Language Learning and Technology: Refining Academic Writing Classes

Teguh Sulistyo[1], Rizky Lutviana[2], Maria Purnawati[3], Kristina Dasut[4]

[1-4]Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang

Abstract: Academic writing is commonly identified as one of the most difficult skills for university students. It requires expertise in linguistic accuracy, critical thinking, and conformity to rhetorical conventions. Traditional writing instruction, however, often emphasizes mechanical correctness and end products at the expense of the recursive, reflective, and social nature of the writing process. The article discusses how the integration of technology supports the teaching of academic writing by offering scaffolding for student learning, supporting collaborative work, encouraging reflective practices, and advocating a process-based approach to teaching. By referencing current trends in language acquisition and education, the article highlights how digital tools, such as grammar-checking software, online collaborative environments, and electronic portfolios, reshape students' experiences with writing tasks. It also identifies barriers like the risk of over-reliance on automated feedback, inequalities of digital access, and the need for teacher preparation in digital methods of teaching. The discussion concludes that technology, when applied reflectively and pedagogically, not only enhances the teaching of academic writing but prepares students for ongoing learning and effective professional communication in the age of digital technologies.

INTRODUCTION

Academic writing occupies a central role in higher education as both a means of assessment and a tool for intellectual development. It requires students not only to demonstrate linguistic proficiency but also to engage in higher-order thinking skills such as analysing, synthesizing, and evaluating information. As Hyland (2019) argues, academic writing is a social practice that positions students within disciplinary communities which leads them to adopt particular rhetorical strategies and conventions. However, for many university students, especially those using English as a foreign language (EFL), academic writing remains a formidable challenge (Marhaban et al., 2021; Sulistyo et al., 2020). Difficulties arise not only

from linguistic limitations, such as grammar and vocabulary, but also from problems in organizing ideas, constructing arguments, and maintaining coherence (Gaffar et al., 2024; Tahira et al., 2022). Traditional approaches to teaching academic writing have often been criticized for being too focused on the final products. Students, in general, are expected to produce texts with minimal support; teachers focus heavily on grammatical errors feedback (Budianto et al., 2020; Rofiqoh et al., 2022; Sulistyo et al., 2024). Thus, these practices provide immediate feedback (Aliyu, 2020; Ruru & Sulistyo, 2020), but teachers do not concentrate on deeper aspects of writing: reasoning, voice, and the steps of writing. Moreover, textbook-driven writing activities focus on a static set of instructions which neglect audience and purpose (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014). As a result, students tend to produce flat texts as they do not really understand the purposes of composing a text.

In this digital era, technology-integrated language learning has created new paradigms on academic writing activities. Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL), for instance, emphasizes the potential of technology to support linguistic competences (Chapelle, 2017). In addition, the use of Mobile-Assisted Learning Language Learning (MALL) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications are beneficial for both teachers and students (Marhaban, Sulistyo, Widiastuti, et al., 2025; Sulistyo, 2024; Widiastuti et al., 2022). Some tools such as grammatical checkers and paraphrasers provide students with immediate feedback on language use. Canva and Padlet also navigate teachers to design writing tasks, monitor progress, and facilitate peer review (Liskinasih et al., 2023).

The pedagogical shift leads to two main facts: replacing paper with digital media and refining writing activities. Consequently, academic writing can be taught as an interactive process rather than as a product-oriented focus. For example, Google Docs makes the process of drafting and revising transparent. Also, peer review platforms encourage collaboration and negotiation of meaning (Ruru & Sulistyo, 2020; Sulistyo et al., 2019). In addition, digital portfolios provide chances for students to reflect on their growth as writers over time (Sulistyo et al., 2020). These developments suggest a process-based approach in writing classes which covers planning, drafting, revising, and publishing (Davoodifard, 2022; Marhaban et al., 2025; Sulistyo & Heriyawati, 2017; Tahira et al., 2022).

However, there are some challenges faced by both teachers and students in technology-based writing activities (Sulistyo et al., 2023). For instance, students may be too dependent on grammar checkers, so they focus too much on language accuracy and neglect the content or organization of the text. In contrast, many teachers suffer from technology literacy and digital pedagogy, so it limits their

capacity to apply technology effectively into writing classes (Sulistyo et al., 2023). It implies that the integration of technology in writing instructions require good plans and wise considerations to minimize misleading practices in writing activities.

For those reasons and facts, this article tries to propose some possible perspectives how technology can refine academic writing instructions in university level. It discusses how technology can promote collaboration among students and encourage reflective practice. It also encourages a shift from product-based to process-based approaches. Integrating language learning and technology, the paper seeks to highlight the potential of digital tools in refining how academic writing classes for the 21st century can be implemented.

DISCUSSION

1. Technology as a Scaffolding Tool

One of the central benefits of technology to academic writing activities is its ability to supports students to master complex writing skills. In traditional classrooms, teachers commonly explain, give instruction, and provide feedback on students work. With the integration of digital tools, however, students now have access to multiple sources of support that extend beyond classroom limits (Sulistyo et al., 2023). Grammar checkers such as Grammarly are widely employed by university students to check grammar, punctuation, and mechanics. While some scholars have raised concerns about the risk of over-reliance on such tools (Dikli & Bleyle, 2014), they can serve as valuable supportive resources (Marhaban, Sulistyo, Widiastuti, et al., 2025; Sulistyo, 2024) when used wisely. Instead of passively accepting suggested corrections, students can be encouraged to compare different grammatical choices, fostering language awareness and metalinguistic reflection. It requires the ability of the teachers to guide the students how to maximize technologies without losing their active participation critically.

Beyond language accuracy, technology also scaffolds the acquisition of academic conventions. Citation managers such as Mendeley, EndNote, and Zotero assist students in managing references, generating bibliographies, and ensuring adherence to citation styles like APA or MLA. These tools reduce the cognitive burden of formatting which helps students to focus on other concerns such as organization and coherence of the text. Research by Li and Flowerdew (2020) suggests that citation software not only helps students meet formal requirements

but also supports the development of intertextuality, a critical element in academic writing.

Thus, technology-based scaffolding should not be seen as a shortcut but as a way to extend the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978). By providing immediate and contextualized feedback, digital tools enable students to take greater ownership of their learning and progress toward independent mastery of academic writing.

2. Promoting Collaboration and Peer Learning

Technologies play their roles in academic writing activities by promoting collaboration and peer learning. Traditional writing classrooms often frame writing as an individual task where students write and submit a text to teachers for feedback and a score. It stresses individual responsibility, but it neglects the social nature of writing. Writing should be dialogic which is shaped by interaction with audiences or readers and communities of practice (Hyland, 2019; Sulistyo et al., 2019). Digital platforms allow this dialogic dimension to be applied in classroom.

Tools such as Google Docs and Padlet provide real-time collaborative spaces where students can co-construct texts, comment on each other's drafts, and suggest revisions. Some research has shown that collaborative writing using such platforms enhances not only writing quality but also learners' sense of agency and accountability (Storch, 2019; Sulistyo et al., 2019). For instance, when students engage in peer review online, they are not merely correcting grammatical mistakes but are also discussing word choices, and argument clarity (Li & Storch, 2017; Sulistyo et al., 2023). This creates chances for learners to develop both critical reading and writing skills.

It is noted that digital platforms such as Padlet, Google Docs, or Bloggs allow students to provide peer feedback and revise drafts continuously, instead of receiving feedback and scores in the end of writing activities in traditional instructions (Marhaban et al., 2025; Sulistyo et al., 2023). This ongoing feedback and revision sound dynamic activities which cultivate students to work collaboratively with their classmates. However, it will work effectively if they get teacher structured guidance and continue practices in academic writing activities. Teachers, on the other hand, should monitor that the activities work properly.

3. Encouraging Reflective Practice

The willingness and abilities to do self-reflection is one of the keys in any language learning, including academic writing classes. It cultivates students to monitor and regulate their own learning so that they can develop their academic writing skills. Traditionally, teachers provide feedback and scores by the end of

the writing activity, but now technology enables more sustained and ongoing reflection (Sulistyo et al., 2023). Some digital tools such as Padlet, Docs, or e-portfolio motivate students to check their own works and make refection over time, from plannings to final products (Sulistyo et al., 2019).

By revisiting their own record of progress, students reflect their ongoing growth. They may be able to identify again their weaknesses, strengths, and areas to be improved. This reflection allows students to reexamine their processes of writing activities so that it makes the process of learning visible (Sulistyo et al., 2023; Yancey, 2019). This learning visibility suggests the belief that writing is a recursive mode and that mistakes and weakness are a part of a learning trajectory. Reflective practices supported by technology develop student learning autonomy and lifelong learning. On the other hand, teachers move beyond providing feedback on the errors of students' texts to fostering student self-regulated through structured guidance. They play as a motivator for students to adapt to the new modes of academic writing activities.

4. Shifting from Product to Process-Based Approach

Technology has brought a shift from a product-based to a process-based approach in academic writing contexts (Davoodifard, 2022). Traditional writing instruction often emphasizes the final products where teachers do not involve much when students are writing their texts except instructions. In contrast, process-based approach views writing as recursive steps where students have to experience planning, drafting, revising, and publishing their texts (Bui & Luo, 2021; Khaki & Tabrizi, 2021; Sulistyo et al., 2023). In this context, teachers may observe their students' writing activities and perhaps they give feedback during the process.

However, the rapid development of technology involvement in writing instructions has cultivated technology-based writing activities. Collaborative platforms like Google Docs allow students and teachers to work together. In addition, track changes across drafts make the writing process visible. Teachers can provide feedback at multiple stages which encourage students to make necessary revisions. Besides, LMS platforms like Canvas can be designed to include multiple submission points, peer review stages, and reflection prompts (Liskinasih et al., 2023). Empirical data taken from different research proves that students who apply process-based writing supported by technology make significant improvements in organization and critical engagement (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2014; Storch, 2019; Sulistyo et al., 2019). Thus, it is in harmony with the needs of 21st-century that students must navigate critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication (4 Cs).

5. Challenges Faced Both Teachers and Students

Regardless of its potential, the integration of technology into academic writing activities faces some challenges for both students and teachers. Unequal access to reliable internet, for instance, may suggest gaps among students (Sulistyo et al., 2021) which might produce inequalities among them. Another challenge concerns teacher readiness where many writing teachers may lack digital literacy. Thus, teacher professional development opportunities are essential to ensure that teachers can utilise technology meaningfully (Aisyah et al., 2021; Cavanagh, 2021).

Ethical consideration is another aspect which must be taken into account. The use of AI-based tools in writing raises concerns about plagiarism, academic integrity, and the loss of critical thinking (Alberth, 2023; Klayklung et al., 2023; Marhaban, Sulistyo, Widiastuti, et al., 2025). The tools can support students to do brainstorming and drafting. However, they must be guided to use the tools responsibly as helpers rather than replacements. Teachers play a key role in framing technology use within ethical guidelines that emphasize originality and critical thinking.

Finally, there is the risk of over-reliance on technology. Students depending on grammar checkers too much may miss the development of linguistic and rhetorical skills. Therefore, balance is crucial: technology should help, not replace, the intellectual effort involved in academic writing. Warschauer (2013) claims that technology alone does not transform pedagogy, so it must be integrated within a broader instructional framework that cultivates reflection, collaboration, and critical inquiry.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that the integration of technology significantly refines academic writing pedagogy. The integration is implemented by moving beyond the limitations of traditionally product-based approaches. The facts prove that digital tools provide scaffolding for language accuracy and academic conventions. Also, technologies foster collaboration and peer learning, encourage reflective practice, and embed a process-oriented mindset into writing instruction. These dimensions highlight the transformative role of technology in making writing instruction more interactive and student-centred.

It implies that technology should not be viewed as tools but as an integral aspect of writing activities. Tools such as grammar checkers, collaborative platforms, and e-portfolios reshape not only how students learn to write but also

how they perceive themselves as writers. They encourage students to become more autonomous, independent, and collaborative learners prepared for the demands of academic and professional communication in the digital age.

At the same time, this paper proposes challenges. The challenges cover unequal access to digital resources, teacher readiness, ethical concerns, and the risk of over-reliance on automation. It suggests that technology integration requires careful planning, professional development, and a balanced approach. This indicates that technology must act as a helper rather than a replacement. Technology has to support rather than reduce human roles in writing.

In conclusion, refining academic writing through technology is not only about adopting new tools but about reformulating pedagogy. By embedding digital technologies, academic writing classes can become more engaging, equitable, and transformative. The final results are equipping students with the skills and dispositions necessary to thrive in 21st-century academic and professional contexts. Consequently, both teachers and students must be ready to enter the new paradigms of writing classes in which technologies have become a part of this course.

References

Aisyah, R. N., Setiawan, S., & Munir, A. (2021). Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) in action: Unraveling Indonesian English as a foreign language teachers' TPACK by implementing telegram. *Call-Ej*, *22*(3), 17–32. http://callej.org/journal/22-3/Aisyah-Setiawan-Munir2021.pdf

Alberth. (2023). The use of Chatgpt in academic writing: A blessing or a curse in disguise? *Teflin Journal*, *34*(2), 337–352. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v34i2/337-352

Aliyu, M. M. (2020). Exploring the nature of undergraduates' peer collaboration in a PBL writing process. *International Journal of Language Education*, *4*(1), 11–23. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i2.8406

Budianto, S., Sulistyo, T., Widiastuti, O., Heriyawati, D. F., & Marhaban, S. (2020). Written corrective feedback across different levels of EFL students' academic writing proficiency: Outcomes and implications. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *7*(2), 472–485. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i2.16569

Bui, G., & Luo, X. (2021). Topic familiarity and story continuation in young English as a foreign language learners' writing tasks. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *11*(3), 377–400. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.3.4

Cavanagh, M. (2021). Pre-service teacher reflection and feedback using an online video platform during professional experience. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *46*(2), 72–85. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2021v46n2.5

Chapelle, C. A. (2017). Teaching culture in introductory foreign language textbooks. Routledge.

Davoodifard, M. (2022). An Overview of writing process research: Towards a better understanding of L2 writing process. *Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL at Teachers College, Columbia University*, *21*(2), 1–20.

Dikli, S., & Bleyle, S. (2014). Automated essay scoring feedback for second language writers: How does it compare to teacher feedback? *Assessing Writing*, 22(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2014.03.006

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2014). Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Gaffar, M. A., Fadilah, D., Nopita, D., Nusantara, U. I., & Java, W. (2024). The influence of peer corrective feedback (PCF) on students' writing skills in hortatory exposition text. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, *11*(July 2024), 557–578.

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing (2nd* ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Khaki, M., & Tabrizi, H. H. (2021). Assessing the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback in process-based vs product-based instruction on learners' writing. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, *21*, 35–53. https://doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.21.03

Klayklung, P., Chocksathaporn, P., Limna, L., Kraiwanit, T., & Jangjarat, K. (2023). Revolutionizing education with ChatGPT: Enhancing learning through conversational AI. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *2*(3), 2960–3722. www.ujer.org

Li, Y., & Flowerdew, J. (2020). Teaching English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP): A review of classroom practices. English for Specific Purposes, 59, 29–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.04.001

Li, M., & Storch, N. (2017). Peer interaction and second language learning: The impact of peer interaction on the development of language skills. In M. García Mayo (Ed.), Learning foreign languages in primary school (pp. 115–138). De Gruyter.

Liskinasih, A., Sulistyo, T., & Purnawati, M. (2023). pelatihan pembuatan media pembelajaran game interaktif berbantuan Canva bagi guru Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, *3*(2), 89–95. https://doi.org/10.56393/jpkm.v3i2.1810

Marhaban, S., Mukminatien, N., Widiati, U., Sulistyo, T., Suhastyanang, W. D., Puspitasari, Y., & Muslem, A. (2021). Strategies employed by EFL doctoral candidates in dissertation writing completion. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *8*(2), 546–560. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i2.17694

Marhaban, S., Sulistyo, T., Widiastuti, O., & Kuala, U. S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in writing: Students' writing competencies and voices. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, *12*(1), 403–425.

Rofiqoh, Basthomi, Y., Widiati, U., Puspitasari, Y., Marhaban, S., & Sulistyo, T. (2022). Aspects of writing knowledge and EFL students' writing quality. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *9*(1), 14–29. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.20433

Ruru, T. A. N., & Sulistyo, T. (2020). Peer review in writing activities: outcomes and perceptions of EFL students. *Journal of Research on English and Language Learning*, *1*(2), 133–140.

https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33474/j-reall.v1i2.6845

Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing. In J. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1–7). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0706

Sulistyo, T. (2024). "Hi, I am a machine translator ready to help": Analisis penggunaan mesin penerjemah. In I. Arifudin, A. F. Gultom, G. Sarmidi, & T. Sulistyo (Eds.), *Interseksi kearifan lokal, sains, dan teknologi: Menghargai perbedaan mewujudkan kesatuan* (pp. 507–516). Kanjuruhan Press. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1mk8n3GKzI62Wn2COflkPMbSg1bGIEeb V/view?usp=sharing

Sulistyo, T., Anjani, W. E., Marhaban, S., Rofiqoh, R., & Puspitasari, Y. (2021). Online learning in ELL: Barriers and perceptions of Indonesian students. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 8(1), 49–54. https://doi.org/10.14445/23942703/ijhss-v8i1p107

Sulistyo, T., Dewantara, A., Widiastuti, O., & Marhaban, S. (2024). Student-teacher relationship : Written feedback provision and writing performance. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, *12*(1), 113–125.

Sulistyo, T., Eltris, K. P. N., Mafulah, S., Budianto, S., Saiful, S., & Heriyawati, D. F. (2020b). Portfolio assessment: Learning outcomes and students' attitudes. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *7*(1), 141–153. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v7i1.15169

Sulistyo, T., & Heriyawati, D. F. (2017). Reformulation , text modeling , and the development of EFL academic writing. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *7*(1), 1–16.

Sulistyo, T., Mukminatien, N., Cahyono, B. Y., & Saukah, A. (2019). Enhancing learners ' writing performance through blog-assisted language learning. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, *14*(9), 61–73. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i09.9535

Sulistyo, T., Oktavia, W., Mafulah, S., Puspitasari, Y., & Holland, T. (2023). Online feedback in interactive blogging: Cultivating students' writing performance and learning engagement. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, *10*(January 2023), 119–148. https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v10i2.Submission

Tahira, M., Yousaf, I., & Haider, A. G. (2022). A comparison of diversity in the writing processes of writers: Implications for teaching of writing in Pakistan. *IJCI International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *14*(2), 1222–1232.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Warschauer, M. (2013). The digital divide and social inclusion. MIT Press.

Widiastuti, O., Ivone, F. M., Sulistyo, T., Hartono, D., Sudarwati, E., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). CALL-mediated task-based language teaching: A speaking project with online audiences in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *12*(1), 232–242. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46427

Yancey, K. B. (2019). Reflection in the writing classroom. Utah State University Press.