IJOLAE Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education

http://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/ijolae

Holistic Writing Module Through Integrated Feedback: Analysis of Target Situation and Learning Need

Husni Mubarok[1]✉, Haryanto[2], Taufiqurrahman[3], Harun Joko Prayitno[4], Shukor Sanim Mohd Fauzi[5], Clementine Salaun[6]

[1-3]Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teaching Sciences, Universitas Islam Nahdlatul Ulama Jepara, Indonesia

[4]Faculty of Education and Teaching Training, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

[5]Faculty of Computer and Mathematical Sciences, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia

[6]Faculty of Linguistics, Universite du Quebec a Montreal (UQÀM), Canada

DOI: 10.23917/ijolae.v8i2.17019

Received: February 20th, 2026. Revised: April 30th, 2026. Accepted: May 2nd, 2026

Available Online: May 14th, 2026. Published Regularly: May, 2026

Abstract

It is crucial for advanced writing learning to have learning modules that allow students to cultivate holistic writing skills through a integrated feedback method. Nonetheless, the current modules do not include a thorough needs assessment, which restricts their applicability and efficiency. An examination of the teaching module, focused on the specific context and learning requirements, provides a thorough framework to facilitate advanced writing learning. This research analyzed the requirements of both lecturers and students concerning a holistic writing module that incorporates integrated feedback, focusing on the target situation (needs and lacks) and learning needs (preferences). The research employs the ADDIE development framework, with a focus on the analysis phase. Data were collected via questionnaires, interviews, and observations, and subsequently analyzed qualitatively using descriptive statistics. The findings revealed that the mean score for the need for the teaching module was 3.29, whereas the mean score for the lack of it was 2.72. This indicates a need for additional development of the teaching module. Learning observation results support this information, with an average score of 2.45, categorized as good. Students require a holistic writing module that incorporates integrated feedback. This research suggests that teaching modules for English Language Teaching (ELT) should be designed through a learner-centered and technology-supported approach to support advanced learning, innovative learning design, and contextual literacy development in higher education. Future research should involve developing and evaluating writing module to verify their efficacy.

Keywords: advanced learning, ADDIE framework, holistic writing, innovative learning design, integrated learning, learning technology.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY license

✉***Corresponding Author:***

Husni Mubarok, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teaching Sciences, Universitas Islam Nahdlatul Ulama Jepara, Indonesia

Email: husni@unisnu.ac.id

1. Introduction

A holistic writing module that enables students to receive feedback, collaborate on their writing, and engage in reflective and higher-order learning processes is essential to support advanced learning in English language education. In fact, the existing writing modules do not provide students with

personalized input tailored to their specific needs, and the learning activities are not centered on collaborative learning. Besides that, the teaching module has the weakness of requiring a comprehensive needs analysis in its development (de Kleijn, 2023; Gay et al., 2020). This results in a significant issue: students' holistic writing skills remain weak. It is demonstrated by their poor performance in articulating the main idea and supporting details (Moreillon, 2007) which is shown by students' difficulty in choosing relevant concepts (Jago et al., 2025) and employing suitable language that aligns with the context of their work. Non-native learners continue to struggle with using appropriate language structures (Baig et al., 2021; Garim et al., 2023), and they also face difficulties in applying correct punctuation (Yulia & Agustiani, 2019) while neglecting the context of their writing and the discourse present in a text (Alfalagg, 2020; Nicholas & Blake, 2024).

To address these issues, it is essential to develop teaching modules that emphasize holistic principles. Learning modules should not be seen merely as a structured set of resources, but they are understood as knowledge beliefs that address the specific needs of students, and consider the dynamics of learning within the classroom (Ramadhan et al., 2020). In English language teaching curriculum, learning modules should answer the question of how well it addresses the genuine needs of students and promotes the active creation of knowledge, rather than merely the memorization of information (Fahruddin et al., 2025). Assertions that incorporating competency objectives can improve critical thinking skills need additional evaluation, as their success largely relies on the structure of assignments, the quality of feedback, and the chances for reflection offered in the course. Therefore, learning modules ought to function as both a connection between writing concepts and practical application, as well as a conversational environment that enables students to investigate ideas, refine their comprehension, and enhance their metacognitive awareness (Septiadevana & Abdullah, 2024). Without this approach, modules may become inflexible and overly technical, hindering their ability to thoroughly address the complexities of developing writing skills.

Writing involves students expressing their ideas, thoughts, and concepts through clear and accessible graphic symbols (Gebremariam & Hiluf, 2023; Laila et al., 2021). Holistic writing involves students paying attention not only to comprehension, grammar, and punctuation but also to the context of their ideas (Tate et al., 2024). Additionally, it is an approach that emphasizes the entire process, which encompasses planning, drafting, revising, and editing, rather than just the creation of the final text (Jacobs & Renandya, 2019). It is a writing ability that views writing as a holistic, interconnected process. This approach goes beyond merely focusing on technical elements like grammar, vocabulary, and spelling; it also emphasizes the importance of offering significant and contextual writing experiences (Alghizzi & Alshahrani, 2024). This method enhances learning innovation in writing by incorporating a thorough language theory that emphasizes the integration of language skills within meaningful contexts (Nunan, 2005; Usman & Anwar, 2021). This can improve students' critical thinking abilities by linking their knowledge to practical experiences and by engaging them in challenging learning situations that require reflection, collaboration, and problem-solving (Sutama et al., 2022). Consequently, a thorough

evaluation of writing skills can be conducted by examining vocabulary proficiency (Chung & Wan, 2025), grammatical accuracy (Aghajani & Adloo, 2018), mechanical elements (Abdelhalim & Alsahil, 2025), content, structure, and the context of the written material (Brown, 2007).

Offering feedback on writing can enhance student motivation, engagement, and comprehension (Thao & Thuy, 2025). Additionally, combining written feedback with conference discussions can enhance student collaboration in writing. This integration encourages dialogue and interaction between students and teachers to improve their writing skills. This is essential for promoting the holistic skill set of students (Salam, 2023), especially in writing, which includes various components such as the development of main ideas, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics (Nguyen & Renandya, 2024; Renandya & Widodo, 2016).

Numerous studies on the impact of feedback highlight its significant potential to enhance students' writing skills, language proficiency, and critical thinking (Kao et al., 2025). However, feedback must be tailored to the specific context and needs of the learners, rather than applied in a uniform manner (Shen & Chong, 2023). These enhancements will be most effective if the feedback is tailored to the specific challenges students are likely to encounter in real-life situations, including the type of text, academic criteria, and the context of language use (Feng et al., 2025). This way, students can develop skills that are not only broad but also pertinent to their future requirements (Thao & Thuy, 2025). Conversely, conducting a learning needs analysis is essential for pinpointing particular areas where students may be lacking, such as in language skills, writing techniques, or metacognitive preparedness, ensuring that the feedback given is customized and specific rather than generic (Weidlich et al., 2025). If these two analyses are not conducted, the effectiveness of feedback demonstrated in numerous studies may not be fully realized, as it may not align with the real needs of students or the requirements of the competencies that need to be met (Feng et al., 2025). Other studies suggest that conducting a needs analysis is essential for gathering initial data (Baig et al., 2021), identifying issues (Damayanti et al., 2024), and requirements (Nisa et al., 2023) when creating teaching modules. Research suggests that writing skills can be improved through various methods, including the implementation of specific writing strategies (Gay et al., 2020), the incorporation of digital technology (Shafiee, 2024), and genre-based writing techniques (Alodwan, 2021; Garim et al., 2023; Selvaraj & Aziz, 2019; Sulistiyo et al., 2021). Despite some progress, research on students' needs concerning the significance of writing modules focused on target situation analysis and learning needs analysis remains scarce. As a result, the creation of writing teaching modules in English Language Teaching (ELT) often lacks a comprehensive consideration of students' needs, lacks, and preferences. As a result, current teaching modules do not integrate written and verbal feedback to enhance holistic writing skills (Alfalagg, 2020; Mahfoodh, 2022; Shen & Chong, 2023).

There is still a significant pedagogical gap in the development of comprehensive writing modules, despite the growth of research on different writing techniques and the use of feedback (de Kleijn, 2023). Current modules often fail to support collaborative learning environments or provide individualized input, contributing to

students' ongoing deficiencies in expressing key concepts, using appropriate language structures, and maintaining contextual relevance. Although prior studies have independently demonstrated the significance of needs analysis and the effectiveness of feedback, there is a noticeable dearth of research on modules that integrate Target Situation Analysis (TSA) and Learning Needs Analysis (LNA) as a basis of developing innovative writing learning module (Mubarok et al., 2024). In particular, there is a limited previous study that has effectively combined written and oral conference comments into a single framework created by a thorough evaluation of student needs and current material deficiencies. This research is unusual because it synthesizes these diverse components to create holistic-writing learning module that fills the gap in complete, needs-based design. The mapping process involved two key considerations: analyzing the target situation to identify student needs and the shortcomings of existing teaching materials, and conducting a learning needs analysis to determine the types of teaching materials preferred by both students and lecturers (Yulia & Agustiani, 2019). These two indicators were subsequently categorized into three aspects: student needs, lack of existing teaching modules, and preferences for ideal teaching modules (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987) to create a thorough needs assessment for the design of teaching modules. This study presents a novel approach to develop holistic writing skills by mapping target situations and learning needs across three crucial aspects, student needs, current module gaps, and ideal module preferences. By highlighting the interwoven processes of planning, drafting, and revising within a meaningful, dialogic framework, this approach makes teaching writing more interesting to support innovative learning.

Building on the identified research gap, this study concentrates on analyzing the target situation and assessing learning needs, which are framed into three main objectives: 1) identifying the needs of teachers and students regarding teaching modules, 2) evaluating the shortcomings of existing teaching modules, and 3) determining preferences for ideal teaching modules. These goals can be categorized into TSA, which addresses needs and shortcomings, and LNA, which focuses on preferences.

2. Method

This study employed the ADDIE framework for development, which consists of five phases: analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. The aim is to develop and assess the effectiveness of the product (Borg & Gall, 2003). This design was selected due to its emphasis on the educational setting, particularly in the creation of teaching modules (Branch, 2024). This research centers on the initial phase of ADDIE: analysis. This aims to identify the requirements of both lecturers and students for developing teaching modules. Needs analysis is a crucial step in creating teaching modules for English language teaching, as it entails collecting detailed and specific data on the module in development (Yulia & Agustiani, 2019).

The participants in this research included two lecturers from the English language education program and students enrolled in that program, with a total sample size of 86, calculated using the Krejcie and Morgan formula (Chanuan et al., 2021). Participants among students were randomly selected by using simple random sampling for having completed the sentence-based

writing course, whereas lecturer participants were randomly chosen based on a minimum of five years of experience in teaching writing courses. This research was conducted at a private university located in Central Java Province, Indonesia.

Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and observations to assess the need for a comprehensive writing instruction module that emphasizes target situation analysis (TSA) and learning needs analysis (LNA). The target situation analysis identified the respondents' needs for the teaching module and highlighted the lack of existing teaching modules. Meanwhile, the learning needs analysis detailed the respondents' preferred teaching materials. Prior to utilizing the instrument for data collection, a validity test was carried out. This involved assessing content validity, which pertains to the appropriateness of each indicator and sub-indicator as related to TSA and LNA in the context of writing in ELT. Additionally, construct validity was evaluated, ensuring that the language used in creating the instrument is clear and comprehensible. The evaluation of the test was conducted by two experts, yielding a content validity score of 3.5 and a construct validity score of 3.7. The value range of 3.1 to 4.0 indicates that both instruments are valid for data collection. The metrics utilized in this study are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Indicators and Sub-Indicators of the Holistic Writing Module

No	Aspects	Instruments	Indicators	Sub-indicators
1	Target situation analysis	Questionnaire	Needs and lacks	Suitability of materials, teaching modules, writing learning, use of feedback, and holistic writing
		Interview	Needs and lacks	Writing materials, writing methods, use of feedback, holistic writing skills, and obstacles
		Observation	Needs and lacks	Learning stages, materials, teaching modules, collaborative activities, feedback, and holistic writing
2	Learning needs analysis	Questionnaire	Preferences	Suitability of materials, teaching modules, teaching writing, use of feedback, holistic writing

The gathered data was subsequently examined through the stages of data reduction, display, and verification as outlined by Miles and Huberman (Arifin et al., 2023). The participants' responses were sorted and categorized according to sub-indicators in the data reduction phase, the information was showcased using tables and graphs in the data presentation phase, and the gathered information was re-examined to confirm its completeness in the data verification stage. Subsequently, the collected data were examined through descriptive statistics, focusing on the count, mean, and percentage of the respondents' answer selections. Table 2 below presents the analysis of the average values related to the progression of the teaching module.

Table 2. Mean Value and Category

Mean Value	Category
1.0 – 2.0	No development needed
2.1 – 3.0	Need development
3.1 – 4.0	Need development

3. Result and Discussion

This section presents the findings and discussion of the needs analysis conducted as the initial phase of the ADDIE development framework. The analysis focused on identifying the actual conditions, learning challenges, and instructional expectations related to the development of a holistic writing module integrated with feedback strategies in English Language Teaching (ELT). The findings were categorized into two major components: Target Situation Analysis (TSA) and Learning Needs Analysis (LNA). TSA was employed to identify students' and lecturers' needs as well as the shortcomings of existing teaching materials, while LNA focused on exploring participants' preferences toward the design of an ideal writing module. These analyses provide an important foundation for developing learner-centered, context-based, and innovative learning materials that support advanced learning and holistic writing development.

a. Target Situation Analysis

Using the collected data, an analysis was performed on two key areas: target situation analysis (TSA), which examined two indicators, namely needs and lacks, and learning needs analysis (LNA), which concentrated on preferences. Needs pertain to what students must accomplish to comprehend and function effectively in the desired context (Fraenkel et al., 2012). Consequently, the needs section thoroughly examined students' writing abilities to determine particular requirements, specifically a holistic writing teaching module, as illustrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Needs in the Writing Module

No	Statements	Options				Total	Mean	P (%)
		4	3	2	1			
1	Writing materials are essential for academic purposes.	172	126	2	0	300	3.4	87.2
2	Writing materials aid in developing paragraph-level writing skills.	116	153	12	0	281	3.2	81.6
3	The teaching materials are organized thoroughly and present a cohesive structure.	128	144	12	0	284	3.3	82.5
4	Teaching materials for writing are introduced through a variety of writing activities, which include: 1) building knowledge of the field (BKOF), 2) modeling of the texts (MOT), 3) joint construction of the text (JCOT), and 4) independent construction of the text (ICOT).	116	156	10	0	282	3.2	81.9
5	This writing approach emphasizes practice over theory.	120	132	24	0	276	3.2	80.2
6	Teaching writing requires students to engage in active collaboration.	88	144	30	1	263	3.0	76.4
7	Feedback comes in various forms, including both written and spoken.	154	138	2	0	294	3.4	85.4
8	I can enhance my writing through feedback from lecturers and fellow students.	148	141	4	0	293	3.4	85.1
9	Specific feedback is intended solely to enhance writing.	124	132	22	0	278	3.2	80.8
10	Some activities progressively enhance writing abilities, moving from sentences to	176	123	2	0	301	3.5	87.5

No	Statements	Options				Total	Mean	P (%)
		4	3	2	1			
	paragraphs.							
11	Writing enhances students' planning, drafting, and refining skills.	168	129	2	0	299	3.4	86.9
12	Learning integrates elements such as content, structure, vocabulary, language (grammar), writing techniques, and writing context.	132	153	4	0	287	3.3	83.4
13	Techniques for integrating presentation abilities and analytical reasoning.	188	87	14	3	292	3.3	84.8
						Average	**3.29**	**83.36**
Category							**Need development**	

According to Table 3, the average value for teaching materials was 3.29, representing 83.36%. The average value was then entered into Table 2, which classified it as needing development because it fell within the 3.1 to 4.0 range. This suggests developing a holistic writing teaching module that aligns with the identified needs.

The sub-indicator for material suitability, as reflected in statements 1 and 2, indicates that the demand for comprehensive writing teaching modules is satisfied by the suitability of the content and an organized learning framework. Students perceive the material not just as information, but also as a tool to enhance their academic performance, highlighting its practical importance in their learning process. The different writing levels, including sentences, paragraphs, and essays, indicate that the learning process is structured in stages that align with students' skill development. This corresponds with the epistemic stage, in which students start to use language on their own. Conversely, the demand for teaching modules that incorporate the stages of BKOF, MOT, JCOT, and ICOT highlights the significance of a process-oriented method in writing instruction (Gao, 2025). This point is reinforced by the idea that gradual learning facilitates effective support, enabling students to transition from reliance to autonomy (Chvala, 2020). Consequently, the suitability of the material, innovative learning design, and scaffolded learning stages are interrelated factors that together influence the effectiveness of holistic writing instruction and promote meaningful student engagement (Jiang, 2022).

The feedback utilization sub-indicator, reflected in statements 7 to 9, shows that the demand for holistic writing teaching materials is significantly impacted by the incorporation of feedback and the recognition of writing as an all-encompassing process. Students acknowledge that feedback in written form and during conferences, whether from instructors or classmates, is vital for pinpointing areas that need enhancement, which directly influences the quality of their writing. This underscores the importance of consistent and focused feedback as a key element of the writing learning process. Additionally, the importance of a holistic approach to writing highlights that writing skills should not be divided into isolated components. Instead, they should integrate language communication, grammar, spelling, ideas, organization, and contextual discourse as an interconnected whole, reflecting the perspective that writing is an ongoing

process (Al-ghaithi & Behforouz, 2023; Park & Ahn, 2022). The connections between variables are clear, as the quality of feedback affects the mastery of writing components, which subsequently enhances students' holistic writing abilities. In other words, feedback acts as an essential link between the learning process and the production of higher-quality writing.

This is consistent with earlier studies that indicate the importance of needs analysis for addressing deficiencies in teaching modules (Gebremariam & Hiluf, 2023) and for guiding the development of teaching modules that are tailored to the characteristics and requirements of students (Ratri & Tyas, 2022). Furthermore, this needs analysis can provide an overview of what students must master in real-world situations (Septiadevana & Abdullah, 2024), particularly concerning holistic writing skills and the use of feedback in their writing.

Table 4. The Lack of a Writing Module

No	Statements	Options				Total	Mean	P (%)
		4	3	2	1			
1	Writing materials do not comply with the relevant curriculum guidelines.	68	69	62	15	214	2.4	62.2
2	Writing materials do not conform to international academic writing standards.	60	45	86	13	204	2.3	59.3
3	Writing modules are insufficiently diverse in their activities.	92	69	66	7	234	2.7	68
4	Writing modules currently lack collaborative activities for students.	52	108	62	6	228	2.6	66.2
5	Teaching writing focuses more on theory than on practical application.	100	54	74	6	234	2.7	68
6	Teaching writing has not been systematically structured to align with the various stages of learning.	84	72	78	2	236	2.7	68.6
7	Students engage in writing lessons emphasizing personal tasks rather than collaborative efforts.	80	129	44	1	254	2.9	73.8
8	I seldom get feedback during my writing classes.	120	57	70	2	249	2.8	72.3
9	Feedback is solely of a general kind.	108	75	60	4	247	2.8	71.8
10	Feedback is not provided cohesively in both written and spoken forms.	88	63	74	6	231	2.6	67.1
11	My writing abilities are still not very strong.	60	147	40	2	249	2.8	72.3
12	I am still having trouble coming up with ideas for my writing.	48	195	14	2	259	3.0	75.2
13	The challenges I encounter involve combining elements of content, structure, vocabulary, language (grammar), writing mechanics, and the context of the written work.	84	159	24	0	267	3.1	77.6
Average							**2.72**	**69.41**
Category							**Need development**	

According to Table 4 above, the average value for the lack of teaching materials was 2.72, corresponding to 69.41%. The average value was then entered into Table 2, which

classified it as needing development because it fell within the 2.1-3.0 range. This suggests that there are still several weaknesses, particularly concerning the appropriateness of materials, teaching modules, writing skills development, the use of feedback, and a holistic approach to writing. Thus, developing a holistic writing teaching module that addresses the identified gaps is essential.

In teaching material relevance, it has been established that writing teaching materials are only partially aligned with the requirements of the Outcome-Based Education (OBE) curriculum. While these materials have contributed to achieving learning outcomes, they have not been consistently incorporated into teaching practices or aligned with international writing standards (Setiawan, 2026). From an analytical perspective, this situation highlights a discrepancy between curriculum design and its execution in the classroom, resulting in the materials utilized being inadequate for effectively fostering measurable writing competencies and meeting global standards (Harjanti et al., 2026). Evidence backing this conclusion comes from interview results, which highlight that the inadequate execution of Outcome-Based Education (OBE) and the absence of adherence to international standards are major barriers to enhancing the quality of writing instruction. Therefore, there is a need for teaching materials that are not only contextual but also aligned with OBE principles and global academic writing standards. The connection between different variables is clear in how the appropriateness of materials aligns with the OBE curriculum, the quality of teaching delivery, and the achievement of international writing standards. A lack of alignment in any one area will have a direct effect on the others. Essentially, the success of writing instruction is largely influenced by how well materials, teaching methods, and assessment criteria are cohesively integrated into a advanced learning framework.

In the teaching module sub-indicator, it suggests that while the teaching module includes a range of activities aimed at fostering student involvement, its execution has not effectively promoted collaborative writing and feedback-based learning. As a result, the opportunity for such engagement remains suboptimal. The lack of collaborative opportunities and the prevalence of verbal feedback from lecturers result in shallower student reflection processes, as informal input is often quickly forgotten (Abdelhalim & Alsahil, 2025).

As mentioned in statements 5, 6, and 7, the teaching writing sub-indicator shows that lecturers have provided space for students to engage in more practical writing-oriented learning. This situation reinforces the idea that enhancing writing skills necessitates varied, recorded, and consistent feedback to genuinely elevate writing quality. Conversely, even though lecturers have allowed time for writing exercises, the restricted class duration creates a disparity between theory and practice. This leads to a disconnect, with theory being covered in class and practice taking place outside of it, ultimately diminishing the overall effectiveness of the learning experience.

The feedback utilization sub-indicator, highlighted in statements 9 and 10, indicates that lecturers' feedback typically involves direct conferencing, during which they provide verbal guidance to help students improve their writing. This can occasionally lead students to overlook topics that require review. Additionally, student involvement in providing feedback remains limited. The holistic writing sub-indicator demonstrates a

significantly higher average value than other metrics. This suggests that students continue to struggle with holistic writing skills, as they have difficulty elaborating on their ideas comprehensively and considering a text's context or discourse. They have primarily concentrated on individual aspects of writing, such as vocabulary, grammar, mechanics, and organization. This is consistent with the findings from the interviews, which show that the emphasis in teaching writing has primarily been on elements that students can easily grasp, such as vocabulary, grammar, and punctuation.

The findings from this weakness analysis are consistent with those of other studies that have identified several common shortcomings in teaching materials. These include failure to align with the relevant curriculum to meet learning goals properly (Baig et al., 2021), a disconnect between specific teaching methods and their application in learning activities (Lee et al., 2008), and an absence of a holistic approach to teaching writing skills that addresses all facets of writing (Darmayenti et al., 2021; Muliastuti et al., 2023).

Table 5. Observation Results of Teaching Writing

No	Aspects	Lecturer 1	Lecturer 2	Mean
1	Learning stages	3.5	3.5	3.5
2	Materials	3	2	2.5
3	Teaching modules	2	2.5	2.25
4	Collaborative activities	2	2	2
5	Feedback	2	3	2.5
6	Holistic writing	2	2	2
Average				**2.45**
Category				**Good**

The data in Table 5 indicates that the mean learning score for the two lecturers was 2.45. The average score, which falls between 2.1 and 3.0, suggests that the two lecturers' teaching of writing was regarded as effective. In the learning phase, the instructors followed the pre-established syllabus, which included activities such as building knowledge of the field (BKOF), modelling of the text (MOT), joint construction of the text (JCOT), and individual construction of the text (ICOT). Nevertheless, students have not had the opportunity to work together during the JCOT phase, thereby reducing their involvement in learning activities. Lecturers emphasize theoretical teaching in their writing lessons, whereas practical writing tasks are offered via the learning management system. This leads to students having limited opportunities to understand that writing is a process, due to insufficient input and encouragement from their lecturers.

The teaching materials lecturers use are based on outdated references and cover topics such as subject-verb agreement, sentence fragments, run-on sentences, sentence variation, and clauses. These materials mainly focus on writing theory and offer limited chances for students to engage in writing practice. Additionally, the materials provided have not been tailored to the students' learning requirements, as they need writing materials to prepare for their final project or paper. Additionally, there is a lack of collaboration among students in writing lessons and when implementing feedback. The only form of feedback given by lecturers is verbal direct feedback.

Students continue to find it challenging to enhance their writing, even when they receive feedback. Lecturers have not yet covered holistic writing, as evidenced by the materials used and the highlighted writing elements. The focus of the observations on writing was limited to vocabulary, grammar, structure, and organization, while the text's context or discourse was not considered.

These findings are consistent with other studies indicating that learning observations are essential for pinpointing areas of weakness in learning (Fahruddin et al., 2025) and offer an overview of the lecturer's current teaching practices (Rahman et al., 2017). Learning observations can serve as a tool for reflecting on the teaching process, helping to pinpoint areas for enhancement in future teaching (Wang & Lam, 2024).

b. Learning Needs Analysis

Learning Needs Analysis (LNA) was conducted to identify students' and lecturers' preferences regarding the development of a holistic writing module integrated with feedback strategies. Unlike Target Situation Analysis (TSA), which focuses on identifying needs and existing gaps, LNA emphasizes the learning conditions, instructional preferences, and expected learning experiences required to support effective writing instruction. This analysis is essential in designing learner-centered teaching materials that align with advanced learning principles, collaborative learning practices, and innovative instructional design in ELT contexts.

The analysis specifically explored participants' preferences concerning material suitability, module format, instructional activities, collaborative writing practices, and feedback integration. In addition, the analysis examined the extent to which students expected learning experiences that promote holistic writing skills, contextual understanding, critical reflection, and active engagement in the writing process. The results of the Learning Needs Analysis are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Preferences of Writing Module

No	Aspects	Responses
1	Suitable materials with	Study program curriculum: 7 National curriculum: 4 Both: 75
2	Kinds of teaching module	Printed: 17 Digital: 45 Both: 24
3	Components of the teaching module	Complete: 82 Not complete: 4
4	Contents of teaching module	Combination of materials, images, tables, charts, learning activities, and exercises: 72 Others: 14
5	Teaching activities are presented in	Varied manner: 85 Non-varied manner: 1
6	Writing activities	Collaboration: 41 Non-collaboration: 34 Both: 11
7	Feedback	peer-feedback: 1 teacher-feedback: 9 Both: 76
8	Kinds of feedback	Teacher written feedback: 10 Teacher-student conferencing: 3

No	Aspects	Responses
		Both: 73
9	Types of feedback	Direct feedback: 66 Indirect feedback: 20
10	Feedback is presented in	Integrated between teacher-written feedback and teacher-student conferencing with direct and indirect: 83 Not integrated: 3
11	Emphasis on holistic writing skills that include content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and writing mechanism	Agree: 84 Disagree: 2
12	Holistic writing skills based on context and/or text type	Agree: 82 Disagree: 4

According to Table 6, students show a preference for materials that are consistent with the national curriculum and relevant to their study programs, suggesting a significant connection between content alignment and the perceived value of learning. This alignment not only guarantees adherence to educational policies but also increases the cognitive relevance of the content, ultimately boosting student motivation and engagement. The availability of digital modules, accessible via mobile devices and offline platforms, demonstrates the integration of learning technology in supporting flexible, accessible, and student-centered writing instruction. This, in turn, reinforces the connection between the accessibility of learning resources and the level of student engagement with the materials. Additionally, the thoroughness of the module elements showcased through various formats (such as tables, figures, and graphs) reflects the incorporation of effective instructional design and the clear organization of the learning framework, which influences students' grasp of concepts. The inclination towards diverse and cooperative learning experiences, especially in writing and feedback, suggests that social interaction is essential for enhancing writing abilities. This is further supported by students' inclination towards receiving both peer and teacher feedback, which improves their emotional comfort and enhances the quality of revisions by combining written comments with verbal explanations. Additionally, students' requests for writing learning that extends beyond mechanical skills to encompass context and discourse highlights the connection between a holistic learning approach and a significant enhancement in writing proficiency (Haerazi et al., 2019; Samsudin et al., 2021).

Developing a teaching module that starts with a needs analysis establishes a solid basis for identifying development analysis, shortcomings of existing teaching modules, and participants' learning preferences (Heong et al., 2020). Needs analysis plays a vital role in the creation of teaching modules, as it offers educators detailed insights into the specific context and the learning requirements of their students (Poonpon, 2021).

These results indicate that the quality of writing teaching modules depends on how well the study program's curriculum aligns with international writing standards (D'Addario, 2025). This alignment not only fosters students' global communication skills but also increases the significance of their academic learning (Kurniawati et al., 2021). This relationship is reinforced by a holistic writing learning strategy that highlights not only linguistic features but also the discourse context, communication objectives, and

feedback, allowing students to create impactful written work. From a pedagogical perspective, the structured arrangement of activities across the stages of BKOF, MOT, JCOT, and ICOT illustrates a distinct connection between gradual support and enhanced student comprehension (Mashfufah et al., 2019). This transition from model-based to intention-based learning aligns with the principles of advanced learning in ELT, especially in promoting both collaborative and independent learning. Additionally, the level of intensity in writing exercises connects activity design to fostering creativity and critical thinking skills. When students have ample chances to write in different contexts, they not only absorb language structures but also enhance their skills in forming arguments and articulating their thoughts thoughtfully (Samsudin et al., 2021). In the meantime, multimodal feedback combines the contributions of teachers and peers through both written remarks and verbal explanations, serves as a supportive tool that enhances the quality of revisions and boosts student involvement in the learning process (Feng et al., 2025). Consequently, the combination of curriculum alignment, structured instructional design, thorough practice, and cohesive feedback creates a comprehensive learning environment that is flexible and compatible with the requirements of advanced learning stages in ELT.

These results indicate that students' overall writing abilities are primarily influenced by the interaction between their comprehension of context and discourse and their proficiency in language (Alghizzi & Alshahrani, 2024). In this dynamic, context acts as a key factor that shapes their choices in language, organization of ideas, and overall text structure (Sari et al., 2023). When students can relate written material to relevant contexts, they improve their educational literacy, discourse awareness, and the coherence and structural suitability of their academic writing. On the other hand, a poor grasp of context leads to a series of issues in writing, including incorrect tense usage, mechanical mistakes, underdeveloped ideas, and inconsistent organization (Bulqiyah et al., 2021). This indicates that linguistic issues are actually reflections of a failure to comprehend discourse. These findings highlight that, in the context of comprehensive learning, language acquisition is inherently linked to social context and communicative goals. Therefore, it is essential for learning to incorporate discourse analysis as a fundamental element. This is in harmony with the principles of advanced learning in ELT, which prioritize higher-order thinking skills, critical reflection, and contextual awareness as essential competencies. Here, students are taught not just to write correctly, but also to write suitably and strategically based on the context of communication (Wang & Lam, 2024). Therefore, the interplay among understanding context, coherence, text structure (Wu et al., 2025), and linguistic accuracy creates a holistic writing proficiency framework, where deficiencies in any one aspect can affect the overall quality of students' writing (Dewi et al., 2021).

These results indicate that the quality of feedback in writing learning is not a singular concept; instead, it depends on the collaborative interaction of different types of feedback that work together as a supportive learning system. The integration of teacher and peer feedback strikes a balance between academic expertise and social interaction (Spilles et al., 2025). Teacher feedback offers structured and objective guidance, while peer feedback delivers a more relatable and contextual viewpoint, ultimately

enhancing student engagement and enjoyment in the learning process. This connection is enhanced by combining written feedback with verbal discussions. Written feedback serves as a lasting mental reference, while verbal interactions provide lively clarifications, allowing students to not only receive information but also to engage with and understand it on a deeper level. Additionally, the integration of both direct and indirect feedback reveals a causal link between the extent of explicit correction and the growth of learning autonomy (Alfalagg, 2020; Khan & Khan, 2024). Direct feedback speeds up the recognition of errors in specific areas like grammar and mechanics, whereas indirect feedback fosters critical thinking and self-reflection. In the context of comprehensive writing education, the incorporation of different types of feedback acts as a governing tool that links the linguistic, cognitive, and social dimensions of writing. This is in accordance with the principles of advanced learning in ELT, which highlight the significance of independence, critical reflection, and collaboration as essential elements for advanced learning. Therefore, the greater the integration and variety of feedback strategies employed, the more significant the effect on the quality of revisions, depth of understanding, and overall advancement of students' writing skills (Chou & Zou, 2020).

4. Conclusion

The key finding of this study indicates that the quality of the Holistic Writing Module using Integrated Feedback is predominantly influenced by the combination of Target Situation Analysis (TSA) and Learning Needs Analysis (LNA), which serve as the basis for its development. The main discoveries reveal a notable disparity between the requirements of real-life scenarios, which necessitate contextual, organized, and flexible writing abilities, and the current module's failure to fully meet these demands. Simultaneously, LNA indicates that students need not only high-quality writing but also an engaging, reflective, and ongoing learning experience facilitated by diverse forms of feedback. In this context, integrated feedback is essential for connecting learning needs with the demands of real-world performance. It facilitates gradual improvement and enhances metacognitive awareness in writing. This study highlights that effective writing instruction should be holistic, tailored to needs, and grounded in context, rather than being incomplete or disjointed. Therefore, the primary contribution of this study is to demonstrate that module design grounded in comprehensive needs analysis and continuous integrated feedback can support advanced learning, innovative learning design, educational literacy, and technology-enhanced writing instruction in ELT. Future research should involve developing and evaluating writing module to verify their effectivenenss based this need analysis.

5. References

Abdelhalim, S. M., & Alsahil, A. A. (2025). Supervisory written feedback in ELT practicum: exploring content, linguistic features, and perceptions of preservice teachers. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04498-4

Aghajani, M., & Adloo, M. (2018). The Effect of Online Cooperative Learning on Students' Writing Skills and Attitudes through Telegram Application. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(3), 433–448. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11330a

Al-ghaithi, A., & Behforouz, B. (2023). The

effect of corrective feedback via a computerized course on omani EFL learners writing performance. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, *24*(1), 74–87. https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.1025572

Alfalagg, A. R. (2020). Impact of Teacher-Student Writing Conferences on Frequency and Accuracy of Using Cohesive Devices in EFL Students' Writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00104-z

Alghizzi, T. M., & Alshahrani, T. M. (2024). Effects of grading rubrics on EFL learners' writing in an EMI setting. *Heliyon*, *10*(18), e36394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e36394

Alodwan, T. A. A. (2021). The Effect of Using Telegram Application on Improving Writing Skill for the Students of English as a Foreign Language. *Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online*, *20*(6), 847–856. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.06.092

Arifin, S., Sutama, Aryani, S. A., Prayitno, H. J., & Waston. (2023). Improving the professional teacher competence through clinical supervision based on multicultural values in pesantren. *Nazhruna: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *6*(3), 386–402. https://doi.org/10.31538/nzh.v6i3.4037

Baig, S., Javed, F., Siddiquah, A., & Khanam, A. (2021). A content analysis of English textbook of Punjab textbook board of grade 8 in Pakistan. *SAGE Open Journal*, *11*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211023159

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. . (2003). *Educational research; an introduction* (7th ed.). Pearson Education International.

Branch, R. M. (2024). Instructional Design; The ADDIE Approach. In *Digital Learning: The Key Concepts*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429425240-105

Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Pearson Education International.

Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M. A., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: tertiary students' perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *4*(1), 61. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i1.2371

Chanuan, U., Kajohnsak, C., & Nittaya, S. (2021). Sample Size Estimation using Yamane and Cochran and Krejcie and Morgan and Green Formulas and Cohen Statistical Power Analysis by G*Power and Comparisons. *Apheit International Journal*, *10*(2), 77–88.

Chou, C. Y., & Zou, N. B. (2020). An analysis of internal and external feedback in self-regulated learning activities mediated by self-regulated learning tools and open learner models. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00233-y

Chung, E., & Wan, A. (2025). Examining the use of academic vocabulary in first-year ESL undergraduates' writing: A corpus-driven study in Hong Kong. *Assessing Writing*, *63*(October 2024), 100913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2024.100913

Chvala, L. (2020). Teacher ideologies of english in 21st century norway and new directions for locally tailored Elt. *System*, *94*, 102327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102327

D'Addario, M. (2025). A taxonomy of standardized terms for generative AI use in the composition classroom. *Discover Education*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-025-00655-8

Damayanti, I. L., Derinalp, P., Asyifa, F., &

Suryatama, K. (2024). Exploring English for academic purposes program: needs analysis and impact evaluation. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *11*(3), 1616–1635. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i3.38329

Darmayenti, Besral, & Yustina, L. S. (2021). Developing EFL religious characters and local wisdom based Efl textbook for Islamic higher education. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(1), 157–180. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.18263

de Kleijn, R. A. M. (2023). Supporting student and teacher feedback literacy: an instructional model for student feedback processes. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(2), 186–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1967283

Dewi, C. A., Erna, M., Martini, Haris, I., & Kundera, I. N. (2021). Effect of contextual collaborative learning based ethnoscience to increase student's scientific literacy ability. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, *18*(3), 525–541. https://doi.org/10.36681/tused.2021.88

Fahruddin, F., Kurniawanti, M. R., Nurgiansah, T. H., & Gularso, D. (2025). Development of Teaching Materials for Evaluating History Learning to Improve Students' Critical Thinking Skills. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *19*(1), 530–541. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v19i1.20882

Feng, Q., Li, W., Zhu, X., & Li, X. (2025). Exploring the effects of elaborated and motivational feedback on learning engagement in online scripted role discussion. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00499-6

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. Mc Grew Hill.

Gao, Y. (2025). Deep learning-based strategies for evaluating and enhancing university teaching quality. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *8*(January). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100362

Garim, I., Latief, N., Amaliah, S., & Garing, J. (2023). Writing with cultural insight: elevating analytical exposition through local culture and project-based learning. *International Journal of Language Education*, *7*(4), 711–728. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i4.58368

Gay, M., Ahmad, I., & Ismail, J. (2020). Bari culture: an integrated-collaborative learning strategy of writing exposition text. *Langua: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Education*, *3*(2), 18–25. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4047251

Gebremariam, H. T., & Hiluf, B. (2023). Using Need-based Writing Instruction through Self-Reflection to Improve Students' Writing Difficulties: A Counterbalanced Design. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *5*(May), 100293. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100293

Haerazi, H., Prayati, Z., & Vikasari, R. M. (2019). Practicing contextual teaching and learning (CTL) approach to improve students' reading comprehension in relation to motivation. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, *8*(1), 139. https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v8i1.2011

Harjanti, F. D., Ardiansyah, R., & Suryandari, S. (2026). Implementing the Pancasila student profile through the Merdeka curriculum: a case study from Surabaya in advancing SDG 4. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *13*(January 2025), 102728. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2026.102

728

Heong, Y. M., Yunos, J. M., Othman, W., Hassan, R., Kiong, T. T., & Mohamad, M. M. (2020). The needs analysis of learning higher order thinking skills for generating ideas. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *59*, 197–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.265

Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning Centered Approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Jacobs, G. M., & Renandya, W. A. (2019). Student Centered Cooperative Learning: Linking Concepts in Education to Promote Student Learning. In *Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.*

Jago, L. S., Monaghan, P., Alcock, K., & Cain, K. (2025). The effect of preschool vocabulary and grammar on early reading comprehension and word reading: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, *47*(August 2024), 100680. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2025.100680

Jiang, Y. (2022). Evaluation of pedagogical impact of business English textbooks on teaching critical thinking skills. *Heliyon*, *8*(11). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11419

Kao, C. W., Reynolds, B. L., Zhang, X., & Wong, M. P. (2025). The effectiveness of unfocused corrective feedback on second language student writers' acquisition of English article, prepositional and verb tense usages. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05126-x

Khan, M. O., & Khan, S. (2024). Influence of online versus traditional learning on EFL listening skills: a blended mode classroom perspective. *Heliyon*, *10*(7), e28510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28510

Kurniawati, L., Wahyono, E., & Mulyasari, E. (2021). Analysis of learning material for elementary. *Ethical Lingua*, *8*(1), 126–134.

Laila, A., Asri Budiningsih, C., & Syamsi, K. (2021). Textbooks based on Local Wisdom to Improve Reading and Writing Skills of Elementary School Students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *10*(3), 886–892. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i3.21683

Lee, T. H., Shen, P. Di, & Tsai, C. W. (2008). Applying Web-enabled Problem-based Learning and Self-regulated Learning to add Value to Computing Education in Taiwan's Vocational Schools. *Educational Technology and Society*, *11*(3), 13–25.

Mahfoodh, O. H. A. (2022). Factors Influencing Efl Students' Utilisation of Teacher Written Feedback. *Teflin Journal*, *33*(1), 98–122. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v33i1/98-122

Mashfufah, A., Nurkamto, J., Sajidan, Wiranto, & Novenda, I. L. (2019). Conceptual: digital book in the era of digital learning approaches (DLA). *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, *243*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/243/1/012107

Moreillon, J. (2007). *Collaborative Strategies for Teaching Reading*.

Mubarok, H., Anif, S., & Prayitno, H. J. (2024). Local Content Through Integrated Collaborative Learning: A Survey of Teaching Materials Needs. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *14*(4), 271. https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0102

Muliastuti, L., Mayuni, I., Nurhaina, A., & Saddhono, K. (2023). Tailoring CEFR to BISOL (Bahasa Indonesia for Speakers of Other Languages) : A Model for Integrative Language Teaching Materials. *International Journal of Language Education*, *7*(4),

590–601. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v7i4.53219

Nguyen, M. T. T., & Renandya, A. W. (2024). *Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*. Elsevier Ltd.

Nicholas, A., & Blake, J. (2024). Profiling learner development with a computerized dynamic assessment of a Japanese learner's L2 email writing. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, *3*(3), 100164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2024.100164

Nisa, K., Ramadhan, S., & Thahar, H. E. (2023). Writing scientific articles for undergraduate students: a need analysis. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *12*(3), 1696–1704. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v12i3.24999

Nunan, D. (2005). *Task-Based Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Park, J. H., & Ahn, S. (2022). L2 learners' cognitive and behavioral engagement with written corrective feedback. *English Teaching*, *77*(3), 133–152. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.77.3.202209.133

Poonpon, K. (2021). Professional development needs of in-service English language teachers in Thailand. *Thaitesol Journal*, *34*(2), 1–25.

Rahman, H., Thalib, S. B., & Mahmud, A. (2017). Integrated character education in social sciences with contextual teaching and learning approach. *New Educational Review*, *48*(2), 53–64. https://doi.org/10.15804/tner.2017.48.2.04

Ramadhan, S., Indriyani, V., Asri, Y., & Sukma, E. (2020). Design of Learning Modules Writing Narrative Text Based on Project Based Learning (PjBL) by Using Mobile Devices. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1471*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1471/1/012029

Ratri, D. P., & Tyas, P. A. (2022). Review locally tailored ELT textbooks to meet primary students' need: Textbooks development. *Journal of English Educators Society*, *7*(2), 145–153. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v7i2.1667

Renandya, W. A., & Widodo, H. P. (2016). *English Language Teaching Today*. Springer.

Salam. (2023). Pendekatan Holistik dan Terintegrasi dalam Mengembangkan Keterampilan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia. *Didaktika: Jurnal Kependidikan*, *12*(1), 71–86.

Samsudin, D., Ansas, V. N., & Triarisanti, R. (2021). The representation of cultural values in Korean as a foreign language (KFL) textbook. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(3), 628–638. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31749

Sari, W. S., Faruk, & Hurley, U. (2023). Reading stories for pleasure: an insight into Indonesian university students' practice in online reading platforms. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 430–442. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i2.63076

Selvaraj, M., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). Systematic Review: Approaches in Teaching Writing Skill in ESL Classrooms. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *8*(4). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v8-i4/6564

Septiadevana, R., & Abdullah, N. (2024). Developing STEM Project-based Learning Module for Primary School Teachers: a Need Analysis. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *13*(4), 2585–2593. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i4.28894

Setiawan, B. N. (2026). Exploring interculturality in Indonesian English language classrooms: reciprocal dialogues between local, national, and global English languages and cultures.

Asian Englishes, *28*(1), 170–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2025.2602101

Shen, R., & Chong, S. W. (2023). Learner Engagement with Written Corrective Feedback in ESL and EFL Contexts: a Qualitative Research Synthesis Using a Perception-based Framework. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 276–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2072468

Spilles, M., Nicolay, P., Hank, C., Plutz, R., & Huber, C. (2025). Negative teacher feedback toward students decreases the probability of empathic classmates making a sociometric choice. *Social Psychology of Education*, *28*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-024-09977-1

Sulistiyo, U., Wulan, R., Al Arif, T. Z. Z., Efriza, D., & Anwar, K. (2021). A critical content analysis of English textbook for senior high school students in Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(1), 84–98. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.16778

Sutama, S., Fuadi, D., Narimo, S., Hafida, S. H. N., Novitasari, M., Anif, S., Prayitno, H. J., Sunanih, S., & Adnan, M. (2022). Collaborative mathematics learning management: critical thinking skills in problem solving. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *11*(3), 1015–1027. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v11i3.22193

Tate, T. P., Steiss, J., Bailey, D., Graham, S., Moon, Y., Ritchie, D., Tseng, W., & Warschauer, M. (2024). Can AI provide useful holistic essay scoring? *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*(November 2023), 100255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100255

Thao, L. T., & Thuy, P. T. (2025). Positive impacts of negative feedback: a deep dive into Vietnamese EFL learners' experiences and responses. *Ampersand*, *15*(March), 100228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100228

Usman, H., & Anwar, M. (2021). Integrated language skill approach: Model of teaching materials for elementary school teacher education programs in Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(2), 656–669. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i2.19031

Wang, L., & Lam, R. (2024). Developing EFL teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching spoken English in Chinese universities. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(1), 128–142. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v14i1.70391

Weidlich, J., Fink, A., Frey, A., Jivet, I., Gombert, S., Menzel, L., Giorgashvili, T., Yau, J., & Drachsler, H. (2025). Highly informative feedback using learning analytics: how feedback literacy moderates student perceptions of feedback. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00539-9

Wu, J., Chen, H., & Chen, L. (2025). The impact of research paradigms on encoding and decoding difficulties of applied linguistics articles. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04742-x

Yulia, H., & Agustiani, M. (2019). An ESP needs analysis for management students: Indonesian context. *Indonesian Educational Administration and Leadership Journal (IDEAL)*, *1*(1), 35–44. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22437/ideal.v1i1.7485