The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
International Journal of Pedagogics

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue10 2026
PAGE NO. 20-24
DOI 10.37547/ijp/Volume06Issue10-04

An Integrated Methodological Framework for Developing University EFL Students' Writing Revision and Editing Skills in Blended Learning Environments

Karatayeva Nilufar Faxridin qizi
Gulistan State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 28 August 2026; **Accepted:** 24 September 2026; **Published:** 16 October 2026

Abstract: This conceptual-methodological study proposes an integrated framework for developing university English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) students' textual revision and language editing skills in blended learning environments. Responding to the need for clearer methodological novelty, operational instruction and assessable learning evidence, the article distinguishes global revision from local editing and coordinates classroom interaction, asynchronous feedback, peer response, version comparison and learner reflection. A purposive, non-systematic synthesis of foundational second-language writing research and selected scholarship identified through Sider Scholar informs a five-stage, recursive instructional design: drafting, diagnostic feedback, content revision, language editing and reflective consolidation. The article specifies sample tasks, teacher and learner responsibilities, artifacts, and a six-dimension, four-level provisional assessment rubric. It also discusses implementation constraints relevant to Uzbek higher education, including unequal connectivity, varying feedback experience and instructor workload. The contribution is a transparent instructional design and a testable evaluation plan, not evidence of experimentally established effectiveness.

Keywords: EFL academic writing; blended learning; revision; editing; feedback literacy; peer review; formative assessment; reflective learning.

Introduction: Effective academic writing requires writers to reconsider what a text argues, how its ideas are sequenced, and how accurately its language communicates meaning. For university EFL learners, these operations are difficult because linguistic resources, genre knowledge and self-monitoring develop together. Yet classroom practices may collapse revision into the correction of surface errors. The distinction matters: global revision reconsiders purpose, claims, evidence, organization and coherence, while local editing improves lexical choice, grammar, punctuation, referencing conventions and register. These processes interact recursively rather than forming an absolute dichotomy (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

Blended learning can provide complementary conditions for these operations: in-person discussion supports negotiation of meaning and modelling, while online documents preserve annotations, successive drafts and reflection. However, digital access or feedback quantity alone cannot establish learning. The pedagogical problem is to align feedback timing, learner action and visible evidence of decision-making across modes.

This study asks: (1) Which established concepts justify differentiated instruction in revision and editing? (2) How can face-to-face and online tasks be coordinated in a teachable cycle? (3) Which artifacts and assessment criteria could support a future evaluation of the model in university EFL courses, including Uzbekistan? Its proposed novelty is the integration of differentiated revision/editing objectives, sequenced feedback, explicit classroom–online alignment and documented

learner reasoning in one assessable cycle. This is a design contribution rather than a claim that any individual component is new.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL POSITIONING

Recursive writing and differentiated instructional priorities

Flower and Hayes (1981) conceptualize composing as a recursive interaction of planning, translating and reviewing. This undermines rigid one-pass correction and supports repeated comparison of drafts. Graham and Perin (2007) synthesize evidence for strategy instruction and collaboration among adolescent writers; their findings offer design heuristics but do not directly demonstrate effectiveness among Uzbek university EFL students. In the present framework, the practical priority is to address argument and organization before intensive sentence-level editing, while allowing writers to revisit any stage as needed.

Feedback, engagement and collaboration

Hyland and Hyland (2006) situate L2 writing feedback within social and instructional relationships. Storch (2013) explains the potential of collaborative writing to elicit negotiation of form and meaning. Neither perspective warrants assuming that comments automatically produce substantive revision. Zhang and Hyland (2018) foreground behavioral, cognitive and affective engagement with teacher and automated feedback: the educationally important question is how learners interpret and use feedback. Consequently, the proposed model records accepted, adapted and rejected comments, each with a justification.

So and Lee (2012) provide context-specific evidence on peer feedback across online and offline modes in a small Korean university study; it motivates complementary activity design rather than universal claims about which medium is superior. Domysheva and Kopylova (2019) discuss cultural considerations in Russian university peer review, suggesting that respectful critique should be modelled rather than presumed. These insights are particularly relevant when introducing peer assessment to classes with uneven prior experience.

Recent scholarship and remaining design gap

A Sider Scholar/OpenAlex search for recent feedback-literacy research identified the scholarly record “Writing assessment literacy and feedback literacy in second language writing” (Mao, Yu, & Lee, 2026). Its bibliographic presence helps identify feedback literacy as a continuing research focus; the present study does not infer specific findings from that record without full-text appraisal. The available source base remains selective, and a comprehensive claim about the 2020–2026 literature would be unjustified. The design gap addressed here is narrower: how to translate established feedback and writing-process principles into a transparent instructional sequence with concrete tasks, auditable artifacts and provisional assessment criteria.

METHODOLOGY

The research adopts a qualitative conceptual-design approach rather than a systematic review, intervention or meta-analysis. Its primary corpus comprises seven studies and books cited in the original manuscript, selected purposively for relevance to recursive composing, strategy instruction, L2 feedback, collaboration, online/offline peer response and a post-Soviet university context. An additional recent scholarly record was located through Sider Scholar using an OpenAlex search on “feedback literacy writing” with publication date from 2020 onward. Because search histories, screening counts and full-text appraisals were not comprehensively documented, no PRISMA flow, exhaustive coverage or replicable systematic search is claimed.

The conceptual analysis used five comparison categories: (a) targeted writing operation (global revision/local editing); (b) source and purpose of feedback; (c) face-to-face versus online affordances; (d) learner agency and reflection; and (e) observable assessment evidence. Synthesis proceeded from concept extraction, through cross-source comparison and mapping to instructional functions, to the design of tasks and indicators. Where literature suggests a pedagogical rationale but not a tested causal effect, the article explicitly labels the resulting practice as a proposal. No students were recruited and no achievement data were generated.

PROPOSED INTEGRATED INSTRUCTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The model treats five stages as distinct teaching foci connected by feedback and version tracking. The unit of implementation is a writing assignment with at least

three retained artifacts: an initial draft, a substantively revised draft and an edited final text, supplemented by a feedback-response log. A teacher may adapt lesson duration and platform to course conditions; the sequence is not dependent on a specific commercial tool.

Sample instructional tasks

Stage and objective	Face-to-face instruction	Online learner task	Evidence
1. Drafting: define purpose and argument	Analyze genre exemplar; model thesis and outline	Prepare outline and Draft 1 in shared document	Outline; Draft 1
2. Diagnosis: prioritize issues	Model constructive comments; calibrate peer review	Annotate two higher-order and two language issues; categorize feedback	Comment record; priority list
3. Content revision: improve meaning	Discuss thesis–evidence links and paragraph order	Rewrite weak claim; reorganize paragraphs; compare versions	Draft 2; change history
4. Language editing: improve expression	Mini-lesson on recurring grammar and register issues	Edit sentence clarity, cohesion, grammar and citation form	Edited draft; edit checklist
5. Reflection: justify decisions	Discuss feedback choices and transfer goals	Submit final text, response log and short reflection	Portfolio; rationale

Task A (argument audit): Students underline the central claim, label each paragraph's function and mark unsupported claims. A peer answers: "Which paragraph most directly supports the thesis, and which needs additional evidence?" Students then revise one claim–evidence link and document the change. Task B (coherence reconstruction): Students compare the order of paragraphs in Drafts 1 and 2 and write a two-sentence explanation of a structural move. Task C (editing clinic): Students identify recurring article, tense, word-choice and reference errors in an anonymized excerpt, explain corrections, and then edit their own drafts. Task D (feedback decision log): For three comments, students record the problem, proposed change, action taken and reason for acceptance, adaptation or rejection.

Instructional roles and accessibility. The teacher provides genre exemplars, calibrated comments, priority rules and short language mini-lessons; peers give evidence-based responses rather than unstructured judgments; each writer retains final responsibility for decisions. Shared documents with revision history may be used when available, but downloadable files, annotated PDFs or paper response sheets can provide equivalent evidence in low-connectivity settings. Automated writing suggestions should be checked against authorial intention and genre conventions, not accepted mechanically.

Why the components are integrated. Differentiated objectives prevent an exclusive focus on surface accuracy; sequencing protects time for substantial rewriting; mixed-mode tasks preserve opportunities for spoken clarification and asynchronous reconsideration; and logs make feedback engagement observable. The claimed contribution is this explicit alignment of objectives, tasks and evidence. It does not establish superiority over existing process-writing, peer-feedback or blended-learning approaches.

PROVISIONAL ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

Assessment should distinguish quality of the final text from the quality of decisions made during revision. Six dimensions are scored from 1 (limited) to 4 (excellent). The descriptors below are proposed analytic anchors, not a validated scale; raters should compare drafts, comments and logs rather than judge the final submission alone.

Dimension	1 — Limited	2 — Developing	3 — Good	4 — Excellent
Content	Claim unclear or unsupported	Some claims improved; gaps remain	Claims mostly supported	Purposeful, well-supported claims

Organization	Sequence obscures purpose	Some logical restructuring	Mostly purposeful progression	Consistently effective structure
Coherence	Links and references confusing	Some improved transitions	Clear links with minor gaps	Precise, consistent textual links
Language	Frequent distracting errors	Partial correction; recurring issues	Mostly accurate, suitable register	Accurate and context-sensitive choices
Feedback use	Little response or rationale	Selective uptake, weak reasons	Reasoned uptake or rejection	Independent, evidence-based decisions
Reflection	Vague or absent	Names issues, few next steps	Explains changes and future goal	Critically evaluates strategy and transfer

Each dimension may be rated 1–4, giving a provisional total of 6–24. Such a total should not be interpreted as an interval-scale measure or a standardized proficiency score. Before research use, expert review of content validity, piloting, rater training and inter-rater agreement testing are necessary. A future study should predefine how raters handle conflicting evidence between textual improvement and self-reported reflection.

DISCUSSION: CONTEXTUAL FEASIBILITY AND RESEARCH AGENDA

In Uzbek higher education, the framework could be incorporated into academic-writing courses without assuming uniform student access to devices or stable connectivity. Teachers can model peer critique in Uzbek or English as pedagogically appropriate while retaining English-language textual goals. Clear rubrics, anonymized examples and structured response stems may help students offer respectful critique. However, these are contextual design recommendations, not findings from an Uzbek classroom trial.

The main trade-off is instructional workload: meaningful feedback, version review and reflective logs require time. A feasible pilot could focus on one genre, restrict feedback to two global priorities per draft, and use peer-response calibration before expanding the model. Teachers should protect student privacy when using shared documents and avoid requiring paid software.

For empirical testing, a future semester-long mixed-methods study could compare repeated writing tasks, collect three versions per assignment, code global and local revisions, and independently score texts using a piloted rubric. Interviews or learner logs could clarify why suggestions were adopted or resisted. Any comparison group would need comparable writing prompts, instructional time and baseline proficiency. Pre/post differences would require careful causal interpretation and should not be invented in a conceptual article.

Limitations include purposive source selection, incomplete recent-literature coverage, unvalidated indicators and the absence of classroom implementation. The current article therefore supports feasibility planning and testable hypotheses, not claims of effectiveness, transfer or statistically significant improvement.

CONCLUSION

This study develops a five-stage, recursive instructional framework for university EFL revision and editing in blended learning environments. Its methodological contribution is the explicit alignment of global revision and local editing objectives with sequenced feedback, complementary classroom–online tasks, version evidence and reflective decision-making. Practical exercises and a six-dimension analytic rubric make the proposal more operational and open to critical testing. Classroom trials, rubric validation and context-sensitive implementation research are required before effectiveness can be asserted.

REFERENCES

1. Domysheva, S. A., & Kopylova, N. V. (2019). Peer review in EFL writing classrooms at Russian universities: Cultural factors. Vestnik of Samara University. History, Pedagogics, Philology, 25(3), 139–147. https://doi.org/10.18287/2542-0445-

2019-25-3-139-147

2. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600
3. Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools. Alliance for Excellent Education.
4. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. Language Teaching, 39(2), 83–101. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399
5. Mao, Z., Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2026). Writing assessment literacy and feedback literacy in second language writing. Language Teaching. [Sider Scholar/OpenAlex bibliographic record; volume, pages and DOI require final verification].
6. So, R., & Lee, C. H. (2012). Peer feedback using blended learning in L2 writing at the university level. English Teaching, 67(3), 307–337. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.67.3.201209.307
7. Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. Multilingual Matters.
8. Zhang, Z. V., & Hyland, K. (2018). Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing. Assessing Writing, 36, 90–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004