

University Students' Perceptions of Social Factors Influencing English Writing in Jakarta and South Tangerang

Haryati¹

¹Universitas Pamulang, Banten, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-09-10

Revised 2026-10-26

Accepted 2026-10-27

Keywords:

Effect

Social Factors

University Students

Writing Ability

ABSTRACT

This study explores the social factors influencing university students' English writing achievement in Jakarta and Tangerang Selatan, along with students' perceptions of how these factors affect their writing performance. Employing a mixed-methods descriptive design, the research combines a survey of 100 English Education students across two universities with semi-structured interviews involving a sub-sample of 12 students to gain deeper insights. Data were collected using Likert-scale questionnaires to identify key social factors and analyzed descriptively, supported by qualitative thematic analysis of the interview transcripts. The findings reveal that students perceive several key social dimensions as influential to their writing development, including sociolinguistic background, socio-economic status and access to literacy resources, engagement with social media and online communities, the lecturer's role and academic environment, family support, and peer dynamics. Moreover, these social factors present both opportunities and challenges for students' writing proficiency. On one hand, social interactions enable students to model essay structures, exchange ideas, and learn proper mechanics, citations, and references. On the other hand, students face notable hurdles, such as difficulty accepting critique from peers and instructors, limited guidance due to large class sizes, and challenges in synthesizing expert ideas with their own understanding. Overall, the study underscores the need for targeted instructional support and improved feedback mechanisms in higher education writing contexts.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Haryati

Universitas Pamulang, Tangerang Selatan, Banten, Indonesia

Email: dosen00511@unpam.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning English is a demanding process for students, even though it has been taught since primary school. Several obstacles make this difficult: teaching methodology, unequal facilities between schools, limited internet access, and disparities in teaching quality [1]. Regarding teaching methodology, many teachers still emphasize grammar over communication practice. They focus on teaching tense rules and completing sentence gaps,

which favors written activities and reduces opportunities for speaking. Teachers often translate English ideas into students' native language, which limits students' speaking experience. Writing also dominates not just teaching but testing, since spoken English evaluations are rare. This is a concern because English proficiency is widely seen as tied to social mobility and industrial opportunity; both speaking and writing skills are needed for students to communicate across different communities. Unequal facilities are another major obstacle, particularly for writing performance [2]. Schools in Indonesia vary depending on their funding source; some are government-funded, while others rely on student tuition—which creates differences in the facilities available for writing instruction, including internet access and digital media use. This affects students' English achievement unevenly; private schools with better facilities are often seen as producing stronger writers. However, this gap is not only about facilities, but it also depends on teachers' ability to select and use various digital tools effectively in their teaching. A related obstacle is limited internet access [3]. When schools provide proper facilities, including reliable internet, both teachers and students are better equipped to support the learning environment, which in turn helps improve students' writing achievement and helps teachers meet their teaching goals. The final obstacle is disparity in teaching quality. This stems from unequal access to training and certification; teachers in urban areas typically have more opportunities to develop their English teaching skills than those in remote regions. Additionally, not all teachers assigned to teach English have a background in the subject, a common issue in public primary schools. Since every teacher needs strong English skills to teach effectively, this mismatch directly impacts students' writing competency and is worsened when schools fail to provide adequate support and resources.

Briefly, during the writing process, students not only present numerous different capabilities, but social factors also affect students' writing ability. Social factors are external environmental influences from society, family, community, and relationships among speakers; these impact how students learn English and behave in social interaction. Social factors are external environmental influences from society, community, classroom atmosphere, teacher feedback, and interpersonal relationships that affect how individuals learn English as foreign language and behave through the language [4], [5]. Social factors can be categorized as family influence, school environment, community, and socio-economic status. Family influence can encourage students to gain more knowledge about any language: mother tongue, Bahasa, English, or other languages. Educated parents have capability to teach and assist their children to learn more than one language. Moreover, Horvath and Steinberg [6] deliver additional social factor classifications: gender, status in society, various ethnicities, and age; they also focus on learning environment in educational settings. Gillani and Eynon [7] determine some factors, including relationships between students and teachers, students and students, and students and social environment. Similarly, Kollapally et al. [8] focus on three main factors in educational settings, particularly English skills: family assistance and economic and social environment. Brint [9] highlights that students' emotional aspects impact their learning achievement, including writing performance.

Furthermore, in writing English ideas, social factors impact the students' writing success; this is mediated by sociocultural aspects. They can be categorized into some elements: family, social environment, friends, attitude, and individual knowledge. Social factors include anxiety, motivation, and self-confidence. Teamwork and students' and teachers' interactions are crucial factors in educational setting [10]–[13]. Xu and Jin [14] demonstrate that family socio-economic status and parental emotional support are significantly associated with students' English language achievement. Parents' education, social environment, students' interaction, and learning atmosphere also play crucial factors in educational sector [15].

Previous research investigated relationship between internal and external factors and students' English achievement. The results reveal that internal factors, such as motivation, age, anxiety, and students' attitude, have no relation to students' writing ability, but in learning English, external factors, including learning strategies, family support, and friends' environment, encourage students' English achievement [16], [17]. Moreover, poor students' English achievement is caused not only by students' negative attitude as internal factor but also by unaccommodating school environment and family assistance; parents' consideration and students' encouragement to learn English have a substantial impact on their writing comprehension. It is clear that parents' attention leads to positive perspective and learning atmosphere when students learn how to write ideas [18], [19]. Ling et al. [20] also added that the classroom learning environment and teachers' feedback help students elevate writing activities since it is alongside other English skills, including speaking, reading, and writing. It helps them improve their writing skills.

Furthermore, Jani and Mellinger [21] argue that the classroom environment has a beneficial impact on students' writing performance, with students being more engaged in writing when there was appropriate ventilation. In terms of practical applicability, the use of grammar checkers was found to be useful in improving writing skills. Sabti et al. [22] demonstrate that students' writing performance is influenced by individual psychological and affective factors, particularly writing anxiety, self-efficacy, and achievement motivation. These factors shape students' confidence, emotional responses, and motivation during the writing process, which may influence their ability to develop ideas and engage effectively in writing tasks.

Although previous research has investigated how several external and internal factors, class environment, and sociocultural factors impacted students' writing achievement progressively, several research gaps can be identified. Some previous studies were conducted in the scope of schools, not in university environment, which provides distinctive sociocultural and academic factors. The social factors observed were investigated independently, such as family support [18], [19], class environment and teachers' feedback [20], [21], and sociocultural and individual psychological factors [23]. However, there remains a lack of studies that comprehensively integrate social factors such as sociolinguistics, social media, online communities, lecturers' roles, and the academic environment within a single study. Moreover, the previous research did not focus on identifying opportunities and challenges faced by students because of these social factors. Hence, this research is intended to fill the gap by identifying social factors influencing

students' writing performance and exploring the opportunities and challenges related to social factors that affect it. Consequently, this research investigated the students' writing achievement as a process of learning English as a foreign language (EFL) for university-level students by integrating sociocultural factors. To fill this gap, this research investigates the social factors that influence the English writing of university-level EFL students in Jakarta and South Tangerang, while also examining the opportunities and challenges associated with these influences. Specifically, this study addresses the following research questions: What social factors do students perceive as influencing their English writing? Furthermore, what opportunities and challenges do students associate with these factors? By answering these questions, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how multi-layered social contexts shape academic writing achievement in higher education.

²⁹ 2. METHOD

The study used a descriptive qualitative approach. Qualitative research relies on people's perceptions and understanding rather than numbers, and it helps explain social conditions [24]. The writers chose this approach because the study is subjective in nature, focuses on descriptions, opinions, and observations rather than numerical data, and examines what the questionnaire responses reveal and what actions follow from them [25]. It also aims to identify and describe the social factors affecting students' writing achievement and their effects on performance. Data were collected through content analysis, since the study examines written and printed responses from the questionnaire in depth.

This research was conducted over a one-year period in 2025 at two higher education institutions in Indonesia: one private university located in South Tangerang and one public university in Jakarta. A total of N=100 undergraduate English Language Education students participated in the questionnaire phase (n=50 from one private university and n=50 from a public university in Jakarta). Purposeful sampling was used to select participants based on three main inclusion criteria: being enrolled as an active student in their 5th to 7th semesters majoring in English Language Education and having completed at least two core academic writing courses. For qualitative follow-up, a subsample of 12 students (6 from each university) was selected through purposeful sampling based on their willingness to participate and varying levels of academic writing achievement.

The primary quantitative data collection instrument was a closed-ended online questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale distributed via Google Forms (ranging from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The questionnaire consisted of 28 items covering six key social dimensions: Sociolinguistic background (4 items), Socio-economic status and resource access (4 items), social media and online community involvement (5 items), Lecturer role and academic environment (5 items), Family support (5 items), Peer environment (5 items). Validation and Reliability: The questionnaire items were adapted from an established framework on social factors in language learning [4], [5] and modified to suit the local university context. Content validity was verified through expert assessment by two senior lecturers in English Language Teaching. A pilot test was conducted with 20 non-participant students before full distribution. Internal consistency reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's alpha. To gain deeper qualitative insights into perceived

opportunities and challenges related to social factors, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 12 selected participants. Each interview lasted approximately 30 to 45 minutes, was conducted in a mix of English and Indonesian to ensure clarity and was audio-recorded with explicit permission. All recordings were then transcribed verbatim for analysis.

To analyze the data, quantitative data from the questionnaire were calculated using descriptive statistics to obtain percentages and mean distributions for each dimension of social factors. Qualitative interview data were analyzed using thematic analysis following a systematic coding procedure: reading the interview transcripts repeatedly, creating labels for key statements regarding perceived influences, opportunities, and challenges, grouping similar codes into broader thematic categories, refining theme boundaries and selecting representative narrative quotes. Participation was completely voluntary, and all respondents signed an informed consent form prior to data collection. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, no personally identifiable information was collected, and participant identities were replaced with alphanumeric codes.

15 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Social Factors in Students' Writing at a University in Jakarta and at a University in South Tangerang

Table 1. Students' Perspective on Social Factors in Students' Writing in Tangerang Selatan

Social Factors	Average				
	SD	D	N	A	SA
Peer Environment	5,50	19,00	23,50	27,50	24,50
Family Support	17,33	13,33	11,33	33,33	24,67
Lecturers' Role and Academic Environment	0,67	4,00	26,00	34,67	34,00
Students Writing Ability	1,00	4,50	35,50	38,00	20,50
The Impact of Social Media and Online Communities	3,00	10,50	18,50	28,50	39,50
Socio-Economic Status and Access to Literacy Resources	2,00	3,33	34,00	36,00	24,67
Sociolinguistic Factors	7,56	17,78	36,44	28,44	9,78

3
Note: SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree. Values represent the average percentage of respondents selecting each response category for each social factor influencing students' writing ability.

Based on the table above, students show mixed but generally moderate-to-high recognition of how social factors affect their writing. For peer environment, responses split between "agree" (27.50%) and "strongly disagree" (24.50%), with peer interaction seen as helpful for exchanging ideas and getting feedback. Family support shows a similar split ("agree" 33.33%, "strongly disagree" 24.67%), reflecting its role through emotional encouragement and learning support. Lecturers' role and academic environment stand out as the most influential factors, with strongly "agree" (34.67%) responses and minimal true disagreement; guidance and feedback clearly help students revise and think more critically. For students' own writing ability, most responses were "neutral" (35.50%) or "agree" (38%), suggesting many still feel uncertain about their skills and see room for growth. Moreover,

social media and online communication received the most positive response overall (“strongly agree” 39.50%, “agree” 28.50%), valued for easy access to references and diverse writing styles. Socio-economic status showed limited impact (“agree” 36%, “neutral” 34%), as students prioritize having open access to digital resources regardless of background. Sociolinguistic factors had the least prominent influence (“neutral” 36.44%, “agree” 28.44%), though language and cultural adaptation still play a role. In conclusion, lecturers and academic environment emerged as the strongest influences on writing ability, followed by social media’s positive contribution through collaboration and resource access. Sociolinguistic and socio-economic factors matter less by comparison. These findings suggest that strengthening academic support and digital learning environments can meaningfully improve students’ writing skills.

Table 2. Students’ Perspective on Social Factors in Students’ Writing in Jakarta

Social Factors	Average				
	SD	D	N	A	SA
Peer Environment	6,00	19,50	24,50	21,00	29,00
Family Support	18,00	10,67	21,33	34,00	16,00
Lecturers’ Role and Academic Environment	1,33	4,67	38,67	32,00	23,33
Students Writing Ability	2,00	6,50	53,00	28,50	10,00
The Impact of Social Media and Online Communities	3,50	10,00	30,50	26,50	29,50
Socio-Economic Status and Access to Literacy Resources	3,33	3,33	38,67	40,00	14,67
Sociolinguistic Factors	7,11	20,89	36,22	28,00	7,78

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree. Values represent the average percentage of respondents selecting each response category for each social factor influencing students’ writing ability.

Jakarta students see writing ability as shaped by multiple, mostly social, factors, with responses generally split between “agree” and “neutral”. Peer environment received positive ratings (“agree” 21%, “strongly agree” 29%), while family support was similarly positive (“agree” 34%). Lecturers’ role and academic environment leaned more toward “neutral” (38.67%) than “agree” (32%), largely due to delayed feedback and limited access to references. For their own writing ability, most students chose “neutral” (53%), reflecting uncertainty and ongoing struggles with grammar, coherence, and complex ideas often tied to fear of making mistakes. Social media and online communities were viewed positively (“strongly agree” 29.50%, “agree” 26.50%) for providing useful information and writing resources. Socio-economic status and access to resources were also seen as helpful (40%), since open access to tools and references removes obstacles in the writing process. Sociolinguistic factors: grammar, word choice, and sentence complexity were likewise seen as contributing to writing quality. Overall, the findings suggest students’ writing ability results from an interconnected mix of social support, academic guidance, digital resources, and language skills, with confidence in personal writing ability remaining an area needing further development.

3.2. Peer Environment

Peer influence plays a significant role in students' writing. Jakarta students (29%) strongly agree that peer interaction shapes how they think, write, and revise. Discussions with peers help with brainstorming, narrowing ideas, forming thesis statements, and fixing grammar, while peer reviewing helps identify unclear logic, weak references, or grammatical errors—ultimately improving writing quality and broadening students' perspectives. Tangerang Selatan students (24.60%) similarly value peer support, especially through discussions on grammar, citations, and thesis development. Beyond academic help, peers offer emotional support that reduces writing-related stress and anxiety—such as fear of mistakes or feeling inadequate—by offering encouragement and reminders of the writing's purpose. Over time, this regular peer interaction helps students build consistent, organized writing habits rather than experiencing writing as a stressful burden.

Regarding the effects of peer environment on students' writing achievement from the results of interview, some students argued that they are able to exchange ideas and knowledge with other peers before they begin writing. Exchanging ideas helps them obtain a lot of information about the topic they write. In this case, they share what they have achieved and share it with others; they share the sources to obtain more comprehension, theory, and references. It assists them in gathering a lot of information or ideas by listing ideas to elevate the ideas in their essay. Moreover, peer environment progressively affects constructive feedback. It can be obtained when they share their argument to improve them; during the process, they criticize and suggest ideas that should and should not be in the essay. A few of them suggest essay structures, language use, supported arguments, and relevant topics to discuss. As a result, the process gradually contributes to students' writing quality.

Nevertheless, peer environment also presents adverse impact on their writing competence. Some students rely on other students, so they duplicate their peers' ideas. Duplicating process occurs during writing activities; it can be in the form of topics, thesis statements, or sources. Consequently, it hinders students' writing competence since they often duplicate without having critical thought and arranging their own arguments. It also results in plagiarism, where students have similar citations to their peers without elaborating the ideas with their own understanding. In fact, it leads to lack of students' understanding of the written ideas and decreases students' writing motivation since they rely on their peers to produce ideas, topics, sources, and other aspects in writing.

3.3. Family Support

Family support plays a key role in shaping students' writing motivation, habits, and confidence. At a university in Jakarta, 34% of students say family support motivates their writing, especially when parents show attention, appreciation, and provide the time and space needed to develop ideas freely. Similarly, 33.33% of South Tangerang University students feel motivated by parental appreciation—when parents take time to read their work, it reinforces that their effort is valued, encouraging them to keep improving. Students also value receiving feedback and advice from parents on their writing, which pushes them to produce stronger sentences, more creative ideas, and better language use overall. This supportive family environment creates a safe emotional space where students feel

comfortable experimenting with new ideas without fear of criticism, ultimately helping them grow as writers.

It is generally acknowledged that family environment presents several beneficial effects on students' writing ability; nevertheless, it leads to several negative effects on their writing activity. The results of interview reveal that some students' excessive praise without criticism of their writing causes them to be less motivated to correct their errors in writing. It also leads them to have difficulty in accepting criticism from their peers or lecturers; they feel irritated and lack motivation to express their ideas in written context. One more thing is the decline of students' critical thinking, as they are not able to express their arguments in writing process, copy ideas without discussing or questioning them in their own words, and continue producing some writing errors like vocabulary, organization, thesis statement, or citation. Furthermore, excessive writing facilities like help with finding references, vocabulary, or topic selection can cause students to rely on others' assistance, reduce independence in arguing ideas, and lead to a decline in problem-solving; as a result, students produce inauthentic written ideas.

3.4. Lecturers' Role and Academic Environment

Lecturers' feedback and academic environment are key external factors shaping students' writing. In Tangerang, 40% of students value lecturer feedback, since corrections and suggestions help them recognize mistakes, understand their progress, and avoid repeating errors. Academic environment—including libraries, internet access, and online journals—also plays a major role (38.26%), giving students resources to develop ideas, learn essay structure, and practice citation. Cultural literacy activities like workshops and social media writing further support critical thinking and language use (21.74%). Moreover, Jakarta students share a similar view, with 42% emphasizing that lecturer feedback improves writing quality, critical thinking, independence, and motivation. Feedback helps them revise grammar, reflect on strengths and weaknesses, and set clearer writing goals over time. Academic environment is also valued (36.18%) for building critical thinking, contextual vocabulary use, and organized writing through research, comparison, and logical argumentation. Additionally, exposure to journals and writing workshops (21.28%) helps students strengthen technical skills and confidence, as they receive structured guidance and peer feedback that improve the overall quality of their academic writing.

From the results of interview, students in two different districts agree that although lecturers' feedback and academic environment contribute a lot to enhancing students' writing competence, students argue both show some weaknesses. Lecturers provide insufficient guidance or feedback due to time limitations and large classes. As a result, students may not receive sufficient support to elevate their grammar, organization, and academic writing skills. In some cases, feedback may focus only on grades rather than detailed explanations, which can reduce students' motivation to revise and learn from their mistakes. Consequently, they do not know which points need to be revised, which can demotivate students. From a similar perspective, the academic environment sometimes provides pressure and fear of making mistakes; these lead to anxiety and cause students to feel lack of confidence in expressing their written ideas. ideas through writing.

Consequently, these limitations may prevent the enhancement of students' overall writing competency.

3.5. Students' Writing Ability

Students' own writing ability plays a major role in making the writing process easier. 35% of students in Tangerang say strong ability helps them organize ideas logically, build stronger arguments with supporting evidence, and produce clear, grammatically correct sentences with appropriate vocabulary. On the other hand, Jakarta students place even more weight on this factor (53%), noting that skilled writers succeed by properly following each writing stage—planning, drafting, revising, and proofreading. This structured approach reduces confusion and lets them focus on content quality rather than basic sentence-building. It also helps them write more efficiently with less need for revision, allowing clearer and more effective academic writing overall. As a result, students experience less stress during the writing process and feel more confident publishing their work on blogs, in articles, or through campus and online journals.

In relation to interview, most students present similar perspective that their writing ability can offer many beneficial effects on producing written ideas. Nevertheless, in certain cases, their advanced writing ability may indirectly present challenges in writing. The challenges can be perfectionist; they focus on the writing mechanism, word choices, citations, and readable ideas; therefore, they spend time revising some parts of their ideas. It can also be caused by overthinking in word selection and high pressure from academic environment. In short, when challenges come during writing process, they come from psychological or personal factors such as perfectionism, where students feel the need to produce flawless writing and repeatedly revise their work. In some cases, self-imposed pressure or high personal standards can also slow down the writing process, as students may spend excessive time refining their sentences or worrying about mistakes.

3.6. Social Media and Online Communities

Social media and online communication offer valuable writing opportunities for students (39.80%). In Tangerang Selatan, students use platforms like comments, captions, and posts to express ideas, while university discussion forums and online journals give them academic spaces to write. This frequent practice helps improve their ability to organize and express ideas over time. Social media also serves as a resource for references and writing tips. Students adapt their style depending on context—using casual language with friends and formal language with lecturers—which builds their awareness of audience, tone, and communication strategy. Jakarta students (29.50%) similarly highlight how social media boosts writing creativity, pushing them to express ideas clearly and engagingly within a short space to capture audience attention. Interactions like comments, likes, and shares also provide quick feedback on grammar, word choice, and coherence, helping students refine their writing. This dynamic digital environment further trains students to shift between formal and informal styles depending on the topic, strengthening their ability to write appropriately across both academic and casual contexts.

The interview reveals students believe social media and online communication also contribute to a decline in students' writing proficiency. With the use of slang and other casual

expressions like abbreviations and informal expressions, students' writing ability weakens other standard writing mechanisms, including spelling and grammar skills. Exposure to online writing allows them to focus on expressing short ideas rather than elaborating complex ideas. If they do not have a strong awareness of how to adapt the online writing habit, they struggle when they write academic writing since they insert some abbreviations in formal writing settings like lol, asap or bcs. However, not all students are in this case; they are able to identify the context or topic they are discussing on online media. Even though casual expressions arise during the online writing process, they deliberately remove them and transform ideas into Standard English. In conclusion, it is crucial for students to learn how to balance informal online communication with standard English in academic writing.

3.7. Socio-Economic Status and Access to Literacy Resources

Socio-economic status and access to resources are seen as factors influencing students' writing ability. In Tangerang Selatan, 36% of students say access to laptops, internet, and learning apps helps them gain writing exposure and enrich their vocabulary, while lack of access can limit writing motivation for some. Even so, most conclude that economic status has only a minor overall effect, since students without resources can often rely on peers for support, contributing to an overall positive writing atmosphere. Jakarta students (40%) hold a similar view, noting that access to literacy resources is not fully determined by economic background, since peers share references and universities offer open-access libraries and digital platforms to all students equally. This helps close the academic information gap and gives students more equal opportunities to strengthen their reading comprehension and academic writing skills.

Nonetheless, the interview indicates that a few students lack vocabulary achievement; thus, they struggle to expand ideas; they tend to arrange ideas with common words used redundantly. It also hinders students from elaborating experts' ideas with their own understanding; they cannot describe topics effectively and create ambiguous sentences. This occurs due to inadequate knowledge of tenses. Moreover, they have additional assignments from lecturers, which becomes a burden since they are required to complete all assignments concurrently; it leads them to feel exhausted managing their time and results in discouragement in writing.

From all above findings, the social factors include internal and external factors of each student; the factors are sociolinguistic, socio-economic status and access to literacy resources, social media and online communities, students' writing ability, lecturers' role and academic environment, family support, and peer environment. The factors also lead to some challenges and opportunities in students' writing processes and writing ability. The findings are similar to Akhtar et al. [1] and Gupta et al. [2], who shared their arguments regarding several challenges faced by students, particularly language inaccuracy, negative attitude towards writing, and teaching methods delivered by lecturers. Students' writing challenges include difficulties in writing process, elaboration of ideas, contextual grammar use, organization of ideas, limited vocabulary, insufficient lecturer feedback, and lack of supporting resources to strengthen ideas. Moreover, family support and environmental settings influence how students start writing, comprehend ideas, and how the ideas are

constructed through evidence-based reasoning; these opportunities lead to positive encouragement among students and writing knowledge achievement [28], [29]. Conversely, some studies focused on applying technological products like AI to assist students in writing; it helps them arrange ideas correctly [30]. The collaboration between technology and human feedback leads to enhancing fairness, validity, awareness and reliability [31], [32]. Farrokhnia et al. [33] observed that generative AI and teachers provided qualified feedback, but they did not reveal extensive writing revisions due to students' attitudes.

In general, it explored relationship between family background, socio-economic status, community, school environment and other social factors and students' English achievement. It is also believed that those social factors positively affect students' English ability in spoken or written form. Comprehending these factors facilitates students' perception of these factors as supporting or constraining their writing, particularly for Indonesian students for whom English functions as the foreign language. In addition, the research advanced the study of social factors; it focuses on how students interpret and use some social factors as insights to revise written works. Students collaborate with all sociocultural environments to support their writing achievement. Moreover, the research offered not only students' writing achievement but also practical guidance for them to improve writing styles and skills. This research presents several limitations. This research used purposive sampling limited to two universities in Jakarta and South Tangerang (N = 100 survey participants; n = 12 interview respondents). As a result, the findings cannot be generalized to all tertiary-level EFL institutions in Indonesia. The data were collected strictly through self-reported questionnaires and interviews. Responses may have been influenced by social desirability bias, in which participants reported ideal writing practices rather than actual writing practices. Moreover, the research measured perceived impact on writing rather than actual changes in writing ability. No pre- and post-tests, objective writing assessment rubrics, or in-person essay evaluations were conducted.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings revealed that students perceived several social and environmental factors as relevant to their English writing experiences. Social factors play a significant role in shaping students' writing experiences, with lecturer feedback, social media, peer interactions, and family support as key external influences. Students consider lecturer feedback crucial for identifying writing errors and guiding revisions, while social media and online communities provide valuable resources and interactive spaces for developing ideas. Rather than a single dominant factor, writing development is shaped by an interconnected network of social environments, digital resources, and individual characteristics. The primary limitations of this research include its reliance on self-reported perceptual data, non-probability purposive sampling at only two institutions, and the absence of direct measures of writing performance. To address these limitations, future research should expand on these perceptual findings by incorporating objective data sources, specifically combining student perceptual data with actual writing and standardized writing rubrics, and longitudinal research designs to track actual writing development over time. By combining subjective perceptions with empirical writing metrics, future research could offer deeper and more

useful insights for higher education instructors and curriculum developers seeking to optimize academic writing instruction.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Akhtar, H. Hassan, A. Saidalvi, and S. Hussain, "A systematic review of the challenges and solutions of ESL students' academic writing," *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 1169–1171, 2019, doi: 10.35940/ijeat.E1164.0585C19.
- [2] S. Gupta, A. Jaiswal, A. Paramasivam, and J. Kotecha, "Academic writing challenges and supports: Perspectives of international doctoral students and their supervisors," *Frontiers in Education*, vol. 7, art. 891534, 2022, doi: 10.3389/educ.2022.891534.
- [3] P. H. Ahmed, "Major writing challenges experienced by EFL learners in Soran University," *Journal of University of Human Development*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 120–126, 2019, doi: 10.21928/juhd.v5n3y2019.pp120-126.
- [4] A. W. Li and P. Collins, "Formative feedback across sources: Student perceptions and writing outcomes with instructor, peer, and AI-generated feedback," *Reading & Writing*, 2026, doi: 10.1007/s11145-026-10761-0.
- [5] K. Gregg, O. Ryan, A. Katz, M. Huerta, and S. Sajadi, "Expanding possibilities for generative AI in qualitative analysis: Fostering student feedback literacy through the application of a feedback quality rubric," *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol. 114, no. 3, art. e70024, 2025, doi: 10.1002/jee.70024.
- [6] K. Horvath and M. Steinberg, "Social classification and the changing boundaries of learning: A neopragmatic perspective on social sorting in digital education," *Learning, Media and Technology*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 566–580, 2023, doi: 10.1080/17439884.2023.2219900.
- [7] N. Gillani and R. Eynon, "Understanding and improving social factors in education: A computational social science approach," in *Handbook of Computational Social Science*, pp. 872–890. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2025, doi: 10.4337/9781802207309.00078.
- [8] N. M. Kollapally, J. Geller, P. Morreale, and D. Kwak, "An ontology for social determinants of education (SDoEd) based on human-AI collaborative approach," *arXiv*, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.10300>
- [9] S. Brint, "High-leverage sociological concepts and the progress of theory, part one," *Theory and Society*, vol. 54, pp. 705–730, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s11186-025-09607-5.
- [10] S. Cao, L. Zhong, and C. Wang, "The impact of student writing assessment literacy on psychological factors: An ordinal logistic regression analysis," *arXiv*, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.00004>
- [11] G. Shulgina, J. Costley, I. Shcheglova, H. Zhang, and N. Sedova, "Online peer editing: The influence of comments, tracked changes and perception of participation on students' writing performance," *Smart Learning Environments*, vol. 11, no. 1, art. 30, 2024, doi: 10.1186/s40561-024-00315-8.
- [12] K. Wang, L. J. Zhang, and M. Cooper, "Metacognitive instruction for improving the effectiveness of collaborative writing for EFL learners' writing development," *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 661–673, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40299-024-00886-7.
- [13] T. A. Shah, S. Hussain, and S. Rashid, "Challenges of teaching writing to ESL learners in a Pakistani public high school: Issues, contributing factors, and solutions based on personal reflections," *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 550–563, 2023, doi: 10.47205/plhr.2023(7-II)49.
- [14] S. Xu and Y. Jin, "Chinese adolescents' socio-economic status and English achievement: The mediating role of parental emotional support," *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, vol. 11, art. 1504, 2024, doi: 10.1057/s41599-024-04048-4.
- [15] M. del M. García-Vita, M. Medina-García, G. P. Polo Amashta, and L. Higuera-Rodríguez, "Socio-educational factors to promote educational inclusion in higher education: A question of student achievement," *Education Sciences*, vol. 11, no. 3, art. 123, 2021, doi: 10.3390/educsci11030123.
- [16] H. Anisa and A. Arifmiboy, "An analysis of factors influencing the students' learning English achievement," *Journal of English Language and Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 264–269, 2021, doi: 10.31004/jele.v6i2.160.
- [17] S. Farianti, "The influence of social factors on students' achievement in learning English," *JL3T (Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching)*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 53–75, 2018.
- [18] C. Chairumisa, R. Apriliaswati, and E. Rosnija, "An analysis on factors influencing students' low English learning achievement," *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Untan*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1–10, 2017.

-
- [19] V. L. Lestari, "The role of parental attention and learning motivation in increasing students' English learning achievement," *SELTICS Journal: Scope of English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 12–21, 2020, doi: 10.46918/seltics.v3i1.540.
 - [20] L. H. Ling, C. H. Wen, and N. H. M. Lateh, "Non-Chinese students' perception on e-learning in enhancing Chinese language skills," *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 43–54, 2019, doi: 10.15282/ijleal.v9.294.
 - [21] J. S. Jani and M. S. Mellinger, "Beyond 'writing to learn': Factors influencing students' writing outcomes," *Journal of Social Work Education*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 136–152, 2015, doi: 10.1080/10437797.2015.977177.
 - [22] A. A. Sabti, S. Md Rashid, V. Nimehchisalem, and R. Darmi, "The impact of writing anxiety, writing achievement motivation, and writing self-efficacy on writing performance: A correlational study of Iraqi tertiary EFL learners," *SAGE Open*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2158244019894289.
 - [23] Y. Tao and J. Yu, "Cultural threads in writing mastery: A structural analysis of perfectionism, learning self-efficacy, and motivation as mediated by self-reflection in Chinese EFL learners," *BMC Psychology*, vol. 12, art. 80, 2024, doi: 10.1186/s40359-024-01572-5.
 - [24] A. Vromen, "Qualitative methods," in *Theory and Methods in Political Science*, 4th ed., V. Lowndes, D. Marsh, and G. Stoker, Eds. Palgrave Macmillan, 2018, pp. 237–253.
 - [25] T. J. Young, "Questionnaires and surveys," in *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication: A Practical Guide*, Z. Hua, Ed. Wiley Blackwell, 2015, pp. 163–180, doi: 10.1002/9781119166283.ch11.
 - [26] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2018.
 - [27] R. Salama, F. Al-Turjman, and C. Altrjman, "Mobile application system for online surveys and questionnaires," in *2023 International Conference on Mechatronics, IoT and Industrial Informatics (ICMIII)*, 2023, pp. 1–10, doi: 10.1109/ICMIII58949.2023.00006.
 - [28] C. Anson and K. Cole, "Empirical studies of writing and generative AI: Introduction to the special issue," *Journal of Writing Research*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2026, doi: 10.17239/jowr-2026.17.03.01.
 - [29] C. Chen and Y. Gong, "The role of AI-assisted learning in academic writing: A mixed-methods study on Chinese as a second language students," *Education Sciences*, vol. 15, no. 2, art. 141, 2025, doi: 10.3390/educsci15020141.
 - [30] M. Usher, "Generative AI vs. instructor vs. peer assessments: A comparison of grading and feedback in higher education," *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 912–927, 2025, doi: 10.1080/02602938.2025.2487495.
 - [31] R. Farzi, "Calibrating generative AI for second language writing assessment: Combining statistical validation with prompt design," *Assessment and Practice in Educational Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 1–12, 2024, doi: 10.61838/japes.2.4.1.
 - [32] Y. Tiandem-Adamou, "Using generative artificial intelligence to support EFL students' writing proficiency in university in China," *Journal of Educational Technology and Innovation*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2024, doi: 10.61414/jeti.v6i4.213.
 - [33] M. Farrokhnia, S. Latifi, P. M. Papadopoulos, L. Hogenkamp, H. Gijlers, H. Khosravi, and O. Noroozi, "Generative AI offers more, but students revise less: Comparing the effects of teacher and AI feedback on student essay revisions," *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, vol. 23, no. 1, art. 6, 2026.
-

2115_Similarity

ORIGINALITY REPORT

8%

SIMILARITY INDEX

6%

INTERNET SOURCES

5%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Harris, Felicia L.. "Unlocking Retention Through Leadership: The Impact of Transformational Leadership Practices on Academic Advisor Retention.", Frostburg State University Publication	1%
2	pdfs.semanticscholar.org Internet Source	1%
3	ojs.academy.edu.ly Internet Source	1%
4	repository.uinsu.ac.id Internet Source	1%
5	Ani Fiani, Dewi Syafitri, Anjasmoro, Nabilah Khairunnisa. "Exploring EFL University Students' Challenges in Learning English Writing", Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal, 2026 Publication	<1%
6	interedtech.com Internet Source	<1%
7	journal-gehu.com Internet Source	<1%
8	eduindex.org Internet Source	<1%
9	academia.edu.pk Internet Source	<1%
10	research.vu.nl Internet Source	<1%
11	ijaile.org Internet Source	<1%
12	www.smarterwaytowrite.com Internet Source	<1%
13	Sikai WANG, Khe Foon HEW. "Enhancing a large language model with a Chain-of-Metacognitive Reasoning approach increases argumentative writing evaluation	<1%

accuracy, student writing outcomes, and mental effort", Computers & Education, 2026

Publication

14	ijetl.org Internet Source	<1 %
15	journal.article2publish.com Internet Source	<1 %
16	public-pages-files-2025.frontiersin.org Internet Source	<1 %
17	rsisinternational.org Internet Source	<1 %
18	www.atlantis-press.com Internet Source	<1 %
19	(10-12-13) http://69.36.77.223/Journal/Feb_13/Feb_13.pdf Internet Source	<1 %
20	Ali Derakhshan. "Tracking the Effects of Gemini as a GenAI Tool on L2 Learners' Writing Proficiency and Anxiety: Latent Growth Curve Modeling Approach", The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher, 2025 Publication	<1 %
21	Chenze Wu, Ricky Lam. "Generative artificial intelligence in writing assessment: University professors' perspectives and recommendations", Assessing Writing, 2026 Publication	<1 %
22	Raúl Quincho-Apumayta, Javier Carrillo Cayllahua, Abraham Ccencho Pari, Vilma Inga Choque, Juan Cárdenas-Valverde. "University Dropout Among Indigenous University Students: A Global Systematic Review", F1000Research, 2025 Publication	<1 %
23	cahaya-ic.com Internet Source	<1 %
24	ejournal.usm.my Internet Source	<1 %
25	journal.iainlangsa.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
26	journal.ump.edu.my Internet Source	<1 %
27	olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org Internet Source	<1 %

28	scholarhub.unimas.my Internet Source	<1 %
29	A.H.G. Kusumah, C.U. Abdullah, D. Turgarini, M. Ruhimat, O. Ridwanudin, Y. Yuniawati. "Promoting Creative Tourism: Current Issues in Tourism Research", CRC Press, 2021 Publication	<1 %
30	Emmanuel Osei-Dwomoh, Hope Amenyah, Gabriel Osei Forkuo. "International Public Sector Accounting Standards Implementation and Public Financial Management Reforms: A Practitioner Audit from Ghana", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2026 Publication	<1 %
31	Morales Cárdenas, Jason. "A Second Language Research Perspective on the Role of Motivation in Cognitive Processes of L2 Academic Writing", Inter-American University of Puerto Rico (Puerto Rico) Publication	<1 %
32	Peele, Hettie V.. "The Use of an Unfolding Case Study to Enhance Self-Efficacy in Nursing Students.", Proquest, 2016. Publication	<1 %

Exclude quotes	Off	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		