Consensus-Based Framework for Enhancing Academic Writing Pedagogy in Indonesian Higher Education

Fahrus Zaman Fadhly [1], Dadang Solihat [1], Marwito Wihadi [1], Nur Fathiyya Zahira Mujahidah [2]

[1] Universitas Kuningan, Kuningan, Indonesia
[2] Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University, Nigde, Türkiye
fahrus.zaman.fadhly@uniku.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Higher education increasingly depends on robust academic writing competence, yet many university students in multilingual and AI-mediated contexts continue to experience persistent difficulties that are not sufficiently addressed by existing pedagogical models. Responding to the absence of a unified, consensus-based framework that integrates feedback literacy, process-oriented pedagogy, affective support, and institutional structures in the Indonesian context, this study employed a three-round Delphi method to elicit and refine expert perspectives on academic writing pedagogy. A purposive sample of fifteen EFL scholars, writing instructors, and curriculum designers from Indonesian universities completed iterative rounds of open-ended questioning and Likert-scale rating, with consensus determined using median scores and interquartile ranges. The findings reveal four core challenges, namely limited feedback literacy, surface-level and product-oriented instruction, affective barriers such as low confidence and anxiety, and fragmented mentoring systems. Experts reached strong consensus on the need for systematic feedback literacy training, the adoption of process-based and technology-supported writing instruction, explicit affective and motivational scaffolding, and institutional mechanisms such as writing centers and structured mentoring. The study culminates in a Consensus-Based Pedagogical Framework that positions academic writing as a cognitive, social, and emotional practice rather than a purely linguistic product. This framework offers a practical roadmap for curriculum developers, policymakers, and instructors, while also contributing to wider debates on the decolonization and digital transformation of academic writing in Global South higher education systems.

1. Introduction

Academic writing often determines who succeeds and who remains marginal in higher education, yet for many students it feels like an opaque and intimidating gatekeeper rather than a meaningful tool for knowledge-making. This tension is especially visible in contexts where students are expected to write in English as an additional language while navigating unfamiliar academic discourses and institutional expectations (Adhami & Taghizadeh, 2024; Chura-Quispe & Castro, 2024; Fadhly et al., 2023; Gagich, 2025; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2024). In such settings, academic writing pedagogy becomes a crucial competency not only for students but also for lecturers, who must mediate between global academic norms and local epistemic cultures.

The challenge has intensified as higher education becomes more multilingual and digitally mediated. Scholars have shown that technological change, linguistic plurality, and shifting academic norms create both opportunities and new forms of inequality in writing instruction (Adhami & Taghizadeh, 2024; Chura-Quispe & Castro, 2024; Fadhly et al., 2023; Gagich, 2025; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2024). While some studies highlight the importance of structural support and context-sensitive pedagogical design (Olsson et al., 2024; Rodrigues, 2025), others focus on how digital platforms and online learning environments can be harnessed to improve engagement and scaffold students' academic writing development (Kim et al., 2025; Amer et al., 2025; Song & Song, 2023). Together, these developments position academic writing pedagogy at the center of broader debates about equity, access, and quality in higher education.

Within this wider digital landscape, the emergence of AI-based tools such as ChatGPT marks a significant turning point for academic writing instruction. Studies report that these tools can scaffold students' writing processes, promote lexical variety, and foster experimentation with revision strategies, particularly for writers who lack confidence or linguistic resources (Amer et al., 2025; Hutson et al., 2024; Gagich, 2025; Mirhosseini et al., 2025; Fadhly, 2023). At the same time, scholars raise serious concerns about plagiarism, authenticity, and the potential erosion of critical and ethical judgment when students outsource cognitive work to AI systems (Davis, 2024; Bozkurt, 2024; Rowland, 2023; Wise et al., 2024; Caprioglio & Paglia, 2023). This duality of promise and risk underscores the urgent need for pedagogical frameworks that do not simply adopt AI as a technical aid, but integrate it critically and ethically into writing pedagogy.

Parallel to technological debates, research has drawn attention to the complex challenges faced by multilingual learners who must negotiate divergent rhetorical structures, citation practices, and discourse expectations. Translingual and decolonial perspectives argue that academic writing instruction should validate students' linguistic identities and broaden what counts as legitimate academic English, rather than enforcing monolithic norms that marginalise local voices (Canagarajah, 2022, 2024; Quist, 2025; Xie & Sun, 2024; Fadhly, 2022; O'Brien & Charura, 2025). Genre-based approaches, such as Aleshinskaya and Vasilieva's (2025) work on academic email writing, demonstrate how explicit teaching of rhetorical moves can scaffold learners' understanding of context-specific conventions. At the same time, a growing body of research shows that collaborative learning environments and peer feedback practices, including writing workshops, dialogic supervision, and student-to-student review, can reduce writing anxiety, deepen metacognitive reflection, and foster more participatory feedback cultures (Dugartsyrenova, 2024; Jusslin & Hilli, 2024; Afifi, 2021; Rodrigues, 2025.

These studies also foreground the affective dimension of writing, noting that students in English as a Foreign Language contexts frequently report anxiety and low confidence, and that the quality of instructor feedback and clarity of expectations crucially shape their sense of efficacy (Nurkamto et al., 2024; Fadhly, 2022; Amer et al., 2025; Gagich, 2025; Mirhosseini et al., 2025; Canagarajah, 2024; De Costa et al., 2024; Daniels & Richards, 2024). Meta-synthesis and meta-ethnographic work further illuminates what expert writers actually do, highlighting practices such as problematising research gaps through extensive reading, strategic outlining, iterative feedback integration, and sensitivity to audience expectations (Fadhly, 2021, 2022, 2023), which resonate with international research framing

academic writing as a recursive, socially situated process (Afifi, 2021; Chura-Quispe & Castro, 2024; Adhami & Taghizadeh, 2024; Gagich, 2025; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2024).

Despite this rich body of scholarship on technology, multilingualism, feedback, and expert writing processes, there remains a notable gap in the form of an integrated, consensus-based pedagogical framework for academic writing, particularly in Indonesian higher education. Existing studies tend to be siloed, addressing discrete aspects such as feedback practices, AI integration, translingual pedagogy, or supervisory relationships, but rarely synthesising these strands into a coherent model that can guide systemic reform (Fadhly et al., 2023; Nurkamto et al., 2024; Dugartsyrenova, 2024; Davis, 2024; Rodrigues, 2025). As a result, lecturers and institutions often adopt fragmented innovations without a shared understanding of how these elements can work together to support students' long-term development as academic writers.

This study addresses that niche by developing a consensus-based framework for academic writing pedagogy that brings together linguistic, technological, affective, and institutional dimensions in a single model tailored to Indonesian higher education. Building on prior qualitative and synthesis-based research (Fadhly, 2021, 2022,; Fadhly et al., 2023), the study mobilizes expert knowledge to identify key principles, practices, and support structures that should underpin academic writing instruction. The novelty lies in its use of a systematic Delphi process to move beyond individual case studies or isolated interventions and to articulate collectively agreed priorities that reflect both global scholarship and local realities.

The significance of this work is twofold. Conceptually, it reframes academic writing not only as a textual skill but as a socially, emotionally, and institutionally embedded practice that must be supported by coherent pedagogical and policy decisions. Practically, it seeks to provide a clear and actionable roadmap for stakeholders in Indonesian higher education who are grappling with AI integration, expanding multilingual enrolments, and growing demands for research productivity. Accordingly, the study aims to identify areas of consensus among expert practitioners regarding core challenges, desirable pedagogical responses, and institutional supports, and to synthesise these into a structured framework that can inform curriculum design, teacher development, and policy formulation.

Subsequent sections present and discuss the findings, detailing the core domains and key principles that make up the consensus based framework for academic writing pedagogy. The article concludes by synthesising its theoretical and practical contributions, showing how the framework

can strengthen academic writing cultures in English language teaching, particularly in Indonesian universities, while also addressing implications for curriculum design, teacher education, and institutional policy and indicating future research to refine and localise pedagogy across diverse ELT contexts.

2. Literature Review

Many studies have explored how to improve academic writing for university students. One effective approach is genre-based learning, which helps students understand the structure and purpose of different types of texts (Fadhly, 2021; Aleshinskaya & Vasilieva, 2025; Chura-Quispe & Castro, 2024). This method also supports students from different language backgrounds by allowing them to use their own language knowledge in writing (Canagarajah, 2022, 2024; Quist, 2025). In addition, learning models that include group work, flipped classrooms, and inquiry-based tasks make writing more engaging and meaningful (Adhami & Taghizadeh, 2024; Hutson et al., 2024; Davis, 2024).

Technology tools such as feedback systems and peer review platforms also help students reflect and improve their writing (Dugartsyrenova, 2024; Amer et al., 2025; Gagich, 2025). However, students still face challenges, such as writing anxiety and difficulty using formal language correctly (Nurkamto et al., 2024; Afifi, 2021; Fadhly, 2023). Some researchers suggest that good academic supervision, inclusive teaching methods, and the careful use of AI tools can help students become more confident writers (Rodrigues, 2025; Fadhly et al., 2023; Rowland, 2023; Mirhosseini et al., 2025).

2.1 Digital Transformation and AI Integration in Academic Writing Pedagogy

The integration of AI tools and digital platforms has reshaped academic writing in higher education, with tools such as ChatGPT increasingly used to draft and review texts, creating both opportunities and concerns for learning outcomes (Amer et al., 2025; DuBose & Marshall, 2023; Song & Song, 2023). Research shows that AI can enhance student motivation and reduce writing anxiety, but educators remain cautious about over-reliance on these tools and the authenticity of student output (Frye, 2022; Koplin, 2023; Caprioglio & Paglia, 2023).

While some scholars argue that AI supports students with low writing confidence or language barriers (Garg et al., 2024; Nguyen et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2024), others raise ethical and pedagogical concerns. These include transparency of AI usage, challenges to academic integrity, and blurred lines of authorship (Bozkurt, 2024; Tang et al., 2024; Rowland, 2023). The pedagogical challenge lies in training students to engage with AI critically and responsibly.

Educators are thus exploring process-based and techno-pedagogical designs that integrate AI into instruction while maintaining the human element of learning (Chura-Quispe & Castro, 2024; Gagich, 2025; Hutson et al., 2024). The goal is to use AI as a scaffold rather than a shortcut, preserving the development of students' critical thinking and writing competence (Zulfa et al., 2023; Tran, 2023; Wise et al., 2024).

2.2 Linguistic Diversity and Decolonizing Academic Writing

Another pressing issue is the tension between global English norms and students' diverse linguistic backgrounds, as traditional academic writing standards often marginalise multilingual voices and create feelings of inadequacy and disempowerment. (Canagarajah, 2022; Daniels & Richards, 2024). This calls for pedagogies that validate students' linguistic identities while guiding them to meet academic expectations (De Costa et al., 2024; Davis, 2024).

Scholars advocate for a shift towards translingual and decolonial approaches in academic writing pedagogy. These approaches embrace language diversity and challenge the monolingual bias in academic discourse (Xie & Sun, 2024; Canagarajah, 2024; Quist, 2025). By allowing students to draw from their full linguistic repertoires, instructors can foster more inclusive and empowering writing environments.

Pedagogical models that incorporate critical language awareness and translingual strategies can promote both academic success and social justice (Olsson et al., 2024; O'Brien & Charura, 2025; Mirhosseini et al., 2025). Such approaches not only improve writing proficiency but also encourage students to see writing as a space for identity negotiation and resistance.

2.3 Feedback Practices, Support Systems, and Authorship Tensions

Effective feedback and academic supervision are crucial to students' writing development, yet challenges persist, as many report inconsistent or insufficient feedback due to faculty workload and institutional constraints. (Jusslin & Hilli, 2024; Rodrigues, 2025). Furthermore, unclear boundaries of authorship in collaborative or AI-assisted writing generate confusion and ethical dilemmas (Amirjalili et al., 2024; Casal & Kessler, 2023; Ghotbi, 2024).

The role of peer feedback, technology-mediated review systems, and genre-based learning is being revisited to address these issues (Aleshinskaya & Vasilieva, 2025; Dugartsyrenova, 2024; Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2024). These approaches not only democratize feedback but also foster student agency and engagement in revision processes.

Finally, scholars emphasize the need for clearer authorship policies and pedagogies that help students understand ethical writing practices amid the AI revolution (Bozkurt, 2024; Maphoto et al., 2024; Zhang & Xu, 2024). This includes teaching students how to acknowledge AI assistance and collaborate responsibly in co-writing scenarios, thereby reinforcing academic integrity and trust in scholarship.

3. Method

This study adopted the Delphi method to reach consensus among experts regarding key challenges, needs, and effective strategies in academic writing pedagogy in higher education. The Delphi technique, widely used in educational research, is effective for generating expert agreement through iterative rounds of structured inquiry and controlled feedback (Rodrigues, 2025; Davis, 2024).

3.1 Participants

A panel of 15 academic professionals was selected purposively based on their expertise in EFL academic writing, publications in peer-reviewed journals, and teaching experience. The participants were lecturers, researchers, and writing consultants from universities in Indonesia. All participants had a minimum of five years of experience teaching academic writing and were actively engaged in curriculum or material development related to writing instruction (Amer et al., 2025; Hutson et al., 2024).

Table 1. Profile of Delphi Expert Panel (N = 15)

No.	Code	Position	Area of Expertise	Years of Experience
1	Exp-01	Senior Lecturer	EFL Writing & Assessment	12
2	Exp-02	Associate Professor	Academic Literacy & Genre Studies	15
3	Exp-03	Lecturer	Writing Pedagogy & Curriculum Design	10
4	Exp-04	Writing Consultant	Academic Editing & Feedback Practices	8
5	Exp-05	Lecturer	English for Academic Purposes	11
6	Exp-06	Assistant Profess	Corpus-Based Writing Instruction	9
7	Exp-07	Researcher	Composition Studies & Teacher Training	13
8	Exp-08	Lecturer	Academic Writing & Critical Thinking	10
9	Exp-09	Senior Lecturer	EFL Writing & Technology Integration	14
10	Exp-10	Lecturer	Intercultural Communication & Feedback	9
11	Exp-11	Associate Professor	Applied Linguistics & Writing Development	16
12	Exp-12	Lecturer	Writing Assessment & Feedback	8
13	Exp-13	Lecturer	Writing Strategies & Learner Autonomy	11
14	Exp-14	Lecturer	Blended Writing Pedagogy	7
15	Exp-15	Research Fellow	EFL Writing & Professional Development	10

Collectively, the experts represented a balanced mix of academic and practical experience, ensuring that the consensus drawn through the Delphi rounds was grounded in both classroom realities and scholarly insight.

3.2 Data Collection

The Delphi process comprised three iterative rounds designed to achieve expert consensus on key issues in academic writing education. In Round 1, experts responded via Google Forms to open ended questions on challenges, pedagogical gaps, and potential innovations in teaching and learning academic writing, and their responses were analysed thematically to identify core issues and recurring concepts that reflected the panel's collective insights. (Adhami & Taghizadeh, 2024).

In Round 2, the themes from the first round were converted into 35 structured items in a Likert scale format, which experts rated for importance and feasibility on a five point scale. The quantitative data were then analysed using descriptive statistics, specifically the median, mean, and interquartile range (IQR), to assess the degree of agreement and identify areas of emerging consensus (Mirhosseini et al., 2025).

In Round 3, a summary of the results, including statistical findings and thematic highlights, was circulated to all participants, who were invited to review and, if needed, revise their previous responses in light of the group's feedback. Consensus was deemed achieved when the interquartile range (IQR) for an item was 1.0 or lower, indicating a high level of agreement among the expert panel. (Nurkamto et al., 2024).

3.3 Data Analysis

Qualitative responses were analyzed using inductive coding to identify core themes. Quantitative data were analyzed with Excel and SPSS for medians, IQRs, and consensus levels. Items that reached consensus in Round 3 were compiled into a final framework of pedagogical recommendations (Peungcharoenkun & Waluyo, 2024).

3.4 Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the affiliated institution. All participants provided informed consent. Anonymity was maintained throughout the rounds to ensure unbiased individual responses and reduce social pressure (Dugartsyrenova, 2024).

4. Result

4.1 Overview of Delphi Rounds

The Delphi study proceeded through three iterative rounds, leading to a high level of agreement among the 15 Indonesian experts on the major challenges, needs, and pedagogical solutions in academic writing instruction. Consensus was considered achieved when the Interquartile Range (IQR) ≤ 1.0, indicating strong alignment in expert judgments (Nurkamto et al., 2024).

4.2 Round 1: Thematic Exploration of Key Challenges

Analysis of open-ended responses yielded four dominant challenge categories affecting academic writing education in Indonesian higher education:

Table. 4.1 Thematic Exploration of Key Challenges

Theme	Description	Freq. (n=15)	Illustrative Expert Comments
1. Limited Feedback Literacy	Students and teachers lack understanding of how to interpret and apply feedback effectively.	12	"Most students view feedback as correction, not guidance for revision."
2. Surface-Level Writing Instruction	Writing classes emphasize grammar and form over argumentation, logic, and research integration.	13	Many courses still teach writing as sentence construction rather than discourse development."
3. Affective Barriers and Low Confidence	Students experience anxiety and self-doubt, particularly in research-based writing.	10	"Fear of criticism often prevents students from submitting drafts or revising actively."
4. Insufficient Mentoring Structures	Lack of systematic mentoring and peer collaboration limits iterative writing improvement.	9	"Students write in isolation; mentoring is usually unstructured or last-minute."

Table 4.1 shows that experts consistently locate the most pressing challenges in four tightly connected areas of practice. Surface level writing instruction appears most frequently, suggesting that many programmes still prioritise grammar, sentence level accuracy, and textual form over argumentation, logic, and research integration, which leaves students with fragmented rather than disciplinary ways of thinking and writing. Almost as prominent is limited feedback literacy, indicating that both students and lecturers tend to treat feedback as correction rather than as dialogic guidance for revision, which weakens students' agency and capacity for self-regulation.

The high incidence of affective barriers and low confidence further reveals that academic writing is experienced as emotionally risky work, where fear of criticism and perfectionism discourage the drafting and redrafting that genuine improvement requires.

Finally, the relatively lower but still substantial frequency of insufficient mentoring structures suggests that many students write in isolation, without systematic supervision or peer support to sustain iterative development. Taken together, these themes portray an ecosystem where students are expected to perform sophisticated academic writing without the conceptual, affective, and relational scaffolding needed to do so.

4.3 Round 2: Quantitative Evaluation of Items

During Round 2, experts rated the importance and feasibility of each proposed strategy on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = very low, 5 = very high). Descriptive analysis showed that feedback-focused interventions and teacher professional development received the highest median scores (Md = 5.0, IQR = 0.75).

Table 4.2. Summary of the top ten items achieving the strongest consensus.

Rank	Item Description	Md	IQR	Category
1	Training programs to enhance teachers' feedback literacy and written response strategies	5.0	0.50	Pedagogy
2	Incorporating peer-review and self-assessment activities into writing courses	5.0	0.75	Feedback Practice
3	Establishing structured writing mentoring at departmental level	5.0	0.75	Institutional Support
4	Integrating process-based writing and multiple-draft submission in coursework	4.8	0.75	Pedagogy
5	Embedding digital platforms (e.g., Google Docs, LMS feedback) for collaborative revision	4.7	0.75	Technology Integration
6	Providing feedback workshops to improve students' reflection and uptake	4.7	1.00	Student Development
7	Designing rubrics emphasizing coherence, logic, and originality rather than grammar alone	4.6	0.75	Assessment Reform
8	Encouraging affective feedback (praise, motivation, supportive tone) to build confidence	4.6	1.00	Affective Dimension
9	Institutionalizing writing centers to support research paper and thesis writing	4.5	0.75	Institutional Support
10	Conducting continuous classroom research on writing pedagogy effectiveness	4.5	1.00	Teacher Professional Growth

4.4 Round 3: Refinement and Final Consensus

In Round 3, experts reviewed a summary of the collective results and were invited to revise their earlier ratings in light of group feedback, which strengthened consensus, particularly for items emphasising affective support and peer collaboration, and signalled a shared view of academic writing as both a cognitive and social endeavour. The final distribution of agreement showed high consensus (IQR ≤ 0.75) on 21 items (60%), moderate consensus (IQR = 1.0) on 8 items (22.9%), and low consensus (IQR > 1.0) on 6 items (17.1%). Qualitative insights further indicated that, while technical proficiency remains essential, sustained engagement in writing also depends on emotional scaffolding, institutional support, and opportunities for authentic audience interaction, which together nurture a more holistic and human centered approach to writing pedagogy.

4.5 Summary of Consensus-Derived Framework

The synthesis of the three Delphi rounds produced a consensus based pedagogical framework for academic writing that integrates four mutually reinforcing dimensions addressing the cognitive, emotional, and institutional aspects of writing pedagogy. The first, Feedback Literacy Development, focuses on equipping students and instructors to provide, interpret, and use written feedback effectively, fostering a dialogic and reflective feedback culture. The second, Process Oriented Pedagogy, foregrounds iterative drafting, peer review, and reflective revision as practices that shift writing instruction from product based evaluation to developmental learning. The third, Affective and Motivational Support, underscores the role of empathy, praise, and encouragement in feedback discourse in strengthening students' confidence and resilience throughout the writing process.

Finally, Institutional Empowerment underscores the establishment of writing centers, mentoring systems, and professional learning communities as essential structures for sustaining pedagogical innovation. Together, these dimensions form a holistic, empirically grounded framework that strengthens academic writing competence in Indonesian higher education while ensuring contextual and cultural relevance.

5. Discussion

5.1. Understanding the Core Challenges of Academic Writing Pedagogy

The Delphi panel reached a strong consensus that academic writing pedagogy in Indonesian higher education is constrained by four interlocking challenges, namely limited feedback literacy, surface level instruction, affective barriers, and inadequate mentoring systems. These findings highlight that students are often socialised into viewing writing as a grammatical exercise rather than as a form of inquiry, which resonates with Afifi (2021), who observed that writing courses in comparable EFL contexts frequently prioritise sentence level accuracy at the expense of argumentation, critical engagement, and disciplinary voice. When instruction is dominated by form focused routines, writing loses its epistemic function and becomes detached from research, reading, and dialogue.

At the same time, the experts underscored that both instructors and students lack robust feedback literacy, since many struggle to interpret, respond to, and act on feedback in ways that lead to substantive revision. This pattern echoes Zhang and Xu's observations that feedback is often experienced as a one way transfer of corrections rather than as a dialogic resource for learning, and it confirms Canagarajah's (2024) argument that reimagining academic writing in multilingual settings requires not only changes in classroom technique, but also deeper shifts in how writing is taught, learned, and valued as a social and intellectual practice.

5.2. Feedback Literacy as a Transformative Dimension

Consensus data revealed that training programmes for feedback literacy and written response strategies were among the most strongly endorsed interventions, with consistently high median scores and narrow interquartile ranges. This indicates that experts view feedback literacy as a transformative lever rather than an optional add on.. The panel's prioritisation of teacher focused feedback training is also consistent with a study by Nguyen et al. (2024), which show that well structured, technology mediated peer and teacher feedback can significantly enhance both writing quality and learner agency.

In the present study, experts went further by framing feedback literacy as a shared responsibility that should be embedded in professional development, curriculum design, and assessment practices. This perspective echoes Fadhly et al. (2023), who argued that Indonesian students' success in academic writing depends less on the mere presence of feedback and more on how far they are guided to interpret, negotiate, and apply it strategically. This reveals a gap, since previous research has usually examined feedback practices in isolated courses or small scale interventions, while the Delphi consensus calls for a system level view of feedback literacy as a core graduate attribute and institutional priority.

5.3. Integrating Process Based and Technology Supported Pedagogy

The panel also reached strong agreement that writing should be understood and taught as a process that unfolds through multiple drafts, iterative feedback, and sustained interaction, supported where appropriate by digital tools. The high ranking of items related to process-based writing, multiple draft submission, and collaborative platforms reflects a broader pedagogical shift documented by Adhami and Hutson et al. (2024), who report significant gains in writing performance in contexts that prioritise inquiry driven, process-oriented work over examination oriented, product driven tasks. The experts in this study highlighted that digital tools such as Google Docs and learning management systems can extend this process beyond classroom time by enabling ongoing peer and teacher interaction, real time revision, and greater transparency of the writing trajectory, findings that resonate with Chura Quispe and Castro (2024) and Amer et al. (2025).

At the same time, they cautioned that technology should function as an enabler of reflection, collaboration, and feedback uptake rather than as a mere submission or correction channel. The key contribution of the present Delphi study in this area lies in linking process based pedagogy with explicit institutional commitments, such as policies that normalise multiple drafts, allow time for revision cycles, and encourage ethically grounded use of generative AI. This addresses a gap in existing literature, which often celebrates technological innovation without adequately theorising the institutional conditions under which digital tools can genuinely support deeper learning in EFL academic writing.

5.4. Addressing the Affective and Motivational Dimensions

Affective and motivational factors emerged as a crucial yet frequently overlooked dimension of academic writing pedagogy. Experts repeatedly noted that anxiety, fear of critique, and low confidence undermine students' willingness to draft, share, and revise their work, particularly for research based writing tasks. These observations converge with Mirhosseini et al. (2025) and Fadhly (2022), who show that students in EFL contexts often perceive academic writing as a high risk activity in which error is heavily penalised and linguistic identity is policed.

The Delphi consensus underscores the importance of affective feedback, including praise, encouragement, and supportive tone, as part of a relational pedagogy that seeks to build trust rather than merely to correct deficiencies. This orientation aligns with Gagich (2025), who argues that student engagement, including engagement with AI tools, deepens when writing is framed as a low stakes developmental process instead of a one shot evaluative event. The present study advances this body of work by elevating affective scaffolding from an individual teacher preference to a domain of explicit pedagogical design that should inform rubrics, supervisor training, and institutional guidelines on feedback. At the same time, it reveals a gap in current practice, since few existing frameworks in the Indonesian context systematically integrate emotional safety, identity affirmation, and confidence building into formal descriptions of academic writing outcomes and curricula.

5.5. Institutional and Systemic Implications

Beyond classroom practice, the experts unanimously emphasised that sustainable improvement in academic writing requires robust institutional infrastructures. High consensus around departmental mentoring, writing centres, and teacher learning communities shows that the panel conceptualised academic writing support as a form of core pedagogical work rather than as an ancillary service. This institutional dimension echoes Rodrigues (2025) and Marshall et al. (2024), who argue that academic supervision and writing support should be recognised, resourced, and rewarded as central to academic labour. In the Indonesian context, participants pointed to fragmented mentoring practices, uneven access to writing support, and limited recognition of writing instruction in workload allocation as structural constraints that impede change. The Delphi findings therefore underscore the need for policy level interventions in areas such as curriculum design, staffing, recognition of writing intensive teaching, and the standardisation of writing assessment. The novelty of this study lies in its explicit articulation of how these systemic levers intersect with classroom pedagogy and learner experience, filling a gap in prior research that has often treated institutional conditions as background context rather than as active components of academic writing pedagogy.

5.6. The Emerging Consensus Framework: A Holistic Perspective

Integrating the four dimensions of feedback literacy, process based and technology supported pedagogy, affective and motivational support, and institutional infrastructure, the Delphi study proposes a contextualised pedagogical model for EFL academic writing in Indonesia. This model reconceptualises writing as more than a linguistic product; it positions writing as a social, emotional, and epistemic practice that connects cognition, culture, and communication. Grounded in expert consensus, the model contributes conceptually by integrating sociocultural, affective, and institutional dimensions into a unified, synergistic framework, and by addressing a key gap in the literature, namely the absence of a consensus based, locally grounded framework that consolidates scattered insights on feedback, multilingualism, technology, and supervision. Practically, it offers a clear roadmap for curriculum developers, writing instructors, and academic leaders to design evidence based and context sensitive interventions that remain attentive to global debates around generative AI, decoloniality, and multilingual academic literacies. As Canagarajah (2024) emphasizes, decolonizing writing pedagogy requires recognising and valuing diverse epistemologies and local practices; in this light, the present Delphi study represents a novel attempt to align global theorising with Indonesian experts' situated knowledge of what constitutes effective and equitable academic writing instruction.

Looking ahead, the findings point to several fruitful directions for future research and pedagogical experimentation. Empirical studies will be needed to implement and evaluate the proposed framework across different faculties, institutional types, and

regions in Indonesia, including longitudinal classroom-based research that tracks changes in student writing performance, feedback literacy, and affective trajectories over time. Comparative studies could examine how the framework transfers to other multilingual higher education contexts in the Global South, while design-based research might explore specific components such as AI mediated feedback, writing centre practices, or supervisor training models in greater depth. Further work is also needed to foreground student voices in validating and refining the framework, particularly in relation to issues of identity, power, and linguistic justice. Such research would not only strengthen the empirical foundations of the model, but also enrich English language teaching more broadly by offering contextually grounded, theoretically informed pathways for integrating academic writing pedagogy, technology, and institutional reform in coherent and sustainable ways.

6. Conclusions

This study used a Delphi approach to generate expert consensus on the core challenges, pedagogical needs, and strategic priorities for academic writing instruction in Indonesian higher education. The panel of fifteen EFL specialists highlighted four interrelated problem areas, namely limited feedback literacy among lecturers and students, product-oriented writing instruction with minimal emphasis on process and argumentation, affective barriers such as low motivation and anxiety, and institutional constraints that marginalise writing within broader curricula. At the same time, the experts converged on several key priorities, including systematic feedback literacy training, process based and multi draft writing pedagogy, the principled use of digital and AI supported platforms to sustain feedback cycles, and stronger alignment between assessment practices, learning outcomes, and institutional support structures.

The novelty of this study lies in its use of a structured consensus method to weave these strands into a contextualised framework that treats academic writing as a social, emotional, technological, and institutional ecosystem rather than a discrete language skill. This framework carries important implications for policy makers, curriculum designers, and teacher educators, since it calls for targeted professional development, formalised mentoring and writing support systems, and policy level recognition of writing as central to academic success and research productivity. Future research should build on this foundation through longitudinal and classroom-based studies that examine how the proposed framework operates across proficiency levels, disciplines, and institutional types, as well as through comparative and mixed method inquiries that foreground teacher and student perspectives,

explore ethical and pedagogical dimensions of AI assisted writing, and refine the model for wider application in diverse English language teaching contexts.

Acknowledgement

References

Adhami, N., & Taghizadeh, M. (2024). Integrating inquiry-based learning and computer-supported collaborative learning into a flipped classroom: Effects on academic writing performance and perceptions of students of railway engineering. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 37*(3), 521–557. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2046107

Afifi, N. (2021). Exploring the use of grammatical metaphor in Indonesian EFL learners' academic writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(3), 719–731. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31759

Aleshinskaya, E., & Vasilieva, N. (2025). The effect of genre-based learning on teaching academic email writing. *Language Related Research, 16*(3), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.48311/LRR.16.3.1

Amer, M. I. B., Rababah, L. M., & Rababah, M. A. (2025). Exploring ChatGPT as a tool for thesis writing: Perspectives of EFL supervisors in Jordanian universities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 16*(1), 33–42. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1601.04

Amirjalili, F., Neysani, M., & Nikbakht, A. (2024). Exploring the boundaries of authorship: A comparative analysis of AI-generated text and human academic writing in English literature. *Frontiers in Education, 9*, Article 1347421. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1347421

Bozkurt, A. (2024). GenAI et al.: Cocreation, authorship, ownership, academic ethics and integrity in a time of generative AI. *Open Praxis, 16*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.1.654

Canagarajah, S. (2022). Language diversity in academic writing: Toward decolonizing scholarly publishing. *Journal of Multicultural*

Discourses, 17(2), 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2022.204970 6

Canagarajah, S. (2024). Decolonizing academic writing pedagogies for multilingual students. *TESOL Quarterly, 58*(1), 280–306. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.3279

Caprioglio, A., & Paglia, L. (2023). Fake academic writing: Ethics during chatbot era. *European Journal of Paediatric Dentistry, 24*(2), 88–89. https://doi.org/10.23804/ejpd.2023.24.02.01

Casal, J. E., & Kessler, M. (2023). Can linguists distinguish between ChatGPT/AI and human writing? A study of research ethics and academic publishing. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics, 2*(3), Article 100068. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rmal.2023.100068

Chura-Quispe, G., & Castro, R. A. G. (2024). A techno-pedagogical design for the production of academic essays in university students. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 16*(1), Article ep486. https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13591

Daniels, S., & Richards, R. (2024). We're all in this thing together: An equitable and flexible approach to language diversity in the Stellenbosch University Writing Lab. In N. Poulin, J. Denny, & D. Martins (Eds.), *Landmark essays in contemporary writing center studies* (pp. 295–307). Routledge.

Davis, M. (2024). Inclusion within a holistic approach to academic integrity: Improving policy, pedagogy, and wider practice for all students. In T. Bretag (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 1129–1147). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99655-8_44

De Costa, P. I, Ojha, L. P., Lee, V. W. Y., & Montgomery, D. P. (2024). Decolonizing higher education pedagogy: Insights from critical, collaborative professionalism in practice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 56*(8), 784–800. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2023.217359 9

DuBose, J., & Marshall, D. (2023). AI in academic writing: Tool or invader? *Public Services Quarterly, 19*(2), 125–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/15228959.2023.218533 8

Dugartsyrenova, V. A. (2024). Facilitating graduate students' technology-mediated peer review practices in an online multicultural academic writing classroom. *Social Science Research Network*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5132789

Fadhly, F. (2022). Extensive reading as a gateway to create research gap: Valuable lessons from Indonesian expert authors. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, 7*(2), 397–413. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v7i2.537

Fadhly, F. Z. (2021). Synthesizing effective strategies for IT-mediated writing: A meta-ethnographic study. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, 6*(2), 563–575. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v6i2.610

Fadhly, F. Z. (2022). Formulating research problem in academic writing: Indonesian expert authors' cognitive experience. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 7*(1), 215–233. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v7i1.1262

Fadhly, F. Z., Muziatun, M., Manan, N. A., Acesta, A., & Solihat, D. (2023). An academic writing model: Lessons learned from experienced writers. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(3), 870–880. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i3.44952

Fadhly, Z. F. (2023). Enhancing the academic writing of EFL learners: An analysis of effective strategies through meta-synthesis. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 397–410. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i2.1438

Frye, B. L. (2022). Should using an AI text generator to produce academic writing be plagiarism? *Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal, 33*(2), 946–1004.

Gagich, M. (2025). Using process-based pedagogical assessment practices to challenge generative AI in the writing classroom. In T. Brown & M. M. Williams (Eds.), *Educational assessments in the age of generative AI* (pp. 1–32). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-7325-0.ch001

Garg, S., Ahmad, A., & Madsen, D. Ø. (2024). Academic writing in the age of AI: Comparing the reliability of ChatGPT and Bard with Scopus and Web of Science. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 9*(4), Article 100563. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2024.100563

Ghotbi, N. (2024). Ethics of artificial intelligence in academic research and education. In S. E. Eaton (Ed.), *Second handbook of academic integrity* (pp. 1–18). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54144-5_143

Hutson, J., Plate, D., & Berry, K. (2024). Embracing AI in English composition: Insights and innovations in hybrid pedagogical practices. *International Journal of Changes in Education, 1*(1), 19–31.

https://doi.org/10.47852/bonviewIJCE4202229 0

Jusslin, S., & Hilli, C. (2024). Supporting bachelor's and master's students' thesis writing: A rhizoanalysis of academic writing workshops in hybrid learning spaces. *Studies in Higher Education, 49*(4), 712–729. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.225080 9

Kim, J., Yu, S., Detrick, R., & Li, N. (2025). Exploring students' perspectives on generative AI-assisted academic writing. *Education and Information Technologies, 30*, 1265–1300. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-12878-7

Koplin, J. (2023). Plagiarism, academic ethics, and the utilization of generative AI in academic writing. *International Journal of Applied Philosophy, 37*(2), 17–40. https://doi.org/10.5840/ijap2023372202

Maphoto, K. B., Sevnarayan, K., Mohale, N. E., Suliman, Z., Ntsopi, T. J., & Mokoena, D. (2024). Advancing students' academic excellence in distance education: Exploring the potential of generative AI integration to improve academic writing skills. *Open Praxis, 16*(2), 142–159.

Marshall, S., Blaj-Ward, L., Dreamson, N., Nyanjom, J., & Bertuol, M. T. (2024). The reshaping of higher education: Technological impacts, pedagogical change, and future projections. *Higher Education Research & Development, 43*(3), 521–541. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.224829 0

Mirhosseini, S. A., Janfada, M., & Iranmanesh, L. (2025). The pain, the pedagogy, and the politics of IELTS: A critical autobiographical inquiry. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 22*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2023.227393 6

Nguyen, A., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Huang, X. (2024). Human–AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education, 49*(5), 847–864. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.232359 3

Nurkamto, J., Prihandoko, L. A., Putro, N. H. P. S., & Purwati, O. (2024). Academic writing apprehension in higher education: A systematic review. *Studies in English Language and Education, 11*(1), 247–266.

O'Brien, C., & Charura, D. (2025). Pedagogical perspectives to ponder: Engaging with social justice An integrative pedagogy of discomfort and love in psychotherapy. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 25*(1), e12895. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12895

Olsson, E. M., Gelot, L., Karlsson Schaffer, J., & Litsegård, A. (2024). Teaching academic literacies in international relations: Towards a pedagogy of practice. *Teaching in Higher Education, 29*(2), 471–488. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2022.210890 5

Peungcharoenkun, T., & Waluyo, B. (2024). Writing pedagogy in higher education: The efficacy of mediating feedback with technology. *Reading & Writing, 15*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.4102/rw.v15i1.435

Quist, J. (2025). *Translingual creative writing theory, practice, and pedagogy: Daoism and decentering monolingual workshops.* Bloomsbury Publishing.

Rodrigues, J. D. N. (2025). Academic supervision as pedagogical work in higher education. *Educação & Realidade, 49*, Article e136363. https://doi.org/10.1590/2175-6236136363

Rowland, D. R. (2023). Two frameworks to guide discussions around levels of acceptable use of generative AI in student academic research and writing. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning, 17*(1), T31–T69.

Song, C., & Song, Y. (2023). Enhancing academic writing skills and motivation: Assessing the efficacy of ChatGPT in AI-assisted language learning for EFL students. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1260843. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1260843

Tang, A., Li, K. K., Kwok, K. O., Cao, L., Luong, S., & Tam, W. (2024). The importance of transparency: Declaring the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in academic writing. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 56*(2), 314–318. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12938

Tran, T. T. H. (2023). AI tools in teaching and learning English academic writing skills. In *Proceedings of the AsiaCALL International Conference* (Vol. 4, pp. 170–187). AsiaCALL.

van Niekerk, J., Delport, P. M., & Sutherland, I. (2025). Addressing the use of generative AI in academic writing. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 8*, Article 100342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100342

Wise, B., Emerson, L., Van Luyn, A., Dyson, B., Bjork, C., & Thomas, S. E. (2024). A scholarly dialogue: Writing scholarship, authorship, academic integrity and the challenges of AI. *Higher Education Research & Development,*

43(3), 578–590. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2023.225223 5

Xie, D., & Sun, Y. (2024). Decolonizing English academic writing education through translingual practices. *Linguistics and Education, 81*, Article 101307. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101307

Yuan, Y., Li, H., & Sawaengdist, A. (2024). The impact of ChatGPT on learners in English academic writing: Opportunities and challenges in education. *Language Learning in Higher Education, 14*(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2023-0006

Zhang, Z., & Xu, L. (2024). Student engagement with automated feedback on academic writing: A study on Uyghur ethnic minority students in China. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 45*(8), 3466–3479. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2023.221396 8

Zulfa, S., Dewi, R. S., Hidayat, D. N., Hamid, F., & Defianty, M. (2023, August). The use of AI and technology tools in developing students' English academic writing skills. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Education* (pp. 47–63).