

Developing Writing Instruction through SFL and GBP in Deep Learning Contexts

Yulia Wahyuningsih¹⁾, Dyah Sih Pratiwi²⁾

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Lampung, Indonesia

email: yuliaw19.yw@gmail.com

²Universitas Muhammadiyah Lampung, Indonesia

email: sihpratiwi90@gmail.com

Abstract: Developing writing instruction requires students to make meaningful linguistic choices, organize ideas coherently, and construct texts appropriate to particular contexts and purposes. However, university students may experience difficulties translating linguistic knowledge into effective academic writing. This study aimed to develop and preliminarily evaluate a writing instructional strategy integrating Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Genre-Based Pedagogy (GBP) within a Deep Learning-oriented context. The study employed a Research and Development (R&D) design based on the 4D model, comprising Define, Design, Develop, and Disseminate stages, with development focusing on the first three stages. The main limited implementation involved 15 English Literature students at Universitas Muhammadiyah Lampung. Data were collected through needs analysis, expert validation, student response questionnaires, and pre-test and post-test writing assessments. The developed module obtained an expert validation mean of 4.52 out of 5, indicating a very valid category, while the practicality score was 4.35, indicating a very high level of practicality. Students' mean writing score increased from 8.93 in the pre-test to 19.20 in the post-test. The N-Gain score was 0.93, categorized as high, and the paired-samples t-test indicated a statistically significant difference ($t = 13.31$, $p < 0.0001$). These findings provide preliminary evidence that integrating SFL and GBP can support systematic, contextualized, and meaningful writing instruction by guiding students in analyzing linguistic choices, understanding genre structures, collaborating, revising, and constructing texts independently. Given the limited number of participants, the effectiveness findings should be interpreted cautiously and further examined with larger samples and different educational contexts.

Keywords: *Systemic Functional Linguistics, Genre-Based Pedagogy, Writing Proficiency*

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing plays an important role in students' academic and professional development. In higher education, students are expected not only to produce grammatically accurate sentences but also to organize ideas, develop coherent texts, and make linguistic choices appropriate to particular contexts and purposes. Writing consequently involves more than the production of correct language forms; it requires students to understand how language is used to construct meaning and communicate ideas effectively. Previous research has also indicated that writing development is associated with students' ability to regulate motivation and engage actively in writing activities (Hasibuan et al., 2024; Moxie et al., 2025).

These demands remain challenging for university students in Indonesia. Concerns regarding literacy development have continued to emerge, particularly following the PISA 2022 results, which have stimulated discussions about the need to strengthen educational practices in Indonesia (Bilad et al., 2024). In writing instruction, students therefore need opportunities to develop not only linguistic accuracy but also the ability to organize ideas,

develop texts, and use language appropriately. Collaborative activities may support this process by allowing students to exchange ideas, receive feedback, and participate actively in constructing texts (Thabran et al., 2021). Writing can thus be viewed as a process involving interaction, reflection, and decision-making rather than as an exclusively individual activity.

A meaningful learning orientation can further help students connect classroom activities with real-world contexts. Joyful learning emphasizes active and meaningful participation in learning experiences (Udvari-Solner, 2012), while deep meaningful learning emphasizes understanding, reflection, and the ability to apply knowledge beyond an immediate learning task (Mystakidis, 2021). In writing instruction, this orientation can encourage students to examine language, consider the meanings they intend to communicate, and apply their knowledge across different writing situations. Recent research on digitally mediated English teaching similarly emphasizes active and contextualized engagement in language learning (Aprilia et al., 2026).

One approach that can support such an orientation is the integration of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Genre-Based Pedagogy (GBP). SFL views language as a resource for making meaning in particular social contexts. From this perspective, linguistic choices are related to the meanings constructed by writers and to the purposes for which texts are produced. SFL is therefore relevant to writing instruction because students can be guided to examine why particular linguistic choices are made and how those choices contribute to meaning rather than learning grammatical forms in isolation.

GBP complements this perspective by providing a structured pedagogical process through which students can understand and produce texts according to their purposes and contexts. Genre-based instruction provides learners with systematic support before they are expected to construct texts independently. The approach commonly involves analysis of model texts, collaborative construction, and independent writing (Hyland, 2003; Nagao, 2019). Previous research has also reported positive contributions of genre-based instruction to students' academic writing performance and genre awareness (Thaksanan & Chaturongakul, 2023). Thus, SFL and GBP provide complementary functions: SFL supports students' understanding of how linguistic choices construct meaning, whereas GBP provides a pedagogical sequence for applying that understanding in writing.

The integration of these approaches also creates opportunities for collaboration. Collaborative writing enables students to discuss ideas and linguistic choices before producing their own texts, while group writing activities can promote interaction and engagement during the writing process (Moxie et al., 2025; Thabran et al., 2021). Reflection and mindful engagement may further encourage students to examine their learning experiences and reconsider their choices (Leila et al., 2018; Moafian et al., 2019). Integrating SFL, GBP, and Deep Learning can therefore provide a framework that connects linguistic knowledge, guided writing practice, collaboration, feedback, revision, and reflection.

Despite the relevance of these approaches, their integration into a structured writing instructional strategy for university students requires further development. In particular, there is a need for an instructional product that translates SFL and GBP principles into practical classroom activities while maintaining a meaningful and reflective learning orientation. The present study addresses this need through the development of a Writing Instruction Module integrating SFL and GBP within a Deep Learning-oriented context for English Literature students.

Accordingly, this study addressed two main research questions: first, how the principles of SFL and GBP can be integrated into a writing instruction strategy within a Deep

Learning-oriented context; and second, what the initial design, validity, practicality, and preliminary learning outcomes are of a Writing Instruction Module utilizing the SFL–GBP strategy developed through the 4D model. Correspondingly, the study aimed to articulate the principles underlying the integration of SFL and GBP and to develop and preliminarily evaluate a Writing Instruction Module through the Define, Design, and Develop stages of the 4D development model.

2. METHOD

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a Research and Development (R&D) design to develop a Writing Instruction Module integrating Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) and Genre-Based Pedagogy (GBP) within a Deep Learning-oriented context. Both qualitative and quantitative data were used to identify students' needs, guide the development process, and obtain preliminary evidence regarding the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of the developed module.

The development procedure followed the 4D model proposed by Thiagarajan (1974), consisting of Define, Design, Develop, and Disseminate stages. The present study focused on the first three stages. The Define stage identified students' writing needs and learning difficulties. The Design stage translated the findings into an instructional framework integrating SFL, GBP, and Deep Learning principles. The Develop stage involved preparing, validating, revising, and implementing the module on a limited basis.

2.2 Participants

The study involved students from the English Literature Study Program at Universitas Muhammadiyah Lampung. Participants were selected purposively based on their relevance to the research objectives and their prior completion of foundational courses related to writing, structure, and linguistics.

A separate group of 10 students participated in a limited trial during the instrument-development process. This trial was conducted to identify potential problems in understanding the instruments and to obtain feedback for revision. After the instruments had been revised and finalized, 15 students participated in the main limited implementation of the developed module. The latter group provided the data for the preliminary evaluation of practicality and effectiveness.

2.3 Development Procedure

2.3.1 Define Stage

The Define stage focused on identifying students' writing needs, existing difficulties, relevant competencies, and learning principles. Needs analysis involved questionnaires, interviews, and observations. The analysis indicated that students experienced difficulties in matching linguistic choices with context and in using thematic vocabulary. Students also expressed strong needs for thematic vocabulary development, revision guidance, contextual relevance, collaborative writing, and genre-based strategies. Interview findings further indicated the need for step-by-step guidance, deeper analysis of text functions, authentic model texts, connections with real-world issues, and more detailed revision activities.

These findings became the basis for determining the content, learning activities, scaffolding, and assessment components of the module.

2.3.2 Design Stage

The Design stage translated the needs-analysis findings into an instructional framework integrating Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Genre-Based Pedagogy (GBP), and Deep Learning principles. The SFL component focused on the ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunctions, which were systematically mapped into the four stages of the Genre-Based Teaching-Learning Cycle:

1. **Building Knowledge of the Field (BKOF):** Focuses on developing topic knowledge and thematic vocabulary through ideational metafunction analysis, connecting real-world issues to activate prior knowledge.
2. **Modelling of the Text (MoT):** Emphasizes deconstructing authentic model texts to analyze genre structures, organizational patterns, and specific lexico-grammatical choices across interpersonal and textual metafunctions.
3. **Joint Construction (JC):** Provides collaborative opportunities for text construction, meaning-making, negotiation, peer feedback, and lecturer scaffolding, fostering active interaction and reflective revision.
4. **Independent Construction (IC):** Requires students to autonomously apply the linguistic and structural resources developed in earlier stages to construct independent texts.

Deep Learning principles were integrated throughout this cycle through meaningful real-world connections, mindful analysis, reflection, problem-solving, and application in new context situations.

2.3.3 Develop Stage

The Develop stage involved preparing, evaluating, revising, and implementing the Writing Instruction Module. The module included learning objectives, instructional materials, model texts, worksheets, exercises, assessment rubrics, and reflection activities. The writing assessment addressed genre structure, interpersonal meaning, lexico-grammatical choices, and cohesion and coherence.

The research instruments included pre-test and post-test writing tasks, a writing assessment rubric, needs-analysis questionnaires, interview guides, observation sheets, student response questionnaires, and expert validation instruments. Instrument development involved determining indicators, preparing blueprints, constructing items, conducting validity and reliability testing, revising the instruments, and conducting a limited trial.

Content validity was examined by subject-matter and instrument experts. The Content Validity Ratio (CVR) was used as an indicator of content validity, with a value of $V \geq 0.8$ considered valid. Construct validity was examined using corrected item-total correlation, while questionnaire reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha. Inter-rater agreement was also considered in the writing assessment.

Following revision and finalization, the module was implemented with 15 students to obtain preliminary evidence regarding its practicality and effectiveness.

2.4 Data Collection

Data were collected through observation, interviews, questionnaires, expert validation, and writing assessments. Observations focused on students' existing writing practices, learning difficulties, participation, and responses during instruction. Interviews provided deeper information regarding students' learning needs, experiences, and perceptions.

Questionnaires were administered during the needs analysis and after implementation to obtain students' perceptions of the developed module, including its practicality,

understandability, motivational value, and general usefulness. Expert validation was conducted to evaluate the module's content, language, presentation, design, and usefulness. Pre-test and post-test writing tasks were administered to examine changes in students' writing performance. The same genre was assessed before and after implementation using criteria related to genre structure, interpersonal meaning, lexico-grammatical choices, and cohesion and coherence.

2.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed according to the purpose of each dataset. Questionnaire data were summarized using descriptive statistics, while observation and interview data were analyzed through coding and thematic analysis.

Pre-test and post-test scores were examined through normality checking, N-Gain analysis, and a paired-samples t-test. The paired-samples t-test was used to determine whether the difference between students' pre-test and post-test writing scores was statistically significant.

The effectiveness of the module was additionally examined using the N-Gain score. The interpretation followed Hake (1998) categories: high gain ($g > 0.7$), moderate gain ($0.3 \leq g \leq 0.7$), and low gain ($g < 0.3$).

The hypotheses were formulated as follows:

H₀: There was no significant difference between students' writing scores before and after implementation of the 4D-model-based SFL–GBP Writing Module.

H_a: There was a significant difference between students' writing scores before and after implementation of the 4D-model-based SFL–GBP Writing Module.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Integration of SFL, GBP, and Deep Learning

The development process demonstrated that SFL and GBP could be systematically integrated into a writing instructional strategy oriented toward Deep Learning. This integration was operationalized through the four stages of the Genre-Based Teaching-Learning Cycle, mapped directly to SFL metafunctions:

1. **Building Knowledge of the Field (BKOF):** Lecturers guided students to build topic knowledge, introduce key concepts, and expand thematic vocabulary, laying the ideational foundation for writing.
2. **Modelling of the Text (MoT):** Students explicitly analyzed model texts to examine how text organization realizing genre purposes (textual metafunction) and how writer's stance is expressed through modality and tone (interpersonal metafunction).
3. **Joint Construction (JC):** Students worked collaboratively in small groups to draft texts, engage in peer negotiation, give and receive feedback, and receive lecturer scaffolding. This step bridged the gap between model analysis and individual writing.
4. **Independent Construction (IC):** Students autonomously produced individual texts, applying the linguistic resources, genre structures, and revision feedback gained from previous stages.

This sequence reflects the complementary relationship between SFL and GBP. SFL provides students with a perspective for examining how language choices contribute to meaning, while GBP provides a structured pathway through which such knowledge can be applied in text production. This finding is consistent with Hyland (2003) emphasis on the

relationship between genre, purpose, and context and with Nagao (2019) discussion of an SFL genre-based approach in EFL writing.

The integration was also consistent with previous findings on genre-based instruction. Thaksanan & Chaturongakul (2023) reported that genre-based instruction could support students' academic writing performance and genre awareness. The present study extends this perspective by incorporating SFL analysis into the genre-based learning cycle and connecting the instructional sequence with Deep Learning principles.

An important feature of the developed strategy was the emphasis on collaborative construction before independent writing. The needs analysis showed that students' experience with Joint Construction was relatively low, with a mean score of 3.53. Consequently, the revised module provided more opportunities for discussion, collaborative writing, feedback, and lecturer scaffolding. Such activities allowed students to exchange ideas and consider linguistic choices before constructing individual texts. This is consistent with research emphasizing the role of collaboration in writing development and student engagement (Moxie et al., 2025; Thabran et al., 2021).

3.2 Needs Analysis and Deep Learning-Oriented Instruction

The needs analysis identified several areas requiring particular attention. Students reported difficulties in matching linguistic choices with context, with a mean score of 4.20, and in using thematic vocabulary, with a mean score of 3.93. Students' expectations further indicated strong needs for thematic vocabulary and revision guidance, both receiving a mean score of 4.47. Contextual relevance obtained 4.40, while collaborative writing and genre-based strategies each obtained 4.33.

These findings directly informed the instructional design. The module emphasized thematic vocabulary development in BKOF, explicit analysis of language and context in MoT, collaborative writing and feedback in JC, and systematic revision leading toward IC. Authentic issues were also incorporated to connect writing activities with students' experiences and surrounding contexts.

This design corresponds with the principles of deep meaningful learning described by Mystakidis (2021), particularly the emphasis on understanding and applying knowledge beyond an immediate learning task. The use of contextual issues also reflects the importance of active and contextualized learning experiences in contemporary English teaching (Aprilia et al., 2026).

Reflection was another important component of the module. Students were encouraged to examine their linguistic choices, consider feedback, and revise their texts. This orientation is compatible with previous discussions of mindfulness and critical engagement among language learners (Leila et al., 2018; Moafian et al., 2019). In this study, Deep Learning was therefore not interpreted simply as making writing activities more enjoyable. Rather, it involved meaningful engagement with content, analysis of language in context, collaboration, reflection, and application.

Joyful learning was also incorporated through opportunities for interaction and communication. As Udvari-Solner (2012) suggests, joyful learning can encourage active participation in learning experiences. In the present module, however, enjoyment was positioned as complementary to deeper engagement rather than as the primary instructional objective.

3.3 Validity and Practicality of the Developed Module

The developed Writing Instruction Module was evaluated by two experts. The overall validation score was 4.52 out of 5, indicating a very valid category. The evaluation covered content feasibility, language, presentation and construction, graphics and design, and usefulness and practicality.

Table 1. Expert Validation Results of the Writing Instruction Module

Aspect	Mean	Category
Content feasibility	4.50	Very good
Language	4.55	Very good
Presentation and construction	4.55	Very good
Graphics and design	4.45	Very good
Usefulness and practicality	4.55	Very good
Overall	4.52	Very valid

The two validators obtained average scores of 4.54 and 4.50, respectively. Overall, the experts considered the module appropriate in terms of content, language, presentation, visual design, and usefulness.

The validation process also resulted in several recommendations. The experts suggested increasing the variety of exposition texts, strengthening explanations of the relationship between linguistic features and the social functions of texts, adding a glossary of linguistic terms, providing visual representations of text structures, and including more reflective and collaborative activities.

These recommendations were incorporated into the revised module. The revision included additional exposition texts related to contemporary issues, a glossary, visual representations of genre structures, enrichment activities, and post-writing reflection. These changes were particularly relevant to the implementation of SFL because functional linguistic concepts require clear explanations and concrete examples for students to connect linguistic features with their functions in texts.

The revised module was subsequently implemented with 15 students. The overall practicality score was 4.35 out of 5, indicating a very high level of practicality. Students' understanding of the material obtained a mean score of 4.43, while motivation and perceived effectiveness obtained 4.44. The time, learning flow, and workload aspect obtained the comparatively lower score of 4.18.

The results indicate that students generally found the module understandable and usable. However, the lower score for time and workload suggests that the combination of linguistic analysis, genre instruction, collaborative construction, feedback, and revision requires careful pacing. This is an important consideration for future implementation of the module.

3.4 Improvement in Students' Writing Performance

The preliminary effectiveness of the module was examined through pre-test and post-test writing scores. The mean score increased from 8.93 in the pre-test to 19.20 in the post-test. The pre-test standard deviation was 1.75, while the post-test standard deviation was 3.14. Fifteen students participated in both assessments.

The N-Gain analysis produced a score of 0.93, which falls within the high-gain category according to Hake (1998) classification. The paired-samples analysis also indicated

a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores ($t = 13.31$, $p < 0.0001$). These results provide preliminary evidence of substantial improvement in students' writing performance following implementation of the module.

The improvement can be considered in relation to the instructional sequence. Students did not move directly from explanation to independent writing. Instead, they developed topic knowledge, examined model texts, analyzed linguistic and organizational choices, constructed texts collaboratively, received feedback, revised their work, and subsequently produced independent texts. This sequence provided repeated opportunities to connect linguistic choices with meaning and genre purpose.

The findings are consistent with previous research on genre-based writing instruction. Nagao (2019) demonstrated the relevance of an SFL genre-based approach to EFL writing, while Thaksanan & Chaturongakul (2023) reported positive effects of genre-based instruction on academic writing performance and genre awareness. The collaborative dimension of the learning process is also consistent with findings reported by Moxie et al. (2025) and Thabran et al. (2021).

The writing assessment also indicated improvement in aspects such as genre structure, cohesion and coherence, and depth of argument. These aspects are relevant to the SFL–GBP integration because genre-based instruction provides students with an understanding of text organization, while SFL draws attention to the linguistic resources used to realize relationships among ideas and communicative purposes.

Nevertheless, the effectiveness findings should be interpreted cautiously. The main implementation involved only 15 students and did not employ a control group. The study therefore provides preliminary evidence rather than conclusive evidence of causal effectiveness. In addition, the assessment focused on writing performance and did not use a separate standardized instrument to measure broader constructs such as critical thinking or metalinguistic awareness. The improvement in writing scores may reflect gains associated with increased attention to language, organization, reflection, and argument development, but it should not be interpreted as direct statistical evidence of improvement in those broader cognitive constructs.

3.5 Theoretical and Pedagogical Contribution

The main contribution of the study lies in bringing together three elements that are frequently addressed separately in writing instruction. SFL provides a perspective for understanding how language constructs meaning in context. GBP provides a staged pedagogical process for learning to understand and produce genres. Deep Learning provides an orientation toward meaningful engagement, reflection, collaboration, and application. The developed module brought these elements together within one writing instructional framework.

From a pedagogical perspective, the sequence from BKOF to MoT, JC, and IC provides lecturers with a structured pathway from supported learning toward independent writing. The findings further suggest that collaboration and revision should be treated as integral parts of writing instruction. Students need opportunities to discuss ideas, receive feedback, reconsider linguistic choices, and revise their texts before completing independent writing. This finding is consistent with the collaborative dimension of writing highlighted by Moxie et al. (2025) and Thabran et al. (2021).

The study also contributes to the discussion of meaningful and reflective writing instruction. Contextual topics, linguistic analysis, collaboration, feedback, and reflection created opportunities for students to engage with writing beyond the mechanical production

of grammatically correct sentences. This orientation is consistent with deep meaningful learning (Mystakidis, 2021) and with research emphasizing mindful engagement in language learning (Leila et al., 2018; Moafian et al., 2019).

However, the contribution should be understood within the scope of the development study. The limited number of participants restricts the generalizability of the findings. Further implementation involving larger samples, different educational contexts, and longer periods is necessary to examine the consistency of the results.

4. CONCLUSION

This study developed a Writing Instruction Module integrating Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), Genre-Based Pedagogy (GBP), and Deep Learning principles through the Define, Design, and Develop stages of the 4D development model. The development process demonstrated that SFL and GBP could be combined in a structured writing strategy in which students moved from developing topic knowledge and analyzing model texts to collaborative construction, feedback, revision, and independent writing.

The needs analysis provided a clear basis for the instructional design. Students reported difficulties in connecting linguistic choices with context and in using thematic vocabulary, while they expressed strong needs for thematic vocabulary development, revision guidance, contextual relevance, collaboration, and genre-based strategies. These needs were addressed through the integration of SFL analysis, the genre-based teaching cycle, contextual topics, collaborative activities, reflection, and revision.

The developed module obtained an expert validation score of 4.52 out of 5, indicating very high validity, and a practicality score of 4.35, indicating very high practicality. The preliminary writing assessment also showed an increase in the mean score from 8.93 to 19.20, with an N-Gain of 0.93 and a statistically significant paired-samples t-test result ($t = 13.31$, $p < 0.0001$). These results provide preliminary evidence that the SFL–GBP strategy can support systematic and meaningful writing instruction.

Despite these promising findings, the effectiveness results should be interpreted cautiously because the main implementation involved only 15 students and did not include a control group. Future research should therefore examine the module with larger and more diverse samples, longer implementation periods, and comparative research designs. Such studies would provide stronger evidence regarding the effectiveness and broader applicability of the SFL–GBP writing instructional strategy within Deep Learning-oriented contexts.

REFERENCES

- Aprilia, F., Amanah, F. P., Anggeraini, Y., Mutiara, H., & Nurwani, R. F. (2026). Pedagogical Use of Social Media in Digitally Mediated English Teaching: Pre-Service Teachers' Perspectives. *ELT-Lectura*, 13(1), 36–48.
- Bilad, M. R., Zubaidah, S., & Prayogi, S. (2024). Addressing the PISA 2022 Results: A Call for Reinvigorating Indonesia's Education System. *International Journal of Essential Competencies in Education*, 3(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.36312/ijece.v3i1.1935>
- Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. *American Journal of Physics*, 66(1), 64–74. <https://doi.org/10.1119/1.18809>

- Hasibuan, A. V. P., Munir, A., & Widyastuti. (2024). The Correlation between Motivational Regulation Strategies and Students' Writing Ability. *ELT-Lectura*, 11(2), 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v11i2.20931>
- Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(1), 17–29. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(02\)00124-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(02)00124-8)
- Leila, A. N., Zari, S., & Mojtaba, K. (2018). The Compatibility of Mindfulness and Critical Thinking among EFL Learners. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 15(3), 811–818. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.17.811>
- Moafian, F., Khoshshima, H., Fadardi, J. S., & Pagnini, F. (2019). Langerian mindfulness and language learning. *Cogent Psychology*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2019.1609242>
- Moxie, J., Dahl, A. A., Fernandez-Borunda, A., & Partridge, H. (2025). Teamwork makes the dream work: group effectiveness in a “Paper Chase” collaborative writing exercise for higher education. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1405449>
- Mystakidis, S. (2021). Deep Meaningful Learning. *Encyclopedia*, 1(3), 988–997. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia1030075>
- Nagao, A. (2019). The SFL genre-based approach to writing in EFL contexts. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 4(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-019-0069-3>
- Thabran, Y., Efriza, D., & Heryanti, R. (2021). Making Sense of Collaborative Writing: A Student-Experience-Based Perspective. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 113. <https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v5i2.8549>
- Thaksanan, P., & Chaturongakul, P. (2023). Enhancing EFL Students' Performance and Genre Awareness in Academic Writing through Genre-based Instruction. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4497563>
- Thiagarajan, S. (1974). *Instructional development for training teachers of exceptional children: A sourcebook*. ERIC.
- Udvari-Solner, A. (2012). Joyful Learning. In *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning* (pp. 1665–1667). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_795