

Academic Writing Instruction in Eastern Indonesia: A Multi-Stakeholder Needs Analysis of Tertiary EFL Learners

Ummu Rofikah

Universitas Muhammadiyah Bima

Corresponding Email: rofikahummu@gmail.com

Abstract- Academic writing instruction in EFL higher education is often planned without comparing learners' perceptions with the expectations of more experienced stakeholders. This study examined perceived needs for academic writing instruction at UIN Alauddin Makassar, Eastern Indonesia, and identified areas of convergence and divergence among 51 fourth-semester students, 100 senior students who had completed an academic writing course, and two academic writing lecturers. A quantitative descriptive needs-analysis design used a structured questionnaire covering perceived EFL proficiency, the importance and goals of academic writing, confidence in writing tasks, preferred topics, and instructional activities. Frequencies, percentages, and mean scores were calculated separately for each group and compared descriptively across stakeholder groups. All groups viewed academic writing as important and identified summarizing and paraphrasing as a shared area of low confidence. However, they differed in evaluations of critical source use and preferred learning activities: senior students prioritized workshops and AI-assisted learning, whereas lecturers favored peer review and individual writing tasks. The study contributes a context-sensitive, multi-stakeholder account that connects needs analysis with academic literacy by showing that perceived general EFL proficiency does not necessarily indicate readiness for source-based academic writing. The findings support instruction that combines diagnostic assessment, explicit source-literacy development, scaffolded feedback, and carefully guided technology use. Because the evidence is perception-based and drawn from one institution, the results represent reported needs rather than direct measures of writing performance.

Keywords: EFL Academic Writing, Multi-Stakeholder Needs Analysis, Academic Literacy, Eastern Indonesia, Tertiary Education

Received	Revised	Published
05-04-2026	27-05-2026	01-06-2026

Article URL : <https://ejournal.ranedu.my.id/index.php/pendiri/article/view/135>

Doi : [10.63866/pendiri.v3i2.135](https://doi.org/10.63866/pendiri.v3i2.135)

1. INTRODUCTION

Academic writing competence has become an essential requirement for tertiary students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL), as university contexts increasingly demand students' ability to communicate knowledge through academic assignments, research papers, and scholarly texts. However, academic writing is a complex literacy practice that extends beyond grammatical accuracy and vocabulary knowledge. It requires learners to construct arguments, organize ideas coherently, engage with academic sources, and adapt their writing to specific disciplinary and rhetorical expectations [1]. For EFL learners, these demands often create challenges because they must simultaneously develop linguistic competence, rhetorical awareness, critical thinking, and academic conventions. Therefore, effective academic writing instruction requires a comprehensive understanding of learners' existing proficiency, difficulties, and expectations rather than relying solely on predetermined instructional assumptions.

To design appropriate writing instruction, needs analysis plays an important role in identifying the gap between learners' current abilities and their desired competencies. In

language education, needs analysis involves investigating learners' necessities, lacks, and wants to ensure that instructional programs correspond with actual learning requirements [2]. Furthermore, needs analysis should consider not only learners' perceptions but also perspectives from other stakeholders, such as teachers and previous learners, because they may provide different but complementary understandings of students' abilities and instructional needs [3]. In EFL academic writing contexts, such analysis is particularly important because students may have different perceptions from teachers regarding their proficiency, confidence, and learning priorities. Previous studies have also highlighted that learners' engagement with writing instruction, including feedback, revision practices, and learning activities, influences the development of writing competence [4], [5].

Previous needs analyses in Indonesian tertiary EFL settings have commonly informed materials or specific language courses, while studies of academic writing have often examined particular difficulties or interventions. Less is known about whether beginning academic-writing students, more experienced students, and lecturers converge on the same priorities in an Eastern Indonesian university. The present study addresses this gap by integrating needs analysis with an academic-literacy perspective: needs are treated not only as gaps in language skills but also as expectations for source use, argumentation, genre awareness, and participation in academic discourse. Its contribution lies in comparing learner-reported and stakeholder-assessed perceptions item by item to identify both shared priorities and contested expectations. Accordingly, the study asks: (1) How do the three groups perceive students' current EFL proficiency, the importance and goals of academic writing, confidence in academic-writing tasks, and preferred topics? (2) Where do their perceptions converge or diverge? and (3) Which instructional activities do the groups prioritize for a needs-responsive academic writing course?

2. RESEARCH METHODS

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive, multi-stakeholder needs-analysis design. Questionnaire-based needs analysis was selected to generate systematic information about learner priorities, perceived difficulties, and instructional preferences. The design compared learner-reported perceptions with assessments from senior students and lecturers [6]. The analysis was descriptive rather than inferential because the stakeholder groups were highly unequal in size, particularly the lecturer group ($n = 2$).

Drawing on questionnaire-based needs-analysis procedures illustrated by Andi and Arafah [6], the present study operationalized two complementary sources of evidence. Learner-reported needs covered the fourth-semester students' perceptions of importance, goals, proficiency, confidence, topic interests, and preferred activities. Stakeholder-assessed needs captured parallel judgments from senior students and lecturers. This structure supported item-by-item comparison of convergence and divergence. Because every measure was perception-based, "stakeholder-assessed" does not imply an objective test of writing performance.

2.2 Participants and Sampling

Purposive sampling was used because each group needed direct knowledge of the target learning context. The three groups represented prospective course participants, more experienced peers, and academic-writing instructors [6].

The target group comprised 51 fourth-semester students from the English Education Department of UIN Alauddin Makassar, Indonesia. They had not yet taken Writing for Academic Purposes and therefore provided learner-reported baseline perceptions. The

comparison group comprised 100 senior students from higher semesters who had completed an academic writing course; throughout this article, they are termed senior students because they remained enrolled at the time of data collection. The resource group comprised two lecturers who taught academic writing and provided instructor assessments of the target students' needs.

2.3 Instruments and Data Collection

Data were collected through a structured questionnaire developed from needs-analysis principles. Questionnaires provide a consistent means of gathering perceptions of learners' abilities, priorities, problems, and preferences [6]. Parallel versions retained the same constructs and response scales, while pronouns and referents were adjusted so that fourth-semester students assessed themselves and the other groups assessed the target students.

The instrument began with demographic items on age, gender, and experience using generative artificial intelligence for writing. It then contained 30 needs-analysis items: two on the importance of academic writing, four on learning goals, seven on confidence in writing tasks, one categorical item on perceived overall EFL proficiency (A1-C1), 10 on preferred writing topics, and six on preferred instructional activities. Importance and confidence items used four-point response scales with construct-appropriate descriptors. The questionnaire was administered separately to the three groups within the same department, and responses were coded and tabulated by stakeholder group before analysis.

2.4 Data Analysis

Questionnaire responses were analyzed descriptively. Frequencies and percentages summarized categorical responses, including perceived proficiency, while mean scores summarized four-point items. Statistics were calculated separately for each stakeholder group and placed in a side-by-side comparison matrix. Convergence was identified when groups fell within the same interpretation category; divergence was identified when categories differed, with numeric mean gaps used to describe the size and direction of differences. No inferential tests were conducted because sampling was purposive and group sizes were highly unequal. Percentages and means from the two lecturers therefore represent two individual expert judgments and are not population estimates.

The mean score was calculated using the following formula:

$$x = \frac{\sum fx}{\sum f} \quad (1)$$

where:

$\bar{X}$ = mean score,

f = frequency of responses,

x = Likert-scale score, and

$\sum f$ = total number of respondents.

The calculation multiplied each response category by its frequency, summed the products, and divided the total by the number of responses.

The mean scores were interpreted using a four-point scale:

- 1.00–1.50 = Not important / Not confident
- 1.51–2.50 = Less important / Slightly confident
- 2.51–3.50 = Important / Moderately confident
- 3.51–4.00 = Very important / Very confident

3. RESULTS

Three cross-stakeholder patterns frame the results. First, all groups converged on the importance of academic writing and on low confidence in summarizing and paraphrasing. Second, the clearest divergences concerned critical source evaluation and preferred learning activities. Third, perceived overall EFL proficiency clustered around B1, yet confidence in several organizational and source-based writing tasks remained limited. Results from the two lecturers are interpreted descriptively rather than generalized.

3.1 Subjective Needs

1. How important do you consider EFL academic writing skills for students' academic success?

NO	SUBJECTIVE NEEDS	STUDENTS	SENIOR STUDENTS	LECTURERS
1	Importance level of EFL academic writing skills for academic success	3.43 (Important)	3.75 (Very Important)	4.00 (Very Important)
2	Importance level of EFL academic writing skills for your future career	3.55 (Very important)	3.80 (Very Important)	4.00 (Very Important)

All three groups agreed that EFL academic writing was important for academic success and future careers. Students rated academic success at 3.43 (important) and career relevance at 3.55 (very important). Senior students gave higher ratings of 3.75 and 3.80, while both lecturers selected the highest response for both items (4.00). The convergence lies in the positive evaluation across groups; the difference lies in intensity, with the more experienced groups assigning greater importance.

2. The perceived importance of learners' goals in studying EFL academic writing

NO	GOALS IN STUDYING EFL ACADEMIC WRITING	STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE	SENIOR STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE	LECTURERS' PERSPECTIVE
1.	To improve clarity in expressing ideas in English	3.20 (Important)	3.75 (Very Important)	4.00 (Very Important)
2.	To enhance my ability to critically analyze and discuss academic texts in English	3.27 (Important)	3.80 (Very Important)	4.00 (Very Important)
3.	To learn how to use academic sources and reference them correctly in English	3.22 (Important)	3.20 (Important)	4.00 (Very Important)
4.	To develop skills for writing academic assignments, theses, and research papers in English.	3.35 (Important)	3.85 (Very Important)	4.00 (Very Important)

Students rated all four academic-writing goals as important (3.20–3.35), with writing assignments, theses, and research papers ranked highest (3.35). Senior students rated clarity (3.75), critical analysis (3.80), and extended academic writing (3.85) as very important, but source use and referencing as important (3.20). Both lecturers rated every goal 4.00 (very important). Thus, the groups converged on the relevance of all goals but diverged in intensity, especially for critical analysis and correct source use.

3. Confidence levels in students' performance in EFL academic writing tasks from the perspectives of students, senior students, and lecturers

NO	WRITING SKILLS PERFORMANCE LEVELS	STUDENTS	SENIOR STUDENTS	LECTURERS
1.	Writing clear and well-structured paragraphs	2.35 (Slightly confident)	2.53 (Moderately confident)	2.00 (Slightly confident)
2.	Using academic vocabulary appropriately.	2.31 (Slightly confident)	2.51 (Moderately confident)	3.00 (Moderately confident)
3.	Organizing essays or papers with a logical flow according to the functional organization of each text type	2.33 (Slightly confident)	2.53 (Moderately confident)	3.00 (Moderately confident)
4.	Applying correct grammar and syntax in writing.	2.29 (Slightly confident)	2.51 (Moderately confident)	3.00 (Moderately confident)
5.	Citing sources and integrating references correctly.	2.59 (Moderately confident)	2.58 (Moderately confident)	3.00 (Moderately confident)
6.	Summarizing and paraphrasing academic texts accurately.	2.27 (Slightly confident)	2.30 (Slightly confident)	2.00 (Slightly confident)
7.	Analyzing and evaluating sources to support your arguments critically.	2.55 (Moderately confident)	2.35 (Slightly confident)	2.00 (Slightly confident)

Students reported their greatest confidence in citing and integrating sources (2.59, moderately confident), although the score was only slightly above the category threshold. They were slightly confident in paragraph construction (2.35), logical organization (2.33), academic vocabulary (2.31), grammar and syntax (2.29), and summarizing and paraphrasing (2.27). Critical source evaluation was rated 2.55 (moderately confident).

Senior students rated citing and integrating sources (2.58), paragraph construction (2.53), logical organization (2.53), academic vocabulary (2.51), and grammar and syntax (2.51) as moderately confident. They were slightly confident in critical source evaluation (2.35) and summarizing and paraphrasing (2.30).

Lecturers rated academic vocabulary, logical organization, grammar and syntax, and source integration at 3.00 (moderately confident). They rated paragraph construction, summarizing and paraphrasing, and critical source evaluation at 2.00 (slightly confident). These values represent the judgments of two lecturers and should be read as descriptive expert assessments.

The strongest convergence concerned summarizing and paraphrasing, which every group placed in the slightly confident category (2.27, 2.30, and 2.00). The clearest divergence concerned critical source evaluation: students rated it moderately confident (2.55), whereas senior students (2.35) and lecturers (2.00) rated it slightly confident. The comparison therefore reveals both a shared higher-order writing gap and possible student overestimation in critical source evaluation.

4. Perceived overall EFL proficiency based on students', senior students', and lecturers' assessments

NO	PROFICIENCY LEVEL	STUDENTS	SENIOR STUDENTS	LECTURERS
1.	A1	-	-	-
2.	A2	21 (41.2 %)	30 (30%)	-
3.	B1	26 (51%)	64 (64%)	50%
4.	B2	4 (7.8%)	6 (6%)	50%
5.	C1	-	-	-

Perceived overall EFL proficiency clustered around B1. Among fourth-semester students, 51.0% selected B1, 41.2% A2, and 7.8% B2. The distribution indicates that self-assessments were concentrated between A2 and B1, with only four students selecting B2.

Senior students also most often selected B1 (64%), followed by A2 (30%) and B2 (6%). The lecturer responses were split: one lecturer selected B1 and one selected B2. Thus, students and senior students converged on B1 as the modal category, whereas the lecturers differed from each other and did not select A2. The lecturer percentages should not be treated as stable population proportions because each 50% represents one person.

These perceived proficiency levels do not constitute standardized proficiency scores. Their value lies in showing how the three groups locate the target students' general EFL readiness before Writing for Academic Purposes. The differences also provide a basis for diagnostic assessment at the start of the course rather than for claims about objectively measured proficiency.

NO	PREFERRED WRITING TOPICS	STUDENTS	SENIOR STUDENTS
1.	Academic research and discoveries	3.14 (Important)	3.60 (Very important)
2.	Current global issues (e.g., climate change, politics)	3.10 (Important)	2.98 (Important)
3.	Literature and arts	2.86 (Important)	3.40 (Important)
4.	Science and technology	3.00 (Important)	3.52 (Very Important)
5.	Personal growth and experiences	3.18 (Important)	3.60 (Very Important)
6.	Cultural and societal issues	3.10 (Important)	3.40 (Important)
7.	Business and economics	2.94 (Important)	3.20 (Important)
8.	Mental health and wellness	3.04 (Important)	3.00 (Important)
9.	Language learning challenges and solutions	3.37 (Important)	3.80 (Very Important)
10.	The role of technology in English language teaching	3.22 (Important)	3.75 (Very Important)

Students rated every proposed topic as important. Language learning challenges and solutions ranked highest (3.37), followed by the role of technology in English language teaching (3.22), personal growth and experiences (3.18), and academic research and discoveries (3.14). Literature and arts (2.86) and business and economics (2.94) received the lowest student means, although they remained within the important category.

Senior students placed the strongest emphasis on language learning challenges and solutions (3.80), the role of technology in English language teaching (3.75), academic research and discoveries (3.60), personal growth and experiences (3.60), and science and technology (3.52), all categorized as very important. Their lowest mean was for current global issues (2.98), which remained important.

The groups converged most strongly on language-learning topics and personal experience. They diverged in intensity for technology, science, academic research, and literature, which senior students generally valued more highly. No lecturer ratings were available for this item group, so the topic comparison is limited to the two student groups.

For course design, the shared priorities support core tasks on language-learning problems, academic research, and personal experience, while technology- and science-related options can broaden relevance for more experienced learners.

3.2 Stakeholder-Assessed Instructional Needs

Stakeholder-assessed instructional needs were represented by ratings of six learning activities. These ratings remain perceptual: they indicate which activities each group considered useful, not activities whose effectiveness was tested experimentally. Comparing the groups nevertheless shows where learners, experienced peers, and lecturers favor similar or different forms of support.

NO	LEARNING ACTIVITIES	STUDENTS	SENIOR STUDENTS	LECTURERS
1.	Collaborative writing	3.12 (Important)	3.20 (Important)	3.00 (Important)
2.	Peer reviews	3.12 (Important)	3.00 (Important)	3.50 (Important)
3.	Writing workshops	3.20 (Important)	3.70 (Very important)	3.00 (Important)
4.	Individual writing tasks	3.14 (Important)	3.00 (Important)	3.50 (Important)
5.	Teacher-centered writing instruction	3.22 (Important)	3.40 (Important)	3.00 (Important)
6.	AI-assisted learning	2.98 (Important)	3.60 (Very important)	3.00 (Important)

Students rated all six activities as important, led by teacher-centered instruction (3.22), writing workshops (3.20), and individual tasks (3.14); AI-assisted learning ranked last (2.98). Senior students prioritized writing workshops (3.70, very important) and AI-assisted learning (3.60, very important), whereas lecturers gave their highest ratings to peer review and individual writing tasks (both 3.50, important). All groups placed collaborative writing in the important category (3.12, 3.20, and 3.00), which represents convergence. The strongest divergence concerned workshops and AI-assisted learning, valued most by senior students, and peer review, valued most by lecturers.

4. DISCUSSION

5.1 Convergence on Importance and Source-Literacy Priorities

The strongest convergence concerned the broad value of academic writing: every group regarded it as important for academic success and future careers. Agreement on broad importance, however, did not eliminate differences in specific priorities. Lecturers consistently assigned maximum importance to all learning goals, while students and senior students were less emphatic about source use and referencing. Needs analysis therefore adds value by distinguishing general endorsement from the relative priority attached to particular academic-literacy practices.

The divergence in source-related goals is pedagogically important. Lecturers rated critical analysis and correct source use as very important, whereas both student groups gave lower

ratings to referencing. At the same time, all three groups reported low confidence in summarizing and paraphrasing. These findings support Wingate's [10] argument for explicit, embedded teaching of argument, evidence evaluation, and participation in disciplinary discourse.

The lower priority assigned to source use by the student groups should not be treated as proof of deficient awareness; it is a perceptual difference that warrants instructional attention. Pecorari [15] identifies plagiarism and source use as continuing concerns in English for Academic Purposes and notes the limited evidence on effective pedagogy. The present results support making source literacy, paraphrase, citation choices, and critical engagement with evidence explicit learning outcomes.

5.2 Perceived Proficiency and Academic-Writing Readiness

B1 was the modal perceived proficiency category for both fourth-semester and senior students, but the lecturer judgments were split between B1 and B2. This pattern shows partial convergence rather than a single shared assessment. Because all ratings were perceptual, the comparison should be interpreted as evidence that stakeholders frame readiness differently, not as proof that one group is more accurate. Bringing these perspectives together is therefore useful in needs analysis [3], [7]. This comparison exposes differences that a learner-only survey would not reveal.

Perceived general EFL proficiency did not align consistently with confidence in academic writing. Even when students were placed at B1 or B2, all groups reported weaknesses in tasks that require disciplinary literacy, rhetorical awareness, argument construction, and evidence-based claims [1], [8]. General proficiency can therefore coexist with limited readiness for source-based, rhetorically organized writing. This interpretation accords with academic-literacy scholarship that treats university writing as participation in socially and disciplinarily situated practices rather than as the simple transfer of general language skills [9], [10], [11].

The shared low confidence in summarizing and paraphrasing makes this academic-literacy gap especially visible. These tasks require writers to comprehend sources, select relevant meanings, reformulate them accurately, and integrate them into a new argument. The lower external ratings for critical source evaluation add another indication that source use, not only grammar, should be treated as a central instructional need [8], [10]. Academic writing instruction should therefore teach genre, argument, synthesis, paraphrase, and critical source evaluation explicitly rather than functioning as an advanced grammar course.

5.3 Stakeholder-Differentiated Pedagogical Priorities

The activity preferences suggest that a needs-responsive course should combine sustained writing practice with structured feedback. A Bayesian meta-analysis found durable, moderate effects of written corrective feedback on L2 accuracy [12], while a synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies shows that feedback practices, learner responses, stakeholder beliefs, motivation, and emotion interact in actual L2 writing classrooms [13]. Together, this evidence supports diagnostic tasks, iterative drafting, formative feedback, and guided reflection rather than reliance on a single preferred activity.

The activity results also reveal complementary rather than interchangeable preferences. Senior students prioritized workshops and AI-assisted learning, lecturers prioritized peer review and individual tasks, and current students placed teacher-centered instruction first. These differences call for a balanced design that combines explicit modeling, workshops, individual drafting, and peer response. The contextual view of feedback developed by Hyland and Hyland [14] supports treating feedback as a situated instructional process rather than as a decontextualized correction technique. AI can be included as guided support, but the present data do not establish its effectiveness.

Taken together, the three themes extend needs analysis beyond a list of preferred items. They show that course design must reconcile shared priorities with stakeholder-specific expectations, distinguish general English proficiency from academic-literacy readiness, and combine multiple forms of practice and feedback.

5. CONCLUSION

This study shows that perceived needs for tertiary EFL academic writing cannot be adequately represented by one stakeholder group or by perceived general proficiency alone. Across 51 fourth-semester students, 100 senior students, and two lecturers, the clearest convergence concerned the importance of academic writing and low confidence in summarizing and paraphrasing. The clearest divergences concerned critical source evaluation and preferred learning activities. The theoretical contribution is to connect multi-stakeholder needs analysis with an academic-literacy perspective: readiness for university writing involves source use, argumentation, genre awareness, and participation in disciplinary discourse, not merely a general EFL level. Comparing learner-reported and stakeholder-assessed perceptions makes both shared priorities and contested expectations visible.

Pedagogically, the findings support an initial diagnostic task followed by explicit instruction in summarizing, paraphrasing, critical source evaluation, argument organization, and citation choices. A balanced course should combine teacher modeling, workshops, individual drafting, peer review, formative feedback, and carefully guided AI use rather than privileging one activity. The conclusions are bounded by a single-institution, perception-based design, purposive sampling, and a lecturer group of only two; no standardized proficiency or writing-performance test was administered. Future research should validate the questionnaire, include larger and more balanced stakeholder samples, compare perceived needs with writing samples, and evaluate whether the proposed instructional sequence improves academic-writing performance across Indonesian higher education contexts.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] K. Hyland, *Second Language Writing*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 2003. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511667251.
- [2] T. Hutchinson and A. Waters, *English for Specific Purposes*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, 1987. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511733031.
- [3] T. Dudley-Evans and M.-J. Saint John, *Developments in ESP: a multi-disciplinary approach*, 5. print. in Cambridge language teaching library. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
- [4] J. Bitchener and D. Ferris, *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- [5] Z. (Victor) Zhang and K. Hyland, "Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 36, pp. 90–102, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004.
- [6] K. Andi and B. Arafah, "Using Needs Analysis to Develop English Teaching Materials in Initial Speaking Skills for Indonesian College Students of English," *The Turkish Online Journal of Design, Art and Communication*, Special Edition, pp. 419–436, 2017, doi: 10.7456/1070ASE/045.
- [7] G. Brindley, "The role of needs analysis in adult ESL programme design," in *The Second Language Curriculum*, 1st ed., R. K. Johnson, Ed., Cambridge University Press, 1989, pp. 63–78. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781139524520.007.
- [8] K. Hyland, *Second language writing*, Second edition. Cambridge, United Kingdom New York, NY Port Melbourne, Australia New Delhi, India Singapore: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- [9] I. Leki, *Undergraduates in a second language: challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. New York: Erlbaum, 2007.
- [10] U. Wingate, *Academic Literacy and Student Diversity: The Case for Inclusive Practice*. Multilingual Matters, 2015. doi: 10.21832/9781783093496.
- [11] M. R. Lea and B. V. Street, "The 'Academic Literacies' Model: Theory and Applications," *Theory Into Practice*, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 368–377, Nov. 2006, doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4504_11.
- [12] D. Brown, Q. Liu, and R. Norouzi, "Effectiveness of written corrective feedback in developing L2 accuracy: A Bayesian meta-analysis," *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1357–1389, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.1177/13621688221147374.
- [13] Z. Mao, I. Lee, and S. Li, "Written corrective feedback in second language writing: A synthesis of naturalistic classroom studies," *Lang. Teach.*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 449–477, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1017/S0261444823000393.
- [14] K. Hyland and F. Hyland, Eds., *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2019. doi: 10.1017/9781108635547.
- [15] D. Pecorari, "Plagiarism and English for academic purposes: A research agenda," *Lang. Teach.*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 362–376, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1017/S0261444821000495.