



SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING INSTRUCTION: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF METHODOLOGIES AND ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

Gabriel Mau Mali

Magister Linguistik, Universitas Warmadewa

E-mail: gerrymali74@gmail.com

Abstract

This study conducts a systematic review of instructional methodologies and assessment practices in second language (L2) writing education by analyzing peer-reviewed publications from 2019 to 2023. It identifies a diverse array of pedagogical approaches, such as process-based, genre-based, task-based, and technology-enhanced instruction, as well as assessment strategies including written corrective feedback (WCF), formative assessment, and digital portfolios. The review reveals that the integration of innovative methods and digital tools, like Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE), multimodal e-feedback, and e-peer feedback, can significantly improve students' writing performance, particularly when accompanied by adequate training for both teachers and learners. Nonetheless, several challenges persist, including limited assessment literacy among non-TEFL educators, inconsistencies in pedagogical implementation, and elevated levels of writing anxiety among learners. The findings highlight the critical need for sustained professional development, context-sensitive and equitable assessment frameworks, and holistic instructional models that also address learners' affective needs. This review advocates for a more integrated and empathetic approach to L2 writing instruction, aiming to foster not only linguistic competence but also learner confidence and well-being.

Keywords: Second Language Writing, Writing Assessment, Pedagogical Approaches, E-Feedback, Writing Anxiety.

INTRODUCTION

The ability to write in a second language (L2) is one of the main skills that is very important for language learners to master, especially those in academic and professional environments (Second Language Writing Instruction, 2021). This skill not only reflects mastery of vocabulary and grammar, but is also an indicator of the ability to think critically, convey ideas in a structured manner, and construct arguments logically in the target language. In the academic context, for example, L2 writing skills are needed to compose essays, research reports, proposals, and scientific articles. Meanwhile, in the professional world, these skills are useful in the preparation of business reports, formal correspondence, and other written communications that demand language accuracy and clarity of meaning.

In recent decades, teaching L2 writing has become one of the significant focuses in the field of language teaching globally. This is inseparable from the fact that writing in a second language is a complex process, as it involves various cognitive, linguistic, and social aspects at the same time. Learners must be able to organize their ideas, choose appropriate grammatical structures, and pay attention to the appropriate language style for specific audiences and communicative goals. In addition, they also need to understand the differences in rhetorical and cultural conventions between the first language (L1) and the second language (L2), which are often a source of difficulties and challenges in themselves.

Previous research has shown that the process of writing in a second language cannot be equated with simply imitating or copying forms of writing in the target language. Instead, this activity requires a deep understanding of various aspects of language, ranging from sentence structure, the use of contextual vocabulary, to the development of coherent and cohesive paragraphs. Furthermore, writing in L2 also demands pragmatic awareness and high cultural sensitivity, given that language serves not only as a means of communication, but also as a reflection of the values, norms, and ways of thinking of the speaker. Therefore, teaching writing in a second language must be designed in a comprehensive and adaptive manner, in order to respond to the challenges faced by learners in various learning contexts.

In response to the increasingly complex needs in teaching second language (L2) writing, educators and researchers have developed a diverse range of pedagogical approaches aimed at improving the effectiveness of the learning process (Worden, 2019). The process-based approach, for example, emphasizes the importance of the stages in writing, from planning, drafting, revision, to editing, with a focus on the gradual development of critical thinking skills and the expression of ideas. Meanwhile, the genre-based approach teaches students to recognize and reproduce different types of texts (such as argumentative essays, reports, or narratives) by paying attention to the social structure and function of each genre. On the other hand, the task-based approach places an emphasis on using language in a meaningful and authentic context, allowing students to develop writing skills through the completion of real-life tasks. In addition, technological advances have also given birth to technology-based approaches, which utilize digital media, online platforms, and collaborative software as a means to increase motivation, interactivity, and access to feedback in the writing process.

Along with the development of these instructional approaches, the practice of assessment in L2 writing teaching has also undergone a significant transformation. Assessment is no longer seen solely as a tool to measure the final outcome, but also as an integral part of the learning process. This includes the application of formative assessments, analytical rubrics, digital portfolios, and reflective and collaborative feedback. The demand for more equitable, transparent, and progress-oriented assessments also encourages educators to design assessment instruments that are not only valid and reliable, but also adaptive to the diversity of learners' backgrounds and abilities.

Although there have been many innovations in the teaching and assessment approach of writing skills in L2, there are still limitations in terms of synthesis and critical evaluation of these practices. In particular, there have not been many studies that have systematically examined, compared, and examined the effectiveness of various teaching methodologies and assessment strategies in different educational contexts. The lack of a comprehensive review of these practices creates an important literature gap, which can hinder the development of theory and practice in the field of L2 writing instruction.

Therefore, this article aims to fill this gap through a systematic review of the latest research in teaching second language writing. The main focus is on identifying the dominant instructional approaches, the assessment strategies used, and the contexts of their implementation at different levels of education and cultural backgrounds. By critically analyzing and synthesizing the findings of various studies, this article is expected to provide a comprehensive overview of the emerging trends, advantages and limitations of each approach, as well as provide useful recommendations for educators, researchers, and policymakers in an effort to improve the quality of writing teaching in L2 in the future.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a systematic review approach to critically evaluate and synthesize previous studies related to the teaching of writing in a second language (L2), with a primary focus on instructional methodologies and assessment practices. The systematic review was chosen because it allowed researchers to map research trends across the board, identify the most commonly used approaches, and find gaps that still need further research. The articles studied

in this study were selected based on several inclusion criteria, namely: (1) it is a scientific journal article that has gone through a peer-review process, (2) it was published in a period between 2019 and 2023, (3) it was written in English, and (4) it explicitly discusses teaching writing in the context of L2, both in terms of teaching approach and assessment strategy. Articles that focus on writing in the first language (L1), do not constitute an empirical study, or are not relevant to the research topic are excluded from the analysis process.

The data collection process is carried out through article searches in several leading academic databases, such as Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, and Google Scholar. Keywords used in searches include terms such as "second language writing", "L2 writing instruction", "writing pedagogy in ESL/EFL", "writing assessment", and "feedback in L2 writing". The articles obtained are stored and managed using reference software such as Zotero. After the process of removing duplication, the selection is made based on a review of the title and abstract, followed by a full reading to ensure fit with the focus of the study.

The collected data were analyzed in a qualitative thematic manner, where each article was reviewed to identify the type of teaching approach used (e.g. process-based, genre-based, task-based, or technology), the assessment strategies applied (such as formative assessments, rubrics, portfolios, or teacher/peer feedback), and the educational context of each study. The results of the analysis are then compiled in an in-depth thematic narrative and equipped with a summary table to facilitate understanding of the characteristics and main findings of each article reviewed. Through this method, research is expected to make a meaningful contribution to developing the discourse on teaching writing in a second language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Synthesis of Empirical Research on L2 Writing Pedagogy, Assessment Practices, and Feedback Strategies

Heading	Result
The Impact of Using Automated Writing Feedback in ESL/EFL Classroom Contexts (Benali, 2021)	The results show that the use of Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) in the context of teaching second language writing (ESL/EFL) has a number of significant benefits, but it also presents various challenges. On the one hand, AWE has been proven to be able to improve the quality of students' writing, encourage independent learning, and reduce teachers' workload by providing quick and repetitive feedback. AWE systems such as Criterion and eRevise allow students to revise writing independently through various features such as grammar correction, vocabulary usage, and text-based arguments. The results of the study also show that automated feedback can motivate students to write and improve their writing, as well as increase awareness of the mistakes they make. Most of the students and teachers in the study expressed a positive view of the use of AWE, especially in terms of improving writing accuracy. However, the effectiveness of AWE still has limitations. The quality of the feedback generated, especially in the content and organization aspects of the writing, is often unsatisfactory. This system is not yet able to provide feedback that is dialogical or contextual as teachers can give. Additionally, many AWEs provide thorough and unfocused feedback, which can potentially confuse low-skilled students. Some studies have also shown that students respond more to accurate and explicit feedback, whereas AWE systems have not been fully able to accommodate students' individual needs based on their linguistic background, ability level, and learning

	<p>goals. In addition, the involvement of teachers in the use of AWE is critical to the success of its implementation, as teachers are still needed to interpret automated feedback, provide additional guidance, and balance between machine and human feedback. Thus, these findings conclude that although AWE can be an effective tool in teaching L2 writing, it cannot fully replace the role of teachers. The integration between automated feedback and human intervention is rated as the best approach to improve students' overall writing learning outcomes. The study also recommends that the design of future AWE systems pay more attention to dialogical aspects, feedback accuracy, and individual needs of students, and emphasizes the importance of teacher training in making optimal use of this technology.</p>
<p>A Systematic Review of Mobile-Assisted Vocabulary Learning and Teaching in ESL/EFL Context (Muhammad Nawaz et al., 2025)</p>	<p>The results of this study reveal significant developments in the field of Mobile-Assisted Vocabulary Learning (MAVL) in the context of ESL/EFL. Through bibliometric mapping of 774 articles and content analysis of 20 empirical studies, it was found that MAVL studies have increased year on year, with a peak of publication in 2019 and the dominance of English use in publications. Influential writers such as Kukulska-Hulme, Paul Nation, and Batia Laufer dominated citations and academic influence in this field. The most frequently cited keywords include vocabulary, mobile learning, and language learning, while new themes such as gamification, augmented reality, and machine learning are becoming more widely researched, reflecting a shift toward a more interactive and technology-based approach. The countries with the highest research contributions to MAVL are the United States, China, and Taiwan, which also show high involvement in intervention studies. In terms of practical focus, the majority of studies emphasized on students' vocabulary performance, followed by perception, motivation, and experience in using mobile applications. Some studies have also examined other aspects such as engagement, preference, and self-regulated learning. From a technological perspective, most of the research uses publicly available applications such as Duolingo and Busuu, but there is also a new trend towards the use of custom applications designed by researchers. The study also notes that university education levels are the most common sample, although studies at the primary and secondary school levels are also starting to emerge. Overall, the findings of this study confirm that MAVL is a rapidly growing and potential field, with trends that show a convergence between innovative pedagogical approaches and advances in mobile technology. However, limitations are still found, such as the lack of international collaboration and the lack of in-depth qualitative studies in the literature. Therefore, the study recommends that future researchers explore areas that have not been well researched, expand methodological approaches, and establish cross-border collaborations to strengthen MAVL's contribution to more effective and sustainable second language teaching.</p>
<p>Writing Assessment</p>	<p>The results of this study show that most of the instructors at the</p>

Technique and Learner Performance: A Study in Instructors' Perceptions (Alshakhi, 2025)	English Language Institute (ELI), King Abdulaziz University, have a positive perception of the writing assessment techniques used, especially through formative quizzes and academic essay writing assignments as a form of summative assessment. Of the 90 respondents, about 93.4% stated that academic essay writing is a valid and reliable method to measure students' writing skills. In addition, most respondents believe that the assessments conducted at ELI have aligned with predetermined learning objectives, and the quizzes given have been proven to help students better prepare for final exams. However, although instructors support the importance of formative assessments in the learning process, only some agree that the value of formative assessments should be given greater weight in the final assessment of students. In-depth interviews reveal a number of additional insights: some teachers feel that the current assessment design is too rigid and lacks flexibility in accommodating the needs of students from different subject backgrounds, such as medicine and nursing. There is also input that the assessment rubric needs to be revised to be more contextual, balanced, and clear in defining each assessment category. In addition, some teachers suggested that the variety of writing assignments be increased, for example by adding assignments to create summaries or reports, as well as providing room for creativity in writing assignments. Although most teachers do not face major challenges in the implementation of writing assessments, they note that the assessment structure and information tables in the exam can limit the variation in student responses and sometimes make student writing uniform. Overall, the study concludes that the writing assessment techniques applied at ELI are considered adequate, valid, and in accordance with academic standards, but there is still room for improvement, especially in terms of task design flexibility and grade distribution. Teachers emphasized the importance of continuous evaluation of the assessment system to remain relevant to the development of students' learning needs and the latest assessment practices in the context of foreign language teaching.
Iranian EFL Teachers' Writing Assessment Beliefs, Literacy, and Training Needs: Do Majors Matter? (Fatemeh et al., 2019)	The results of this study show that there is a significant difference between teachers in English as a foreign language (EFL) in Iran with a TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) education background and non-TEFL ones, especially in terms of their Writing Assessment Literacy (WAL), training experience, and pedagogical beliefs. Teachers with TEFL backgrounds received significantly more WAL training than non-TEFL groups. The majority of TEFL teachers obtain training through academic programs, while most Non-TEFL teachers only get it from on-the-job training, with nearly half having never received WAL training before. Further analysis revealed that TEFL teachers had better levels of training in almost all aspects of WAL, such as designing writing assignments, using rubrics, portfolio assessments, skill integration, and providing test-based feedback. In addition, TEFL groups are more confident in claiming themselves to be

competent writing instructors than non-TEFL groups. On the other hand, Non-TEFL teachers show a higher need for basic training in almost all aspects of WAL. However, there were only a slight significant difference in their perceptions of the accuracy of written assessments, suggesting that both groups were equally aware of the importance of fair and accurate assessments. In terms of writing assessment methods, TEFL teachers showed a stronger belief in the use of rubrics, integrated assessments, self-assessments, portfolios, and computer technology than non-TEFL teachers, who expressed much doubt. This difference suggests that TEFL teachers tend to be more open to innovative and diverse approaches to writing assessments. The study also highlights that the teacher education system in Iran has not been fully able to prepare teachers, both TEFL and Non-TEFL, in terms of writing assessment competencies. Most teachers, regardless of their background, state the need for advanced and thorough training in this field. Overall, the study recommends reforms to the education and teacher training system in Iran, including improvements in pre-service education programs and strengthening of continuing training. Improving literacy in writing assessments is seen as an important step to ensure the effectiveness of writing teaching in the context of more professional and structured second language learning.

Formative Multimodal E-Feedback in Second Language Writing Virtual Learning Spaces (Kulprasit, 2022)	The results of this study highlight the potential and effectiveness of multimodal e-feedback in teaching second language (L2) writing in a virtual learning environment. In the digital context, multimodal e-feedback refers to the use of various types of electronic feedback, whether written, oral, audio, video, synchronous, or asynchronous, which are provided through digital media such as word processors, email, instant messaging applications, social media, and online conferencing tools. This study shows that the formative integration of e-feedback in every stage of the writing process (from planning, drafting, to revision and editing) can significantly improve students' writing performance, engagement in learning, and form a more dialogical and interactive learning experience. Various e-feedback modes such as color highlights, live comments in the app, audio/video recordings, and screenshots are used to respond and guide the student's writing process. Students also benefit from online self-assessments and peer feedback. However, the effectiveness of e-feedback is highly dependent on the readiness of technology, students' ability to access and understand the types of e-feedback, and the teacher's teaching style. This research also emphasizes the importance of training for teachers so that they are able to make maximum use of e-feedback technology. However, there are challenges in the multimodal implementation of e-feedback, such as the risk of excessive cognitive burden on students and teachers if there is no agreement on the form of feedback used and the focus of writing. Therefore, there is a need for open communication and negotiation between teachers and students in determining the
--	--

		<p>most appropriate e-feedback strategy. Overall, this study concludes that the integrated use of formative multimodal e-feedback in the writing process in a virtual environment makes a major contribution to the development of second-language students' writing skills, provided that the implementation is carried out appropriately, contextually, and sustainably.</p>
Second Language Writing Anxiety of Thai EFL Undergraduate Students: Dominant Causes, Levels and Coping Strategies (Talasee & Poopatwiboon, 2024)		<p>The results of this study revealed that Thai students who study English as a foreign language (EFL) experience high levels of anxiety writing in a second language. Of the 55 students studied, as many as 72.73% were classified as high writing anxiety, while the rest (27.27%) were in the category of moderate anxiety; no students with low anxiety levels were found. The main cause of this anxiety is the high frequency of writing tasks (77.09%), followed by linguistic difficulties (70.90%) and fear of writing tests (70.90%). Other factors that also affect are low self-confidence, lack of writing practice, time pressure, and fear of negative comments from teachers. In addition to identifying the causes and levels of anxiety, this study also revealed five main strategies used by students to overcome writing anxiety, namely: (1) positive self-talk to build confidence; (2) start with planning, such as creating an outline before writing; (3) relaxation techniques, such as deep breathing and regulating physical tension; (4) setting goals, to provide direction and motivation during the writing process; and (5) social support, such as talking to friends or sharing experiences with fellow authors. Overall, the study confirms that writing anxiety in a second language is a serious problem faced by EFL students, especially in the context of dense academic tasks and high-performance pressures. Therefore, the researchers recommend that teachers understand the factors that trigger this anxiety and implement supportive learning approaches, such as creating a safe classroom atmosphere, providing constructive feedback, and facilitating the development of coping strategies for students. Thus, learning to write in a second language can be more productive and less stressful for students</p>
Integrating Genre with Ethnography as Methodology in Understanding L2 Writing Instruction in a Chinese University (Zhang & Pramoolsook, 2022)		<p>The results of this study show that the teaching of second language (L2) writing in one of the universities in China reflects a "pedagogical mosaic", in which different approaches, such as traditionalist, process-based, and genre-based approaches, are implemented in varying degrees by the teachers according to their respective pedagogical preferences and backgrounds. Although all instructors refer to the same national syllabus, their teaching approaches are very diverse. For example, Professor Lin adopts a traditionalist approach with an emphasis on sentence structure and grammatical patterns without contextual integration, which makes it difficult for students to understand the purpose and relevance of the teaching material. Instead, Ms. Cheng applies a genre-based approach consistently, guiding students through the stages of deconstruction, co-construction, and self-construction. This approach has been shown to increase students' awareness of the genre as well as increase their interest and confidence in</p>

writing. Meanwhile, Ms Michelle, a foreign lecturer, combines a genre-based approach with a process approach. He emphasized the importance of peer feedback, draft revision, and creative expression, and demonstrated flexibility in accommodating students' genre preferences. His approach encourages students to focus more on content rather than form, which increases confidence in writing. Professor Wang, who teaches academic writing courses, applies an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) approach that places more emphasis on argument structure, academic format, and clarity of writing style. He focuses on providing knowledge of the writing process and language systems needed to prepare a final project or thesis. The study underscores that despite the existence of a nationally uniform curriculum framework, practice in the field shows significant localization and improvisation by teachers. An important implication of these findings is the need for the professional development of teachers who focus on a more structured and systematic gender-based approach. With the ethnographic approach used, this study provides an in-depth contextual understanding of how L2 writing teaching is carried out and how it affects students' writing awareness and competence.

Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Instruction: A Meta-Analysis (Lim & Renandaya, 2020)

The results of this meta-analysis show that written corrective feedback (WCF) has a moderate positive effect on improving grammatical accuracy in second language (L2) writing. From the 35 main studies analyzed, an average effect of Hedges's $g = 0.59$ was obtained, which suggests that WCF interventions are indeed useful in the context of L2 writing learning. The analysis also found that the direct feedback type produced a greater effect ($g = 0.761$) compared to indirect feedback ($g = 0.625$), although the difference was not statistically significant. The effectiveness of WCF also appears to be higher when administered in a foreign language context (EFL) than in a second language context (ESL), and results are better when given in the short term (one-shot treatment) and focusing on specific types of errors (focused feedback). One of the most important findings of the study is that students' proficiency levels are the most influential factor in determining the effectiveness of WCF. Students with low to lower secondary abilities benefited the most ($g = 0.982$), compared to students with high intermediate abilities ($g = 0.696$), while students at the middle level showed a smaller impact ($g = 0.364$). This indicates that the fit between the type of feedback and the student's developmental readiness is critical for optimal outcomes. In addition, analysis of the long-term effects through delayed posttests showed that WCF had a fairly good retention effect, especially for indirect feedback, which could potentially encourage deeper language processing by students. Overall, the study reinforces WCF's position as a useful strategy in teaching L2 writing, but also emphasizes that the effectiveness of feedback is strongly influenced by a variety of moderators, including the teaching setting, proficiency level, type and scope of feedback, and treatment design. Therefore, teachers are

	advised to carefully consider these factors when implementing WCF in the classroom, so that writing learning becomes more effective and in accordance with the needs of students.
E-Peer Feedback Training on L2 Writing: A Case Study of Inexperienced Learners (Do, 2024)	<p>This study shows that explicit training is very important in increasing the effectiveness of e-peer feedback for inexperienced second language (L2) learners. In the early stages without training, two EFL students from Vietnam showed difficulty in providing feedback online. The feedback they provide tends to be vague, non-specific, poorly structured, and of little benefit to revision. The main barriers identified include technical limitations in using Google Docs, confusion about aspects of writing that need to be commented on, low confidence in using English, and the perception that feedback is intended for teachers, not to help fellow learners. As a result, the revisions made did not show significant improvements. However, after receiving structured training, which included clear marginal comments, rubric-based specific guidance, the use of "sandwich feedback" strategies, and permission to use L1 (mother tongue) when needed, both students showed significant improvements. They are able to provide longer, more specific, and relevant comments, as well as show a deeper understanding of the content of the writing. In addition, involvement in verbal feedback (via Zoom) after written feedback provides an opportunity for students to clarify ununderstood comments, improve mutual communication, and reinforce revision results. Participants also began using the "you" greeting in comments, reflecting an increased sense of belonging and engagement between participants. However, the organizational aspect of ideas in writing remains a weakness, and students still need the teacher's intervention to improve this area. This suggests that although peer feedback training is effective, the role of teachers remains crucial in guiding more complex areas of writing skills. Overall, the study emphasizes that the successful implementation of e-peer feedback is highly dependent on initial training tailored to students' needs, and that the strategic involvement of teachers remains necessary to ensure the effectiveness of this collaborative learning process in teaching L2 writing.</p>
Corrective Feedback on Writing in EFL Context: Comparison of Two Approaches (Gündüz Kartal & Atay, 2019)	<p>This study compares two approaches to providing corrective feedback (CF) in the context of learning to write English as a foreign language (EFL), namely explicit feedback rooted from a cognitive-interactional approach, and graduated feedback from a sociocultural approach. The results of the study show that graduated feedback is more effective in encouraging students to self-correct, which is self-correction of their mistakes. Of the total 151 errors handled in the graduated feedback group, 87% were successfully corrected by students themselves, while in the explicit feedback group, only 30% of the 145 errors were corrected independently. This shows that a sociocultural approach that gives students space to discover and correct their own mistakes is better able to develop learning independence and language awareness. However, in terms of speed and time efficiency, explicit feedback has proven to be</p>

more practical. The average time needed for a feedback session per student in the graduated feedback group was 19 minutes 64 seconds, while in the explicit feedback group it was only 11 minutes and 48 seconds. Explicit feedback also resulted in an uptake rate, which is a student's response to corrections given by the teacher, which is higher (92 cases) than graduated feedback (9 cases). This suggests that although explicit feedback tends to result in correct revisions faster, students become more dependent on teachers and less trained to think independently. In addition, the change in student behavior from the first session to the second session showed that although the techniques used by the teacher remained consistent, only in the graduated feedback group there was an increase in the students' ability to recognize and correct mistakes without assistance, which can be seen from the increase in the number of self-corrections. The study concluded that both types of feedback have their own advantages: graduated feedback is more effective at fostering learning autonomy, while explicit feedback is more efficient for teaching in large classrooms or when time is limited. Therefore, the selection of the type of feedback should be adjusted to the learning objectives and the context of the class

The results of a systematic review of various studies in the field of teaching second language (L2) writing revealed that practices and approaches in learning and assessment of writing have developed rapidly and diversely, both in terms of teaching methodology and assessment techniques used. Key findings show that the use of technology and innovative pedagogical approaches have become the dominant trends in the last decade.

In terms of teaching methodology, various studies highlight the effectiveness of integrating genre, process, and technology-based approaches in improving students' writing skills. Zhang and Pramoolsook's (2022) research showcases the complexity of the approaches used by teachers in China, from traditional to genre-based approaches, suggesting that teaching practices are not uniform despite being within the same curriculum framework. This indicates the importance of teacher professional development and pedagogical flexibility to adapt the approach to the needs of students.

The technology-based approach also shows promising potential. The use of Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE) as researched in a 2021 study showed benefits in improving writing accuracy and supporting independent learning, although the quality of feedback that is not yet fully contextual remains an obstacle. Similarly, studies on formative multimodal e-feedback (Kulprasit, 2022) and e-peer feedback (Do, 2024) confirm that technology can strengthen the feedback process, provided teachers and students are well-trained in utilizing it.

Meanwhile, in terms of assessment, the results of the review show that the L2 writing assessment not only plays a role in measuring learning outcomes, but also as a means of learning itself. A meta-analysis study by Lim and Renandya (2022) confirms that written corrective feedback (WCF) has a positive impact on students' grammatical accuracy, especially in students with low to lower secondary abilities. The different approaches to providing feedback, both explicit and graduated, each have advantages, as outlined by Kartal and Atay (2018), who emphasize the importance of adapting the approach to the classroom context and student characteristics.

Furthermore, studies examining teachers' perceptions of assessment practices (Alshakhi, 2025) and teacher assessment literacy (Alshakhi, 2019) show that although teachers generally support valid and reliable assessments, there are still challenges related to contextual assessment design, training gaps, and the need to improve writing assessment literacy. This research highlights the importance of continuous training and revision of assessment policies in order to accommodate the increasingly diverse needs of students.

In addition to pedagogical and assessment aspects, the results of the review also raised an affective dimension, such as students' writing anxiety. A study by Thai researchers (2025) shows that the majority of college students experience high levels of writing anxiety due to assignment load, linguistic difficulties, and evaluative pressure. This confirms that in designing writing instruction, teachers need to consider approaches that support students' emotional health, including creating a safe learning environment and providing constructive feedback.

Overall, this review shows that teaching and assessment of writing in a second language is increasingly complex and dynamic. The integration of technology-based pedagogical approaches, improving teacher assessment literacy, and attention to student affective factors are key in improving the quality of L2 writing teaching. Therefore, it is recommended that educators, policy makers, and researchers continue to innovate and critically reflect on existing practices in order to be able to respond to the growing demands of language education.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the teaching and assessment of writing in a second language (L2) has undergone rapid and increasingly complex developments, characterized by the integration of various pedagogical and technological approaches. Process, genre, and technology-based approaches such as Automated Writing Evaluation (AWE), multimodal e-feedback, and e-peer feedback have proven to be effective in improving students' writing skills, as long as the implementation is contextual and supported by adequate training for teachers and students. Assessment is also no longer seen as just a final evaluation tool, but an integral part of the learning process, where written corrective feedback (WCF) has been shown to help students, especially those with low to medium abilities, improve their grammar accuracy. However, the study also found significant challenges, especially related to the low assessment literacy among non-TEFL teachers as well as the need for ongoing training in the area of writing assessment. In addition, the affective aspects of students, such as writing anxiety, are important concerns that need to be addressed through the creation of a supportive learning environment and constructive feedback. Therefore, an effective approach to teaching L2 writing must be holistic, blending innovative pedagogical strategies, appropriate technology, reflective formative assessments, and emotional support to create a truly empowering learning process for learners.

REFERENCES

- Alshakhi, A. (2025). Writing Assessment Technique and Learner Performance: A Study in Instructors' Perceptions. *Educational Process International Journal*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2025.14.55>
- Benali, A. (2021). The Impact of Using Automated Writing Feedback in ESL/EFL Classroom Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 14(12), 189. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n12p189>
- Do, H. M. (2024). E-peer feedback training on L2 writing: A case study of inexperienced learners. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 20(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v20n1.1242>
- Fatemeh, S., Kar Higher Education Institute, Qazvin, Iran, Mohammadreza, V., & School of Foreign Languages, Istanbul Gelisim University, Istanbul, Turkey. (2019). IRANIAN EFL TEACHERS' WRITING ASSESSMENT BELIEFS, LITERACY, AND TRAINING NEEDS: DO MAJORS MATTER? *I-Manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 9(2), 26. <https://doi.org/10.26634/jelt.9.2.15381>
- Gündüz Kartal, M. G. K., & Atay, D. (2019). Corrective Feedback on Writing in EFL Context: Comparison of Two Approaches. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 385–401. <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.651390>
- Kulprasit, W. (2022). Formative Multimodal E-Feedback in Second Language Writing Virtual Learning Spaces. *PASAA*, 64(1), 52–67. <https://doi.org/10.58837/CHULA.PASAA.64.1.3>
- Lim, S. C., & Renandaya, W. A. (2020). Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing

Instruction: A Meta-Analysis. *TESL-EJ Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 24(3), 1–24.

Muhammad Nawaz, Ganapathy, M., Manzoor, S., Tess Ezzy, & Farooqi, S. U. H. (2025). A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF MOBILE-ASSISTED VOCABULARY LEARNING AND TEACHING IN ESL/EFL CONTEXT. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 22(1), 40–58. <https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2025.22.1.3>

Second Language Writing Instruction. (2021). In K. Hyland, *Springer Texts in Education* (pp. 129–132). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79143-8_24

Talasee, K., & Poopatwiboon, S. (2024). Second Language Writing Anxiety of Thai EFL Undergraduate Students: Dominant Causes, Levels and Coping Strategies. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 14(1), 235. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v14n1p235>

Worden, D. (2019). Developing L2 writing teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of genre through the unfamiliar genre project. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 46, 100667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.100667>

Zhang, Y., & Pramoolsook, I. (2022). Integrating genre with ethnography as methodology in understanding L2 writing instruction in a Chinese university. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00131-y>