

## Metacognitive Awareness and Academic Writing Performance: Evidence from Foreign Students in Indonesian Language Programs

Nia Budiana<sup>1\*</sup>, Imam Suyitno<sup>2</sup>, Gatut Susanto<sup>3</sup>, Agung Rinaldy Malik<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia

<sup>4</sup> Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author: [nia.budiana.2102119@students.um.ac.id](mailto:nia.budiana.2102119@students.um.ac.id)

**Citation:** Budiana, N., Suyitno, I., Susanto, G. & Malik, A. R. (2026). Metacognitive Awareness and Academic Writing Performance: Evidence from Foreign Students in Indonesian Language Programs, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 689-698. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.3928>

**Published:** January 03, 2026

### ABSTRACT

Metacognitive strategies are widely recognized as central to successful second language (L2) academic writing, yet most research has focused on Anglophone contexts. This study examines how foreign learners in Indonesian language programs (*Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing—BIPA*) employ metacognitive strategies in planning, monitoring, and evaluating academic writing. A qualitative case study design was applied, with data collected through semi-structured interviews with 11 intermediate-level BIPA students from Thailand, Timor Leste, Gambia, Madagascar, Pakistan, and Egypt. Data were transcribed and analyzed thematically using Braun and Clarke's framework to identify patterns of engagement. The findings reveal three interrelated dimensions of metacognitive practice. In planning, some students demonstrated systematic goal-setting, outlining, and resource preparation, while others relied on spontaneous drafting or peer discussions. Monitoring strategies ranged from real-time self-checking for coherence and vocabulary use to reactive monitoring, where revision was deferred until after drafting, often compromising coherence. Evaluation strategies also varied: proactive learners engaged in comprehensive revision and incorporated feedback, whereas others limited evaluation to surface-level corrections. These differences were mediated by cultural orientations, linguistic proficiency, and prior academic experiences. This study extends metacognition research beyond English-dominated contexts, offering insights from Indonesian academic writing. Pedagogically, the results underscore the need for explicit instruction in metacognitive strategies within BIPA curricula, particularly in scaffolding planning and monitoring skills. The findings highlight that metacognition is not universal but contextually situated, shaped by cultural and educational traditions.

**Keywords:** Metacognitive strategies; Academic writing; BIPA learners

### INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of international student mobility has transformed the study of less commonly taught languages into an important academic concern, particularly through the rise of *Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing* (BIPA) programs. In Indonesia, BIPA has grown substantially in the past decade as universities welcome students from Asia, Europe, and Africa seeking both cultural and academic engagement (Setiawan, 2021; Wijayanti & Lee, 2023). For these learners, academic writing in Indonesian is not only a linguistic task but also a vehicle for scholarly participation, identity formation, and intercultural communication (Hyland, 2022). Yet research indicates that foreign students often struggle to meet academic writing standards in Indonesian, with recurring difficulties in coherence, argumentation, and the integration of references (Putra, 2020; Kusuma & Fitriani, 2022). These persistent challenges point to deeper cognitive and regulatory issues beyond linguistic competence, thus highlighting the importance of examining metacognitive dimensions of writing.

Writing in a second language (L2) is widely recognized as a cognitively demanding process that requires learners to mobilize not only grammatical knowledge but also higher-order thinking and self-regulation (Kormos, 2019; Han & Hiver, 2018). In applied linguistics, metacognition has been defined as learners' awareness of and ability to regulate their cognitive processes, encompassing planning, monitoring, and evaluating (Flavell, 1979; Schraw & Dennison, 1994). Recent studies affirm that metacognitive awareness plays a decisive role in L2 writing development, enabling learners to anticipate challenges, revise effectively, and critically reflect on outcomes (Teng & Zhang, 2018; Bai, 2021; Negretti, 2023). Strong metacognitive skills are also associated with greater autonomy and sustained academic achievement (Andrade & Evans, 2020). Nevertheless, the majority of this literature has emerged from English as a Second/Foreign Language (ESL/EFL) contexts, which limits its applicability to linguistically and culturally distinct languages such as Indonesian (Renandya & Widodo, 2019; Widodo, 2021).

Recent scholarship has highlighted that metacognitive awareness in L2 writing is not a universal mechanism but is dynamically shaped by affective, cultural, and contextual factors. Studies demonstrate that the ability to plan and monitor writing is closely tied to learners' confidence and identity (Teng & Zhang, 2020), while self-regulation strategies enhance argumentative quality and coherence (Bai, 2021), and cultural discourse traditions may either facilitate or constrain the use of metacognitive strategies (Negretti, 2023). Empirical evidence further shows that students with strong metacognitive awareness engage in systematic planning, active monitoring, and reflective evaluation, leading to more coherent and accurate texts (Teng & Zhang, 2018; Han & Hiver, 2018; Andrade & Evans, 2020), whereas those with weaker regulation often produce fragmented writing and struggle with source integration (Bai, 2021; Negretti, 2023). These findings affirm the central role of metacognitive strategies in L2 writing development while suggesting that their application varies across linguistic and cultural contexts. Nevertheless, the literature remains heavily Anglocentric, privileging English as the primary medium of inquiry (Hyland, 2022; Negretti, 2023), leaving a significant gap in understanding how metacognition functions in non-English languages. Indonesian, with its unique rhetorical traditions and status as an emerging academic language in Southeast Asia, remains underexplored despite its pedagogical significance in programs such as BIPA.

Addressing this gap, the present study investigates the relationship between metacognitive awareness and academic writing performance among foreign students in BIPA programs. By situating Indonesian within the wider discourse on L2 writing research, this article aims to contribute fresh empirical evidence and theoretical insights, while offering pedagogical implications for integrating metacognitive training into BIPA curricula to enhance learners' academic competence and intercultural engagement.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Metacognition in L2 Writing

Since Flavell (1979) introduced the concept, metacognition has become central in second language (L2) research, particularly in academic writing. In L2 contexts, metacognition is defined as learners' ability to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own writing processes (Schraw & Dennison, 1994; Wenden, 2001). Recent studies confirm that metacognitive awareness directly enhances text quality, improving coherence, cohesion, and argumentative development (Teng & Zhang, 2018; Bai, 2021). Han and Hiver (2018) demonstrated that genre-based instruction combined with metacognitive regulation produced more logically structured texts in academic settings. Furthermore, longitudinal evidence shows that strengthening metacognitive awareness not only improves writing performance but also fosters greater autonomy and learner self-efficacy (Negretti, 2023; Andrade & Evans, 2020). These findings establish metacognition as a foundational dimension of successful L2 writing.

More specifically, metacognitive strategies serve as mediators between linguistic limitations and academic success. While L2 writers often struggle with grammatical accuracy, planning and monitoring allow them to overcome these deficiencies and produce texts that meet academic standards (Kormos, 2019; Bai, 2021). Empirical studies reveal that learners explicitly trained to use metacognitive strategies develop higher levels of cohesion and logical consistency than peers who focus primarily on language form (Teng & Zhang, 2020; Negretti, 2023). As a result, integrating explicit metacognitive training into L2 writing curricula has been widely recommended to enhance both awareness and self-regulation. This pedagogical approach equips learners not only to produce stronger academic texts but also to develop transferable skills in critical thinking and independent learning.

### 2. Academic Writing Challenges in BIPA

Although international scholarship on L2 writing is dominated by English contexts, research increasingly shows that learners of Indonesian as a foreign language (*Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing*, BIPA) face unique challenges. Among the most common difficulties are organizing ideas, developing logical argumentation, and adhering to Indonesian academic writing conventions (Putra, 2020; Kusuma & Fitriani, 2022). Setiawan and Kusuma (2022) reported that many foreign students struggle with rhetorical structures unfamiliar to their first

languages, often leading to fragmented or incoherent texts. Wijayanti and Lee (2023) further found that academic literacy development in BIPA programs remains limited, leaving students without sufficient guidance to meet scholarly expectations. These findings indicate a significant pedagogical gap in supporting academic writing within BIPA curricula.

Beyond structural issues, cultural factors also shape the challenges of writing in Indonesian. For example, rhetorical traditions in Indonesia often emphasize harmony and politeness, in contrast to the direct and critical styles more common in Western academic discourse (Widodo, 2021). Such differences complicate adaptation for foreign students accustomed to more confrontational or explicit rhetorical patterns (Renandya & Widodo, 2019). Moreover, recent studies highlight that BIPA learners frequently encounter difficulties in integrating academic sources due to limited vocabulary and insufficient citation training (Setiawan, 2021; Wijayanti & Lee, 2023). Together, these challenges illustrate that academic writing in Indonesian involves not only linguistic competence but also complex cultural negotiation. Understanding these challenges is therefore critical to designing effective pedagogical interventions for BIPA programs.

### 3. Research Gaps and Theoretical Contribution

Despite a growing body of work on metacognition in L2 writing, the literature remains disproportionately Anglocentric, privileging English as the primary medium of inquiry (Hyland, 2022; Negretti, 2023). This imbalance restricts theoretical advancement by limiting insights to contexts shaped by Anglophone norms. Indonesian, however, with its affixation system, discourse markers, and rhetorical traditions, differs substantially from English and other widely taught languages (Widodo, 2021). Yet global L2 writing research has rarely engaged with these distinctive features. Existing studies primarily document linguistic difficulties faced by BIPA learners but seldom examine how metacognitive engagement shapes their academic writing practices (Putra, 2020; Kusuma & Fitriani, 2022). This absence leaves an important gap in applied linguistics research.

Theoretical contributions can therefore be achieved by extending the metacognition framework to non-English contexts. Investigating how foreign students deploy metacognitive strategies in Indonesian academic writing offers new insights into the interaction between cognition, language, and culture (Renandya & Widodo, 2019; Andrade & Evans, 2020). Moreover, BIPA contexts provide fertile ground to explore how local rhetorical traditions influence self-regulation in writing, thereby enriching global theories of L2 writing development (Negretti, 2023). By situating Indonesian within wider debates on metacognition and writing, research in this domain can contribute both pedagogically—through curriculum design—and theoretically, by broadening the scope of applied linguistics beyond Anglophone dominance.

## METHOD

### Research Design

To address the research questions, a qualitative research paradigm was applied, focusing on a case study framework. Within this approach, **semi-structured interviews** were chosen as the principal method of data collection. Case study methodology is well suited for exploring educational phenomena in depth and within their real-life context, allowing the researcher to capture participants' perspectives in a flexible yet systematic manner (Yin, 2018). Interviews were considered the most appropriate tool in this study because they provided direct access to the lived experiences of foreign students in BIPA programs, particularly regarding how they employed metacognitive strategies in academic writing.

By relying on interviews, the study generated rich, first-hand accounts of how learners planned, monitored, and evaluated their writing processes in Indonesian. The interactive nature of semi-structured interviews allowed participants to elaborate on their personal strategies and challenges, while still ensuring that key themes related to metacognition were consistently addressed across respondents. This method also enabled the researcher to probe deeper into issues that emerged spontaneously, such as the influence of learners' cultural and linguistic backgrounds on their academic writing practices. Importantly, using interviews as the core data collection tool enhanced the depth and authenticity of the findings, ensuring that the analysis remained grounded in participants' voices and experiences (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

### Participants

The participants of this study were **11 foreign students** enrolled in the intermediate level of the *Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing* (BIPA) program at Universitas Negeri Malang. They represented diverse national backgrounds, including Thailand, Gambia, Pakistan, Madagascar, Timor Leste, and Egypt. For confidentiality, pseudonyms were replaced with participant codes (T.1–T.11). More details in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Demography Participants

No	Code	Country of Origin	Gender
1	T.1	Thailand	M
2	T.2	Gambia	M
3	T.3	Thailand	F
4	T.4	Pakistan	M
5	T.5	Madagascar	F
6	T.6	Thailand	M
7	T.7	Timor Leste	F
8	T.8	Thailand	F
9	T.9	Egypt	M
10	T.10	Thailand	F
11	T.11	Timor Leste	M

*Note: Data on gender and length of stay are anonymized and categorized for research purposes only.*

## Research Instruments

To capture the complexity of metacognitive strategy use in academic writing, this study employed multiple instruments that aligned with the case study design. The first instrument consisted of observation and transcription protocols that documented the verbal utterances of BIPA students during the writing process. These utterances, recorded in real time and later transcribed, provided insight into students' planning, monitoring, and evaluating behaviors while composing texts. Such verbal reports have been widely used in L2 research to trace metacognitive processes that are otherwise not directly observable (Negretti, 2023).

The second instrument was document analysis of students' academic writing texts. Participants were required to produce academic essays and short research-based assignments in Indonesian. These written products were collected and systematically categorized according to the learners' national backgrounds, allowing for cross-cultural comparison of metacognitive writing strategies. Document analysis in qualitative studies is considered an important complementary instrument as it provides tangible evidence of learners' strategy use and outcomes (Bowen, 2009).

The third instrument involved semi-structured interviews with BIPA instructors who guided the students during the writing process. Teachers were asked to reflect on the ways students employed metacognitive strategies, the difficulties they encountered, and the support mechanisms provided in the classroom. Semi-structured interviews allowed flexibility for probing individual experiences while ensuring that core themes were addressed consistently across participants (Cohen et al., 2018). Collectively, these instruments provided a triangulated dataset that enabled a comprehensive analysis of metacognitive awareness and its role in shaping academic writing performance among BIPA learners.

## Research Procedure and Analysis

This study was conducted in three stages: preparation, data collection, and analysis. At the preparation stage, ethical clearance was obtained, participants were purposively recruited from the intermediate-level BIPA program, and the interview protocol was validated by experts and refined through pilot testing. In the data collection stage, semi-structured interviews were carried out individually with 11 foreign students. Each interview lasted 40–60 minutes, conducted in either Indonesian or English based on participants' preferences, and audio-recorded with consent. Field notes were also taken to capture non-verbal cues and contextual details. During the analysis stage, interviews were transcribed verbatim and examined manually using Braun and Clarke's (2019) six-step thematic analysis: familiarization, coding, theme development, theme review, theme definition, and report writing. Credibility was strengthened through peer debriefing and cross-checking coded data with field notes to ensure trustworthiness.

## RESULT

### Planning Strategies in Metacognitive Engagement

The analysis revealed that students' planning strategies varied widely across cultural and individual backgrounds, ranging from structured outlining to spontaneous drafting without prior organization. A majority of participants reported that they began their academic writing by setting explicit goals, selecting culturally relevant topics, and preparing outlines to guide the process. For example, T.5 (Madagascar) consistently emphasized the importance of planning as a way to "gain confidence before writing," while T.1 (Thailand) described outlining as a tool to ensure that no ideas were overlooked. These participants demonstrated a metacognitive awareness of writing as a staged process, where planning was integral to coherence and logical flow. In contrast, several participants displayed less structured approaches to planning. T.7 (Timor Leste) admitted that he preferred to begin

writing immediately after discussing with peers, noting: “I usually talk with my friends and then just start writing. Sometimes my ideas are not ordered, but I fix them later.”

Similarly, T.11 (Timor Leste) stated that outlines were difficult and “time-consuming,” preferring instead to reorder ideas during revision. These responses suggest that some learners equated planning with collaborative brainstorming rather than with independent structural design. While such practices still reflect an awareness of preparation, they also reveal limited recognition of planning as a metacognitive tool for enhancing coherence. Interestingly, differences also emerged based on regional background. Learners from Southeast Asia (e.g., Thailand, Timor Leste) tended to link planning to collective practices such as peer discussions, reflecting cultural orientations toward group learning. In contrast, students from South Asia and Africa (e.g., T.4 Pakistan, T.2 Gambia) framed planning as an individual responsibility. T.4 (Pakistan) highlighted his strategy: “I try to find references first, because without them my essay has no foundation. Planning helps me save time later when I write.” Likewise, T.2 (Gambia) explained that while he struggled with formal outlines, he relied heavily on listing key points before drafting. These accounts demonstrate that planning was conceptualized differently across learners, with cultural background shaping both the form and the perceived purpose of the activity. Overall, the findings indicate that while planning strategies were widely recognized, their application varied in depth and sophistication. Students such as T.1, T.4, and T.5 demonstrated clear metacognitive awareness by using outlines, resource identification, and topic alignment as tools for managing complexity in academic writing. Others, particularly T.7 and T.11, approached planning in a more reactive manner, treating it as optional and secondary to the act of writing itself. This variation underscores the role of cultural and experiential factors in shaping learners’ metacognitive engagement during the planning phase of academic writing. Selected Interview Excerpts (Planning Strategies):

T.1 (Thailand): “Before writing, I always make a list of points. It helps me not to forget what I want to say and makes my essay more organized.”

T.2 (Gambia): “I find it hard to make an outline, but I usually write key points so that I don’t get lost.”

T.4 (Pakistan): “I try to find references first, because without them I feel the essay has no foundation. Planning saves time later when I start writing.”

T.5 (Madagascar): “Outlining is important for me. I draw a simple structure: introduction, arguments, and conclusion. It gives me confidence to continue writing.”

T.7 (Timor Leste): “I usually discuss with my friends and then directly start writing. Sometimes my ideas are not well-ordered because I don’t make an outline.”

T.11 (Timor Leste): “Planning is difficult. I just write and then change the order later. For me, it is easier than outlining first.” ini sudah bagus.

### Monitoring in Metacognitive Engagement

The second dimension of metacognitive engagement observed in this study is monitoring, or the process of overseeing and regulating writing while it is being produced. The findings highlight five participants who demonstrated distinct approaches, reflecting varying levels of metacognitive awareness. Some learners applied monitoring as a continuous and deliberate strategy. T.3 (Thailand) described how she routinely paused after writing a few sentences to ensure clarity, revising expressions and adding connectors when necessary. Similarly, T.9 (Egypt) emphasized checking whether paragraphs were logically connected, noting that he frequently rewrote sentences to strengthen the flow of arguments. Both participants illustrate a high level of metacognitive engagement, where monitoring was integral to coherence rather than an afterthought.

Other students used monitoring to focus primarily on accuracy at the surface level. T.2 (Gambia) explained that his monitoring centered on vocabulary, often pausing to consult a dictionary or peers when he felt uncertain. This indicates a pragmatic approach where linguistic accuracy was prioritized, even if coherence at the macro level received less attention. T.4 (Pakistan), by contrast, considered monitoring a way to validate content. He reflected on whether the information he included was sufficient to support his arguments, stopping mid-draft to add further evidence when needed. By comparison, T.11 (Timor Leste) adopted a more reactive orientation to monitoring. He admitted that stopping frequently disrupted his flow of ideas, preferring instead to finish the draft before reviewing. This limited use of monitoring often resulted in fragmented arguments and less coherent outcomes.

Taken together, the findings reveal that while monitoring was recognized by all participants, its depth and focus varied widely—from coherence-oriented strategies (T.3, T.9), to accuracy- or content-oriented checks (T.2, T.4), to reactive, end-stage corrections (T.11). These differences highlight the dual role of monitoring as both a cognitive strategy and a culturally mediated practice, shaping the quality of academic writing in BIPA contexts.

T.2 (Gambia): “Sometimes I get stuck with vocabulary, especially when I want to use academic words in Indonesian. At that moment, I usually pause and check the dictionary or ask a classmate who knows better. For me, this step is part of monitoring, because I cannot continue writing if the word doesn’t feel right.”

T.3 (Thailand): “When I write, I often pause after a few sentences to re-read carefully. If the sentences don’t flow smoothly, I add connectors or reorganize the ideas. It may slow me down, but I feel it makes my writing more logical and easier to understand.”

T.4 (Pakistan): “While writing, I try to check whether the information I include is strong enough for my argument. If it looks weak, I stop in the middle and add examples or details. I believe this habit makes my essay more convincing, even if it takes more time.”

T.9 (Egypt): “I often look back at the previous paragraph to see if it connects with what I am writing now. If the link is missing, I rewrite or rearrange the sentences. For me, monitoring is about making sure the logic of my essay continues without breaking.”

T.11 (Timor Leste): “Monitoring while writing is difficult for me because it interrupts my ideas. If I stop too often, I lose the flow of thought. That is why I prefer to finish quickly and only check later, although I realize this sometimes makes my text less coherent.”

### Evaluating in Metacognitive Engagement

The third dimension of metacognitive engagement is evaluating, which involves reflecting on and revising one’s writing after a draft is produced. This stage highlighted how BIPA students assessed the quality of their work, responded to feedback, and made revisions to improve clarity, structure, and accuracy. The findings show considerable variation across participants, ranging from comprehensive, multi-level evaluation to minimal, surface-level corrections.

Several participants displayed proactive and thorough evaluation strategies. T.1 (Thailand) consistently reread her essays, focusing on coherence across sections and checking whether arguments supported the thesis. She also considered audience expectations, asking herself if her essay sounded “academic enough.” Similarly, T.5 (Madagascar) emphasized revision as a process of strengthening arguments, frequently rewriting sections and integrating feedback from instructors. These participants illustrate high levels of metacognitive awareness, treating evaluation not merely as proofreading but as a process of refining thought.

Other participants linked evaluation strongly to peer and teacher feedback. T.7 (Timor Leste) explained that he relied heavily on teacher comments to revise his essays, as he struggled to detect weaknesses independently. T.8 (Thailand) described sharing drafts with classmates to receive feedback on grammar and vocabulary, which she then used to polish her final version. These cases suggest that evaluation was often collaborative, reflecting cultural learning orientations that privilege external input.

By contrast, some learners restricted evaluation to surface-level corrections. T.4 (Pakistan) admitted that his evaluation focused primarily on grammar and spelling, stating that he rarely restructured content unless a teacher specifically pointed it out. Likewise, T.9 (Egypt) described evaluation as “fixing mistakes” rather than rethinking arguments, indicating a narrower conception of reflection. These students showed weaker engagement with evaluative strategies, treating revision as technical rather than conceptual.

Overall, the findings highlight three modes of evaluative engagement: (1) comprehensive, self-driven revision (e.g., T.1, T.5), (2) collaborative, feedback-oriented revision (e.g., T.7, T.8), and (3) surface-level corrections (e.g., T.4, T.9). This variation demonstrates that evaluation among BIPA students was influenced not only by proficiency but also by cultural attitudes toward authority, collaboration, and self-regulation.

T.1 (Thailand): “After finishing, I always read my essay two or three times. I check if the ideas really connect and if my conclusion matches the introduction. I also ask myself whether the language sounds academic enough, and if not, I revise until it feels more formal.”

T.4 (Pakistan): “When I evaluate, I mostly look for grammar or spelling mistakes. I don’t usually change the structure unless the teacher tells me. For me, evaluation means correcting errors, not rewriting the whole essay.”

T.5 (Madagascar): “For me, revising is part of thinking again. Sometimes I realize my argument is weak, so I rewrite a paragraph or add more sources. I also use the teacher’s comments to improve, because they help me see what I didn’t notice before.”

T.7 (Timor Leste): “It is hard for me to see the problems in my own writing. That is why I wait for my teacher’s feedback. After I get comments, I usually revise carefully, especially the parts about organization and vocabulary.”

T.8 (Thailand): “I often share my draft with classmates before submitting. They tell me about grammar or word choice, and I make corrections based on that. Peer feedback makes me feel more confident with the final version.”

T.9 (Egypt): “When I check my essay, I focus on fixing mistakes in sentences, like wrong words or grammar. I don’t usually change my ideas, because I think they are already fine. For me, evaluation is about cleaning the text, not changing the content.”

The analysis of students’ metacognitive engagement in academic writing revealed three interrelated dimensions—planning, monitoring, and evaluating—that varied in depth and sophistication across participants. In the planning stage, some learners demonstrated strong awareness by setting explicit goals, outlining, and preparing

resources, while others relied more on spontaneous drafting or peer discussions. Monitoring practices ranged from continuous self-checking for coherence and accuracy to reactive approaches where revision was deferred until after drafting, often resulting in fragmented texts. In the evaluation stage, proactive learners engaged in comprehensive revision and incorporated feedback, whereas others restricted evaluation to surface-level corrections. Collectively, these findings suggest that while all students recognized the importance of metacognitive strategies, the degree to which they applied them was shaped by linguistic proficiency, cultural orientation, and access to instructional support.

Table 2 provides a detailed summary of the three dimensions of metacognitive engagement identified in this study, outlining their sub-strategies, descriptions, observable behaviors, participant variations, and pedagogical implications. The table highlights how BIPA learners applied planning, monitoring, and evaluating in distinct ways, reflecting both individual learning preferences and broader cultural orientations.

**Table 2.** Dimensions of Metacognitive Engagement in Academic Writing among BIPA Students

Dimension	Sub-strategies	Detailed Description	Observed Behaviors	Variation Across Participants	Pedagogical Implications
<b>Planning</b> (First Dimension)	Goal-setting	Defining objectives before starting to write, including topic selection and intended outcomes	Stating writing goals explicitly- Choosing culturally relevant or familiar themes- Anticipating difficulties in vocabulary and structure	Strong in T.1 (Thailand), T.5 (Madagascar); weaker in T.7, T.11 (Timor Leste)	Training needed to make goal-setting explicit and linked to writing outcomes
	Outlining & Structuring	Creating a framework for ideas before drafting	Using lists or diagrams to organize ideas- Structuring text into introduction–body–conclusion- Sequencing arguments logically	Applied consistently by T.1, T.5; minimal use by T.7, T.11 (tended to draft without outlines)	Instruction on effective outlining techniques should be embedded in BIPA writing courses
	Resource Identification	Preparing references and supporting material before writing	Collecting academic sources- Searching online for vocabulary- Using peer input for topic enrichment	Prominent in T.4 (Pakistan), T.2 (Gambia); less systematic in T.8 (Thailand)	Explicit orientation on resource use to strengthen argumentation
<b>Monitoring</b> (Second Dimension)	Real-time Self-checking	Reviewing content while writing to ensure clarity and coherence	Pausing after sentences/paragraphs to re-read- Adjusting connectors for logical flow- Revising vocabulary choices	Evident in T.3 (Thailand), T.9 (Egypt); less frequent in T.11 (Timor Leste)	Teach iterative drafting as a continuous process rather than a one-off task
	Accuracy Checking	Focusing on language correctness during drafting	Checking grammar and spelling while writing- Verifying vocabulary through dictionary or peers- Avoiding “carry-over” errors	Observed in T.2 (Gambia), T.4 (Pakistan), T.8 (Thailand)	Scaffold monitoring from surface-level corrections toward higher-level organization
	Reactive Monitoring	Deferring checking until after completing the draft	Writing continuously without pauses- Reviewing only at the end- Struggling with coherence when revising late	Dominant in T.6, T.11 (Timor Leste)	Encourage reflective pauses and structured checkpoints during writing
<b>Evaluating</b> (Third Dimension)	Comprehensive Revision	Evaluating coherence and argumentation after drafting	Reading full text multiple times- Revising weak arguments- Restructuring sections when necessary	Strong in T.1 (Thailand), T.5 (Madagascar)	Emphasize evaluation as a form of critical thinking beyond proofreading
	Feedback-based Revision	Using peer or teacher	Incorporating teacher suggestions- Sharing drafts with peers-	Evident in T.7 (Timor Leste), T.8 (Thailand)	Promote collaborative evaluation to

		comments to improve writing	Revising vocabulary and organization based on feedback		strengthen reflective skills
	Surface-level Correction	Limiting evaluation to technical fixes	Correcting grammar, spelling, punctuation- Rarely restructuring arguments- Perceiving evaluation as “error cleaning”	Common in T.4 (Pakistan), T.9 (Egypt)	Expand students’ concept of evaluation from mechanical correction to conceptual revision

## DISCUSSION

The findings of this study contribute to the growing body of literature on metacognitive engagement in second language (L2) academic writing by examining how BIPA students planned, monitored, and evaluated their work. Consistent with earlier research, the results confirm that metacognitive strategies are central to the development of coherence, accuracy, and overall writing quality (Bai, 2021; Teng & Zhang, 2020). However, this study extends the scope of inquiry beyond English-dominated contexts, offering insights from Indonesian as a foreign language—a domain that remains underexplored in applied linguistics (Renandya & Widodo, 2019; Widodo, 2021). The variation in learners’ approaches across planning, monitoring, and evaluating stages demonstrates how cultural and linguistic backgrounds mediate the use of metacognitive strategies, affirming the view that metacognition is contextually situated rather than universal (Negretti, 2023).

The findings on planning strategies revealed both structured and reactive approaches, ranging from goal-setting and outlining to reliance on peer discussions. Learners such as T.1 and T.5 demonstrated advanced planning behaviors, aligning with research that links systematic preparation to stronger text coherence (Han & Hiver, 2018; Kormos, 2019). Conversely, others adopted less structured practices, treating planning as optional. This resonates with Andrade and Evans (2020), who argue that while planning enhances academic literacy, its value is often underestimated by novice writers. Importantly, the variation across participants underscores cultural influences: Southeast Asian learners often associated planning with collective practices, whereas South Asian and African learners emphasized individual preparation. This confirms Setiawan and Kusuma’s (2022) observation that rhetorical traditions shape how learners prepare for academic tasks.

In terms of monitoring, the study revealed contrasting practices. Students such as T.3 and T.9 engaged in continuous self-checking, reflecting a high level of awareness similar to what Bai (2021) describes as “real-time regulation.” Others, such as T.11, adopted reactive monitoring, postponing revision until after drafting—an approach that often compromised coherence. These findings align with Negretti’s (2023) conclusion that learners differ significantly in their ability to sustain reflective monitoring. Yet, this study adds nuance by showing that monitoring also varied by focus: some students prioritized coherence, while others concentrated on grammar or vocabulary accuracy. This suggests that monitoring in BIPA contexts not only addresses linguistic challenges but also reflects epistemological orientations toward writing, a point that has been less emphasized in L2 writing literature dominated by English-language contexts.

Evaluation strategies likewise revealed a spectrum of engagement, from comprehensive revision to surface-level correction. Students such as T.1 and T.5 treated evaluation as an opportunity to refine arguments, consistent with research showing that self-reflection enhances argumentative quality (Teng & Zhang, 2018; Bai, 2021). Others, such as T.4 and T.9, limited evaluation to grammar checks, echoing Andrade and Evans’ (2020) findings that novice writers often conflate evaluation with error correction. Notably, several participants relied heavily on teacher or peer feedback, which aligns with Hyland’s (2022) argument that feedback-driven revision is a cornerstone of academic literacy development. However, overreliance on external input raises concerns about learner autonomy, suggesting that BIPA programs need to balance collaborative feedback with fostering independent evaluative skills.

Taken together, these findings highlight both the universality and contextual specificity of metacognitive engagement in L2 writing. They confirm that planning, monitoring, and evaluating are indispensable to successful writing (Bai, 2021; Negretti, 2023), while also showing how cultural traditions and linguistic environments shape their enactment. Theoretically, this study broadens the Anglocentric scope of metacognition research by situating it within Indonesian academic writing, contributing to calls for more diverse perspectives in applied linguistics (Widodo, 2021). Pedagogically, the results underscore the need for explicit training in metacognitive strategies within BIPA curricula, particularly in scaffolding planning and monitoring skills for students who rely on reactive approaches. Future research should investigate how these strategies develop longitudinally and explore interventions that integrate metacognitive training with genre-based instruction.

## CONCLUSION

This study examined how foreign learners in BIPA programs engaged metacognitively with academic writing through the dimensions of planning, monitoring, and evaluating. The findings reveal that while all participants recognized the importance of these strategies, their application varied in depth, ranging from systematic goal-setting and real-time revision to spontaneous drafting and surface-level correction. These differences were mediated by linguistic proficiency, cultural orientations, and previous academic experiences, highlighting that metacognition is not a universal mechanism but a contextually situated practice. Theoretically, the study extends the scope of metacognition research beyond Anglophone contexts, demonstrating its relevance in Indonesian academic writing and adding nuance to the global debate on L2 writing. Pedagogically, the results underscore the need for explicit training in planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies within BIPA curricula, particularly for learners who adopt reactive or limited approaches. Providing scaffolding for self-regulation, peer collaboration, and feedback incorporation can enhance learners' ability to produce coherent and academically appropriate texts. Future research should explore metacognitive strategy development longitudinally, investigate its interaction with digital tools and multimodal resources, and compare findings across different L2 contexts to strengthen theoretical generalization. Such efforts will further illuminate the dynamic relationship between cognition, culture, and academic literacy.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful for the financial support from the Indonesian Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) through Indonesian Education Scholarship (BPI), Center for Higher Education Funding and Assessment.

## REFERENCES

- Andrade, H., & Evans, N. (2020). *Developing self-regulated learners*. Routledge.
- Bai, B. (2021). Self-regulation and metacognition in L2 writing: Linking awareness to performance. *System, 96*, 102404. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102404>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal, 9*(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589–597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906–911. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>
- Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based tasks and L2 writing development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 44–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.03.001>
- Hyland, K. (2022). *Second language writing* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kormos, J. (2019). The role of attention in second language writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 41*(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263117000385>
- Kusuma, I., & Fitriani, R. (2022). Academic writing challenges of BIPA learners in Indonesian universities. *Journal of Language and Education, 8*(2), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2022.112>
- Negretti, R. (2023). Metacognition in academic writing across cultures. *Journal of Writing Research, 15*(1), 25–50. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2023.15.01.02>
- Putra, A. (2020). Coherence and cohesion issues in academic writing of BIPA learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 287–298. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i2.25011>
- Renandya, W. A., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). English language teaching in Southeast Asia: From policy to practice. *Asian Englishes, 21*(3), 240–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13488678.2019.1626630>
- Schraw, G., & Dennison, R. S. (1994). Assessing metacognitive awareness. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 19*(4), 460–475. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1994.1033>
- Setiawan, A. (2021). Source integration in Indonesian academic writing: Challenges for BIPA learners. *Journal of Nusantara Studies, 6*(2), 120–135. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol6iss2pp120-135>
- Setiawan, A., & Kusuma, I. (2022). Rhetorical traditions in Indonesian academic writing: Implications for BIPA learners. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 12*(2), 311–324. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i2.45216>
- Teng, F., & Zhang, L. J. (2018). Effects of metacognitive strategies on L2 writing performance. *Language Teaching Research, 22*(6), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818765319>

- Teng, F., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Metacognitive knowledge and strategy use in L2 writing: A structural equation modeling approach. *System, 91*, 102263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102263>
- Wenden, A. (2001). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(4), 515–537. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.4.515>
- Widodo, H. P. (2021). Reframing L2 writing pedagogy in Asian contexts. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 53*, 100847. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100847>
- Wijayanti, D., & Lee, S. (2023). Academic literacy practices of BIPA learners: Insights from Indonesian universities. *Asian Journal of Education, 44*(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2023.2194421>