



LECTURER SCAFFOLDING THROUGH INDIRECT ELICITATION AFTER COLLABORATIVE EDITING FOR ERROR RECOGNITION IN NON-ENGLISH MAJORS

Seflianti¹, Niwayan Sukraini², Santang³

IAHN Tampung Penyang Palangka Raya¹²³

e-mail: seflianti@iahntp.ac.id¹, niwayansukraini@iahntp.ac.id²,
sanperawatan@gmail.com³

Diterima: 28/7/2026; Direvisi: 16/8/2026; Diterbitkan: 27/8/2026

ABSTRAK

Proses *collaborative editing* memungkinkan mahasiswa menilai tulisan melalui pertukaran pandangan dengan teman sebaya, tetapi kemampuan mengenali kesalahan tidak selalu berkembang sejalan dengan keterlibatan tersebut. Penelitian ini menelaah bagaimana mahasiswa berpartisipasi dalam *small-group collaborative editing* dan merespons *lecturer scaffolding* melalui *indirect elicitation*. Studi kasus kualitatif eksploratif ini dilaksanakan pada Mei 2026 dengan melibatkan 14 mahasiswa semester dua pada mata kuliah *General English Language*. Rangkaian kegiatan berlangsung melalui penulisan tiga kalimat berdasarkan *tense* yang diperoleh melalui undian, pemeriksaan tulisan secara berkelompok selama 15 menit, pembahasan hasil tulisan dalam *whole-class discussion*, dan wawancara kelompok semi-terstruktur. Informasi penelitian diperoleh melalui observasi kelas, produk tulisan, dan wawancara, kemudian ditelaah menggunakan analisis tematik serta triangulasi sumber. Keterlibatan mahasiswa terlihat dalam diskusi dan pemeriksaan antarteman, tetapi kesalahan ejaan, kapitalisasi, tata bahasa, dan bentuk kalimat masih ditemukan setelah tahap penyuntingan kelompok. Ketika dosen menggunakan *indirect elicitation*, mahasiswa terdorong untuk memeriksa kembali tulisan dan menelusuri bagian yang dianggap bermasalah sebelum melakukan perbaikan. Dengan demikian, *collaborative editing* dan *lecturer scaffolding* menunjukkan fungsi yang saling melengkapi dalam membangun proses pemeriksaan tulisan yang lebih reflektif.

Kata Kunci: Akurasi Menulis, Collaborative Editing, Indirect Elicitation, Lecturer Scaffolding, Pengenalan Kesalahan

ABSTRACT

The *collaborative editing* process allows students to evaluate written work through the exchange of perspectives with their peers, but the ability to recognize errors does not necessarily develop in line with their level of engagement. This study examines how students participate in *small-group collaborative editing* and respond to *lecturer scaffolding* through *indirect elicitation*. An exploratory qualitative case study was conducted in May 2026 involving 14 second-semester students enrolled in a *General English Language* course. The learning sequence consisted of individually writing three sentences based on a *tense* obtained through a lottery, reviewing the writing collaboratively for 15 minutes, discussing the resulting written work in a *whole-class discussion*, and participating in semi-structured group interviews. Data were obtained from classroom observations, students' written products, and interviews, and were subsequently examined through thematic analysis and source triangulation. Student engagement was evident in peer discussion and review, yet spelling, capitalization,



grammatical, and sentence-form errors remained after the group-editing stage. When the lecturer employed *indirect elicitation*, students were encouraged to reconsider their writing and examine potentially problematic parts before making revisions. Thus, *collaborative editing* and *lecturer scaffolding* serve complementary functions in fostering a more reflective process of reviewing students' written work.

Keywords: *Writing Accuracy, Collaborative Editing, Indirect Elicitation, Lecturer Scaffolding, Error Recognition*

INTRODUCTION

Writing accuracy is an important aspect of English language learning because producing an accurate text requires learners to simultaneously manage ideas, sentence structure, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, and writing mechanics. For non-English major students, these demands can be particularly challenging because writing requires not only the ability to organize ideas but also the ability to monitor the linguistic accuracy of their production. Ideally, students should be able to critically review their writing, identify inappropriate forms, and revise them independently through processes of checking and reflection. However, this process does not always occur optimally because students may have limited linguistic knowledge and insufficient experience in evaluating written texts, allowing errors to remain even after the writing has been reviewed.

One approach that can provide students with opportunities to examine and improve their writing is *cooperative learning*. Cooperative learning places students in group interactions in which they have opportunities to exchange ideas, discuss problems, and support one another in achieving learning objectives. A systematic review indicates that *cooperative learning* can contribute to interaction, participation, and student engagement in English language learning (Uzma & Sumarni, 2023). This finding is consistent with Chen (2021), who demonstrated that the implementation of *cooperative learning* in EFL classrooms provides opportunities for learners to interact and construct the learning process collaboratively. Lopez and Estremera (2025) likewise showed that collaborative learning approaches can promote interaction and support among L2 learners, suggesting that group activities have the potential to create a more participatory learning environment.

In writing instruction, such interaction can be implemented through *peer feedback*, *peer editing*, and collaborative editing activities. Through these activities, students not only receive feedback from lecturers but also have opportunities to read their peers' writing, compare language forms, and discuss possible revisions. Ahmad et al. (2025) demonstrated that *peer feedback* can support improvements in EFL writing proficiency, while Uswah (2025) found that the combination of *peer editing* and *self-editing* can encourage collaboration and reflection in writing instruction. Ideally, therefore, *collaborative editing* should help students broaden their attention to errors and increase their involvement in the revision process. Nevertheless, the existence of peer interaction does not necessarily guarantee that all linguistic errors will be accurately recognized, particularly when the students involved have relatively similar levels of language proficiency.

This limitation indicates a gap between participation in the editing process and the ability to recognize errors accurately. Students may actively participate in discussions, provide opinions about their peers' writing, and believe that their work has been adequately reviewed, while still overlooking certain errors because they lack sufficient linguistic knowledge or strategies to verify language forms. In the context of *collaborative writing*, Hlatshwayo et al.



(2026) demonstrated that *scaffolding* and feedback practices can support collaborative writing performance, indicating that peer collaboration can become more productive when accompanied by appropriate pedagogical assistance. Susilowati and Rahmadhani (2023) similarly demonstrated that *scaffolding* can be employed as a technique for developing metacognitive abilities in writing activities. These conditions indicate that collaborative activities require support that directs students not only to participate actively in discussions but also to re-examine the accuracy of the linguistic decisions they make.

One form of support that is relevant to this context is *lecturer scaffolding*, which refers to the provision of gradual assistance that enables students to accomplish tasks that they cannot yet fully perform independently. Nguyen (2022) demonstrated that *teacher scaffolding* strategies can provide appropriate support based on learners' needs in English language learning contexts. In writing instruction, such support can be directed toward helping students identify problematic parts of their texts and encouraging them to review their writing rather than replacing their thinking process. Thus, lecturers can function as facilitators who bridge the limitations of *peer editing* without taking over the entire correction process. This approach becomes particularly relevant when students have completed an initial group review but continue to demonstrate uncertainty in identifying linguistic errors.

One strategy that can be employed in providing such *scaffolding* is *indirect elicitation*. Unlike direct correction, which provides students with the correct form, *elicitation* gives learners opportunities to identify and correct their own errors through questions or prompts. Ayouni and El Sukny (2022) demonstrated that *elicitation* can be employed as a form of *corrective feedback* to direct students' attention toward grammatical errors without immediately providing the answer. Harutyunyan and Bekaryan (2021) likewise identified *elicitation* as a form of *corrective feedback* that can encourage learners to participate in the language correction process. Findings from Tarigan et al. (2023) concerning *oral corrective feedback* also highlight the importance of teachers' roles in directing learners' attention toward errors, suggesting that questions or prompts can provide an alternative means of encouraging students to re-examine their language production.

Although research on cooperative learning, *peer feedback*, *scaffolding*, and *corrective feedback* has continued to develop, there remains a need to clarify how these forms of support operate sequentially in writing activities involving non-English major students. Previous studies have demonstrated the benefits of collaborative interaction or *peer feedback*, whereas research on *scaffolding* has largely examined teacher support as a broader instructional strategy (Uzma & Sumarni, 2023; Ahmad et al., 2025; Nguyen, 2022; Lopez & Estremera, 2025). Meanwhile, research on *elicitation* has demonstrated its potential as *corrective feedback*, but further investigation is needed into how indirect prompts are used after students have completed *small-group collaborative editing* and how such prompts facilitate the recognition of previously undetected errors (Ayouni & El Sukny, 2022; Harutyunyan & Bekaryan, 2021). This gap is particularly important in the context of non-English major students, whose limited linguistic competence may cause group members to share similar linguistic assumptions and consequently maintain errors that have not been identified. Therefore, this study views *collaborative editing* not merely as an activity for increasing participation but also as an initial stage that requires subsequent verification through *lecturer scaffolding*.

Based on this gap, this study aims to analyze how non-English major students engage in *small-group collaborative editing* and how *lecturer scaffolding* through *indirect elicitation* helps them recognize errors in their writing. Specifically, the study examines students'



interaction during group editing, the types of errors that remain unidentified after peer review, and students' responses when the lecturer provides indirect prompts during whole-class discussion. The novelty of this study lies in examining the pedagogical sequence connecting *collaborative editing* with *indirect elicitation* rather than examining the effectiveness of the two strategies separately. Accordingly, this study is expected to provide empirical evidence that *collaborative editing* can function as an initial review stage, whereas *indirect elicitation* can serve as a *scaffolding* stage that encourages students to re-examine their writing and recognize previously undetected errors. The findings are also expected to provide practical implications for lecturers in designing writing instruction that integrates peer interaction with appropriately structured pedagogical support.

RESEARCH METHOD

The fieldwork took place in May 2026 during a *General English Language* learning activity at IAHN Tampung Penyang Palangka Raya, Indonesia. Rather than separating the learning process from the data-collection process, the study followed the activities as they naturally unfolded in the classroom. Fourteen second-semester students from the Hindu Religious Education Study Program participated, all of whom were non-English majors with basic to elementary English proficiency (*CEFR A1–A2*). They had previously encountered the basic concepts of *Simple Past*, *Simple Present*, and *Simple Future Tense*, which provided the linguistic context for the writing and editing activities examined in this study. The classroom sequence began with each student producing three sentences based on a *tense* selected through a lottery, after which students with the same topic worked together to examine and revise one another's sentences for 15 minutes. The revised sentences were subsequently rewritten on the whiteboard and brought into a whole-class discussion, where the lecturer deliberately withheld immediate correction and instead used prompts such as “*Are you sure this sentence is correct?*” to invite students to reconsider their own writing. The activity ended with *semi-structured group interviews*, allowing students to describe how they experienced the editing process and the subsequent lecturer-guided discussion.

The evidence was drawn from what students did, what they produced, and what they later reported about the activity. Classroom observations were recorded in field notes throughout the learning sequence, with attention given to participation in group discussions, peer-review behavior, and responses following *indirect elicitation*. The written sentences displayed on the whiteboard were photographed and examined for errors that persisted after the group-editing stage, particularly those involving spelling, capitalization, grammar, and sentence forms. After the classroom activity, group interviews were conducted and audio-recorded to capture students' experiences, their confidence in the revisions made by their groups, and their reactions when the lecturer used indirect questions rather than supplying corrections. All recordings were transcribed before the analytical process began. These sources were considered together so that observed classroom behavior could be compared with the written evidence and with students' own accounts of what they experienced during the activity.

The analysis developed from repeated engagement with the collected material rather than from predetermined categories. Observation notes, written products, and interview transcripts were read several times to establish an overall picture, followed by the identification of relevant segments and the development of initial codes. Related codes were then brought together into tentative themes, which were repeatedly checked against the original evidence before being refined, defined, and named; the final themes were subsequently organized to



reflect the patterns emerging across the learning sequence. The coding remained inductive, while each emerging interpretation was kept traceable to evidence from the three data sources. *Source triangulation* was used to examine students' engagement, the errors that persisted following *collaborative editing*, and their responses to *indirect elicitation* from more than one evidentiary perspective. To keep the analytical process transparent, decisions made during coding and the organization of codes into broader categories were documented throughout the study. Interpretations that connected these empirical patterns with theoretical perspectives and previous research were reserved for the *Discussion* section rather than incorporated into the presentation of the findings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

This section presents the research findings obtained from classroom observations, students' written work displayed on the whiteboard, and semi-structured group interview transcripts. The presentation of the findings follows the sequence of the learning activities, namely *small-group collaborative editing*, individual writing review, and lecturer-guided whole-class discussion through *indirect elicitation*. Observation data were used to describe students' engagement during the editing process and their responses during the whole-class discussion. Students' written work was used to identify errors that remained after the *peer editing* process, while interview data were used to describe students' experiences and responses to the two stages of the activity.

1. Student Engagement in *Small-Group Collaborative Editing*

The *collaborative editing* activity began with students individually writing three sentences based on the *tense* topic they obtained through a lottery system. Students who received the same *tense* topic then joined the same group to review and edit the sentences produced by group members for 15 minutes. Classroom observations indicated that students actively participated in the writing and reviewing activities and engaged in exchanging opinions while checking their peers' sentences. Interview findings showed that two of the three groups reported being confident that their sentences had been correctly reviewed and revised, whereas one group reported that they remained uncertain before entering the whole-class discussion.

A summary of students' engagement during the *small-group collaborative editing* activity is presented in Table 1. The table includes the observed forms of activity, data sources, and findings obtained during the activity. This presentation is intended to demonstrate students' engagement based on observation and interview data without interpreting the causes or meanings underlying the observed behaviors. The data in the table also indicate differences in the groups' levels of confidence after the writing review process.

Table 1. Student Engagement during *Small-Group Collaborative Editing*

Observed Aspect	Data Source	Finding
Individual writing activity	Classroom observation	Students wrote three sentences based on the <i>tense</i> obtained through the lottery system.
Group discussion	Classroom observation	Students exchanged opinions while reviewing and editing the sentences of group members.
Peer writing review	Classroom observation	Students reviewed and attempted to revise their group members' writing for 15 minutes.



Confidence in the review results	Group interview	Two of the three groups stated that they were confident that the writing had been correctly revised.
Uncertainty about the review results	Group interview	One of the three groups reported that they remained uncertain before the class presentation.
Unrecognized errors	Group interview	All three groups stated that the errors later identified during the whole-class discussion had not been recognized during the group discussion.
Adequacy of review time	Group interview	Several students stated that 15 minutes was insufficient to thoroughly review all sentences.

Based on Table 1, classroom observations showed that students participated in writing, discussion, and peer-review activities during the *small-group collaborative editing* stage. Interview data indicated that two groups expressed confidence in the review results, whereas one group remained uncertain. All three groups also stated that the errors later identified during the whole-class discussion had not been recognized during the group-review process. Several students reported that the limited review time prevented them from thoroughly checking all sentences.

2. Writing Errors Remaining after *Peer Editing*

Analysis of the students' writing displayed on the whiteboard showed that several errors remained after the *small-group collaborative editing* process. These errors were found in spelling, capitalization, sentence-initial capitalization, grammar, sentence forms, and sentence patterns beyond the focus of the instructional material. The written evidence showed that some errors occurred in more than one student, whereas other forms of error were found in only one student. Details of the types of errors and examples from the students' writing are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Types of Errors Remaining after *Small-Group Collaborative Editing*

Error Category	Students	Number of Students (n)	Percentage (%)	Evidence from the Writing
Spelling	S1, S3, S9, S11	4	28.6	<i>night</i> was written as <i>nigh</i> t; <i>yesterday</i> was written as <i>yesteday</i> ; <i>do not</i> was written as <i>dot not</i> ; <i>volleyball</i> was written as <i>volliball</i> in all three sentences.
Capitalization within sentences	S3, S4, S6, S7, S10, S12, S13, S14	8	57.1	<i>Finished</i> , <i>Paper</i> , <i>Project</i> , <i>Pizza</i> , <i>miLk</i> , <i>Like</i> , <i>Study</i> , <i>Fried</i> , <i>Drink</i> , and <i>Not</i> were written with unnecessary capital letters in the middle of sentences.
Sentence-initial capitalization	S12, S14	2	14.3	<i>english</i> was written with a lowercase initial letter; a sentence began with <i>we</i> , and an interrogative sentence began with <i>will</i> , both using lowercase initial letters.



Grammatical errors	S2, S8	2	14.3	S2 wrote <i>I did not didn't go to school yesterday</i> ; S8 wrote <i>She drink coffee every morning</i> .
Incorrect sentence forms	S5	1	7.1	Negative and interrogative forms were written using affirmative sentence structures.
Sentence pattern beyond the lesson focus	S4	1	7.1	The student wrote <i>Were you sick yesterday?</i> , which was beyond the grammatical pattern addressed in the lesson.

Table 2 shows the distribution of students across the error categories that remained after *small-group collaborative editing*. Capitalization errors within sentences were the most frequently identified category, occurring in eight of the 14 students (57.1%). Spelling errors were identified in four students (28.6%), while sentence-initial capitalization and grammatical errors were each identified in two students (14.3%). Incorrect sentence forms and sentence patterns beyond the lesson focus were each identified in one student (7.1%).

The interview findings also showed that the three groups did not recognize these errors while conducting the group review. Two groups had previously stated that they were confident that their writing had been correctly reviewed, whereas one group remained uncertain. Several students reported that they began questioning the accuracy of their writing only after the lecturer posed a question during the whole-class discussion. Thus, the written and interview data indicate that several error categories remained in the students' writing after the *peer editing* stage and had not been identified by the students during the group discussion.

3. Students' Responses to *Indirect Elicitation*

After the *peer editing* activity was completed, each student rewrote the reviewed sentence on the whiteboard to be discussed with the entire class. At this stage, the lecturer did not immediately provide the correct answer but asked questions such as "*Are you sure this sentence is correct?*" Students were then asked to reconsider the sentence they had written before the correction was discussed collectively. Observation and interview findings showed several student responses, including rechecking the sentence, expressing uncertainty about the sentence form, and attempting to identify the part considered inaccurate.

Details of students' responses during the *whole-class discussion* through *indirect elicitation* are presented in Table 3. The table combines observation and interview data to demonstrate the forms of responses that emerged after the lecturer posed the question. Interview excerpts are included to provide direct evidence of students' experiences. These data are presented without connecting them to theories or previous studies because such explanations are addressed in the Discussion section.

Table 3. Students' Responses to *Indirect Elicitation*

Form of Response	Data Source	Finding/Excerpt
Reconsidering sentence accuracy	Interview	Several students stated that they began thinking that there might be an error after the lecturer asked, " <i>Are you sure this is already correct?</i> "



Rechecking the sentence	Interview	Students stated that they checked the sentence again to identify a part that might be incorrect.
Not yet knowing the location of the error	Interview	One student stated, “ <i>I thought there was something wrong, but I didn't know what the mistake was.</i> ”
Searching for possible errors	Interview	A student stated, “ <i>After that, I started thinking about what the mistake might be and checked the sentence again.</i> ”
Initial response to writing displayed in front of the class	Observation	Several students appeared hesitant and embarrassed when their writing was displayed on the whiteboard.
Response during the discussion	Observation	Students participated in the discussion of corrections collectively as the whole-class discussion progressed.

Based on Table 3, students demonstrated several forms of response after receiving *indirect elicitation* from the lecturer. Several students stated that the lecturer’s question prompted them to check their sentences again, although they initially did not know which part was incorrect. This was reflected in a student’s statement that they felt something was wrong but did not yet know where the error was located. Observations also showed that several students appeared hesitant or embarrassed at the beginning of the discussion and subsequently participated in the collective discussion of corrections.

4. Students’ Perceptions of the Learning Activity Sequence

Group interviews were also conducted to examine students’ perceptions of the sequence of activities consisting of *small-group collaborative editing* and *whole-class discussion*. All three groups stated that group discussion provided an opportunity to exchange opinions and conduct an initial review of their writing. When asked to choose between reviewing their writing through group discussion and discussing it collectively with the entire class, the students expressed a preference for the whole-class discussion overall. However, the students continued to state that group discussion should be conducted before the whole-class discussion.

Details of students’ perceptions of the two stages of the activity are presented in Table 4. The data in the table include the benefits reported by students, their preferences regarding the activity stages, and the emotional responses that emerged during the whole-class discussion. The presentation is based on group interview data and is not intended to provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of the activity. Table 4 also includes a specific finding concerning the reason why one student produced a sentence pattern that was beyond the focus of the instructional material.

Table 4. Students’ Perceptions of *Small-Group Editing* and *Whole-Class Discussion*

Aspect	Interview Finding
Function of group discussion	Students stated that group discussion provided an opportunity to exchange opinions and conduct an initial review of their writing.
Preference for whole-class discussion	All three groups stated that <i>whole-class discussion</i> helped them discuss and identify errors that had not been found during group discussion.



Continuation of group discussion	Students continued to state that <i>small-group discussion</i> should be conducted before the whole-class discussion.
Emotional responses	Three students stated that they felt helped despite initially feeling embarrassed because they were afraid of making mistakes in front of their classmates. The other eleven students stated that they did not feel embarrassed because the entire class was learning together.
Understanding of errors	Students stated that the collective discussion helped them identify which parts of their writing required correction and improvement.
Sentence pattern beyond the material	One student who wrote <i>Were you sick yesterday?</i> explained that the sentence was based on a language pattern previously encountered while using a mobile phone.

Based on Table 4, students stated that *small-group discussion* provided an opportunity to exchange opinions and conduct an initial review. All three groups also stated that *whole-class discussion* helped them discuss errors that had not been identified during the group discussion. Regarding emotional responses, three students reported feeling embarrassed at first but nevertheless felt helped, whereas eleven students stated that they did not feel embarrassed because the learning process was conducted collectively. One student also explained that the sentence pattern *Were you sick yesterday?* was written based on a language pattern previously encountered while using a mobile phone.

Overall, the findings revealed four groups of findings obtained from classroom observations, students' written work, and interviews. First, students participated in *small-group collaborative editing* and reviewed their peers' writing. Second, several spelling, capitalization, grammatical, and sentence-form errors remained in the writing after the group-review stage. Third, after the lecturer provided *indirect elicitation*, students rechecked their writing and responded to the possibility of errors in their sentences. Fourth, students continued to view group discussion as an initial stage of the review process, while *whole-class discussion* was used to discuss the writing and errors that remained after the group-review stage.

Discussion

What emerges from the classroom process is not simply that students were active during *small-group collaborative editing*, but that reviewing language became a process of shared negotiation. Students exchanged judgments, compared their linguistic knowledge, and attempted to make decisions without immediately depending on the lecturer. The activity therefore created a space in which students could make their linguistic reasoning visible through interaction, although active participation did not necessarily lead to accurate judgments. This aligns with Haryadi (2024), Yasminto (2025), and Uzma and Sumarni (2023), who emphasize collaboration as a means of increasing learner involvement, interaction, and language development. The findings consequently suggest that the value of *collaborative editing* lies not only in correcting sentences but also in allowing students to engage directly with linguistic decisions.

The persistence of errors after group review makes the limits of this process particularly visible. Spelling, capitalization, grammatical, and sentence-form errors remained even though some groups believed their revisions were already correct. This pattern may be related to the relatively similar linguistic abilities of the participants, since students were evaluating language through knowledge that was not always sufficient to distinguish accurate from inaccurate forms.



Rohmani et al. (2025) reported various English-learning difficulties among non-English-major students, while Mattarima and Sunengko (2026) identified grammatical errors as a continuing issue in EFL writing. Thus, *peer editing* should not be regarded as a self-sufficient mechanism for error detection; its contribution appears stronger as an initial space for examination and discussion.

The same condition helps explain why the presence of *peer feedback* did not ensure that every error was identified. Students naturally evaluated their peers' sentences through the linguistic resources they already possessed, allowing some inaccurate judgments to remain unchallenged within the group. This provides a useful context for Siti (2026) and Yanti et al. (2026), who discuss *peer feedback* and *peer review* as components of writing development, while Uswah (2025) highlights the value of combining *peer editing* with reflection. The present findings add that reflection is needed because students may have to reconsider not only the sentence itself but also the reasoning that led them to regard a particular form as correct.

The lecturer's intervention became meaningful precisely when this collaborative process reached its limits. Rather than immediately supplying the correct form, questions such as "*Are you sure this sentence is correct?*" reopened students' consideration of sentences they had previously accepted. The lecturer therefore did not replace students' work but redirected their attention toward a linguistic problem that had remained unresolved. This corresponds with Andrade Tacuri and Valladares Pugo (2024) and Baharman and Dewi (2026), who emphasize *scaffolding* as supportive practice in EFL writing instruction. In this study, *scaffolding* functioned as a prompt for further examination while preserving students' responsibility for identifying the problem.

The students' responses further clarify the role of *indirect elicitation*. Several students first recognized that something might be wrong but were unable to identify the precise location of the error, showing that noticing a possible problem and resolving it are not necessarily simultaneous processes. The lecturer's question initiated re-examination, while the subsequent search for the problematic form still required students to mobilize their own linguistic reasoning. This interpretation is consistent with Casinto (2023) on *scaffolded peer feedback*, Liasmin et al. (2026) on *scaffolded writing*, and Hlatshwayo et al. (2026) on *scaffolding and feedback in collaborative writing*. The finding therefore suggests that structured assistance can support collaborative learning without removing the cognitive work from students.

The sequence of activities also indicates that *small-group editing* and whole-class discussion served complementary rather than competing purposes. Students continued to value group work as a space for exchanging opinions and conducting an initial review, even though some errors were only discovered during whole-class discussion. The second stage effectively reopened problems that had survived the first stage, with *lecturer scaffolding* responding to the limitations of peer judgment rather than replacing it. This complements the perspectives of Casinto (2023) and Hlatshwayo et al. (2026) regarding the role of structured support and feedback in collaborative writing. The students' preference for whole-class discussion while still retaining group work as a preceding stage further supports the value of this sequential arrangement.

Taken together, the findings point to a relationship among *collaborative editing*, *peer feedback*, and *lecturer scaffolding* that is more dynamic than the effectiveness of any single technique. *Collaborative editing* gives students responsibility for examining language, while *indirect elicitation* provides a second opportunity to question judgments that remain uncertain or inaccurate. This extends the perspectives of Haryadi (2024), Uswah (2025), and Yanti et al.



(2026), while also connecting with Susilowati and Rahmadhani (2023) on the metacognitive potential of *scaffolding* and distinguishing the approach from technology-mediated assistance such as *Artificial Intelligence Grammar Tools* discussed by Sinta et al. (2026). The pedagogical implication is that writing activities can be structured progressively: students first negotiate their writing with peers, then respond to carefully timed lecturer questions, and finally participate in identifying and correcting their own errors.

CONCLUSION

The study positions *small-group collaborative editing* as a useful space for students to negotiate and examine language, but its contribution becomes limited when peers draw on similar levels of linguistic knowledge. Active participation alone did not ensure that students could identify the errors remaining in their writing, particularly in spelling, capitalization, grammar, and sentence forms. The introduction of *lecturer scaffolding* through *indirect elicitation* provided a complementary layer of support by prompting students to reconsider forms they had previously accepted without immediately supplying the correction. The central insight is therefore that collaborative review and lecturer guidance work most meaningfully when connected as successive stages: peer interaction initiates the checking process, while guided questioning reopens linguistic decisions that remain unresolved.

This finding offers a practical direction for writing instruction in which students retain responsibility for examining their own language while receiving carefully timed support from the lecturer. A sequence that moves from peer review to *whole-class discussion* and then to student-led reconsideration may preserve the interactional value of collaboration without assuming that peers can independently resolve every linguistic problem. At the same time, the study was situated in one classroom with 14 students and a limited *peer-editing* period, so the findings should be adapted cautiously to different learner groups and instructional conditions. Future studies could examine larger and more varied groups, compare different durations of collaborative editing, and investigate how alternative forms of *lecturer scaffolding* influence error recognition and sustained writing accuracy. Extending this inquiry to other language skills may also clarify whether *indirect elicitation* can support reflective learning beyond the writing context.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F., Sultan, S., Rehman, A., Dawood, J. A., Wardha, W. U., & Elhassan, M. A. M. (2025). Enhancing EFL writing proficiency through peer feedback: A mixed-method analysis. *The Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 2025(2), 363–382. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2025.3.363.382>
- Andrade Tacuri, M. I., & Valladares Pugo, P. A. (2024). *Scaffolding strategies in the EFL classroom to develop writing skills*. <https://dspace.ucuenca.edu.ec/items/5a3c22a1-8321-4c08-9b37-e0314bc47a4e>
- Ayouni, N., & El Sukny. (2022). An analysis on elicitation as corrective feedback to students' grammar errors. *Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics (JETLi)*, 3(2), 104–115. <https://ejournal.unida-aceh.ac.id/jetli/article/view/393>
- Baharman, B., & Dewi, A. C. (2026). Strategi scaffolding dalam pengajaran menulis untuk siswa dengan kemampuan heterogen. *Journal of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education*, 2(1), 25–34. <https://jurnal.yayasanmeisyarainsanmadani.com/index.php/JHUSE/article/view/664>



- Casinto, C. D. (2023). Scaffolded peer feedback and second language writing proficiency: Implications for inclusive ESL teaching practice. *TESL-EJ*, 26(4), n4. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1383916>
- Chen, R. (2021). A review of cooperative learning in EFL classroom. *Asian Pendidikan*, 1(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.53797/aspen.v1i1.1a.2021>
- Harutyunyan, L., & Bekaryan, L. (2021). Corrective feedback in ELT context. *Messenger ASUE*, 2021(5), 160–170. <https://arar.sci.am/dlibra/publication/322993/edition/295924>
- Haryadi, R. N. (2024). Penerapan pembelajaran kolaboratif dalam meningkatkan kompetensi menulis bahasa Inggris pada siswa. *Wistara: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 5(2), 123–135. <https://doi.org/10.23969/wistara.v5i2.19671>
- Hlatshwayo, P., Harran, M., & Luck, J. (2026). The impact of scaffolding and feedback practices on ESL collaborative writing performance. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 44(2), 371–385. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2025.2494696>
- Liasmin, L., Irmawati, I., Ruslan, A., Marwiah, M., & Ningsih, W. (2026). Transformasi laporan kegiatan mahasiswa: Dari naratif ke analitis melalui pendekatan scaffolded writing. *Matano: Jurnal Pengabdian dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*, 2(1), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.51574/matano.v2i1.4625>
- Lopez, B. D., & Estremera, M. L. (2025). Collaborative learning approaches to promote peer interaction and support among L2 learners: A systematic literature review. *BRU ELT Journal*, 3(2), 174–186. <https://doi.org/10.14456/bej.2025.12>
- Mattarima, S. M. U., & Sunengko, S. (2026). Kesalahan gramatikal dalam penulisan teks recount mahasiswa EFL: Jenis, frekuensi, dan faktor penyebab. *PTK: Jurnal Tindakan Kelas*, 6(2), 457–466. <https://doi.org/10.53624/ptk.v6i2.918>
- Nguyen, Q. N. (2022). Teachers' scaffolding strategies in internet-based ELT classes. *Teaching English as a Second Language Electronic Journal (TESL-EJ)*, 26(1). <https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume26/ej101/ej101a1/>
- Rohmani, L. A., Sajidah, H. B. N., & Putra, A. A. I. A. (2025). Analisis problematika mahasiswa non-jurusan Bahasa Inggris dalam mempelajari materi states of matter pada mata kuliah Bahasa Inggris untuk IPA. *Jurnal Jendela Pendidikan*, 5(03), 637–645. <https://doi.org/10.57008/jjp.v5i03.1733>
- Sinta, S., Marini, M., Sarwindah, S., & Irawadi, S. (2026). Pelatihan penggunaan artificial intelligence grammar tools pada kemampuan menulis bahasa Inggris mahasiswa baru. *Jompa Abdi: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 5(1), 102–107. <https://doi.org/10.57218/jompaabdi.v5i1.2646>
- Siti, M. (2026). Penerapan teknik umpan balik teman sebaya sebagai metode pembelajaran menulis efektif bidang studi Bahasa Inggris. *Winaya*, 4(1), 39–39. <https://jurnalwinaya.id/index.php/winaya/article/view/38>
- Susilowati, T., & Rahmadhani, A. (2023, December). Membangun metakognitif dalam menulis menggunakan teknik scaffolding. In *Seminar Nasional Literasi Prodi PBSI FPBS UPGRIIS* (pp. 318–325). <https://conference.upgris.ac.id/index.php/snl/article/view/4880>
- Tarigan, K. E., Stevani, M., Ginting, F. Y. A., Prayuda, M. S., Sari, D. W., & Lumbanraja, B. (2023). Oral corrective feedback and error analysis: Indonesian teachers' beliefs to improve speaking skill. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(6), 140–150. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n6p140>



- Uswah, M. (2025). Collaboration and reflection: Improving EFL students' writing skills through peer and self editing. *Journal of English Language Studies (JET-Li)*, 7(2), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.55215/jetli.v7i2.57>
- Uzma, F., & Sumarni, S. (2023). Cooperative learning in the English language learning: A systematic review. *English Language & Literature International Conference (ELLIC)*, 6(1), 1–15. <https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/documents/detail/3555703>
- Yanti, M., Ramadini, A., Rahmadona, D., Ramadhan, R. R., & Kurniawan, S. (2026). Penerapan model peer-review dalam membangun keterampilan menulis teks laporan hasil observasi siswa di Sekolah Dasar Negeri 109/II Desa Manggis. *Pendas: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Dasar*, 11(03), 406–422. <https://journal.unpas.ac.id/index.php/pendas/article/view/59911>
- Yasminto, M. (2025). Kolaborasi Kuliah Pengabdian Masyarakat (KPM) dan Kampung Inggris: Upaya optimalisasi kemampuan berbahasa mahasiswa. *JIK-PkM: Jurnal Inovatif dan Kreatif Hasil Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat*, 3(2), 136–147. <https://jurnal.iaih.ac.id/index.php/JIK-PKM/article/view/1881>