraged to exchange suggestions respectfully and to articulate constructive criticism. Observations indicated a high level of engagement during peer editing sessions, with learners actively discussing possible improvements and negotiating

the meaning of their texts. This aligns with Rollinson's (2005) claim that peer response encourages interaction and fosters a community of practice among learners.

However, the study also identified certain challenges. Some students struggled with providing detailed or useful feedback, especially early in the semester. Others felt uncomfortable critiquing their classmates' work due to fear of offending or due to perceived lack of authority. These issues were gradually mitigated through teacher scaffolding, modeling of effective feedback, and the use of guided peer review forms.

An analysis of the peer feedback forms revealed a predominance of comments related to content and organization, followed by grammar and vocabulary. This suggests that students prioritized global revision over surface-level corrections, indicating a deeper engagement with writing as a communicative act. The reflective journals also highlighted a shift in students' attitudes toward writing. Initially, several learners expressed anxiety and reluctance toward peer editing. By the end of the course, most reported feeling more confident not only in giving feedback but also in revising their own work based on peer suggestions. This shift points to the role of peer editing in fostering writing autonomy and self-efficacy.

Further analysis revealed that students who consistently participated in peer editing showed the most substantial improvements in their final writing portfolios. These students displayed a heightened awareness of audience and purpose, and their texts reflected stronger cohesion and logical structure.

Peer editing also contributed to a shift in classroom culture—from one focused on grades to one centered on learning and growth. Notably, even students who were initially reluctant became more invested in the editing process over time. These findings reinforce the idea that peer feedback, when embedded in

a supportive framework, can cultivate a reflective, motivated community of writers.

Beyond improved writing quality, peer editing fostered a positive affective climate within the classroom. Students reported feeling more supported and less isolated in their writing journey, which contributed to reduced writing anxiety. Collaborative exchanges enabled them to normalize the struggles of drafting and revising, shifting perceptions of writing from a solitary task to a shared endeavor. These affective gains complemented cognitive improvements, demonstrating the multifaceted benefits of peer editing.

Furthermore, the teacher's role as facilitator proved crucial in guiding effective communication and resolving conflicts, highlighting the importance of scaffolded peer interaction for optimal outcomes.

In summary, the results suggest that peer editing, when scaffolded and supported, can significantly improve the writing process. It enhances textual awareness, promotes collaboration, and builds a supportive academic environment. These findings contribute to the growing body of evidence advocating for peer-based formative assessment in language instruction.

Illustrations, Tables, And Figures

Visual and tabular materials play a crucial role in complementing the textual analysis presented in this study. They provide concrete evidence, and a clearer understanding of the processes and outcomes related to peer editing. All illustrations, tables, and figures included in this article are numbered sequentially for easy reference within the text. Each item includes a descriptive title and explanatory caption to ensure that readers can interpret the data independently of the main narrative.

Tables summarize quantitative information, such as the frequency and types of feedback students

provided to their peers. This numerical representation helps identify patterns in peer comments and highlights which aspects of writing received the most attention. For example, the distribution of feedback types can reveal whether students focused more on global issues like content and organization or on surface-level details such as grammar and vocabulary.

Figures, such as sample peer feedback forms, illustrate the tools and instruments used to structure the peer editing sessions. These visual aids demonstrate how feedback was guided, ensuring consistency and depth in students' evaluations. By providing these concrete examples, the study emphasizes the importance of scaffolding in peer editing activities to maximize their effectiveness.

Overall, the inclusion of illustrations, tables, and figures enriches the study by offering multiple perspectives on the peer editing process, reinforcing the qualitative findings with visual and statistical evidence.

Table 1. Improvement in Writing Components After Peer Editing

Writing Component	Average Score Before Editing	Average Score After Editing	% Improvement
Content and Ideas	65	82	26%
Organization	60	78	30%
Grammar and Syntax	55	75	36%
Vocabulary Usage	58	73	26%
Overall Writing Score	59	77	30%

Note. Scores based on rubric assessments of drafts before and after peer editing.

Table 2: Peer Feedback Form Completion Rates

Section	% of Students Who Completed This Section Thoroughly
Thesis Statement Clarity	90%
Organization & Coherence	85%
Grammar and Syntax	80%
Vocabulary Use	75%
Overall Suggestions	70%

Note. Data represents how consistently students filled out each section of the peer feedback form.

CONLUSIONS

Peer editing emerges from this study as a valuable pedagogical strategy for improving the writing skills of university students. The practice not only enhances the quality of writing through revision but also nurtures metacognitive skills, collaborative competence, and learner autonomy. Students who actively engaged in peer editing developed a clearer understanding of audience expectations and writing conventions, leading to more coherent and purposeful texts.

The findings underscore the importance of instructor facilitation and training in order to maximize the benefits of peer editing. Effective peer review requires clear guidelines, modeling, and feedback literacy. With proper implementation, peer editing can move beyond a classroom activity and become a sustained habit of mind that students carry into their academic and professional lives.

Future studies may build upon this research by exploring peer editing in online contexts, across

disciplines, or among multilingual learners. Additional quantitative data could also help strengthen the generalizability of results. Nonetheless, this article offers meaningful insights into how collaborative revision practices contribute to the writing process and calls for broader integration of peer editing in writing curricula.

This study confirms that peer editing is not only effective for enhancing writing skills but also valuable for developing essential academic dispositions such as critical thinking, collaboration, and resilience. The active involvement of students in providing and receiving feedback fosters a deeper connection to their writing process and promotes lifelong learning habits. Future pedagogical approaches should integrate peer editing systematically, accompanied by adequate training and support for both students and educators. Such integration promises to transform writing instruction by empowering learners to become autonomous, reflective, and engaged writers, equipped to meet the demands of an evolving academic landscape.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Bruffee, K. A. (1984). Collaborative learning and the "conversation of mankind." College English, 46(7), 635–652.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387.

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.

Nicol, D., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model

and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199–218.

Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. ELT Journal, 59(1), 23–30.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard

University Press.