

Challenges and interventions in writing from the perspective of selected tertiary students: Basis for an enhanced and context-sensitive writing curriculum

Herrera, Philip Donald P. ✉

Cebu Institute of Technology – University, Philippines (philipdherrera@gmail.com)



ISSN: 2243-7703
Online ISSN: 2243-7711

Received: 30 December 2024

Revised: 13 January 2025

Accepted: 1 February 2025

OPEN ACCESS

Available Online: 1 February 2025

DOI: 10.5861/ijrse.2025.25003

Abstract

In an English classroom, participants—students and teachers alike whose first language may not necessarily be English—immerse to the six, previously five, macro skills namely: speaking, writing, listening, reading, and viewing. It is important to underscore, as studies have shown, the thought that writing, along with listening, is seen to be the hardest among the skills to teach. In light of such assertion, this study looked into the challenges tertiary students encountered when they write essays or writing tasks required for submission as well as their proposed interventions on how they can be best helped with respect to these challenges. The data were obtained through a survey questionnaire containing two open-ended questions (one dealing with what challenges students encounter and the other their proposed interventions in light of these challenges) deployed across 140 students who were asked to about their perceived challenges in writing as well as their proposed interventions on how they can be helped following the needs analysis framework. The findings revealed that among the most prominent challenges encountered by students are as follows: (1) clarity and coherence, (2) organization of ideas, and (3) word choice. On the proposed interventions, the following were obtained based on the responses: (1) feedback from instructor, (2) input on the use of strategies such as outlining and mind maps, and (3) reading and exposure to required language materials. These findings are then used as basis for policy recommendations for an enhanced writing curriculum offered by the department responsive to these needs and incorporating the students' proposed interventions. As a venue for further studies, it would be good to conduct a focus-group discussion (FGD) on the side of the teachers for the implementation of an enhanced writing curriculum to be offered among college students.

Keywords: challenges, interventions, writing curriculum, context-sensitive, tertiary students

Challenges and interventions in writing from the perspective of selected tertiary students: Basis for an enhanced and context-sensitive writing curriculum

1. Introduction

Writing is one of the five, previously four, macroskills of English. The others are speaking, reading, listening, and, more recently, viewing. According to Beare (2019), it is considered as one of the hardest skills to master and to teach because it requires the simultaneous application of all other requisite skills. Additionally, as in the study of Balqiyah (2021), not only is the simultaneous application of requisite skills required in writing, the learners themselves are also very much involved in the process of writing: pre-writing, during writing, and post-writing. Both these points are central to how writing is learned and mastered in the context, at least, of English as a second language. Such assertion is also echoed by Baharudin et. al (2023) who said, in their study, that writing in English is seen to be a challenging task for non-native speakers of the language, as the participants in this study.

Such difficulty in mastering writing is concretized in the study of Aldabbus and Almansouri (2022) in their study on academic difficulties faced by tertiary EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners. The findings of their study revealed salient points considered by students as challenges when they write. These are as follows: choosing the appropriate words, difficulty in developing thesis statements, organizing ideas, and writing coherent paragraphs. They further went on to say that these challenges are further aggravated by the fact that students were not exposed to the required language materials as evident by their low English language proficiency and lack of feedback. Finally, their study suggested that the findings should form as part of the considerations in designing the writing/language curriculum.

Sa'adan et. al (2024) echoed the same by pointing out that, in terms of undergraduate students, there are, indeed, challenges when it comes to writing. Their study also found out that, apart from the ones mentioned in the previous paragraph, the undergraduate students also encounter difficulties goal setting, clarity of instructions, topic, familiarity, and confidence in grammar and usage. In light of these challenges and difficulties, they mentioned that it is important to determine the efficacy of specific instructional strategies and interventions in relation to these writing difficulties.

In the Philippine academic context, the study of Gorospe and Rayton (2022) sustained similar findings in the context of college students. Their study found out that students have problems in writing particularly in major sub-areas of the skill which are: syntax, grammar, and vocabulary. In addition, the study also noted that, among the students' recommendations in light of these writing difficulties, teacher assistance and exposure to language materials such as reading matter in the development of writing skills. In relation to these difficulties, the study of Salvador (2024) outlined writing strategies that aim to facilitate the writing skills of Filipino college students. The study revealed that basic writing workshops, online webinars, and instructional material development are pivotal in the process of learning the nuances of writing as a skill. The studies cited in this paper point to three important insights: (1) that writing is a difficult skill to master; (2) that there are challenges faced by students especially if they are not native speakers of the English language, and (3) that these challenges must be accounted for in the design and implementation of the language curriculum.

Given these assertions from the studies cited, it is also important to include in the discourse the concept of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) as a way to synthesize these assertions. According to Hyland (2022), ESP is different from a more general English course as it focuses on particular and purposeful use of language. Such particularity in language and purposeful use of language in the context of ESP points to the centrality of needs analysis (the framework adopted in this study). In other words, the specific purpose in the acronym of ESP is dependent primarily on context—and this context is best concretized when the needs (challenges, difficulties,

perceptions) of students are accounted for. Although the English 014 class used in this study is not an ESP-course, this is still important as this assertion on the importance of needs analysis and students' context paints a greater picture of the writing class—or any language class for that matter—that, in writing, we cannot isolate the context and experiences that shaped the students.

2. Theoretical Framework

The study follows the needs analysis framework as its theoretical underpinning. According to Brown (1995), as cited by Kaya (2021), it refers to the systematic collection and analysis of all subjective and necessary information to define and validate the curriculum according to the language learning requirements of students. This is important to underscore since the concept of language learning requirements—construed as the tertiary students' perceived challenges and their proposed interventions—is central to this study. As such, the English 014 (Writing Communication) class is considered to be 'ideally' according to the varying learning language requirements of these tertiary students. This view is sustained by Sani, et. al (2020) in their study about needs analysis and strategies for language teachers. They mentioned, in their paper, that needs analysis is a pivotal element of any language course—regardless if the course is considered to English for Specific Purposes or General English. This is best concretized in curriculum design and teaching and learning. In other words, the curriculum design and the teaching-learning activities in the course should very much reflect the centrality of students in the discourse.

Sharmin (2023) articulated that the conduct of needs analysis determines the success of any language course. She further categorically asserted that such conduct of needs analysis allows the students to take part in curriculum design, which is largely the work of teachers and other experts. This is an important insight in relation to the present study because it is true that, in the context of the English 014 course, the syllabus and the curriculum are designed by the teachers who are teaching this course; however, students' needs are not yet accounted for in such design. That is why this study attempts to redo that practice by actually allowing the students—who are at the receiving end of classroom instruction—to actively take part in the writing course such that their writing concerns and proposed interventions are taken into consideration. This is echoed by Hidayati and Meisani (2023) in their study. They indicated that the findings of any needs analysis done to students should form part of the course goals and objectives, ultimately benefitting the students for which it is designed.

These four studies on needs analysis, although not to be taken as the study's attempt to provide a comprehensive examinations of studies on the topic, point to glaring fact that a language course must be in accordance to the students' context—be it their needs or challenges. As such, the effectiveness of the language course's design and implementation is not solely dependent on the teachers as its designers and implementers, but it also rests on how attuned the course is in terms of its topics, activities, and other assessments to the needs of the students who, as mentioned, are at the receiving end of instruction.

Although, it is important to mention that the English 014 (Writing Communication) class from which these students who were participants of these study were enrolled is considered to be a general education (English) course. That is why there is no clear regard on the context of students particularly in terms of writing as the curriculum, its design, the materials are solely based on the teachers implementing the course. In that light, the findings of this study, where needs analysis was conducted, is actually an attempt by the researcher to redefine the English 014 (Writing Communication) course from a general English course to an English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course. That way, in the researcher's view given the findings of the study, the course becomes more responsive and attuned to the actual needs of the students enrolled in the class. Additionally, it also aims to place premium in needs analysis as an important diagnostic mechanism for non-native English language students in response to their context.

In relation to context, this study also subscribes to the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm (IPP) as its another framework. IPP, as it is more commonly known, is central to the Jesuits particularly in their mission in the

education sector. It is considered not as a template for a lesson plan but rather a worldview that fosters constant reflection. The IPP puts premium on the concept of context as the beginning of teaching-learning. This is, perhaps, an abstraction of needs analysis. In other words, the underlying concept of ‘analyzing the needs of the students’ primarily points to this concept of context. In Ignatian education, the context is the first among the sequence of steps—primarily because, Jesuits believe as pointed out by Mesa (2023), it facilitates the conditions of learning. That is why what follows the determination of context in the Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm is the experience. Therefore, true learning, in the sense of Jesuit education, occurs when context students (and by extension of the world) is factored in the design and implementation of the curriculum. Additionally, the Jesuits’ idea of context also is borne out of a related term—*cura personalis*, which means care or respect for the individual (student’s) person. Again, this is important in the present study as the students’ context is given emphasis in the design and the implementation of the course.

Needs analysis, context, and *cura personalis* are interrelated terms. In fact, needs analysis, a method, is a concretization of the value of knowing the students’ context—meeting where they are before they enter the classroom and caring for them as students endowed with (writing) experiences that ultimately shape them. Therefore, as a way to reiterate, needs analysis provides a potent view of not only the extent of the students’ learning of the writing skill but, more importantly, the challenges that they encounter with it and the interventions that can help them harness the skill.

2.1 Statement of the Problem

This study explores tertiary students’ perceived challenges and interventions in academic writing. Particularly, it aims to answer the following specific questions:

- What are the perceived challenges encountered by college students in academic writing?
- How do they think they can be helped in light of such challenges?
- What recommendations may be proposed given the challenges and interventions obtained from the students?

3. Methodology

Research Design - The study follows a qualitative-quantitative approach in obtaining the required data to answer the specific questions. The first part of the study involved the provision of an open-ended survey questionnaire where students were asked to regarding the challenges they encounter in in the context of academic writing. Afterwards, they were asked to answer, still in detail, how they think they can be best helped given the challenges that they have indicated. As this study aimed to only provide baseline data on students’ challenges and interventions in academic writing, the choice of having an open-ended questionnaire warrants that the respondents would be able to articulate very well and in detail these perceived challenges and the interventions they think that can best help them. On the side of the researcher, this provision allows for a broader determination of the challenges and interventions suited to the varying context of the students as respondents. The second part was obtaining the frequency of the students’ responses to determine the dominant challenges and prevailing interventions to arrest such challenges. In this study, the top three responses for both challenges and interventions in academic writing were considered. In addition, to supplement the tabulated data, qualitative insights on these challenges and interventions are provided. Finally, policy recommendations are provided in light of all these in relation to the curriculum enhancement of the English 014 (Writing Communication) course.

Research Participants - The participants in the study were 140 selected tertiary students enrolled in English 014 (Writing Communication) class. They were chosen following the convenience sampling method (provided that they were officially enrolled in the course) as the open-ended survey questionnaire was carried out as a way to look the students’ context with respect to the challenges that they encounter when they do academic writing as

well as their proposed interventions on how they can be best helped. Since English 014 is a General Education course (GE) which means that all students regardless of degree program will take the course, the participants of this study vary in terms of degree program: Engineering, Psychology, Computer Science and Information Technology, Business and Accountancy, Criminology, Hospitality Management, Nursing, and Pharmacy. It is important to take note that the degree program from which the research participant belongs to is not a variable or a factor in this study because this, the present study, only aims to provide a baseline data on the challenges of students in academic writing and their proposed interventions notwithstanding their academic programs.

Research Environment - The participants are selected undergraduate students from Cebu Institute of Technology – University. These undergraduate students come from various degree granting units of the institution. They are a mixed-group of students in both gender (male and female) and in year level. These are not a factor in this study given the reason mentioned in the previous paragraph. Cebu Institute of Technology – University is one of the four universities that had been granted autonomous and deregulated status from the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) for its exemplary performance in these areas: instruction, extension, and research. It has five degree-granting units: College of Arts, Sciences, and Education, College of Engineering and Architecture, College of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences, College of Management, Business, and Accountancy, and the College of Criminal Justice.

Research Data - The data were obtained from an open-ended survey questionnaire which allowed the participants to reflect and indicate the challenges that they encountered in writing. Afterwards, they were also asked to answer how they think they can be best helped in light of these challenges. As mentioned in the previous design section of this paper, the choice of having an open-ended questionnaire allowed for the participants to be in detail about their challenges in academic writing as well as their proposed interventions. In other words, as this study is only a baseline study of challenges and interventions in academic writing, the students were not confined to pre-determined difficulties and interventions, thereby allowing them to be reflect on the breadth and depth of their challenges and interventions. As a researcher, this was a warranted choice since the data were quite exhaustive and responsive to the aim of this paper—to provide baseline data. Once these data on the challenges and interventions were obtained, they were tabulated based on simple frequency to determine the dominant challenges and interventions. Again, this was guided by the fact that this paper is only a showcase of baseline data on academic writing challenges and interventions. Afterwards, qualitative insights from the study participants detailing their experiences in light of difficulties were also provided to supplement the quantitative data and provide context.

Research Procedures - Before the study commenced, the research obtained approval from the Research and Development Coordinating Office (RDCO) of the university upon the endorsement of the dean of the College of Arts, Sciences, and Education (as the servicing college for this course). Once the approval was obtained, the researcher informed the selected students about the study and that their participation is purely voluntary. Consent forms were obtained from the students. As a preliminary activity prior to the gathering of the needed data, the students were asked to do freewriting on a particular academic topic of his/her choice. This was done to allow the students to enter into the writing process. Afterwards, they were asked to fill-out the qualitative survey instrument detailing the challenges they encountered from that experience of writing (or writing in general). Then, they were also asked to consider the interventions that they think can help them arrest or address, at least, these challenges. These became the sources of data for this study. Once the needed data were already available, the researcher did simple frequency to determine the dominant challenges and interventions listed by the participants. There was also provision of qualitative insights on these challenges and interventions, done through open coding, to supplement the numerical data. Finally, researcher analysis on policy recommendations in light of the findings as well as in relation to the curricular enhancement of the English 014 course is provided.

Ethical Considerations - Ethical oversight was observed in the duration of this study. The participants were thoroughly informed about the nature and purpose of this study as their consent was also primordially considered. To protect their identity, the qualitative insights provided as a supplement in the study are anonymized. Finally,

as a way to protect their data, these were stored in Microsoft Teams, the official learning management system of the university, in a two-factor authenticated laptop. Once the data were gathered, preliminary results on the dominant challenges and their proposed interventions were also shared to them for transparency.

4. Results and Discussion

The section below presents the data obtained from the open-ended survey questionnaire that was deployed to the research participants. It is important to note that, as this study only aims to provide baseline data on the challenges and proposed interventions on the side of the students, simple frequency is used to determine the dominant figures. Then, qualitative insights are provided as a supplement to the numeric data.

Table 1
Challenges of Undergraduate Students in Writing (N=140)

Challenges Noted by Undergraduate Students	Frequency of Tokens / Responses
Clarity and coherence	56
Organization of ideas	44
Word Choice / Appropriateness of words	30
Frequent grammar error	24
Writer's block	20
Limited vocabulary	15
Sentence structure	7
Consistency of tone and style	6
Idea generation	4
Total Number of Tokens	206

The total number of tokens/responses is more than the number of respondents as they were allowed to include more than one challenge. This gives a more nuanced understanding of the students' collective challenges in writing.

Some qualitative insights from the respondents are lifted below in relation to these challenges:

Respondent A: *"One of the challenges I encountered is that I have a problem organizing my thoughts and writing it down properly. I also have the issue of using the same words again and again and sometimes I get into situations that I find it hard to fit the vocabulary I use to people of a certain age."*

Respondent B: *"One of the challenges I encounter when writing is organizing my thoughts clearly and coherently. I often struggle with structuring my essays in a way that ensures a logical flow of ideas."*

Respondent C: *"I sometimes struggle with finding the right words or phrasing to express my ideas as clearly as I envision them, which can result in feeling stuck or frustrated during the drafting process."*

Respondent D: *"Making sense of the thoughts that is flowing when given a certain topic and having to use words to deliver my thoughts into writing. Redundancy."*

Based on the table, the dominant challenges noted by undergraduate students in relation to writing are clarity and coherence, organization of ideas, and word choice. Just by a mere look at these three dominant challenges, these are skills higher than grammar or sentence structure. In other words, again based on the findings, these undergraduate students need more help in terms of the process of writing itself—such as choosing the appropriate word choice, organizing ideas, and being clear and coherent. The most dominant challenge faced by undergraduate students is clarity and coherence. This finding is supported by the study of RahmtAllah (2020) who had the same finding. In his paper, he found out that EFL students—those who consider English as their foreign language—also faced considerable difficulty in producing coherent texts. The same can be said in this study, and by extension, this points to a greater fact that, even for students who consider English as their first language, also struggles to produce clear and coherent texts.

According to Khonamari et. al (2020), coherence, and by extension clarity, is difficult for students is thought

to occur because students lack the necessary linguistic skills and knowledge of L2. In other words, they have not mastered yet the request linguistic knowledge (such as vocabulary and grammar rules) required in the L2 which affects their ability to be coherent and clear. This, again, goes back to the previous assertion that writing requires the simultaneous application of writing skills. A related difficulty or challenge posed by undergraduate students is organization of ideas. This is echoed in the study done by Saprina, Rosyid, and Suryanti (2021) who dealt with undergraduate students as well in the context of them writing argumentative essays. Their study, similar to this one, found out that idea organization and development is thought to be difficult for undergraduate students. In particular, they mentioned that students found it difficult to construct thesis statements—central to being able to organize ideas—and combine sentences.

Finally, in the study of Thuy et. al (2022), they also found out of the same writing difficulty as that of this study—particularly in terms of word choice or the appropriateness of words. In their study, they noted that, among the reasons why word choice is difficult is that students are able to apply the word’s meaning based on its context coupled with their limited vocabulary. The results of this study as well as the cited studies point to the fact that these three dominant challenges are not only true to foreign language learners but also to second language learners; and, across nationalities, the same skills are considered to be difficult or challenging.

Table 2

Proposed Interventions Based on these Challenges according to Undergraduate Students

Proposed Interventions Based on Identified Challenges	Frequency of Tokens / Responses
Feedback from peers and mentor/instructor	51
Input on the use of writing strategies such as mind maps, outlining strategies for pre-writing	47
Exposure to required language materials	45
Use or provision of Artificial Intelligence as assistive technology	15
Provision of practice writing exercises	19
Freewriting exercises	11
Proofreading and reviewing	10
Practice grammar exercises	6
Use of writing prompts	2
Setting achievable goals/dividing the task in chunks	2
Total Number of Tokens	208

The total number of tokens/responses is more than the number of respondents as they were allowed to include more than one proposed intervention. This gives a more nuanced understanding of the students’ collective proposed intervention in writing.

Reproduced below are some qualitative insights from the respondents:

Respondent A: *“To address these difficulties, I believe pointing out or giving critique to my wordplay on my essays or any written work would be good enough.”*

Respondent B: *“I believe I could benefit from more practice in outlining my essays before I start writing. This would help me organize my thoughts more effectively and ensure that each paragraph contributes to the overall argument.”*

Respondent C: *“(I think it would be helpful for me to) ask for guidance, especially in word choice and grammar.”*

Respondent D: *“I think I can be helped by giving me opinions and sharing some personal techniques how to not struggle in writing simple essays. “*

Respondent E: *“First, to better organize my thoughts, I could start by creating a detailed outline before I begin writing and I could practice adding more and exposing myself to different writing styles.”*

Respondent F: *“I think I can be helped in terms of these difficulties as long as I practice or read books and also start writing anything that comes to mind such as music, poems, notes and more.”*

The findings show that the top three proposed interventions indicated by the students are: feedback from peers and mentor, input on the use of writing strategies, and exposure to required language materials. In terms of feedback topping the proposed intervention, this is supported by the study of Hattie et. al (2021) who mentioned that feedback, while valuable, is also variable. In other words, as their study asserted, students are more drawn to what they call as “where to next?” feedback where teachers offer scaffolding in the conceptualization to the submission of the paper. In other words, feedback, as it is supposed to mean here, is not a one liner input in the paper. It must, therefore, point the students to their work. In terms of peer feedback, Wu and Schunn (2020) mentioned that it is effective, although construed to be associated with revisions, as it allows students to grow in their writing abilities.

In terms of input on the use of writing strategies, the same point is echoed by the study of Chen (2022) who indicated that integrating writing strategy instruction in the context of EFL learners prove to be effective as it brings positive impacts to students’ strategic awareness and writing performance. Finally, the undergraduate students who were the respondents of this study also mentioned the need for them to be exposed to required language learning materials for them to hone their skills. While this is this very obvious, curators and implementers of a writing or language curriculum must also consciously factor this in—aware that students may be exposed so differently to the language materials which will facilitate their learning to write in the English language.

Policy Recommendations Based on the Findings of the Study

Tailor-fit and Context-sensitive Language / Writing Curriculum

The findings of this study imply that there must be not only a tailor-fit language or writing curriculum but, rather importantly, a context-sensitive one. Therefore, while the English 014 class is considered to be a General Education (GE) course, its nature and approach must be re-defined as an ESP-oriented course. In this way, not only are these challenges and proposed interventions are factored in, but generally, the curriculum is geared towards not only what is practical but also what is attuned to the context of the students. Having mentioned that, this tailor-fit and context sensitive language/writing curriculum must be an active mechanism such that teachers of this course must always consider primordially the inputs of the students in the design, implementation, and eventually evaluation of the course curriculum. To make it explicit, the inputs of students (in the form of the results of the needs analysis) must be articulated in the syllabus itself—as the document that shows the curriculum. In particular, these results must be reflected in the choice of topics, their sequence, the activities and the required assessments for these topics.

Periodic Conduct of Needs Analysis

In relation to the first policy recommendation, granting that the English 014 class is redesigned to be ESP-oriented, it is, therefore, important to make needs analysis a staple feature of the course—perhaps as an entry/diagnostic assessment. As such, the results of the periodic needs analysis done distinctly in each English 014 class are an exemplification of how the inputs of students are considered, as mentioned in the previous recommendation, in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the course curriculum. In other words, it is not a question of how the students enrolled in the class will be able to make an input on their context because the results of the needs assessment will show exactly that—their context. In addition, teachers must be given a retooling on how to conduct a needs analysis in order to maximize the data that might be fleshed out from the students.

Exit Assessment for Writing

The study asserts that, while needs analysis is central to making the English 014 class an ESP-oriented course, it is not enough. That is why, if the conduct of the needs analysis considered to be an entry assessment, it is also equally important to implement an exit assessment for writing vis-à-vis the results of the needs analysis. In other words, it is also very much significant to look into the extent of how much the students have mastered

the indicated writing skills as reflected in their collective needs or difficulties. The exit assessment for writing, then, becomes the point that ties the entire practice—the needs analysis, the design and implementation of curriculum and the achievement of set goals—together.

Implications for Teachers and Learners

To reiterate, this study aimed to provide baseline data by looking into the dominant challenges and proposed interventions that students have in relation to academic writing. The findings showed that these students struggle with clarity and coherence, organization of ideas, and word choice. Additionally, they noted that they can be best helped in the context of these challenges through feedback from the instructor, input on different writing strategies, and exposure to required language materials. These are important as these would imply the following:

- For language teachers, they must put premium on the context of the students in their design, selection, and implementation of a language or writing curriculum;
- It is also important to incorporate the findings of the study (such varied exercises on cohesion and coherence, drills and pre-writing writing activities, and exposure to language materials) in their syllabi ensuring that teaching-learning activities (TLAs) cover these equitably;
- Granting that students' contexts differ and vary, it is the role of the language teacher to meet them where they are and consider this in the implementation of the course;
- Finally, the study has emphasized on the value of feedback; as such, language teachers, then, must devote time to provide substantial and constructive feedback to the students. This would allow the students to reflect on how they fallen short or progressed in writing.

On the side of the learners, the findings imply that:

- Writing requires practice especially within the broader context of second language learning;
- Exposure to language materials such as books is not limited to the confines of the classroom, particularly in the advent of technology;
- Finally, their ability to reflect on their own writing challenges and proposed interventions is a skill required of a second language learner.

5. Conclusions

The findings of the study showed that among the dominant challenges faced by tertiary students in terms of academic writing are clarity and coherence, organization of ideas, and word choice. In addition, in terms of interventions on how they think they can be best helped, they mentioned about the importance of feedback from the instructor, an input on different writing strategies such as outlining and mind maps, and finally, on the value of reading and exposure to required language materials. Both these challenges and interventions, as indicated by the students' responses, point to a targeted writing instruction geared towards the harnessing of these skills such as word choice, organization of ideas, and clarity and coherence. The interventions can also be used as a mechanism to concretize the harnessing of the above-mentioned skills in the classroom in the form of teaching-learning activities.

5.1 Recommendations

As venue for further studies relative to the topic considered for this study, the following recommendations are provided:

- It would be good to look into the errors committed by students in writing an academic paper following the Error Analysis Theory as these would reveal the extent of how much they have learned about

writing.

- As an offshoot to the above-mentioned recommendation, it is important that qualitative insights on the reasons for these errors must be factored, similarly, as these would also reveal nuances of how a second language learner learns writing.
- It is equally significant to look closely at each of the writing challenge/difficulty noted by the students as these are important as well in the conduct of the needs analysis.
- It is also interesting to consider targeted determination of challenges and interventions in academic writing vis-à-vis the research participants' respective (homogeneous) degree programs.

6. References

- Aldabbus, S., & Almansouri, E. (2022). Academic writing difficulties encountered by university EFL learners. *British Journal of English Language Linguistics*, 10(3), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.37745/bjel.2013/vol10n3111>
- Baharudin, F., Ramli, N. H. L., Habali, A. H. M., Azmi, A. A., & Rahmat, N. H. (2023). Process of Writing: The Challenges in writing skill among ESL Learners. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(10). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v13-i10/18649>
- Beare, K. (2019, February 5). *Why is writing more difficult than speaking?*. Retrieved from Thoughtco: <https://www.thoughtco.com/why-writing-more-difficult-than-speaking-1210489>
- Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, M. A., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: Tertiary students' perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 4(1), 61. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i1.2371>
- Chen, A. (2022). The Effects of Writing Strategy instruction on EFL learners' writing Development. *English Language Teaching*, 15(3), 29. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v15n3p29>
- Gorospe, J. D., & Rayton, M. I. C. (2022). "I can't write": problems, factors, and recommendations. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 31, 280–288. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v31i1.6433>
- Hattie, J., Crivelli, J., Van Gompel, K., West-Smith, P., & Wike, K. (2021). Feedback That Leads to Improvement in Student Essays: Testing the Hypothesis that "Where to Next" Feedback is Most Powerful. *Frontiers in Education*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.645758>
- Hidayati, L. & Meisani, D.R. (2023). The Needs Analysis of English for Specific Purposes: A Study in an Indonesian Medical School. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 465-479. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v7i2.1424>
- Hyland, K. (2022). English for specific purposes: What is it and where is it taking us? *ESP Today*, 10(2), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.2.1>
- Mesa, J. (2023, May 25). *The IPP (Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm) and its Relevance Today Celebrating 30 years of the IPP - Educate Magis*. <https://www.educatemagis.org/global-stories/the-ipp-ignatian-pedagogical-paradigm-and-its-relevance-today-celebrating-30-years-of-the-ipp/>
- Kaya, S. (2021). From needs analysis to development of a vocational English language curriculum: A practical guide for practitioners. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 5(1), 154–171. <https://doi.org/10.33902/jpr.2021167471>
- Khonamari, F., Hashemi, E., Pavlikova, M., & Petrasova, B. (2021). Coherence Problems of EFL Students' writing in light of the Gricean Maxims. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 12(2), 294–313. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2021.2.294.313>
- RahmtAllah, E. a. E. (2020). EFL Students' coherence Skill in writing: A case study of third year students of Bachelors in English Language. *English Language Teaching*, 13(8), 120. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n8p120>
- Salvador, J. (2024). Writing competence of first year college students at a state university. *JPAIR*

- Multidisciplinary Research*, 56(1), 102–120. <https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v56i1.888>
- Saprina, C. M., Rosyid, A., & Suryanti, Y. (2021). Difficulties in developing idea encountered by students in writing argumentative essay. *Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics Studies (JET Li)*, 3(1), 48–54. <https://doi.org/10.55215/jetli.v3i1.3419>
- Sa'adan, N., Noorezam, M., Taib, S. A., Jenal, N., & Yusuf, M. H. (2024). A Study of Writing Difficulties and Writing Stages among Undergraduates. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(7). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v14-i7/21988>
- Sani, A., Badawi, U. S., Waziri, I. A., & Zahradeen, N. T., (2020). Needs analysis: Strategies for language teachers. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 6(2), 46-55.
- Sharmin, S., (2023). A Study On Need Analysis On English Language Needs Of Undergraduate Students In Bangladesh, *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(4), 10-31.
- Thuy, N. T. T., Anh, H. P. T., Ngan, N. T. T., Vy, N. T. T., & Anh, N. T. V. (2022). Difficulties with word choice in academic writing and solutions: a research on english-majored students at can tho university, vietnam. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(6). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v7i6.4543>
- Wu, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2020). The effects of providing and receiving peer feedback on writing performance and learning of secondary school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 58(3), 492–526. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831220945266>

