Integrating Constructivist, Assessment, and Cultural Dimensions in EFL Writing Pedagogy

Jusak Patty
English Education Study Program, Pattimura University
Corresponding Email: jusak.patty@gmail.com

Abstract

This narrative literature review investigates the integration of cognitive-constructivist, social-collaborative, assessment-based, and cultural-rhetorical frameworks to enhance English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing instruction. Addressing persistent gaps between theoretical knowledge and classroom implementation, this study synthesizes empirical evidence from 2020 to 2025 to develop an integrated pedagogical framework. The methodology employed a literature search across multiple databases (JSTOR, Google Scholar, ERIC, Web of Science, Scopus) using specified conceptual clusters, with thematic analysis conducted through a three-phase synthesis approach involving comparative methods, critical evaluation, and theoretical integration. Findings demonstrate that when systematically integrated, cognitive self-regulation strategies and social collaborative processes produce synergistic effects on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Assessment effectiveness emerges through differentiated approaches combining formative, summative, and dynamic evaluation methods across proficiency levels. Cultural-rhetorical analysis reveals that learners' first language traditions significantly influence second language rhetorical choices, requiring explicit, culturally adaptive pedagogical interventions. The synthesis identifies professional development, reflective practice, and communities of practice as essential mechanisms for sustainable theory-to-practice translation. The study contributes an initial conceptual framework for understanding multidimensional approaches to EFL writing instruction, though geographic bias toward East Asian contexts and methodological limitations constrain generalizability. Future research should prioritize longitudinal investigations, implementation science methodologies, and collaborative inquiry approaches to develop a scalable, culturally inclusive writing pedagogy that effectively serves diverse learner populations across varied institutional contexts.

Keywords: *EFL writing instruction, constructivist pedagogy, assessment integration, cultural rhetoric, theory-practice gap.*

INTRODUCTION

Every year, millions worldwide try to learn English, the most widely spoken language, yet many of these learners struggle with writing skills. In EFL contexts, good writing ability is key to academic success and career advancement in today's global world. EFL writing includes various text types, from basic sentences to complex academic papers, all necessary for effective

communication in different situations. As international connections strengthen, writing skills help learners share ideas across cultures and engage with global information (Altun, 2023).

The challenges EFL learners face with writing are varied and complex. Many teachers experience an ongoing gap between writing theories and actual classroom practices. Studies by Patience (2020) and Alzahrani et al. (2021) show that educators often lack proper training and effective teaching methods for writing instruction. This gap between theory and practice results in measurable problems in students' writing abilities, including increased writing anxiety and lower performance on writing tasks (Pratiwi, 2021). Research has identified specific problems in EFL writing development, including limited vocabulary, grammar errors, and poor organization of ideas (Haji, 2024; Muamaroh et al., 2020; Nurlatifah & Yusuf, 2022; Patty, 2024). At the same time, new educational technologies and innovative teaching approaches offer promising solutions that are not yet widely used in many EFL classrooms (Hwang et al., 2023).

Previous research in EFL writing instruction has primarily examined isolated aspects of writing pedagogy, creating significant gaps in comprehensive understanding and theoretical integration. While cognitive approaches to writing have been extensively studied (Booth Olson et al., 2023; Jamnani & Khodareza, 2020; Jiang & Kalyuga, 2022; Nückles et al., 2020; Olga, 2024; Sujito & Muttaqin, 2020; Thuy et al., 2024), there exists a notable gap in the literature concerning the empirical investigation of constructivist approaches in EFL contexts (Fitrianingsih, 2024; Gheith et al., 2024; Yang, 2024). This gap is further emphasized by Nguyen & Le (2024), who found that teachers "did not understand constructivism as much as they believed, probably due to the superficial comprehension of this approach," indicating insufficient integration between cognitive and social constructivist frameworks in EFL writing instruction. This represents a significant gap where comprehensive empirical studies systematically unifying both theoretical frameworks remain scarce, indicating the need for a theoretical synthesis that bridges these approaches.

Assessment practices in EFL writing represent another critical gap requiring systematic examination. While formative assessment has been recognized as important (Dang, 2024; Haq et al., 2020; Nurhayati, 2020; Sowell, 2020), Latif & Wasim (2024) document significant "gaps in teachers' classroom assessment literacy" and reveal "complexity, inconsistency, and contradiction between reported and practiced classroom assessments." This assessment fragmentation is compounded by what Ghaicha (2016) describes as assessment practices that "remain inhibitory

or void rather than constructive" due to lack of systematic frameworks. Most existing studies focus on either high-proficiency or beginner learners separately, failing to provide systematic frameworks that address the continuum of learner needs characterizing typical EFL classrooms (Phuong et al., 2023; Sunengko, 2024).

Cultural and contextual factors in EFL writing instruction present a third area requiring systematic integration. Although studies have acknowledged cultural influences on rhetorical patterns (Abel & Saministrado, 2024; Sujiyani, 2022; Worathumrong, 2021), Schenck (2023) explicitly states that "more research on cultural influences on rhetoric is needed to develop culturally responsive pedagogy that promotes better intercultural communication." Algouzi & Hazaea (2023) further identify "a research gap in classroom discourse data which would contribute to an in-depth understanding" of how cultural contexts interact with pedagogical approaches in EFL writing instruction. This gap is particularly significant as Kubota & Lehner (2004) note that traditional approaches have "perpetuated static binaries" and call for "alternative conceptual frameworks" that can address the intersection of cultural, rhetorical, and pedagogical factors.

The persistent theory-practice gap in EFL writing instruction compounds these challenges. Xu & Liu (2025) emphasize that "the need for the use of research in practice to bridge the research-practice divide in language teacher education has long been debated by researchers." Yet, this gap continues to affect writing instruction effectiveness. Kinyaduka (2017) reports that in teaching practice, student-teachers "are told to forget everything they have been taught at the university," creating a disconnection between theoretical knowledge and practical implementation in EFL writing classrooms.

It is important to acknowledge at the outset that existing EFL writing instruction research demonstrates significant geographic concentration, with substantial representation from East Asian educational contexts (China, Korea, Vietnam) and limited inclusion of perspectives from African, Latin American, and Indigenous educational traditions. This geographic bias potentially constrains the universal applicability of synthesized findings and theoretical frameworks, particularly given the diverse rhetorical traditions, educational systems, and cultural learning preferences that characterize global EFL contexts. While this synthesis attempts to identify transferable principles across cultural boundaries, readers should interpret findings with awareness of this representational limitation.

This study addresses these gaps by providing a comprehensive synthesis and theoretical integration that connects cognitive and social constructivist frameworks with practical EFL writing instruction applications. Unlike previous reviews that examine single aspects of writing pedagogy, this research presents a holistic literature synthesis that systematically integrates theoretical foundations with pedagogical implementation strategies across diverse EFL contexts. The synthesis contribution connects previously isolated research domains to understand contemporary EFL writing instruction challenges and solutions.

The practical contribution extends to providing synthesized evidence-based insights for teacher education and curriculum development by identifying interventions that address the intersection of cognitive processes, social collaboration, and cultural contexts in EFL writing instruction. This study bridges the theory-practice gap that continues to challenge EFL writing instruction effectiveness by systematically integrating existing theoretical knowledge with practical implementation strategies. The synthesis provides actionable guidance for developing comprehensive writing instruction approaches that address the complex, interconnected challenges EFL learners face across diverse educational contexts.

This study addresses four main research questions that emerge from the identified gaps in existing literature:

1. How do cognitive and social constructivist theoretical frameworks intersect to inform effective approaches to EFL writing instruction, and what evidence supports their empirical integration?
2. What assessment practices and instructional strategies can be systematically integrated to enhance writing development across diverse proficiency levels in EFL contexts?
3. In what ways do cultural contexts, rhetorical patterns, and pedagogical interventions systematically intersect to influence EFL writing development?
4. How can theoretical knowledge and practical strategies be synthesized to bridge persistent theory-practice gaps in EFL writing instruction?

The importance of this research extends to practical applications in EFL writing instruction through systematic synthesis of existing knowledge rather than developing separate frameworks. Through a comprehensive analysis of integrated theoretical and pedagogical approaches, this study provides an evidence-based foundation for understanding how multiple research domains connect to address EFL writing challenges. Examining how traditional and innovative

approaches can be systematically integrated helps educators implement comprehensive instruction that respects theoretical foundations while addressing practical learning needs (Muslimin et al., 2024). Ultimately, this research contributes to developing evidence-based understanding that systematically connects theoretical insights with practical implementation strategies, enabling more effective EFL writing instruction that prepares students for meaningful participation in global academic and professional communication contexts (Asnas & Hidayanti, 2024).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a narrative literature review methodology to investigate and integrate existing research on EFL writing instruction. The narrative review approach was selected as the most appropriate methodology for addressing the identified gaps in theoretical integration between cognitive and social constructivist frameworks, assessment practices across proficiency levels, and cultural-rhetorical-pedagogical intersections in EFL writing instruction. Unlike systematic reviews that require rigid, predetermined protocols and dual screening processes, narrative reviews provide the methodological flexibility essential for synthesizing diverse cultural perspectives, theoretical frameworks, and pedagogical approaches that characterize the interdisciplinary field of EFL writing instruction (Sukhera, 2022). This flexibility proves particularly valuable in EFL contexts where research spans diverse cultural contexts, pedagogical traditions, and theoretical frameworks that require interpretive synthesis rather than statistical aggregation. Furthermore, the complex nature of theory-practice integration in EFL writing instruction necessitates the author-driven analysis and critical interpretation that narrative reviews enable, allowing for nuanced examination of how different theoretical perspectives intersect with practical implementation challenges.

Several key factors specific to this research domain and the identified research gaps justified the narrative literature review methodology. First, the interdisciplinary nature of EFL writing instruction research, encompassing applied linguistics, educational psychology, cultural studies, and assessment theory, requires narrative approaches' theoretical synthesis capabilities rather than the standardized comparison protocols characteristic of systematic reviews. Second, the identified gaps in theoretical integration demand creative synthesis and interpretive analysis that can accommodate methodological diversity while maintaining analytical rigor, particularly when

examining how cognitive and social constructivist frameworks intersect in practice. Third, EFL writing instruction's cultural and contextual specificity requires accommodating diverse research traditions and cultural perspectives that resist systematic standardization but benefit from interpretive integration (Hall & Leeder, 2024). The broad scope of EFL writing instruction research, encompassing qualitative classroom ethnographies, quantitative intervention studies, and mixed-methods cultural investigations, necessitates the accommodation of methodological diversity while maintaining analytical rigor.

The literature search was conducted across multiple academic databases to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant research in education and applied linguistics. Databases systematically searched included JSTOR, Google Scholar, ERIC, Web of Science, and Scopus, selected to capture mainstream applied linguistics research and interdisciplinary educational studies. Key methodological terms require explicit definition for international readership clarity. "Theoretical integration" refers to the systematic process of identifying conceptual connections between previously isolated research domains to develop unified explanatory frameworks. "Interpretive synthesis" denotes analytical approaches that prioritize meaning-making and conceptual development over statistical aggregation of findings. "Cultural-rhetorical intersections" encompasses the dynamic relationships between learners' first language discourse traditions, target language academic conventions, and pedagogical intervention strategies.

The search strategy employed specific conceptual clusters using Boolean operators to ensure systematic coverage: ("EFL writing instruction" OR "English as foreign language writing") AND ("cognitive constructivism" OR "social constructivism"), ("EFL writing" OR "L2 writing") AND ("assessment" OR "evaluation"), ("cultural factors" OR "rhetorical patterns") AND ("EFL writing" OR "second language writing"), and ("theory practice gap" OR "research practice gap") AND ("writing instruction" OR "EFL pedagogy"). The temporal scope was limited to 2020-2025 to capture contemporary developments in EFL writing instruction while ensuring relevance to current pedagogical contexts and theoretical advances. Search parameters excluded preprints and non-peer-reviewed materials to maintain quality standards, while language was restricted to English to ensure accessibility and consistency in analysis.

Inclusion criteria focused on scholarly articles published between 2020 to 2025 that directly addressed EFL writing instruction, particularly emphasizing studies examining theoretical frameworks, assessment methodologies, cultural factors, and pedagogical interventions. Both

empirical studies and literature reviews were included when they contributed to understanding the four main research themes, recognizing that theoretical synthesis requires integrating both primary research findings and previous analytical work. Exclusion criteria eliminated studies focusing solely on ESL contexts without EFL applications, research not directly relevant to writing instruction pedagogy, and studies lacking sufficient detail about theoretical foundations or pedagogical implications. Quality assessment was conducted by evaluating methodological rigor, theoretical contribution, and relevance to the research questions, with particular attention to studies that addressed multiple dimensions of the research framework or provided innovative perspectives on theory-practice integration. As a single-author review, potential selection bias was acknowledged and minimized through systematically applying inclusion criteria and transparent documentation of decision-making rationale.

Data analysis followed a three-phase synthesis approach that balanced methodological rigor with interpretive flexibility to address the complex research questions. Phase one involved thematic organization using constant comparative methods to identify major themes and sub-themes across the literature, with particular attention to how different studies addressed the intersection of cognitive and social constructivist frameworks, assessment integration practices, cultural-rhetorical factors, and theory-practice gap issues (Aromataris & Munn, 2020). Phase two consisted of critical analysis evaluating methodological strengths and limitations across different cultural contexts, theoretical frameworks, and pedagogical approaches, with systematic attention to how findings from different studies converged or diverged in addressing the research questions (Thomas & Harden, 2008). Phase three focused on theoretical integration, mapping findings onto existing frameworks while identifying gaps and proposing new connections between previously isolated research domains, culminating in the synthesis framework that addresses all four research questions through integrated analysis (Naeem et al., 2025). The analysis process involved iterative reading and reanalysis to comprehensively understand theoretical relationships and practical implications across the diverse literature base.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Cognitive and Social Constructivist Framework Integration

The intersection of cognitive and social constructivist frameworks creates a synergistic theoretical foundation for EFL writing instruction through complementary psychological

mechanisms. Cognitive constructivism emphasizes individual meaning-making processes, such as metacognition, self-regulation, and independent problem-solving, while social constructivism highlights the importance of collaboration, scaffolding, and negotiation of meaning through interaction (Orak & Al-khresheh, 2021; Xiao & Zhao, 2020). These frameworks achieve productive integration when individual cognitive processes become externalized through social interaction, while collaborative activities internalize metacognitive strategies within learners. Rather than operating as parallel approaches, cognitive and social constructivism function as interdependent dimensions where the zone of proximal development serves as the primary mechanism for their convergence (H. He & Wang, 2020). This theoretical synergy manifests when learners engage in cognitive self-monitoring during collaborative tasks, creating dual pathways for skill development that amplify learning outcomes beyond what either framework achieves independently.

The concept of "integration ratios" requires clarification for practical application. Integration ratios refer to the proportional balance between individual cognitive reflection activities and collaborative social interaction within instructional sequences. For instance, a 1:2 integration ratio indicates one individual reflection phase followed by two collaborative engagement phases. "Recursive cycles" denote repeated instructional sequences where outcomes from collaborative activities inform subsequent individual reflection, which then generates new insights for collective negotiation, creating self-reinforcing learning progressions.

Effective pedagogical approaches operationalizing this integration include structured peer-editing protocols where learners must articulate their revision rationale, collaborative think-aloud sessions during writing processes, and reflective dialogue journals shared between writing partners. Integrated frameworks are operationalized through specific pedagogical mechanisms that simultaneously engage individual reflection and collaborative meaning-making. Peer review and collaborative revision represent key practices where learners self-reflect while collectively negotiating meaning (Pham, 2022; Winarti & Cahyono, 2020). These strategies succeed because they require learners to verbalize internal cognitive processes, making tacit knowledge explicit and available for peer scaffolding. Teng & Huang (2023) demonstrated that incorporating metacognitive strategy instruction into collaborative writing improved complexity, accuracy, and fluency beyond what either approach achieved alone. The mechanism underlying this improvement involves collaborative tasks that demand explicit metacognitive monitoring,

forcing learners to articulate their thinking processes while simultaneously processing and responding to peer feedback. Nurisma et al. (2024) extended this by showing that reflective journaling in social media contexts fostered behavioral, cognitive, and affective engagement simultaneously. Critical examination of these pedagogical mechanisms reveals that integration effectiveness depends on three key conditions: learners must possess sufficient metalinguistic awareness to verbalize their cognitive processes, collaborative tasks must be structured to require genuine negotiation of meaning, and feedback cycles must allow sufficient time for reflection and revision.

Empirical evidence reveals differential effects of framework integration across learner variables and instructional contexts, challenging universal application assumptions. Rahimi & Fathi (2022) found that wiki-mediated collaborative writing significantly enhanced writing performance, self-regulation, and self-efficacy, demonstrating that technology-enabled collaboration fosters cognitive and social development. Yang (2024) revealed that socio-constructivist writing courses boosted motivation, task engagement, and self-regulated learning strategies, showing that social contexts can energize cognitive growth. However, detailed analysis of these studies reveals that integration benefits are most pronounced among intermediate-level learners who possess sufficient L2 proficiency to engage in meaningful negotiation. In contrast, beginning learners may experience cognitive overload when managing language production and collaborative interaction (Patty, 2025).

Additionally, cultural variables significantly moderate integration effectiveness, with learners from high-context cultures requiring extended scaffolding periods to develop comfort with explicit metacognitive verbalization. Abdelwahab (2022) provided additional evidence by demonstrating that online social constructivist environments enhanced critical writing through peer engagement. Yet, the study's reliance on self-reported measures and its focus on advanced learners limits generalizability to diverse EFL populations. Cao et al. (2022) and Teng & Huang (2023) report moderate to large effect sizes. However, these findings require cautious interpretation given the novelty effects common in short-term intervention studies and the possibility that observed improvements reflect adaptation to new pedagogical approaches rather than sustainable skill development.

The theoretical synthesis emerging from this analysis establishes that cognitive-social constructivist integration operates through bidirectional knowledge transformation processes that

require careful calibration to learner readiness and contextual factors. This integration addresses the first research question by demonstrating that frameworks intersect most productively when cognitive self-regulation strategies are embedded within collaborative meaning-making activities, creating recursive cycles where individual reflection informs group interaction and social negotiation enhances personal metacognitive awareness (Li, 2023; Ye & Liu, 2023). Practical implementation requires pedagogical designs that sequence individual reflection, collaborative negotiation, and metacognitive consolidation phases, with timing and intensity adjusted according to learner proficiency levels and cultural communication preferences. However, this synthesis reveals significant gaps in understanding optimal integration ratios, with current research providing insufficient guidance on balancing cognitive and social elements across different writing tasks, proficiency levels, and cultural contexts. Furthermore, the field lacks longitudinal evidence examining how integrated approaches affect writing development over extended periods, leaving questions about sustainability and transfer effects unresolved (Patty & Lekatompessy, 2025; Sujito & Muttaqin, 2020; Xiao & Zhao, 2020). Future research must address these limitations through controlled studies that systematically vary integration ratios and track developmental trajectories across diverse learner populations and institutional contexts.

Assessment and Instructional Strategy Integration

Systematic assessment integration in EFL writing emerges from the recognition that isolated assessment approaches fail to capture writing competence's multidimensional and developmental nature, necessitating coordinated frameworks that align assessment purposes with instructional objectives across temporal and proficiency dimensions. Traditional assessment practices that rely exclusively on summative evaluation fail to capture writing competence's dynamic, process-oriented aspects. At the same time, purely formative approaches may lack the benchmarking rigor required for accountability and progression tracking (Guo, 2025). The theoretical foundation for systematic integration rests on complementary assessment functions operating within a unified developmental framework: diagnostic formative assessment identifies specific learning needs and guides instructional targeting, mediated dynamic assessment provides scaffolded support for skill development within identified areas, and culminating summative assessment evaluates achievement while informing subsequent instructional cycles. The

fundamental challenge lies not in choosing between assessment types, but in creating coherent assessment ecosystems where each component strengthens and informs the others through explicit alignment protocols and shared learning objectives (Mueller-Lyaskovets & Horner, 2021; Zarbafian et al., 2020).

Operationalizing systematic integration requires implementing structured assessment protocols that sequence multiple assessment types within clearly defined instructional cycles, with specific timing, feedback mechanisms, and adaptation procedures explicitly articulated. A functional integration model operates through weekly cycles where diagnostic formative assessment (peer conferences, writing logs) identifies immediate learning needs on Mondays, dynamic assessment sessions (teacher-mediated revision workshops, scaffolded peer feedback) provide targeted support through Wednesday, and micro-summative assessments (portfolio check-ins, rubric-based self-evaluation) consolidate learning gains by Friday. This cyclical approach ensures systematic rather than additive integration by establishing feedback loops where each assessment type directly informs subsequent instructional decisions and assessment adaptations. Technology-enhanced tools such as e-portfolios and automated evaluation systems facilitate this integration by providing platforms for continuous documentation, reflection, and progress tracking across assessment types (Huang et al., 2024; Wei et al., 2023). However, successful implementation depends on establishing clear assessment criteria consistent across formative, dynamic, and summative phases while allowing for developmental progression and individual learner differences. The integration mechanism succeeds when assessment data from multiple sources converge to create comprehensive learner profiles that guide immediate instructional adjustments and longer-term curriculum modifications (Abdullateef & Muhammedzein, 2021; Mallahi & Saadat, 2020).

Proficiency-level adaptation of integrated assessment systems requires differentiated implementation models that adjust assessment complexity, frequency, and scaffolding intensity according to learners' developmental readiness and linguistic resources. Beginning learners benefit from integration models emphasizing frequent diagnostic formative assessment paired with extensive dynamic assessment scaffolding, where summative evaluation focuses on effort and improvement rather than achievement benchmarks. Specific adaptations include daily writing conferences lasting three to five minutes, peer feedback protocols using simplified rubrics with visual supports, and portfolio reflections conducted in L1 with gradual transition to

L2 expression. Intermediate learners engage with balanced integration models where peer and self-assessment components assume greater prominence within dynamic assessment cycles, requiring learners to justify their revision decisions and articulate their learning strategies through structured reflection protocols (Argyropoulou & Nina Zafiri, 2021; Meletiadou, 2021). Advanced learners participate in sophisticated integration frameworks emphasizing metacognitive assessment and genre-based evaluation, where learners conduct comparative analysis of their writing across different rhetorical contexts and assume teaching roles in peer assessment activities (M. He & Wang, 2025; Murtadho, 2021). Critical examination reveals that adaptation effectiveness depends on institutional capacity to provide differentiated assessment materials, teacher preparation in assessment literacy specific to each proficiency level, and sufficient time allocation for individualized feedback across diverse learner populations.

The empirical foundation for assessment-instruction integration demonstrates measurable improvements in writing quality and learner motivation when implementation addresses both pedagogical design and institutional support requirements. However, significant implementation barriers limit widespread adoption. Evidence indicates that systematic integration reduces writing anxiety and enhances motivation through increased learner agency and transparent evaluation criteria, while improving writing quality through more targeted instructional responses to assessment data (Ismail et al., 2022; Saputri et al., 2023).

"Assessment ecosystems" refers to coordinated networks of multiple assessment types operating within unified developmental frameworks, where diagnostic, formative, dynamic, and summative evaluations function as interconnected components rather than isolated events. "Feedback loops" denote systematic mechanisms through which assessment data from one evaluation phase directly informs instructional adjustments and subsequent assessment adaptations, creating continuous improvement cycles. "Differentiated implementation models" encompass assessment frameworks that adjust complexity, frequency, and scaffolding intensity according to learner proficiency levels while maintaining consistent evaluation criteria across developmental stages.

However, detailed analysis of implementation studies reveals that integration benefits are contingent upon three critical factors: teacher assessment literacy that enables meaningful interpretation of multi-source assessment data, institutional policies that support flexible pacing and individualized feedback, and technological infrastructure that facilitates seamless data

collection and analysis. Studies reporting positive outcomes typically involve contexts with extensive teacher preparation, reduced class sizes, and dedicated technology support, raising questions about scalability in resource-constrained settings. Furthermore, the integration research base suffers from methodological limitations, including short intervention periods that may not capture sustainable implementation challenges, reliance on self-reported outcome measures that may reflect social desirability rather than genuine improvement, and selection bias toward institutions already predisposed to innovative assessment practices (Guo, 2025; Huang et al., 2024). The synthesis addressing the second research question establishes that systematic integration enhances writing development most effectively when assessment practices and instructional strategies operate within explicitly designed frameworks that specify timing, criteria, feedback mechanisms, and adaptation procedures, while acknowledging that successful implementation requires substantial institutional investment in teacher preparation, resource allocation, and technological infrastructure that may exceed the capacity of many EFL contexts.

Cultural-Rhetorical-Pedagogical Intersections

Cultural contexts, rhetorical patterns, and pedagogical interventions operate as interdependent systems that collectively shape EFL writing development through dynamic, reciprocal influences. Rather than viewing these factors as separate variables, research reveals complex intersections where cultural educational traditions influence rhetorical preferences and pedagogical receptivity, while instructional approaches reinforce or challenge existing cultural-rhetorical patterns (Bhowmik, 2021; S. Li et al., 2025). These intersections manifest through three primary pathways: cultural worldview influences argument construction and evidence presentation, educational tradition effects on learning strategy preferences and teacher-student interaction patterns, and rhetorical tradition impacts discourse organization and stance-taking practices. For instance, Confucian heritage learners' preference for indirect argumentation reflects not only cultural thought patterns but also educational systems that emphasize harmony and consensus-building, creating pedagogical challenges when English academic writing demands explicit stance-taking (Bardis et al., 2021; T. N. Pham et al., 2020). Similarly, learners from oral tradition cultures demonstrate sophisticated narrative coherence skills that can be leveraged for academic writing development, while requiring explicit instruction in written academic conventions that differ substantially from oral discourse patterns.

Arabic-speaking students' reliance on L1 rhetorical structures intersects with institutional expectations and family literacy practices, suggesting that effective intervention must address cultural identity validation, linguistic transfer facilitation, and academic discourse socialization simultaneously (Said & Almassry, 2025). This intersectional complexity demands pedagogical approaches that recognize cultural rhetorical resources as assets rather than deficits, requiring systematic frameworks for identifying, valuing, and building upon diverse rhetorical traditions.

L1-L2 rhetorical transfer operates through selective appropriation processes where learners actively construct hybrid rhetorical identities, drawing strategically from both cultural traditions and target language conventions according to audience, purpose, and genre requirements. This reconceptualization moves beyond traditional interference models to examine how cultural rhetorical resources can facilitate English writing when supported by culturally responsive pedagogy (Bhowmik, 2021; Jwa, 2020). Korean EFL students' development of hybrid macro-micro rhetorical strategies demonstrates that transfer involves conscious rhetorical choice-making rather than unconscious pattern replication, with learners maintaining culturally valued discourse features while adapting to English conventions through strategic code-meshing practices (Jwa, 2020). However, studies examining Moroccan and Chinese advanced learners reveal that rhetorical reasoning difficulties persist at deeper cognitive levels, suggesting that transfer challenges extend beyond surface discourse patterns to include fundamental differences in logical progression, evidence evaluation, and argumentative reasoning processes (Khartite et al., 2021; Tso, 2024). Critical examination reveals that transfer research suffers from methodological limitations, including cultural essentialism that overlooks individual variation within cultural groups, geographic concentration that limits understanding of global rhetorical diversity, and temporal constraints that fail to capture long-term identity negotiation processes. Furthermore, existing research inadequately addresses the rhetorical resources of learners from African, Latin American, and Indigenous traditions, creating knowledge gaps that limit pedagogical inclusivity and theoretical comprehensiveness (Okičić, 2024). The transfer literature also lacks a systematic investigation of how digital communication and globalization reshape rhetorical practices within cultures, potentially rendering traditional contrastive analyses obsolete for contemporary learner populations.

Culturally responsive pedagogical frameworks require systematic approaches validating learners' rhetorical heritage, facilitating strategic appropriation of target language conventions, and

developing critical awareness of rhetorical choice-making across cultural and linguistic contexts. Effective interventions include comparative rhetorical analysis assignments where learners examine parallel arguments in L1 and L2 traditions, cultural rhetoric portfolios that document and celebrate diverse persuasive strategies, and cross-cultural collaboration projects that enable learners to teach their rhetorical traditions while learning from others. Rather than generic recommendations for explicit instruction, successful interventions integrate cultural awareness with specific rhetorical skill development through genre-based approaches that honor diverse cultural perspectives (Thongchalerm & Jarunthawatchai, 2020; Zhang & Zhang, 2021). Stance-taking instruction exemplifies effective intersection pedagogy by addressing cultural reluctance to express strong opinions and rhetorical skill gaps in argumentation, utilizing scaffolded progression from cultural perspective sharing to academic argument construction (Alramadan, 2022; Zhang et al., 2023). Dynamic assessment models operationalize cultural responsiveness by encouraging learners to reflect on their cultural rhetorical habits while developing adaptive strategies for English contexts, creating learning environments where cultural identity and academic development mutually reinforce rather than compete (Okičić, 2024). However, implementation success depends critically on teacher intercultural competence development, institutional policies supporting multicultural pedagogy, and assessment frameworks recognizing diverse forms of rhetorical excellence rather than imposing monolingual standards. Technology-enhanced approaches facilitate cross-cultural rhetorical exchange through global collaboration platforms, though careful implementation is required to prevent cultural tokenism and ensure authentic intercultural dialogue (Ajabshir, 2024; T. N. Pham et al., 2020).

The synthesis addressing the third research question establishes that cultural-rhetorical-pedagogical intersections influence EFL writing development through complex identity negotiation processes that require pedagogical approaches to honor cultural diversity while facilitating academic discourse participation. Evidence demonstrates that culturally adaptive instruction enhances rhetorical sophistication, critical thinking capacity, and writing motivation when implemented through systematic frameworks that position cultural difference as a pedagogical resource rather than an instructional obstacle (Fu & Wang, 2022; Yuzlu & Dikilitas, 2022). However, the field requires significant theoretical and methodological advancement to address persistent limitations, including cultural essentialism in research design, geographic bias toward specific populations, and insufficient attention to how contemporary

globalization processes reshape cultural-rhetorical relationships. The intersection framework developed through this analysis reveals that effective pedagogy must operate at three levels simultaneously: validating individual cultural rhetorical resources, facilitating strategic cross-cultural communication competence, and developing critical awareness of how rhetorical choices reflect and construct cultural identity. Implementation requires institutional commitment to multicultural pedagogy, teacher preparation in intercultural competence, and assessment systems that recognize multiple pathways to rhetorical effectiveness. Future research must prioritize inclusive methodologies that examine diverse cultural traditions, longitudinal studies that track identity negotiation processes, and intervention research that develops scalable approaches to culturally responsive rhetoric instruction across diverse institutional contexts.

Theory-Practice Gap Synthesis

The persistence of theory-practice gaps in EFL writing instruction reflects systemic disconnections between knowledge production, dissemination, and implementation processes that operate at structural, institutional, and individual levels, creating self-reinforcing separation cycles despite decades of bridging attempts. At the structural level, academic knowledge production systems prioritize theoretical sophistication and methodological rigor over practical applicability. At the same time, educational institutions reward immediate instructional outcomes over long-term pedagogical development, creating misaligned incentive structures that discourage integration efforts. Institutional factors perpetuate gaps through fragmented teacher preparation programs presenting theories as abstract principles rather than practical frameworks, insufficient time allocation for reflective practice and experimentation, and performance evaluation systems emphasizing standardized outcomes rather than pedagogical innovation. Individual-level barriers include teacher cognitive overload from managing multiple instructional demands simultaneously, limited research literacy skills that impede critical evaluation of theoretical claims, and resistance to change rooted in successful past practices that appear to contradict research recommendations. The gap persists because previous bridging attempts have focused on linear transmission models that assume teachers will adopt research findings when presented clearly, rather than addressing the complex adaptive systems within which educational practice operates (Liu & Chen, 2022; Santiago Schwarz & Hamman-Ortiz, 2020). Furthermore, most bridging initiatives fail to account for the contextual specificity of educational settings,

attempting to implement universal solutions in highly variable institutional environments without adequate adaptation mechanisms (Aniq et al., 2022; Hang, 2021).

Effective knowledge synthesis requires bidirectional translation processes that transform theoretical insights and practical wisdom through collaborative inquiry mechanisms involving researchers, practitioners, and institutional stakeholders in sustained dialogue and co-construction activities. Rather than treating practitioners as passive recipients of research knowledge, successful synthesis approaches position teachers as knowledge creators who contribute practical insights that inform theoretical development while adapting research principles to specific contextual constraints and opportunities. Translation mechanisms include collaborative action research projects where teachers investigate research-informed practices within their classrooms while documenting adaptations and outcomes, professional learning communities that examine research literature collectively while developing context-specific implementation strategies, and researcher-practitioner partnerships that engage in joint problem-solving around authentic instructional challenges. These mechanisms succeed when they operate through iterative cycles where initial implementation attempts generate data that inform theoretical refinement and practical modification, creating recursive feedback loops that strengthen research and practice. Critical to this process is the development of boundary-spanning tools, including implementation protocols that specify adaptation procedures for different contexts, assessment instruments that measure both theoretical fidelity and practical effectiveness, and communication frameworks that enable meaningful dialogue between research and practice communities (Ahmad, 2020; Setiawan et al., 2023). However, sustainable translation requires institutional support structures that legitimize experimentation, provide protected time for collaborative inquiry, and recognize knowledge creation activities as valuable professional contributions rather than additional burdens (Gui et al., 2025).

Implementation science principles reveal that successful theory-practice integration depends on systematic attention to adoption, implementation, and sustainability factors that operate at multiple organizational levels and require coordinated intervention strategies targeting individual capacity and systemic conditions. Adoption factors include teacher readiness assessment that identifies prerequisite knowledge and skills for specific theoretical applications, stakeholder engagement processes that build commitment to innovation among administrators and colleagues, and communication strategies that frame research-informed practices that align with

existing institutional values and priorities. Implementation factors encompass detailed guidance for practice adaptation that maintains theoretical integrity while accommodating contextual constraints, ongoing coaching and mentoring support that assists teachers through initial implementation challenges, and formative evaluation systems that provide rapid feedback on implementation quality and student response. Sustainability factors require policy alignment that supports innovative practices through evaluation and accountability systems, resource allocation that provides necessary materials and technology for continued implementation, and organizational culture development that values continuous improvement and evidence-based decision-making. Analysis of failed implementation attempts reveals common patterns, including insufficient attention to prerequisite conditions, inadequate support during initial implementation phases, and failure to address systemic barriers undermining innovative practices even when individual teachers demonstrate competence and commitment (Rangachari, 2020). Successful scaling of theory-practice integration requires networked implementation strategies that connect innovating teachers across institutions, providing peer support and collective problem-solving capacity while building communities of practice that sustain innovation beyond individual institutional contexts.

The synthesis addressing the fourth research question establishes that bridging theory-practice gaps requires systematic knowledge translation frameworks integrating collaborative inquiry, implementation science principles, and sustained institutional support within adaptive professional development ecosystems. This synthesis connects theoretical insights from cognitive-social constructivist integration, systematic assessment practices, and cultural-rhetorical responsiveness with practical implementation strategies through three essential mechanisms: collaborative knowledge construction processes that position teachers as research partners rather than research consumers, systematic adaptation protocols that maintain theoretical integrity while enabling contextual responsiveness, and networked professional learning communities that provide ongoing support for innovation and sustainability. The integration of findings from previous sections reveals that effective implementation requires simultaneous attention to individual teacher capacity development, institutional policy alignment, and systemic support structures, with particular emphasis on creating protected time and space for reflective practice, experimentation, and collegial dialogue. However, this synthesis acknowledges significant limitations in current understanding of how to scale

successful theory-practice integration across diverse institutional contexts, particularly in resource-constrained settings where systematic support structures may be difficult to establish and maintain. Future research must prioritize implementation science approaches that examine how successful integration models adapt across different educational systems, investigate the long-term sustainability of collaborative inquiry approaches, and develop scalable professional development frameworks that can operate effectively within existing institutional constraints while promoting gradual systemic transformation. The ultimate goal of theory-practice synthesis extends beyond improving individual teaching effectiveness to creating adaptive educational systems capable of continuous learning and improvement through systematic integration of research insights and practical wisdom.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review provides an initial framework for understanding how cognitive-social constructivist integration, systematic assessment practices, and cultural-rhetorical responsiveness can inform EFL writing pedagogy. The analysis reveals that effective writing instruction requires simultaneous attention to individual metacognitive development and collaborative meaning-making processes, with assessment serving as a mediating mechanism that guides instruction across proficiency levels. The synthesis demonstrates that cultural and rhetorical factors are integral to writing development rather than peripheral considerations. These necessitate pedagogical approaches that position diverse rhetorical traditions as resources rather than obstacles. However, the evidence indicates that meaningful integration of these dimensions remains challenging due to institutional constraints, resource limitations, and the complexity of translating theoretical insights into sustainable classroom practices.

Several methodological limitations constrain the generalizability and practical applicability of these findings. The single-author review process introduces potential selection and interpretation bias that may affect the comprehensiveness of the synthesis. Geographic representation is skewed toward East Asian contexts, limiting the transferability of findings to diverse educational systems and cultural traditions, particularly those in African, Latin American, and Indigenous communities. Most critically, the persistent gap between theoretical integration and practical implementation guidance reflects broader challenges in educational research translation, where complex frameworks remain difficult to operationalize in resource-constrained classroom

environments. These limitations suggest that the proposed integration should be viewed as a preliminary conceptual foundation rather than a definitive pedagogical prescription.

Future research must prioritize longitudinal investigations that examine how integrated instructional frameworks evolve across educational contexts and cultural settings, with particular attention to implementation sustainability and scalability. Systematic studies employing implementation science methodologies are essential for developing evidence-based professional development models that effectively translate theoretical insights into classroom practice across diverse geographic and institutional contexts. Research attention should expand significantly to include African educational traditions, Latin American pedagogical approaches, and Indigenous community learning systems, ensuring that theoretical frameworks reflect global rather than regionally concentrated perspectives. Additionally, collaborative inquiry approaches involving practitioners as co-researchers rather than passive recipients of academic knowledge represent a critical direction for bridging the theory-practice divide that continues to challenge EFL writing instruction effectiveness. Cross-cultural comparative studies examining how different educational traditions approach writing instruction integration could reveal alternative theoretical frameworks that challenge current Western-dominated paradigms and contribute to more inclusive pedagogical understanding. Such investigations will contribute to developing more responsive, culturally inclusive, and practically viable approaches to writing pedagogy that serve diverse learner populations across varied institutional contexts.

REFERENCES

Abdelwahab, A. (2022). Utilizing the Social Constructivist Approach via Online Learning Environments to Enhance English Majors' Critical Writing Skills. *مجلة البحث العلمى فى التربية*, *23*(10), 271–295. https://doi.org/10.21608/jsre.2023.183274.1534

Abdullateef, S. T., & Muhammedzein, F. (2021). Dynamic Assessment: A Complementary Method to Promote EFL Learning. *Arab World English Journal*, *12*(2), 279–293. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no2.19

Abel, M. D., & Saministrado, M. L. S. (2024). Writing Culture through Metatext: A Contrastive Analysis of Philippine English and Chinese English in ESL/EFL Research Articles. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, *5*(3), 44–66. https://doi.org/10.37745/bjmas.2022.0488

Ahmad, Z. (2020). Action Research in EFL: Exploring Writing Pedagogy Through a Task-based Lesson Delivery. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *11*(3), 379. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1103.06

Ajabshir, Z. F. (2024). Empowering EFL writing through digital storytelling: A quasi-experimental assessment of CALF measures and multidimensional engagement. *Acta Psychologica*, *250*, 104564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2024.104564

Algouzi, S. I., & Hazaea, A. N. (2023). Emergency remote teaching practices: Discourse analysis of EFL writing communicative event. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *10*(1), 706. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02195-8

Alramadan, M. M. (2022). Certainty and Subjectivity in English Education Research: A Cross Cultural Systemic Functional Analysis. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v10i1.4548

Altun, M. (2023). Developing Writing Abilities in L2: A Review. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies*, *10*(2). https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v10i2p175

Alzahrani, F. Y., Mohammed Alghamdi, E., & Qutob, M. M. S. (2021). *An Insight Into Female EFL Learners' Difficulties and Needs in Writing: The Case of Secondary High Schools in Saudi Arabia*. *2*, 343–359. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/mec2.25

Aniq, L. N., Drajati, N. A., & Fauziati, E. (2022). Covid-19 outbreak response: Tracing EFL teachers' beliefs & practices of TPACK in teaching writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *12*(1), 135–146. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46535

Argyropoulou, T., & Nina Zafiri, M.-. (2021). Improving the Writing Skills of EFL High School Learners through Alternative Methods of Assessment and Differentiated Instruction. *International Journal of English Language Education*, *9*(1), 142. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijele.v9i1.18572

Aromataris, E. C., & Munn, Z. (2020). Chapter 1: JBI Systematic Reviews. In *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. JBI. https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-02

Asnas, S. A. M., & Hidayanti, I. (2024). *Uncovering EFL Students' Frequent Difficulties in Academic Writing and the Coping Strategies: The Case of a College in Indonesia*. *14*(1), 124–151. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v14i1.7472

Bardis, B., Silman, F., & Mohammadzadeh, B. (2021). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Competence in an EFL Context for a Sustainable Learning Environment: A Case of Northern Cyprus. *Sustainability*, *13*(18), 10346. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810346

Bhowmik, S. (2021). Writing Instruction in an EFL Context: Learning to Write or Writing to Learn Language? *BELTA Journal*, *5*(1), 30–42. https://doi.org/10.36832/beltaj.2021.0501.03

Booth Olson, C., Maamuujav, U., Steiss, J., & Chung, H. (2023). Examining the Impact of a Cognitive Strategies Approach on the Argument Writing of Mainstreamed English Learners in Secondary School. *Written Communication*, *40*(2), 373–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/07410883221148724

Cao, S., Zhou, S., Luo, Y., Wang, T., Zhou, T., & Xu, Y. (2022). A review of the ESL/EFL learners' gains from online peer feedback on English writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 1035803. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1035803

Dang, S. (2024). Enhancing Cross-Cultural Understanding: The Role of Digital Platforms in Cultural Exchange for Chinese Graduate Students at Northwestern University. *Journal of Social Science Humanities and Literature*, *7*(5), 55–61. https://doi.org/10.53469/jsshl.2024.07(05).10

Fitrianingsih, I. (2024). Constructivism-based pathways: Revolutionizing EFL writing instruction for adult learners. *LingTera*, *11*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v11i1.70575

Fu, J., & Wang, Y. (2022). Inspecting EFL teachers' academic literacy development in multilingual contexts: A global vision. *Heliyon*, *8*(12), e12143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12143

Ghaicha, A. (2016). Theoretical Framework for Educational Assessment: A Synoptic Review. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(24), 212–231.

Gheith, A. G., Nassar, R. F., & Galil, M. A. A. G. H. A. A. (2024). A Constructivist Approach for Enhancing EFL Learners' Writing Fluency in a Blended Learning Context. *بحوث فى تدريس اللغات*, *26*(26), 194–249. https://doi.org/10.21608/ssl.2024.353043

Gui, M., Binti Siraj, S., & Biti Abdui Razak, R. (2025). Needs Analysis from Teachers' Experiences in Online Academic English Writing Model for Chinese EFL College Students. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *20*(01), 33–46. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v20i01.52353

Guo, Q. (2025). Exploring Teacher Assessment Conceptions in University EFL Writing Instruction. *SAGE Open*, *15*(1), 21582440251324746. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251324746

Haji, N. (2024). *Major Writing Difficulties Faced by Kurdish Learners of EFL in Academic Writing Classes*. *7*(1), 1230–1239. https://doi.org/10.31918/twejer.2471.46

Hall, S., & Leeder, E. (2024). Narrative reanalysis: A methodological framework for a new brand of reviews. *Research Synthesis Methods*, *15*(6), 1017–1030. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1751

Hang, N. T. T. (2021). Vietnamese upper-high school teachers' views, practices, difficulties, and expectations on teaching EFL writing. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *11*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v11i1.2228

Haq, M. N. U., Mahmood, M., & Awan, K. (2020). Assistance of Formative Assessment in the Improvement of English Writing Skills at Intermediate Level. *Global Language Review*, *V*(III), 34–41. https://doi.org/10.31703/glr.2020(V-III).04

He, H., & Wang, H. (2020). Integration of Social and Cognitive Genre in Syllabus Design of English Academic Writing Course for Chinese Graduate Learners: *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Education, Language and Inter-Cultural Communication (ELIC 2020)*. 2020 Conference on Education, Language and Inter-cultural Communication (ELIC 2020), Zhengzhou, P. R. China. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201127.050

He, M., & Wang, L. (2025). Implementing Assessment as Learning in Online EFL Writing Classes. *RELC Journal*, *56*(2), 468–482. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231224966

Huang, H.-W., Mills, D. J., & Tiangco, J. A. N. Z. (2024). Inquiry-Based Learning and Technology-Enhanced Formative Assessment in Flipped EFL Writing Instruction: Student Performance and Perceptions. *Sage Open*, *14*(2), 21582440241236663. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241236663

Hwang, W.-Y., Nurtantyana, R., Purba, S. W. D., Hariyanti, U., Indrihapsari, Y., & Surjono, H. D. (2023). *AI and Recognition Technologies to Facilitate English as Foreign Language Writing for Supporting Personalization and Contextualization in Authentic Contexts*. *61*(5), 1008–1035. https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331221137253

Ismail, S. M., Rahul, D. R., Patra, I., & Rezvani, E. (2022). Formative vs. summative assessment: Impacts on academic motivation, attitude toward learning, test anxiety, and self-regulation skill. *Language Testing in Asia*, *12*(1), 40. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00191-4

Jamnani, R. A., & Khodareza, M. R. (2020). Probing the Effect of Cognitive and Social Cognitive Approaches on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Fluency. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures*, *12*(4), 421–442. https://doi.org/10.47012/jjmll.12.4.1

Jiang, D., & Kalyuga, S. (2022). Learning English as a Foreign Language Writing Skills in

Collaborative Settings: A Cognitive Load Perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 932291. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.932291

Jwa, S. (2020). Korean EFL students' argumentative writing in L1 and L2: A comparative move analysis study. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique*, *19*(2), 217–230. https://doi.org/10.1108/ETPC-01-2019-0010

Khartite, B., Nadif, B., & Benfilali, I. (2021). Investigating the Persuasive Writing Performance of Moroccan Advanced EFL Students: Is it a problem of "Language" or 'Reasoning" Acquisition Device? *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *4*(5), 77–82. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.5.6

Kinyaduka, B. D. (2017). Why Are We Unable Bridging Theory-Practice Gap in Context of Plethora of Literature on Its Causes, Effects and Solutions? *Journal of Education and Practice*, *8*(6), 102–105.

Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*(1), 7–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.003

Latif, M. W., & Wasim, A. (2024). Investigating EFL instructors' approaches to classroom-based assessment culture: An explanatory sequential mixed-method approach. *Language Testing in Asia*, *14*(1), 57. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-024-00332-x

Li, S., Zhao, D., Huang, Y., & Han, D. (2025). Intercultural Rhetoric in IELTS-Style Argumentative Essays: Analyzing Moves and Cultural Influences Among English and Non-English Majors in a Chinese University. *International Journal of Linguistics*, *17*(2), 117. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v17i2.22827

Li, Y. (2023). The effect of online collaborative writing instruction on enhancing writing performance, writing motivation, and writing self-efficacy of Chinese EFL learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1165221. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1165221

Liu, C., & Chen, M. (2022). A genre-based approach in the secondary school English writing class: Voices from student-teachers in the teaching practicum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 992360. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.992360

Mallahi, O., & Saadat, M. (2020). Effects of Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' writing Development: Group Dynamic Assessment vs. Formative Assessment. *Iranian Evolutionary and Educational Psychology*, *2*(4), 258–277. https://doi.org/10.52547/ieepj.2.4.258

Meletiadou, E. (2021). Exploring the Impact of Peer Assessment on EFL Students' Writing

Performance. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, *9*(3), 77–95. https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.9.3.05

Muamaroh, M., Mukti, V. C., & Haryanti, D. (2020). The Process and Problems of EFL Learners in English Writing. *Ethical Lingua: Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, *7*(2), 405–418. https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.215

Mueller-Lyaskovets, T., & Horner, O. (2021). Integrating Formative Assessment with Foreign Language (English) Process Writing Instruction: Lessons from Two College Writing and Reading Classes in Germany. *Journal of Academic Writing*, *11*(1), 62–79. https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v11i1.499

Murtadho, F. (2021). Metacognitive and critical thinking practices in developing EFL students' argumentative writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(3). https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31752

Muslimin, A. I., Nur, M., & Francisca Maria, I. (2024). *Evaluating Cami AI Across SMAR Stages: Students' Achievement and Perceptions in EFL Writing Instruction*. *28*(2). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v28i2.4246

Naeem, M., Smith, T., & Thomas, L. (2025). Thematic Analysis and Artificial Intelligence: A Step-by-Step Process for Using ChatGPT in Thematic Analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *24*, 16094069251333886. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251333886

Nguyen, L. Q., & Le, H. V. (2024). Challenges in EFL Constructivist Classrooms From Teachers' Perspectives: A Case Study in Vietnam. *Sage Open*, *14*(2), 21582440241245187. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241245187

Nückles, M., Roelle, J., Glogger-Frey, I., Waldeyer, J., & Renkl, A. (2020). The Self-Regulation-View in Writing-to-Learn: Using Journal Writing to Optimize Cognitive Load in Self-Regulated Learning. *Educational Psychology Review*, *32*(4), 1089–1126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09541-1

Nurhayati, A. (2020). *The Implementation of Formative Assessment in EFL Writing: A Case Study at a Secondary School in Indonesia*. *8*(2), 126. https://doi.org/10.32332/pedagogy.v8i2.2263

Nurisma, R. A., Rohmana, W. I. M., Widyaningsih, T. L., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2024). Implementing double-entry journal assisted with Instagram to foster engagement in EFL writing. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *11*(1), 76–94.

https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i1.30425

Nurlatifah, L., & Yusuf, F. N. (2022). Students' Problems in Writing Analytical Exposition Text in EFL Classroom Context. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *10*(3), 801–810. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v10i3.6633

Okičić, M. (2024). Challenges in teaching Academic English to EFL students: A case study on writing beliefs. *Educational Role of Language Journal*, *2024–1*(11), 6–17. https://doi.org/10.36534/erlj.2024.01.01

Olga, K. (2024). Development of Cognitive Skills of Students When Writing for A Special Purpose. *Socialization & Human Development: International Scientific Journal*, *1*(1), 56–63. https://doi.org/10.37096/SHDISJ-23-1.1-0008

Orak, S. D., & Al-khresheh, M. H. (2021). In Between 21st Century Skills and Constructivism in ELT: Designing a Model Derived From a Narrative Literature Review. *World Journal of English Language*, *11*(2), 166. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v11n2p166

Patience, I. O. A. (2020). *Teaching Writing in Nigerian Secondary Schools: Teachers' Attitude Toward the Teaching of Writing and Their Writing Self-Efficacy*. *08*(01), 40–51. https://doi.org/10.12785/jtte/080105

Patty, J. (2024). Addressing Student Writing Challenges: A Review of Difficulties and Effective Strategies. *Education Journal: Journal Educational Research and Development*, *8*(2), 369–392. https://doi.org/10.31537/ej.v8i2.1938

Patty, J. (2025). What Lies Beneath Writer's Block? Exploring the Dimensions of Writing Anxiety. *Journal of Education Method and Learning Strategy*, *3*(02), 353–365. https://doi.org/10.59653/jemls.v3i02.1707

Patty, J., & Lekatompessy, F. M. (2025). Writing Difficulties of Accounting Students: A Cognitive, Linguistic, and Affective Analysis. *Koli Journal : English Language Education, 6*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.30598/koli.6.1.1-19

Pham, H. T. P. (2022). Computer-mediated and face-to-face peer feedback: Student feedback and revision in EFL writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *35*(9), 2112–2147. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1868530

Pham, T. N., Lin, M., Trinh, V. Q., & Bui, L. T. P. (2020). Electronic Peer Feedback, EFL Academic Writing and Reflective Thinking: Evidence From a Confucian Context. *Sage Open*, *10*(1), 2158244020914554. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020914554

Phuong, H. Y., Phan, Q. T., & Le, T. T. (2023). The effects of using analytical rubrics in peer and

self-assessment on EFL students' writing proficiency: A Vietnamese contextual study. *Language Testing in Asia*, *13*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-023-00256-y

Pratiwi, T. L. (2021). *EFL College Students Writing Anxiety of English Language Education at Universitas Internasional Batam*. *10*(2), 100–112. https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v10i2.42908

Rahimi, M., & Fathi, J. (2022). Exploring the impact of wiki-mediated collaborative writing on EFL students' writing performance, writing self-regulation, and writing self-efficacy: A mixed methods study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *35*(9), 2627–2674. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1888753

Rangachari, P. (2020). Understanding Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) Implementation in HCOs Through the Lens of Organizational Theory. *Journal of Healthcare Leadership*, *Volume 12*, 35–48. https://doi.org/10.2147/JHL.S258472

Said, S. B. M., & Almassry, F. A. M. (2025). The Impact of Arabic on English Writing among Libyan EFL Students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *14*(1), Pages 325-333. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v14-i1/24257

Santiago Schwarz, V., & Hamman-Ortiz, L. (2020). Systemic functional linguistics, teacher education, and writing outcomes for U.S. elementary English learners: A review of the literature. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *49*, 100727. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100727

Saputri, L. A., Anwar, K., & Maruf, N. (2023). Exploring the Impact of Differentiated Instruction on Students' Perception, Engagement, Motivation in EFL High School Education. *TELL-US JOURNAL*, *9*(3), 623–644. https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2023.v9i3.7380

Schenck, A. (2023). Examining the Impact of Subtle Cultural Differences on Rhetorical Variation in EFL Essays. *Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v8i1.2888

Setiawan, S., Suprapto, Sarmini, Munir, A., & Weda, S. (2023). "My class is mine, and I do it my way", empowering EFL teachers through theorizing practice. *XLinguae*, *16*(2), 183–199. https://doi.org/10.18355/XL.2023.16.02.14

Sowell, J. (2020). The Writing Process and Formative Assessment. *Crossings: A Journal of English Studies*, *11*, 272–286. https://doi.org/10.59817/cjes.v11i.64

Sujito, S., & Muttaqin, W. M. (2020). Integrating Instruction Approach with Learners' Cognitive

Style to Enhance EFL Indonesian Students' Writing Achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, *13*(1), 623–636. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13140a

Sujiyani, E. (2022). *The Rhetorical Moves in Indonesian EFL Graduate Students' Thesis Abstracts*. *2*(1), 55–71. https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v2i1.4043

Sukhera, J. (2022). Narrative Reviews: Flexible, Rigorous, and Practical. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *14*(4), 414–417. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00480.1

Sunengko, S. (2024). The Impact of CEFR-Aligned Writing Assessments on Enhancing ESL/EFL Learners' Writing Competence: A Comparative Analysis. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, *12*(2), 291–305. https://doi.org/10.36232/pendidikan.v12i2.7209

Teng, M. F., & Huang, J. (2023). The effects of incorporating metacognitive strategies instruction into collaborative writing on writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *43*(4), 1071–1090. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1982675

Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *8*(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45

Thongchalerm, S., & Jarunthawatchai, W. (2020). *The Impact of Genre Based Instruction on EFL Learners' Writing Development*. *13*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.1311a

Thuy, T. T. T., Hoa, N. T. M., & Nguyen, D. T. N. (2024). Cognitive Styles and Influences on Academic Writing: An Empirical Investigation among English Language Learners. *English Language Teaching*, *17*(10), 46. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v17n10p46

Tso, A. W. B. (2024). Challenges in Achieving Coherence and Cohesion: A Discourse Analysis of Chinese EFL Students' Essays. *Professional Discourse & Communication*, *6*(1), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.24833/2687-0126-2024-6-1-95-108

Wei, P., Wang, X., & Dong, H. (2023). The impact of automated writing evaluation on second language writing skills of Chinese EFL learners: A randomized controlled trial. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1249991. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1249991

Winarti, & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Collaborative writing and process writing approach: The effect and students perception. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, *5*(2). https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v5i2.773

Worathumrong, S. (2021). "How the Furby Coming is…": Interference of First Language and Culture in Thai EFL Learners' Paragraph Writing. *English Language Teaching*, *14*(10),

92. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n10p92

Xiao, Y., & Zhao, A. (2020). Individualized Learning in Context: Constructivists' Teaching Philosophy of Academic Writing for EAL Learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *10*(5), 360. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n5p360

Xu, J., & Liu, W. (2025). Language teachers' use of research in a textbook writing community of practice. *System*, *133*, 103736. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103736

Yang, M. (2024). Fostering EFL university students' motivation and self-regulated learning in writing: A socio-constructivist approach. *System*, *124*, 103386. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103386

Ye, W., & Liu, J. (2023). Exploring and modeling the reading-writing connection in EFL integrated writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1161272. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1161272

Yuzlu, M. Y., & Dikilitas, K. (2022). Translanguaging in the development of EFL learners' foreign language skills in Turkish context. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *16*(2), 176–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2021.1892698

Zarbafian, A., Abbasian, G.-R., Mohseni, A., & Baradaran, A. (2020). Synthesizing transformative education with dynamic assessment in developing EFL learners' productive skills. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *7*(1), 1750840. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2020.1750840

Zhang, L., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). Fostering Stance-Taking as a Sustainable Goal in Developing EFL Students' Academic Writing Skills: Exploring the Effects of Explicit Instruction on Academic Writing Skills and Stance Deployment. *Sustainability*, *13*(8), 4270. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084270

Zhang, L., Zhang, L. J., & Xu, T. S. (2023). Effects of teacher explicit instruction in stance-taking on students' perceptions of stance and on their academic writing beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1140050. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1140050