

## PAPER

# Needs Analysis from Teachers' Experiences in Online Academic English Writing Model for Chinese EFL College Students

Mingxian Gui, Saedah  
Binti Siraj(✉), Rafiza Binti  
Abdui Razak

Faculty of Education,  
University of Malaya,  
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

[saedah@um.edu.my](mailto:saedah@um.edu.my)

## ABSTRACT

The integration of technology in education has gained significant attention, particularly in China's higher education sector. While much research examines the role of digital tools in education, there is limited focus on understanding the specific needs of online courses from the perspectives of educators. In the context of online academic English writing for Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, teachers encounter various challenges that have not been thoroughly explored. This study employs a qualitative approach (N = 6) to conduct a needs analysis focused on the experiences of instructors teaching online academic English. By examining the difficulties teachers face and the improvements they seek, this study highlights key issues in three areas: pedagogical strategies and resources, course scheduling, and learner engagement. The thematic analysis of data from six participants reveals a strong desire for more interactive and collaborative learning frameworks in online teaching model development. These findings offer valuable, context-specific insights into teachers' needs in online writing instruction and EFL pedagogy within the Chinese higher education context, providing implications for enhancing online teaching practices tailored to this particular setting.

## KEYWORDS

online teaching, academic English writing, needs analysis, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) college students

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of technology and its widespread integration into education have led to an increasing reliance on various digital tools for remote learning [1]. Among these, video conferencing tools are often used for synchronous online teaching, while asynchronous tools such as discussion boards, recorded lectures, and learning management systems also play significant roles in online education [2]. Although online teaching—encompassing both synchronous and asynchronous modes—has

Gui, M., Siraj, S.B., Razak, R.B.A. (2025). Needs Analysis from Teachers' Experiences in Online Academic English Writing Model for Chinese EFL College Students. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, 20(1), pp. 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v20i01.52353>

Article submitted 2024-09-27. Revision uploaded 2024-11-20. Final acceptance 2024-11-20.

© 2025 by the authors of this article. Published under CC-BY.

received significant attention in higher education, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic, many educators found the abrupt shift from the traditional face-to-face model to online formats overwhelming. Despite the growing variety of online teaching tools available, evidence suggests that instructors have not necessarily found online teaching more manageable [3]. Studies [4, 5] have highlighted that teachers often experience frustration and face numerous challenges in adapting to the online model. However, research on educators' specific needs during online teaching remains limited, with few studies focusing on the difficulties they encounter and the types of support and solutions they seek to improve the online teaching experience.

The future of the online English model appears encouraging. With appropriate training and thoughtful model development, online classes can provide numerous advantages. Tai et al. [5] discovered that implementing peer-review methods in online education enhances undergraduate writing skills and boosts class participation. Zaghlool [6] conducted research that integrated computer-assisted language learning (CALL) tools into English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, showing positive student attitudes towards online writing tasks. Tarrayo [7] underscored two key advantages of the online writing model: the effective use of available digital resources and the enhancement of students' reflective practices. The collaborative nature of the online teaching further enriches language acquisition. This cooperation and exchange promote global cross-cultural understanding and advance electronic and information literacy [8]; students encounter authentic language contexts and gain more chances for independent and critical thinking [9]. Notably, in online English writing classes, communication between students and educators improves significantly, encompassing peer interaction, mutual assessments, automated feedback, and organized language outputs [10]. Likewise, the online course environment and English writing model seamlessly integrate, enriching communication and fostering effective feedback in writing endeavors [11].

Academic writing serves as a cornerstone for success in higher education. Yet, it presents significant hurdles for numerous university students. The intricate nature of academic English often impedes student performance [12]. Crafting academic English requires students to articulate their arguments in a formal and serious manner [13]. Furthermore, academic writing skills necessitate that students engage with, analyze, organize, and cultivate their own ideas, based on pertinent information, and present those ideas logically [14]. Given these challenges, it is understandable that students from non-English-speaking countries encounter various difficulties [15]. Despite the complexities of academic English, no single approach proves best for teaching it, as instructors must convey a multitude of writing skills, encompassing content development, writing processes, and linguistic frameworks [16].

Despite the importance of teaching in online courses, there is very little research analyzing Chinese university teachers' needs for online academic English writing teaching. Specifically, research focused on understanding the needs of Chinese teachers in the context of the online academic English model remains limited. In China, academic English teaching, whether online or offline, has often been neglected [17]. Despite the increasing emphasis on both domestic relevance and a global perspective in educational reforms, few institutions offer specialized courses focused on academic English [18]. Instead, most higher education institutions in mainland China offer a general "College English" course, which primarily focuses on grammar and is based on the College English Test textbook, rather than on academic writing [19]. While previous studies [20–23] on English writing have found positive effects from integrating technology into teaching, these studies were typically not conducted fully online, as they still included offline components such as in-person training and discussions. Furthermore, much of the existing research on English writing has been

conducted from the students' perspective, with limited attention given to the challenges teachers face in online academic English teaching and the specific support they need to enhance their online teaching practices.

This study conducted a needs analysis to identify the specific requirements of teachers regarding necessities, deficiencies (challenges in this study), and desires in the online model for academic English writing. Specifically, this study aims to explore the following two research questions:

1. Is there a need to develop an online teaching model in academic English writing for Chinese EFL college students?
2. What are the needs for developing an online teaching model?

## 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Context

This study received ethical approval from the ethics committee of the corresponding author's institution. The study took place at a public comprehensive university in the eastern district of China.

The conducted research is classified as a needs analysis. This methodology serves as a strong foundation in designing English for Academic Purposes (EAP) courses [23]. A thorough needs analysis guarantees that course development meets the specific demands of the target audience. Nation and Macalister [24] highlight that different phases of needs analysis assist educators in comprehending present necessities, future inquiries, and course expectations. Hutchison [25] categorizes needs analysis into three key elements: 1) necessities (essential items for teachers), 2) lacks (skills or knowledge teachers lack), and 3) wants (items teachers perceive they need). The needs analysis phase is vital in shaping online teaching design.

### 2.2 Subjects

The research employed purposive sampling. This approach enhances alignment between sample selection and research goals, thereby reinforcing the rigor and credibility of the collected data and findings [26]. Participants were chosen based on specific criteria: their teaching experience, subjects taught, and research areas. Each participant had a minimum of three years of EFL teaching experience in higher education and held a relevant educational background. Following their consent, six teachers ( $N = 6$ ) took part in this study. Their demographic details are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Demographic information of participants

Participant No.	Teaching Experience	Main Teaching Subjects
Teacher A	6	TEFL; Writing Pedagogy
Teacher B	5	TEFL; Writing Pedagogy
Teacher C	4	Applied Linguistics; General Writing
Teacher D	4	Applied Linguistics; General Writing
Teacher E	4	Curriculum Design and Technology
Teacher F	3	Curriculum Design and Technology

### 2.3 Data collection and analysis

This study utilized qualitative methodologies, as such approaches in needs analysis offer a deeper insight for researchers involved in online teaching design. Data were collected via semi-structured online interviews, each lasting around 20 minutes. The interview questions adhered to needs analysis principles and were evaluated by an expert to confirm content validity. All interviews were recorded and transcribed for textual analysis.

Data analysis primarily employed thematic analysis [27]. All recordings were transcribed verbatim and analyzed sequentially based on the order of interviews. The data underwent thorough reading followed by coding. Only data pertinent to the needs of the current online English academic writing model were considered at this stage. The codes underwent four phases: open coding, axial coding, categorization, and theme identification, which are detailed in the accompanying table (refer to Table 2), illustrating the methodologies and quantities applied at each phase.

**Table 2.** Illustration of coding process

Coding Phase	Action	Numbers of Codes	Trustworthiness
<b>Open Coding</b>	repeatedly reading; searching for content; annotating the content	218	Peer Review; Expert Review
<b>Axial Coding</b>	applying inductive and deductive reasoning method; constantly comparing	68	
<b>Categories</b>	selecting and integrating categories of organized data	8	
<b>Themes</b>	working continually toward thematic specificity	3	

The structured correlation of themes with designated categories enhances the data analysis, allowing for a thorough comprehension of the fundamental patterns and relationships present in the research outcomes. The ultimate findings were presented through the identified themes.

### 2.4 Trustworthiness

In the eyes of qualitative researchers, the judgment of the trustworthiness of a qualitative study refers to “dependability, credibility, transferability and confirmability” [28, 29]. In this study, two strategies, peer review and expert review, also known as peer debriefing [28], are used to ensure the trustworthiness of this qualitative research. Guba [28] believes that peer debriefing can provide researchers with the opportunity to examine the depth of research and expose themselves to different research questionings. In peer debrief, researchers can receive academic help and guidance from other professionals, that is, feedback, which can improve the quality of investigation findings. This also means that, during the research process, investigators need to present their research process and findings to these peers and receive feedback. In this study, to ensure the trustworthiness, peers coming from in the field of TEFL and the Education Institute and an expert in the field of technology and education are participated. Peer review is reflected in letting peers evaluate and question research background information, data processing and analyzing methods

and procedures, coding processes, as well as research findings. The triangulation of data analysis from three different parties (peer, expert, and researcher) guaranteed the trustworthiness of the related research findings.

### 3 RESULTS

The thematic analysis of the needs analysis findings based on three main aspects: necessities for online teaching, teachers' challenges in teaching academic English writing, and teachers' wants for online teaching. The emerging themes reflected findings are grounded in qualitative data from semi-structured interviews with six English teachers. The findings offer insights into online teaching in academic English writing from the perspective of teachers, providing a foundation for developing an effective online teaching course.

#### 3.1 Findings on theme 1: Necessities for an online teaching

The first theme in the main findings answers the "necessities" question in Needs Analysis. It outlines the items participants presumed necessary for online academic English writing teaching can be illustrated from three phases: pre-class, while-teaching, and post-class.

**Pre-class preparation phase.** The investigation found two essential items during the pre-class preparation phase: grouping students and locating culturally relevant teaching materials.

**Grouping** refers to classifying students by their varying English proficiency levels, allowing them to enter courses with appropriate difficulty. This practice is deemed necessary, yet it rarely materializes in most Chinese classrooms. Teacher A said, *categorizing students into beginner, intermediate, and advanced classes helps address diverse needs*. Teacher E echoed this point, said *the significant disparity in student abilities within a single class makes it challenging to create a lesson that satisfies everyone*.

Grouping also holds a second significance, as it promotes peer learning and interaction through study groups. Teacher B mentioned, *in our class, I will divide students into different learning groups for discussions or presentations, errr to enabling greater student engagement*.

**Culturally relevant teaching material:** It stressed the preparation to integrate more contextualized materials into the teaching content. This point was raised by Teacher C, who believes *a major issue with current textbooks is their inability to resonate with students, ultimately hindering their interest*. Teacher D echoed this sentiment, stating *preparing teaching materials is crucial; they should both engage students and align with teaching objectives*.

**While-teaching phase.** In this phase, the investigation revealed two crucial main codes that need consideration in online teaching. These include the utilization of interactive platforms and the creation of collaborative learning environments. Educators believe these two factors are essential for ensuring student participation in online courses.

**Utilization of interactive platforms:** particularly real-time models, surpasses recorded lessons. The teaching process must incorporate numerous model activities to maintain classroom dynamism. Teacher F mentioned, *I personally prefer live classes, as they provide a sense of real-time interaction with students*. Teacher C shared

a similar view, noting that *during the pandemic, the school used recorded lessons. My biggest impression was the disconnect between teachers and students, with no communication.*

**Creation of a collaborative learning environment:** which encompasses small group activities and discussions aimed at fully integrating each student into the learning process. Teacher A indicated, *In my writing classes, I typically divide students into groups for discussions and presentations.* Teacher E also emphasized the importance of collaborative learning, stating that *while self-directed learning is crucial for college students, cultivating collaborative skills is equally essential.*

**Post-class phase.** In the post stage of the course, teachers identified two crucial factors for online teaching. One is an automated system for evaluating student assignments, while the other is a platform for showcasing student work.

**The automated evaluation tool** utilizes AI-supported writing evaluation tools. It assesses student submissions based on existing grading criteria, providing timely feedback. This approach received strong approval from teachers. Teacher A noted that *the use of AI tools is efficient, especially in large classes where immediate feedback is challenging.* Several other teachers also emphasized the efficiency of such tools and the positive experience for students.

**The Platform for Showcasing Student Work** was deemed essential by teachers, yet often overlooked. Teacher D said, *many students lack interest because this is merely a mandatory course to pass. Aside from group presentations, there is little opportunity to display their writing works.* Teacher C echoed similar sentiments, suggesting that *the showcasing of student work appears merely to satisfy teacher requirements, done solely for grades, which is sad.*

### 3.2 Findings on theme 2: Teachers' challenges

The second theme addresses the “lacks,” that is deficiencies identified in the needs analysis, specifically what challenges teachers when implementing online academic English writing teaching and the problems they face. This theme elucidates the challenges encountered by teachers from various perspectives, which include teaching-related challenges and learning-related challenges.

**Teaching-related challenges.** As the most prominent issue, which encompasses several critical aspects such as teaching techniques, teaching resources, and course planning. Notably, teachers unanimously express that teaching academic English writing is quite challenging, whether in online or face-to-face courses. Four experienced writing instructors indicated that they continue to navigate and struggle along this path.

**Teaching techniques:** The survey reveals that teachers find it difficult to continuously adjust methods to accommodate and meet students' varying writing abilities. Teacher A mentioned, *In our class, students have different levels. Some students may have started to recognize the importance of context in academic writing, while others cannot even write a complete and correctly meaningful sentence.* Another teacher, E, highlighted the difficulty of teaching techniques due to the required flexibility and the heavy preparation burden it creates.

**Teaching resources** stem from the mismatch between most available textbooks and actual lesson content as well as examination format. Teacher D noted, *I find it unreasonable that only a small portion of the textbook covers academic English writing, while more content focuses on general English writing. When it comes time for the final*

exam, students are expected to write both application essays and argumentative essays. This is quite difficult. Additionally, Teacher B mentioned that what students genuinely need may be an academic writing guide that provides step-by-step models rather than just a couple of chapters within a larger text.

**Teaching schedule** represents a significant issue, amplifying the challenges they face. In particular, they feel a critical shortage of online teaching hours. Four writing instructors indicate that the time allocated by the school is insufficient to cover the material, let alone engage in teaching activities. Additionally, two other teachers from the teaching and technology sectors express similar concerns, asserting that adequate teaching time, whether online or offline, should be a fundamental requirement. The second issue pertains to the illogical arrangements of online courses. Teacher B notes that *during the pandemic, our classes, conducted through recorded online sessions, covered all content in one go. The problem is that many students choose to binge-watch content in a single day to meet requirements, rather than attending the classes, which is quite unreasonable.* Teacher F added, *the online teaching system lacks sensible organization, and both recorded and live sessions should be updated according to the course schedule and milestones rather than all at once.*

**Learning-related challenges.** The challenges related to learning underscore a critical theme regarding what is lacking in needs analysis. This theme is best understood from the perspective of teachers' model. Students, as the primary recipients and participants of the teaching, face specific deficiencies when engaging in online learning. These challenges significantly impact overall teaching quality. Two main factors emerge: the deficiency in writing skills and the lack of student engagement.

**The lack of writing skills** stands out as the most significant finding. Teachers acknowledge that the primary reason students struggle in writing is due to the inadequacy of their skills in meeting the course requirements. Writing skills encompass foundational elements such as vocabulary, syntax, and grammar in English composition, and contextual abilities, which involve applying learned content to real-world scenarios.

Given the varying abilities of students, the challenges they encounter also differ. However, keeping pace with the same model content proves difficult. Teacher B said, *Vocabulary and grammatical errors, common in general English, are even more prevalent in academic English writing. Not to mention the specialized formats for citations.* Another instructor, Teacher A, added, *some advanced third- and fourth-year students may use tools to address lexical issues, yet they still exhibit significant shortcomings in articulating arguments and ensuring content coherence, often neglecting contextual concerns.*

**The lack of student engagement:** It was reflected through a lack of motivation and participation in class, observable in both online and face-to-face courses. Teacher D pointed out, *many students in our class come merely to earn credits for the course.*

In the class discussion, Teacher A added *many students attend primarily to earn credits, not to enhance their professional skills. For them, simply showing up and passing the final exam suffices.* This view was supported by Teacher C. In online courses, a significant number of students remain silent during group activities and individual presentations, opting out of engagement.

**Invisible attendance** reflects another gap in student learning, which is particularly noticeable in online courses. Teacher F mentioned, *This issue relates to the school's online course structure, where some classes do not require students to be visible and allow for self-enroll. As a result, many students sign in but merely remain inactive in the backstage, disregarding the actual content.*

### 3.3 Findings on theme 3: Teachers' wants

In the third theme of needs analysis for the research, the focus lies on the expectations and visions that teachers have for future online course design that is teachers' wants. The findings revealed that teachers envisage three key aspects for online academic English writing: curriculum setting, professional development training, and diversity of assessment.

**Curriculum setting:** Teachers strongly believe that academic English, as a vital skill for Chinese EFL university students, should be established as an independent course for systematic teaching, rather than being treated as a subsidiary of comprehensive writing. This view is shared by four experienced writing instructors. Instructor A noted, *Our institution only began to value academic English in the senior year, while earlier it was merely a component of general English writing, which is quite unreasonable.*

**Professional development training** refers to model training for teachers that includes guidance on teaching theories and the application of technology on online platforms. This enables educators to leverage technology for enhanced online course experiences. Teacher F highlighted this need, gaining consensus from other participants: *Schools often assume that as technology evolves, teachers should naturally adapt, but the reality is that many teachers lack sufficient proficiency with the latest technologies.* Teacher C added that *professional training for educators should not be limited to teaching methods but should also provide a platform for sharing and communication among teachers.*

**The diversity of assessments:** Assessments should encompass both summative and formative assessments. It is essential that exams align with course content and exhibit creativity, genuinely assisting students in assessing their abilities and identifying issues. Teacher F remarked, *Traditional end-of-term exams are inadequate; ongoing feedback and interaction are crucial.* Teacher C added, *I think we need to let students know what is the meaning behind the marks and offer them more chances to reflect on what they have achieved or missed.*

## 4 DISCUSSION

The aim of this study is to investigate the needs of teachers in the online academic English writing model. It seeks to identify the challenges teachers face in online teaching and understand their requirements and expectations for course design. The findings of this phase are crucial for developing more effective online courses later on. The following sections will discuss three main findings based on the needs analysis that is the challenges teachers encounter, and the needs and expectations of teachers.

### 4.1 Discussion on needs analysis: challenges

**Teaching-related challenges:** The study reveals that teachers face challenges from two main sources: those related to teaching and stress stemming from students. This aligns with findings by Moses and Mohamad [30], who highlighted that addressing the diverse needs and learning abilities of students complicates writing models for teachers. Similarly, Jones-Mensah and Hilton [31] found that despite being in the same classroom, students from various majors exhibit different academic writing skills, underscoring the importance of flexible and adaptive

teaching methods. The survey also points out a mismatch and lack of context in current teaching resources, presenting another challenge for teachers. Previous studies [7, 9, 30] emphasized the significance of selecting appropriate teaching materials to strengthen academic English models and learning retention, yet existing resources fail to meet these requirements. Beyond resources, teaching methods pose challenges as well. Limited teaching practice and unreasonable online teaching schedules also represent significant obstacles for teachers. Zhang and Zou [33] suggested that a 45-minute class in China is insufficient for effective comprehensive teaching, leading to partial learning. Zhang [34] noted that teachers experience heavy pressure due to unreasonable course scheduling, which negatively impacts teaching quality. Burrough et al. [35] further emphasized the importance of high-quality teaching for student learning outcomes. In summary, all challenges faced by teachers in the online model impact effective teaching.

Moreover, the integration of technology into the classroom presents its own set of concerns. Many teachers are not adequately trained in utilizing digital tools, which can lead to ineffective implementation and student disengagement. Research by Zhang and Hyland [36] indicates that a lack of technological proficiency can hinder teachers' ability to create interactive and engaging learning experiences.

Therefore, as educators navigate the complexities and challenges of online teaching, it becomes essential to address these multifaceted issues to foster a more effective and equitable learning environment.

**Learning-related challenges:** In the context of learning-related challenges, studies revealed that teachers confront significant hurdles stemming from students' inadequate learning skills and their low course engagement, which impacts the online model. The challenges students face in academic writing can adversely affect both their writing performance and overall course participation. Research [2, 37] identify that Chinese students encounter syntactic and coherence issues in academic English writing due to differences in writing structures between Chinese and English. In this regard, Hyland [23] notes that linguistic challenges hinder students' expressive abilities, thereby preventing a connection between text and readers. Furthermore, the complexity of academic writing complicates students' efforts, as they struggle not only with linguistic issues but also with mastering various writing styles.

These challenges represent not only the dilemmas faced by students in academic English but also influence their motivation and course involvement, ultimately resulting in poor academic outcomes. Zhao [21] found that students often perceive academic writing tasks as hard and irrelevant, leading to disinterest. Similarly, Bailey [38] notes that another factor contributing to students' lack of interest is the high expectations within academic English writing. Additionally, writing anxiety exacerbates these challenges, as high demands and expectations can significantly decrease students' engagement [39]. To address these challenges, several intervention strategies have been proposed, such as incorporating innovative teaching methods such as flipped classrooms [18], gamified learning [20], and interactive models [21]. These approaches can enhance student enthusiasm and participation to some degree, but integrating these strategies into online education requires meticulous planning and consideration.

## 4.2 Discussion on needs analysis: Needs and wants

The participants believed it is essential to design online academic English writing teaching that better meets teachers' needs. The survey found that when designing

online teaching, preparation should occur in different phases: before, during, and after the class. This approach ensures effective teaching and learning through a continuous process of monitoring and support.

**Pre-class design:** In the pre-class phase, participants highlighted that effective preparation involves grouping and meticulously designed teaching materials and content, which are both necessary and foundational for successful teaching. Grouping strategies, as shown in prior studies, help students from various perspectives by enabling peer assistance and collaboration [40]. Carefully designed model content ensures that teaching is organized and focused, which helps establish clear learning objectives that are crucial for effective models [35], [41]. Clear teaching objectives and supportive teaching materials provide both students and teachers with a roadmap, increasing the overall efficiency of the teaching process.

Similarly, integrating technology into pre-class preparation aligns with teachers' expectations for the online model. For example, creating online study groups for real-time discussions can enhance student engagement and improve their learning experiences [20–21]. Research indicates that when educators employ a mix of strategies—such as visual aids, interactive multimedia, and hands-on activities—their ability to reach and connect with a broader student demographic is significantly enhanced [33], [42]. Moreover, fostering a collaborative environment through pre-class activities is one goal teachers wanted to acquire in the online teaching, and it is believed to stimulate motivation and accountability among learners, compelling them to take charge of their educational journey.

**While-class design:** The study reveals that teachers believe it crucial to establish an interactive teaching and collaborative learning environment. They hope to enhance this through online teaching platforms. The use of various tools is necessary, such as real-time discussion groups, forums, collaborative group activities, and gamified teaching methods. These elements play a vital role in maintaining student interest and participation. Interactive teaching not only meets student needs but also encourages deeper engagement in the learning process [20]. A collaborative learning atmosphere is deemed essential for promoting student learning, particularly in fostering understanding, developing a sense of community, and enhancing cooperation [32]. Through peer discussions and feedback, students can express their confusion, share perspectives, and engage in in-depth discussions, adopting a more comprehensive approach [42]. Similarly, a collaborative learning environment can strengthen students' community awareness, fostering a sense of belonging, which leads to a more positive attitude toward classroom activities and learning.

The findings indicate that implementing these strategies can lead to improved academic performance and satisfaction among students. Additionally, fostering a culture of inquiry and exploration within this interactive and collaborative framework can stimulate higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills. Educators are urged to leverage technology to create dynamic and fluid learning experiences that transcend traditional boundaries.

**Post-class design:** The study indicates that for more effective online teaching, continuous post-class feedback and various assessment methods are essential. Educators aim to use these strategies to gain insight into students' academic writing processes and outcomes at different stages, facilitating better adjustments to online courses.

Ongoing feedback is crucial for post-class improvement, as it enables students to quickly recognize and correct their mistakes. Xu and Zhang [19] found that AI-supported automated feedback tools can significantly enhance students' writing progress. Formative assessments, on the other hand, provide timely feedback,

allowing students to reflect on their performance and make necessary adjustments [21]. This cycle of continuous feedback is vital for sustainable improvement and development in academic English for students.

Moreover, assessment is an indispensable part of teaching, and employing multiple assessment methods, such as peer reviews and self-assessments, helps students understand their writing from a more comprehensive perspective [36]. These methods not only encourage critical evaluation of their own and others' work but also enable teachers to more directly and effectively gauge students' absorption and application of the teaching content.

Additionally, integrating technology into assessment practices can further enrich the learning experience. Tools such as plagiarism checkers and grammar enhancers empower students to take ownership of their writing by providing immediate insights into areas for improvement [42]. As noted by Yang et al., [22], incorporating these resources leads to a more engaged learning environment, where students feel encouraged to experiment with their writing techniques without fear of error.

## 5 CONCLUSION

The needs analysis conducted in this study aimed to identify the specific challenges faced by teachers in delivering online academic English writing teaching and to uncover their needs for creating more effective online learning experiences. The findings highlight that addressing these challenges requires a comprehensive strategy tailored to the unique demands of online teaching. Key components of this strategy include developing specialized online teaching materials, designing flexible and supportive course schedules, and offering targeted professional development opportunities for instructors. By integrating interactive teaching methods, collaborative learning activities, and regular feedback mechanisms, educators can foster more engaging and effective online environments that better support students' academic writing development. The implications of this study are significant for the future design of online academic English courses, suggesting that a more nuanced approach to online pedagogy—one that accounts for both technological and pedagogical needs—can enhance the quality of the model. Future research should focus on the long-term impact of these strategies, exploring how they can be adapted and implemented in different educational contexts to further improve online academic English teaching and student outcomes.

## 6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We sincerely thank the participants for their time and effort in this experiment. We also appreciate the support and assistance provided by the College of English at Chinese University during the study. Finally, we acknowledge the reviewers for their valuable suggestions and feedback regarding this study.

## 7 REFERENCES

- [1] N. Peachey, "Synchronous online teaching," in *Digital Language Learning and Teaching*, M. Carrier, R. M. Damerow, and K. M. Bailey, Eds., 2017, pp. 143–155. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315523293-12>

- [2] A. Cheung, "Synchronous online teaching, a blessing or a curse? Insights from EFL primary students' interaction during online English lessons," *System*, vol. 100, p. 102566, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102566>.
- [3] R. Lynch and M. Dembo, "The relationship between self-regulation and online learning in a blended learning context," *IRRODL*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v5i2.189>
- [4] K. M. Moser, T. Wei, and D. Brenner, "Remote teaching during COVID-19: Implications from a national survey of language educators," *System*, vol. 97, p. 102431, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102431>.
- [5] H. C. Tai, W. C. Lin, and S. C. Yang, "Exploring the effects of peer review and teachers' corrective feedback on EFL students' online writing performance," *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 284–309, 2015. Available: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474> [Accessed: Nov. 24, 2021].
- [6] Z. D. Zaghlool, "The impact of using CALL online writing activities on EFL university students' writing achievement," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 141–148, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1002.01>
- [7] V. N. Tarrayo, A. G. Anudin, H. B. Mendoza, and E. S. Parungao-Callueng, "Challenges and opportunities in teaching writing online amidst the pandemic: Voices from English language teachers in Philippine universities," *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 74–90, 2022. Available: <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2022v47n4.5>
- [8] R. J. Blake, "New trends in using technology in the language curriculum," *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol. 27, pp. 76–97, 2007. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190508070049> [Accessed: Mar. 28, 2007].
- [9] M. Wildner-Bassett, "Teacher's role in computer-mediated communication and distance learning," in *Opening Doors through Distance Language Education: Principles, Perspectives, and Practices*, S. Goertler and P. Winke, Eds., 2018, pp. 67–84.
- [10] S. Wilkinson, "Articulating studying abroad: The depth dimension," in *Language Program Articulation: Developing a Theoretical Foundation*, C. Barrette and K. Paesani, Eds., 2015, pp. 44–58.
- [11] N. R. Alias, Z. Hasim, K. M. Sauffi, and T. N. Bencharif, "The effectiveness of online feedback and automated writing feedback in improving writing: A systematic literature review," *Asian Journal of Research in Education and Social Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 900–912, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ajress/article/view/25725> [Accessed: Nov. 10, 2024].
- [12] Y. Jiang, X. Gai, M. S. Üstün-Yavuz, M. Zhang, and J. M. Thomson, "A meta-analysis of training effects on English phonological awareness and reading in native Chinese speakers," *Psychological Journal*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 599–617, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.675>
- [13] A. A. Zaki and M. M. Yunus, "Potential of mobile learning in teaching of ESL academic writing," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 11–19, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n6p11>
- [14] H. Al Fadda, "Difficulties in academic writing: From the perspective of King Saud university postgraduate students," *English Language Teaching*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 123–130, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n3p123>
- [15] J. Mallia, "Strategies for developing English academic writing skills," *Arab World English Journal*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 3–15, 2017. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.1>
- [16] K. Hyland, *Feedback in Second Language Writing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108635547>
- [17] Y. Gao and H. Wang, "Developing Chinese university students' academic literacies in English language classrooms via a production-oriented approach: An action research perspective," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 14, p. 1189555, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1189555>

- [18] W. Zhang and L. Luo, "Some thoughts on the development and current situation of college English teaching in China," *Foreign Language World*, vol. 3, pp. 2–7, 2014. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:157024642> [Accessed: Apr. 10, 2014].
- [19] J. Xu and S. Zhang, "Understanding AWE feedback and English writing of learners with different proficiency levels in an EFL classroom: A sociocultural perspective," *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, vol. 31, pp. 357–367, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00577-7>
- [20] J. Chen, M. Wang, P. A. Kirschner, and C. C. Tsai, "The role of collaboration, computer use, learning environments, and supporting strategies in CSCL: A meta-analysis," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 88, no. 6, pp. 799–843, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318791584>
- [21] Y. Cui, C. D. Schunn, X. Gai, Y. Jiang, and Z. Wang, "Corrigendum: Effects of trained peer vs. teacher feedback on EFL students' writing performance, self-efficacy, and internalization of motivation," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 12, p. 788474, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.788474>
- [22] Q. F. Wen, "Foreign language education in China in the past 70 years: Achievements and challenges," *Foreign Lang. Teach. Res.*, vol. 5, pp. 14–22, 2019. Available: <https://doi.org/10.46451/ijts.2020.12.02> [Accessed: Apr. 10, 2019].
- [23] K. Hyland, "Specific purpose programs," in *Handbook of Language Teaching*, M. H. Long and C. J. Doughty, Eds., Wiley, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444315783.ch12>
- [24] I. S. P. Nation and J. Macalister, *Language Curriculum Design*. New York & London: Routledge, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203870730>
- [25] T. Hutchinson and A. Waters, *English for Specific Purposes: A Learner-Centered Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 1987. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733031>
- [26] H. Suri, "Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis," *Qualitative Research Journal*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 63–75, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ1102063>
- [27] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Using thematic analysis in psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 77–101, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- [28] E. G. Guba, "Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries," *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 75–91, 1981. [Online]. Available: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30219811> [Accessed: Nov. 12, 2012].
- [29] T. A. Schwandt, Y. S. Lincoln, and E. G. Guba, "Judging interpretations: But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation," *New Directions for Evaluation*, vol. 2007, no. 114, pp. 11–25, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.223>
- [30] R. N. Moses and M. Mohamad, "Challenges faced by students and teachers on writing skills in ESL contexts: A literature review," *Creative Education*, vol. 10, no. 13, pp. 3385–3391, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2019.1013260>
- [31] I. Jones-Mensah and K. Hilton, "Assessing the statistical differences in academic writing skills across disciplines in higher education," *Cogent Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2344379>
- [32] R. Zhang and D. Zou, "Types, purposes, and effectiveness of state-of-the-art technologies for second and foreign language learning," *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 696–742, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1744666>
- [33] Z. Zhang and K. Hyland, "Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 36, pp. 90–102, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2018.02.004>
- [34] N. Burroughs *et al.*, "A review of the literature on teacher effectiveness and student outcomes," in *Teaching for Excellence and Equity, IEA Research for Education*, Cham: Springer, vol. 6, 2019, pp. 7–17. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16151-4\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16151-4_2)

- [35] S. Strauß and N. Rummel, “Promoting interaction in online distance education: Designing, implementing and supporting collaborative learning,” *Information and Learning Sciences*, vol. 121, nos. 5/6, pp. 251–260, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ILS-04-2020-0090>
- [36] X. You, “New directions in EFL writing: A report from China,” *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 253–256, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.09.002>
- [37] D. Bailey, “Social networking for language learning participation in relation to task value and L2 writing anxiety,” *CALL-EJ*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2019.
- [38] D. Altınmakas and Y. Bayyurt, “An exploratory study on factors influencing undergraduate students’ academic writing practices in Turkey,” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 37, pp. 88–103, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.11.006>
- [39] L. J. Cai, “Students’ perceptions of academic writing: A needs analysis of EAP in China,” *Asian-Focused ELT Research and Practice: Voices from the Far Edge*, pp. 127–151, 2017. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/13/V4/I1/A2/Cai> [Accessed: Sep. 13, 2013].
- [40] D. Fisher and N. Frey, *Better Learning Through Structured Teaching: A Framework for the Gradual Release of Responsibility*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2021.
- [41] I. Lee, “Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms,” *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 49, p. 100734 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734>
- [42] D. Yang, J. M. Lavonen, and H. Niemi, “Online learning engagement: Critical factors and research evidence from literature,” *Themes in eLearning*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–18, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:189807031> [Accessed: Sep. 23, 2024].

## 8 AUTHORS

**Mingxian Gui** is with the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, 50604, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (E-mail: [s2164655@siswa.um.edu.my](mailto:s2164655@siswa.um.edu.my)).

**Saedah Binti Siraj** is with the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, 50604, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (E-mail: [saedah@um.edu.my](mailto:saedah@um.edu.my)).

**Rafiza Binti Abdui Razak** is with the Faculty of Education, University of Malaya, 50604, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.