

Open
AccessCheck for
updates

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Section: *Literature, Linguistics & Criticism***Instructional strategies for enhancing academic writing competence in EFL learners**Shamim Akhter¹, Sarfraz Aslam^{2*}, Chow Pick Wei³, Tribhuwan Kumar⁴ & Amjad Islam Amjad⁵¹INTI International University, Malaysia²Faculty of Education and Humanities, UNITAR International University, Malaysia³Faculty of Education and Liberal Arts (FELA), INTI International University, Malaysia⁴College of Science and Humanities at Sulail, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia⁵School of Education, Technology and Social Sciences, UNICAF University, Malawi*Correspondence: sarfraz.aslam@unitar.my**ABSTRACT**

Academic writing represents a critical competency for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners pursuing higher education and professional advancement. However, developing proficiency in this complex skill remains challenging due to linguistic, cognitive, and cultural factors. This paper examines evidence-based instructional strategies that effectively enhance academic writing competence among EFL learners. Drawing from current literature in second language writing pedagogy, this study explores process-oriented approaches, genre-based instruction, technology-enhanced learning, collaborative writing techniques, and metacognitive strategy training. The analysis reveals that integrated approaches combining explicit instruction, structured practice, meaningful feedback, and authentic writing tasks yield optimal outcomes. Furthermore, the incorporation of digital tools and collaborative learning environments significantly contributes to learner engagement and writing development. The findings underscore the importance of contextually appropriate pedagogical choices that address learners' linguistic proficiency levels, academic goals, and sociocultural backgrounds. This paper provides practical recommendations for EFL instructors seeking to design effective writing curricula and implement research-informed teaching practices.

KEYWORDS: academic writing, quality Education, instructional strategies, learning opportunities, process writing, genre-based approach

Research Journal in Advanced Humanities

Volume 7, Issue 4, 2026

ISSN: 2708-5945 (Print)

ISSN: 2708-5953 (Online)

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 15 June 2026

Accepted: 10 August 2026

Published: 12 September 2026

HOW TO CITE

Akhter, S., Aslam, S., Wei, C. P., Kumar, T., & Amjad, A. I. (2026). Instructional strategies for enhancing academic writing competence in EFL learners. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 7(4). <https://doi.org/10.58256/5b4xzk78>



Published in Nairobi, Kenya by Royallite Global, an imprint of Royallite Publishers Limited

© 2026 The Author(s). This is an open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic writing proficiency constitutes an essential component of success in English-medium higher education and professional contexts worldwide (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). For English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, mastering academic writing presents multifaceted challenges that extend beyond linguistic competence to encompass rhetorical conventions, disciplinary discourse practices, and critical thinking skills (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). The growing emphasis on English as the lingua franca of international scholarship intensifies the need for effective pedagogical approaches that support EFL learners in developing sophisticated academic writing abilities. AI-mediated collaborative learning offers significant potential for enhancing student engagement in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context through adaptive scaffolding and real-time feedback, but it also presents challenges such as cognitive overload and diminished social presence (Guo et al., 2025). In recent years, integrating transformational pedagogies into educational institutions has become increasingly important to prepare students for the ethical, social, and emotional concerns of the 21st century (Mee et al., 2026).

Research indicates that EFL learners often struggle with various dimensions of academic writing, including organization, argumentation, coherence, register appropriateness, and citation practices (Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Lee & Deakin, 2016). These challenges stem from multiple sources: limited exposure to academic discourse, differences between L1 and L2 rhetorical patterns, insufficient vocabulary knowledge, grammatical complexity, and unfamiliarity with academic genre conventions (Hinkel, 2015). Consequently, writing instruction in EFL contexts requires carefully designed pedagogical interventions that address these interconnected competencies systematically.

The purpose of this paper is to examine evidence-based instructional strategies that demonstrate effectiveness in enhancing academic writing competence among EFL learners. Specifically, this review investigates five key pedagogical approaches: process-oriented writing instruction, genre-based pedagogy, technology-enhanced learning, collaborative writing strategies, and metacognitive strategy training. By synthesizing current research and theoretical perspectives, this paper aims to provide EFL practitioners with actionable insights for designing comprehensive writing curricula that promote meaningful learning outcomes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Foundations

The development of academic writing competence in EFL contexts is informed by multiple theoretical frameworks that illuminate different aspects of the learning process. Social constructivist perspectives emphasize the role of social interaction, scaffolding, and situated learning in writing development (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). From this viewpoint, writing is conceptualized as a social practice mediated through language and collaborative meaning-making, suggesting that instructional approaches should incorporate peer interaction and teacher-student dialogue.

Cognitive theories of writing highlight the complex mental processes involved in composing texts, including planning, translating ideas into language, and revising (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Kellogg, 2008). For EFL learners, these cognitive demands are compounded by the need to process language in a non-native tongue, manage working memory constraints, and navigate between L1 and L2 writing schemas (Cumming, 2001). Understanding these cognitive challenges informs instructional design that provides appropriate scaffolding and reduces cognitive load through strategic task sequencing.

Genre theory offers another crucial lens for understanding academic writing instruction, positing that effective communication requires mastery of discipline-specific textual conventions and rhetorical moves (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2007). This perspective has generated influential pedagogical models, particularly the teaching-learning cycle in Systemic Functional Linguistics, which emphasizes explicit instruction in genre features, guided practice, and independent writing (Rothery, 1996; Rose & Martin, 2012).

2.2 Challenges in EFL Academic Writing

EFL learners face distinctive challenges that differentiate their writing development trajectories from those of native English speakers and ESL learners in immersion contexts. Limited exposure to authentic academic discourse restricts opportunities for implicit acquisition of disciplinary conventions and sophisticated vocabulary (Nation, 2013). Additionally, transfer effects from L1 rhetorical traditions may produce texts that diverge from

English academic writing norms in organization, argumentation style, and voice (Connor, 1996; Kaplan, 1966). Research has identified several persistent areas of difficulty. Grammatical accuracy remains problematic, with EFL writers struggling particularly with article usage, verb tense consistency, subject-verb agreement, and complex sentence structures (Bitchener, 2008; Ellis et al., 2008). Lexical challenges manifest in limited vocabulary range, inappropriate register choices, and difficulties with academic collocations and formulaic expressions (Coxhead, 2000; Durrant, 2016). At the discourse level, EFL learners often produce texts lacking coherence markers, clear thesis statements, and effective paragraph structure (Hinkel, 2001).

Furthermore, EFL learners frequently demonstrate uncertainty regarding source integration, paraphrasing, and citation practices, partly due to different cultural understandings of textual ownership and intertextuality (Chandrasegaran, 2013; Pecorari, 2003). These challenges necessitate explicit academic integrity conventions alongside technical writing skills.

3. INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING ACADEMIC WRITING

3.1 Process-Oriented Approaches

Process writing pedagogy, which gained prominence in the 1980s, emphasizes writing as a recursive activity involving planning, drafting, revising, and editing stages (Zamel, 1983; White & Arndt, 1991). This approach shifts focus from final products to the cognitive processes and strategies writers employ during composition. For EFL learners, process-oriented instruction offers several advantages: it legitimizes multiple drafts, reduces anxiety associated with producing perfect first attempts, and provides opportunities for reflective practice (Hedge, 1988; Raimes, 1985).

Effective implementation of process writing in EFL contexts involves several key practices. Pre-writing activities including brainstorming, mind-mapping, freewriting, and discussion help learners generate ideas and activate relevant language (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2023). Teachers can provide structured planning templates that guide learners through organizational decisions, particularly helpful for those unfamiliar with Western academic rhetorical patterns (Rao, 2007).

The drafting stage benefits from strategies that reduce cognitive burden, such as focusing initially on content development while temporarily postponing concern with grammatical accuracy (Krashen, 1984). Revision instruction should explicitly teach learners to evaluate global issues (content, organization, coherence) before attending to local concerns (grammar, mechanics) (Sommers, 1980). Peer review sessions, when properly scaffolded with clear guidelines and training, enable learners to develop critical reading skills while gaining multiple perspectives on their writing (Liu & Hansen, 2002; Min, 2006).

Research indicates that combining process approaches with explicit language instruction yields superior outcomes for EFL learners compared to purely process-based methods (Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2003). Teachers should therefore integrate attention to linguistic features vocabulary, grammar patterns, discourse markers—within the process framework rather than treating them as separate concerns.

3.2 Genre-Based Instruction

Genre-based pedagogy, grounded in Systemic Functional Linguistics and English for Specific Purposes traditions, emphasizes explicit teaching of text types and their characteristic linguistic features (Swales, 1990; Martin, 1992). This approach addresses EFL learners' need for clear models and systematic instruction in the conventions of different academic genres, such as essays, research articles, abstracts, and literature reviews.

The teaching-learning cycle, a widely adopted genre-based framework, comprises three iterative phases: deconstruction, joint construction, and independent construction (Rothery, 1996). During deconstruction, teachers and learners analyze model texts to identify purpose, structure, and linguistic features. This explicit focus on textual patterns helps EFL learners recognize rhetorical moves, organizational strategies, and lexicogrammatical choices characteristic of specific genres (Hyon, 1996).

Joint construction involves collaborative text creation between teacher and students, providing scaffolded practice in applying genre knowledge. This phase allows teachers to model thinking processes, demonstrate language choices, and provide immediate feedback (Humphrey & Macnaught, 2016). Finally, independent construction requires learners to produce texts individually, applying internalized genre knowledge to new contexts.

Empirical studies support genre-based instruction's effectiveness for EFL writers. Cheng (2008) found that explicit genre teaching significantly improved Chinese EFL students' writing quality compared to traditional approaches. Similarly, Yasuda (2011) demonstrated that genre awareness activities enhanced Japanese EFL learners' ability to produce well-organized argumentative essays. The approach proves particularly valuable for preparing learners to meet discipline-specific writing demands in academic settings (Hyland, 2007).

However, critics caution against overly prescriptive applications that may constrain creativity or perpetuate formulaic writing (Freedman, 1993). Effective genre instruction should therefore balance explicit teaching of conventions with opportunities for critical analysis and creative adaptation of generic forms to specific communicative purposes (Devitt, 2004).

3.3 Technology-Enhanced Writing Instruction

Digital technologies offer unprecedented opportunities for enhancing EFL writing instruction through automated feedback, collaborative platforms, authentic audiences, and access to vast linguistic resources (Warschauer & Grimes, 2007; Chapelle & Sauro, 2017). Technology integration can address several challenges inherent in EFL contexts, including limited instructor availability for individualized feedback, insufficient writing practice opportunities, and restricted exposure to diverse text types. Successful technology integration also depends on teachers themselves, since digital competence is closely linked to EFL teachers' job motivation and sense of job efficacy, which in turn shapes their willingness and capacity to adopt digital tools in writing instruction (Tian et al., 2025).

Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) systems, such as Grammarly, Criterion, and more recently AI-powered tools like ChatGPT, provide immediate feedback on multiple textual dimensions including grammar, mechanics, organization, and style (Stevenson & Phakiti, 2019; Warschauer & Ware, 2006). Research indicates that AWE can effectively support revision processes and raise grammatical awareness, particularly when combined with human feedback (Attali, 2004; Chukharev-Hudilainen et al., 2019). However, limitations exist regarding accuracy, particularly with complex errors, and AWE cannot adequately assess higher-order concerns like argumentation quality or critical thinking (Grimes & Warschauer, 2010). Recent studies on generative AI tools have demonstrated their effectiveness in providing immediate, comprehensive feedback across multiple writing dimensions, with ChatGPT showing particular promise in complementing traditional teacher assessment (Lu et al., 2024; Asadi et al., 2025).

Online collaborative writing platforms, including Google Docs, wikis, and specialized educational technologies, facilitate peer interaction and cooperative text construction (Elola & Oskoz, 2010; Kessler et al., 2012). These tools enable real-time collaboration, transparent revision histories, and asynchronous peer feedback, supporting social constructivist learning principles. Studies demonstrate that online collaboration can increase student engagement, promote language negotiation, and improve writing quality (Li & Zhu, 2017; Storch, 2019). Furthermore, Wang (2025) found that EFL learners' acceptance of large language models in academic writing is significantly influenced by performance expectancy and social influence, suggesting that emphasizing practical benefits enhances adoption.

Corpus-based tools provide EFL learners with access to large databases of authentic language use, enabling data-driven learning approaches (Boulton, 2010; Johns, 1991). Concordancers allow learners to investigate word patterns, collocations, and contextual usage in academic corpora, supporting vocabulary development and register awareness (Cobb, 1997; Flowerdew, 2015). Research suggests that corpus consultation enhances learners' ability to make appropriate lexical and grammatical choices in academic writing (Charles, 2012; Gilmore, 2009).

Blogging and social media platforms offer opportunities for authentic audience interaction and sustained writing practice in semi-formal contexts (Ducate & Lomicka, 2008; Shih, 2011). While not strictly academic writing, these environments can build writing fluency, reduce anxiety, and foster learner identity as writers in English (Arslan & Şahin-Kızıl, 2010).

3.4 Collaborative Writing Strategies

Collaborative writing, where two or more learners jointly compose a text, represents a powerful pedagogical approach informed by sociocultural theory and cooperative learning principles (Storch, 2013; Wigglesworth &

Storch, 2009). This strategy addresses EFL learners' needs for language practice, peer support, and opportunities to co-construct knowledge through dialogue.

Research identifies several benefits of collaborative writing for EFL learners. Peer interaction during collaborative composing generates language-related episodes where learners negotiate meaning, discuss language choices, and solve problems collectively (Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Williams, 2012). These metalinguistic discussions promote noticing of linguistic features and deepen understanding of language use (Swain, 2006). Studies indicate that texts produced collaboratively often demonstrate higher linguistic accuracy and complexity than individually written texts (Storch, 2005; Wigglesworth & Storch, 2012).

Effective implementation requires attention to task design, group formation, and scaffolding. Tasks should have clear objectives, appropriate complexity, and require genuine collaboration rather than mere division of labor (Shehadeh, 2011). Heterogeneous pairing of learners with different proficiency levels can be beneficial when accompanied by explicit instruction in collaboration strategies and mutual respect (Kim & McDonough, 2008). Teachers should provide models of effective collaboration and establish norms for equal participation.

Online collaborative writing tools facilitate asynchronous and synchronous collaboration, enabling revision tracking and threaded discussions (Bradley et al., 2010). Research suggests that technology-mediated collaborative writing can be particularly effective for EFL learners who benefit from extended processing time and reduced performance anxiety (Arnold et al., 2012). This is consistent with evidence that mindfulness can mediate the relationship between learning uncertainty and test anxiety among EFL students, suggesting that anxiety-reduction techniques may further support writing performance in technology-mediated and collaborative settings (Chang et al., 2025).

However, potential challenges include unequal participation, interpersonal conflicts, and learner resistance to collaborative approaches (Storch, 2002). Teachers must actively monitor group dynamics, provide intervention when necessary, and help learners develop collaboration competencies alongside writing skills.

3.5 Metacognitive Strategy Training

Metacognitive awareness the ability to reflect on and regulate one's own learning processes plays a crucial role in writing development (Flavell, 1979; Victori, 1999). For EFL learners, metacognitive strategy training enhances autonomy, promotes strategic approach to writing challenges, and facilitates transfer of skills across contexts (Wenden, 1998; Zhang & Zhang, 2013).

Effective metacognitive instruction involves teaching learners to plan strategically, monitor their composing processes, and evaluate outcomes critically (Oxford, 2011). Planning strategies include setting goals, analyzing task requirements, activating prior knowledge, and selecting appropriate approaches (Cumming et al., 2016). Monitoring involves tracking progress, identifying difficulties, and adjusting strategies as needed. Evaluation encompasses assessing text quality, reflecting on strategy effectiveness, and identifying areas for improvement (Macaro, 2006).

Self-assessment activities, where learners evaluate their own writing against explicit criteria, promote metacognitive awareness and ownership of learning (Andrade & Valtcheva, 2009). Providing learners with rubrics, checklists, and exemplary texts supports development of evaluative skills (Panadero & Jonsson, 2013). Reflective journals and learning logs encourage learners to articulate their writing processes, challenges encountered, and strategies employed (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

Research demonstrates that explicit strategy instruction significantly improves EFL writing performance. Sasaki (2000) found that metacognitive awareness distinguished success from less successful EFL writers. Nguyen and Gu (2013) reported that Vietnamese EFL learners who received metacognitive strategy training showed greater improvement in writing quality and self-regulation compared to control groups. Similarly, Teng and Zhang (2020) demonstrated that metacognitive instruction enhanced Chinese EFL learners' writing motivation and performance. More recently, Maryam et al. (2025) confirmed that self-directed learning combined with critical thinking ability significantly improves EFL students' academic writing skills, particularly in sentence construction, coherence, and paragraph organization.

Strategy training should be integrated within regular writing instruction rather than taught in isolation (Cohen, 2011). Teachers can model their own metacognitive processes through think-alouds, explicitly

demonstrate strategy application, and provide opportunities for guided practice with gradually reducing support (Harris et al., 2010).

4. INTEGRATED APPROACHES AND PEDAGOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

While each instructional strategy discussed offers distinct advantages, research increasingly supports integrated approaches that combine multiple methods tailored to learners' specific needs and contexts (Badger & White, 2000; Hyland, 2003). Effective writing pedagogy for EFL learners should incorporate process-based activities that develop composing strategies, genre-based instruction that provides explicit models and linguistic resources, technology tools that enhance feedback and collaboration, collaborative learning opportunities that promote peer interaction, and metacognitive training that fosters learner autonomy.

Several pedagogical principles emerge from literature. First, explicit instruction proves essential for EFL learners who lack extensive exposure to academic English discourse (Tribble, 1996). Teachers should clearly articulate learning objectives, model target features, and provide abundant examples. Second, scaffolding must be systematically implemented and gradually withdrawn as learners develop competence (Wood et al., 1976). This includes providing frameworks, templates, sentence starters, and other support structures that reduce cognitive load while promoting independence.

Third, feedback should be timely, focused, and actionable, addressing both global and local concerns (Ferris, 2003; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Rather than correcting all errors, feedback can strategically focus on patterns and high-frequency issues, encouraging learner self-correction. Multiple feedback sources teacher, peer, self-assessment, automated tools provide complementary perspectives (Rollinson, 2005). Recent research indicates that combining AI-generated feedback with teacher feedback produces significantly greater improvements in EFL writing across all scoring criteria, including task achievement, coherence, cohesion, vocabulary, and grammatical accuracy (Khampusaen, 2025).

Fourth, authentic writing tasks that connect to learners' academic or professional goals enhance motivation and facilitate transfer of skills (Hyland, 2016). Giving learners a genuine role in shaping the curriculum can have a similar effect: student-negotiated syllabi have been found to boost EFL learners' willingness to communicate and academic passion relative to entirely teacher-designed syllabi, suggesting that involving learners in course and task design may further strengthen motivation for writing (Alibakhshi et al., 2026). Assignments should engage learners with meaningful content, address real communicative purposes, and allow for creativity within genre constraints. Finally, sustained practice remains fundamental; writing proficiency develops through extensive experience rather than sporadic assignments (Kellogg, 2008).

Contextual factors significantly influence pedagogical effectiveness. Teachers must consider learners' proficiency levels, educational backgrounds, learning goals, and cultural contexts when designing instruction (Matsuda et al., 2006). What succeeds in one setting may require adaptation for others. Additionally, teacher preparation and ongoing professional development prove critical for implementing research-informed practices effectively (Burns & Richards, 2009).

5. CONCLUSION

Developing academic writing competence represents a complex, multifaceted challenge for EFL learners. This paper has examined five evidence-based instructional strategies that address different dimensions of this challenge: process-oriented approaches that cultivate composing strategies and reduce writing anxiety, genre-based pedagogy that provides explicit models of academic discourse conventions, technology-enhanced learning that offers diverse feedback sources and collaborative opportunities, collaborative writing strategies that promote peer interaction and language negotiation, and metacognitive training that develops learner autonomy and strategic awareness.

The literature indicates that no single approach proves universally superior; rather, integrated pedagogies that combine strengths of multiple methods while addressing specific learner needs yield optimal outcomes. Effective instruction balances explicit teaching with opportunities for discovery, provides appropriate scaffolding while promoting autonomy, emphasizes both linguistic accuracy and meaningful communication, and connects writing practice to authentic academic or professional purposes.

Several implications emerge for EFL practitioners. First, writing curricula should be systematically

designed to address multiple competencies linguistic, rhetorical, cognitive, and metacognitive rather than focusing narrowly on grammatical accuracy. Second, teachers must develop expertise in diverse pedagogical approaches and make informed decisions about when and how to employ different strategies. Third, institutional support for professional development, reasonable class sizes, and adequate resources proves essential for implementing high-quality writing instruction.

Future research should continue investigating how different instructional approaches interact and can be optimally sequenced across proficiency levels. Longitudinal studies tracking writing development over extended periods would illuminate developmental trajectories and long-term effects of specific pedagogies. Additionally, research examining writing instruction in diverse EFL contexts, different countries, educational levels, disciplinary areas would enhance understanding of contextual factors influencing pedagogical effectiveness. Finally, emerging technologies, particularly AI-powered writing assistants, warrant careful investigation regarding their potential benefits and limitations for EFL writing development.

In conclusion, enhancing academic writing competence among EFL learners requires theoretically informed, empirically supported, and contextually responsive pedagogical practices. By drawing on current research and remaining attentive to learners' evolving needs, EFL instructors can design writing instruction that empowers learners to succeed in academic and professional contexts requiring sophisticated English literacy skills.

Acknowledgement: The authors acknowledge the UNITAR International University Malaysia for publication support.

REFERENCES

- Alibakhshi, G., Javaheri, R., & Akhter, S. (2026). Student-negotiated syllabi boost EFL learner willingness to communicate and academic passion versus teacher-designed syllabi. *Discover Education*.
- Andrade, H., & Valtcheva, A. (2009). Promoting learning and achievement through self-assessment. *Theory into Practice*, 48(1), 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577544>
- Anierobi, E. I., Amjad, A. I., Ubani, F. A., Aslam, S., Khasawneh, M. A. S., & Alshamsi, H. (2025). The role of social support and academic self-efficacy in enhancing academic engagement among undergraduates. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 14(6), 4689. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v14i6.33999>
- Arnold, N., Ducate, L., & Kost, C. (2012). Collaboration or cooperation? Analyzing group dynamics and revision processes in wikis. *CALICO Journal*, 29(3), 431-448. <https://doi.org/10.11139/cj.29.3.431-448>
- Arslan, R. Ş., & Şahin-Kızıl, A. (2010). How can the use of blog software facilitate the writing process of English language learners? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 23(3), 183-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2010.486575>
- Asadi, N., Khodabandeh, F., & Khojasteh, L. (2025). AI-generated feedback in English writing instruction for EFL learners: A systematic review. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 24(1), 1-22.
- Attali, Y. (2004). Exploring the feedback and revision features of Criterion. *Journal of*
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
- Bitchener, J., & Basturkmen, H. (2006). Perceptions of the difficulties of postgraduate L2 thesis students writing the discussion section. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5(1), 4-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2005.10.002>
- Boulton, A. (2010). Data-driven learning: Taking the computer out of the equation. *Language Learning*, 60(3), 534-572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00566.x>
- Bradley, L., Lindström, B., & Rystedt, H. (2010). Rationalities of collaboration for language learning in a wiki. *ReCALL*, 22(2), 247-265. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344010000108>
- Burns, A., & Richards, J. C. (Eds.). (2009). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chandrasegaran, A. (2013). The effect of a socio-cognitive approach to teaching writing on stance support moves and topicality in students' expository essays. *Linguistics and Education*, 24(3), 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2012.12.003>
- Chang, G., Akhter, S., & Lin, C. (2025). Exploring learning uncertainty and test anxiety with mindfulness as a mediator in EFL students: An Expectancy-Value Approach. *Learning and Motivation*, 92, 102189.
- Chapelle, C. A., & Sauro, S. (Eds.). (2017). *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Charles, M. (2012). 'Proper vocabulary and juicy collocations': EAP students evaluate do-it-yourself corpus-building. *English for Specific Purposes*, 31(2), 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2011.12.003>
- Cheng, A. (2008). Analyzing genre exemplars in preparation for writing: The case of an L2 graduate student in the ESP genre-based instructional framework of academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 29(1), 50-71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm021>
- Chukharev-Hudilainen, E., Saricaoglu, A., Torrance, M., & Feng, H. (2019). Combined deployments of automated writing evaluation and writing process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 43, 2-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.08.005>
- Cobb, T. (1997). Is there any measurable learning from hands-on concordancing? *System*, 25(3), 301-315. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00033-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00033-9)
- Cohen, A. D. (2011). *Strategies in learning and using a second language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second-language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-238. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951>

- Cumming, A. (2001). Learning to write in a second language: Two decades of research. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 1-23.
- Cumming, A., Lai, C., & Cho, H. (2016). Students' writing from sources for academic purposes: A synthesis of recent research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 23, 47-58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2016.06.002>
- Devitt, A. J. (2004). *Writing genres*. Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ducate, L. C., & Lomicka, L. L. (2008). Adventures in the blogosphere: From blog readers to blog writers. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 21(1), 9-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220701865474>
- Durrant, P. (2016). To what extent is the Academic Vocabulary List relevant to university student writing? *English for Specific Purposes*, 43, 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2016.01.004>
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>
- Elola, I., & Oskoz, A. (2010). Collaborative writing: Fostering foreign language and writing conventions development. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(3), 51-71.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2023). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>
- 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>
- Flowerdew, L. (2015). Data-driven learning and language learning theories. In A. Leńko-Szymańska & A. Boulton (Eds.), *Multiple affordances of language corpora for data-driven learning* (pp. 15-36). John Benjamins.
- Freedman, A. (1993). Show and tell? The role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27(3), 222-251.
- Gilmore, A. (2009). Using online corpora to develop students' writing skills. *ELT Journal*, 63(4), 363-372. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn056>
- Grimes, D., & Warschauer, M. (2010). Utility in a fallible tool: A multi-site case study of automated writing evaluation. *The Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment*, 8(6), 1-43.
- Guo, F., Lin, C., & Akhter, S. (2025). Autonomy and familiarity in AI-mediated collaboration: A self-determination theory perspective on motivational interdependence in EFL learners. *Learning and Motivation*, 92, 102219
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. H. (2010). Self-regulated strategy development in the writing process. In B. Wong & D. L. Butler (Eds.), *Learning about learning disabilities* (pp. 249-266). Elsevier.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Hinkel, E. (2001). Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied Language Learning*, 12(2), 111-132.
- Hinkel, E. (2015). *Effective curriculum for teaching L2 writing: Principles and techniques*. Routledge.
- Humphrey, S., & Macnaught, L. (2016). Functional language instruction and the writing growth of English language learners in the middle years. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(4), 792-816. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.247>
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Hyon, S. (1996). Genre in three traditions: Implications for ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(4), 693-722. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587930>
- Johns, T. (1991). Should you be persuaded: Two examples of data-driven learning. In T. Johns & P. King (Eds.), *Classroom concordancing* (pp. 1-16). University of Birmingham.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language Learning*, 16(1-2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x>
- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2008.01.01.1>
- Kessler, G., Bikowski, D., & Boggs, J. (2012). Collaborative writing among second language learners in academic web-based projects. *Language Learning & Technology*, 16(1), 91-109.
- Khampusaen, D. (2025). The impact of ChatGPT on academic writing skills and argumentative essay quality of Thai EFL students. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 18(1), 963-988.
- Kim, Y., & McDonough, K. (2008). The effect of interlocutor proficiency on the collaborative dialogue between Korean as a second language learners. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 211-234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807086288>
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory, and applications*. Pergamon Press.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.
- Lee, I., & Deakin, L. (2016). Interaction in L1 and L2 undergraduate writing tutorials. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 33, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.06.001>
- Li, M., & Zhu, W. (2017). Good or bad collaborative wiki writing: Exploring links between group interactions and writing products. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 35, 38-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.01.003>
- Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. University of Michigan Press.
- Lu, Q., Yao, Y., Xiao, L., Yuan, M., Wang, J., & Zhu, X. (2024). Evaluating the role of ChatGPT in enhancing EFL writing assessments in classroom settings: A preliminary investigation. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1261. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03755-2>
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(3), 320-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00425.x>
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. John Benjamins.
- Maryam, Z., Sanif, S., Rehman, A. U., Mohamed, S. H., & Azman, N. B. (2025). The impact of self-directed learning on academic writing skills of EFL learners with critical thinking ability as a mediator. *International Journal of Instruction*, 18(1), 567-584. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2025.18132a>
- Matsuda, P. K., Canagarajah, A. S., Harklau, L., Hyland, K., & Warschauer, M. (2006). Changing currents in second language writing research: A colloquium. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(2), 151-179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.04.001>
- Mee, R. W. M., Pek, L. S., Yob, F. S. C., Nallisamy, V., Camara, J. S., & Derahvasht, A. (2026). Gamified socio-emotional learning for children: Insights from a thematic and co-word analysis of recent literature. *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, 10(1).
- 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>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nguyen, L. T. C., & Gu, Y. (2013). Strategy-based instruction: A learner-focused approach to developing learner autonomy. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(1), 9-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812457528>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Pearson Education.
- Panadero, E., & Jonsson, A. (2013). The use of scoring rubrics for formative assessment purposes revisited: A review. *Educational Research Review*, 9, 129-144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.002>

- Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(4), 317-345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2003.08.004>
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL students do as they write: A classroom study of composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(2), 229-258. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586828>
- Rao, Z. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 100-106. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm002>
- Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23-30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci003>
- Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney School. *Equinox*.
- Rothery, J. (1996). Making changes: Developing an educational linguistics. In R. Hasan & G. Williams (Eds.), *Literacy in society* (pp. 86-123). Longman.
- Sasaki, M. (2000). Toward an empirical model of EFL writing processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 259-291. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00028-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00028-X)
- Second Language Writing, 13(2), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.001>
- Shehadeh, A. (2011). Effects and student perceptions of collaborative writing in L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(4), 286-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.05.010>
- Shih, R. C. (2011). Can Web 2.0 technology assist college students in learning English writing? Integrating Facebook and peer assessment with blended learning. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 27(5), 829-845. <https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.934>
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(4), 378-388. <https://doi.org/10.2307/356588>
- Stevenson, M., & Phakiti, A. (2019). The effects of computer-generated feedback on the quality of writing. *Assessing Writing*, 40, 48-65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.03.006>
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119-158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00179>
- Storch, N. (2005). Collaborative writing: Product, process, and students' reflections. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.05.002>
- Storch, N. (2013). Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. *Multilingual Matters*.
- Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. *Language Teaching*, 52(1), 40-59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000320>
- Swain, M. (2006). Language, agency and collaboration in advanced second language proficiency. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Advanced language learning: The contribution of Halliday and Vygotsky* (pp. 95-108). Continuum.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320-337. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x>
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100701. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100701>
- Tian, J., Hashemifardnia, A., & Akhter, S. (2025). Exploring the intersections between digital competence with job motivation and job efficacy in EFL teachers: insights from achievement goal theory. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1), 1053.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: A case study of two effective and two less effective writers. *System*, 27(4), 537-555. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(99\)00049-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00049-4)
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wang, Q. (2025). EFL learners' motivation and acceptance of using large language models in English academic writing: An extension of the UTAUT model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1514545. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1514545>

- Warschauer, M., & Grimes, D. (2007). Audience, authorship, and artifact: The emergent semiotics of Web 2.0. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 27, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190508070013>
- Warschauer, M., & Ware, P. (2006). Automated writing evaluation: Defining the classroom research agenda. *Language Teaching Research*, 10(2), 157-180. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr190oa>
- Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.515>
- White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process writing*. Longman.
- Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2009). Pair versus individual writing: Effects on fluency, complexity and accuracy. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 445-466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532209104670>
- Wigglesworth, G., & Storch, N. (2012). What role for collaboration in writing and writing feedback? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 364-374. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.005>
- Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 321-331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.007>
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>
- Yasuda, S. (2011). Genre-based tasks in foreign language writing: Developing writers' genre awareness, linguistic knowledge, and writing competence. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20(2), 111-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.03.001>
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165-187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647>
- Zhang, L. J., & Zhang, D. (2013). Thinking metacognitively about metacognition in second and foreign language learning, teaching, and research: Toward a dynamic metacognitive systems perspective. *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies*, 396, 111-121.