Foreign Language Instruction Probe
Vol. 5, No. 1, May 2026
https://jurnal.stit-buntetpesantren.ac.id/index

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54213/flip
p-ISSN: 2830-5949
e-ISSN: 2830-4837

Assessing Intertextuality: Toward a Competence Framework for Dialogic Meaning-Making in Academic Writing

Hendi Hidayat[1*]
UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon[1]
hendihidayat@uinssc.ac.id[1]

Nizar Ibnus[2]
UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon[2]
nizaribnus@uinssc.ac.id[2]

Maimunah[3]
UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon[3]
Maimunah@uinssc.ac.id[3]

Received: March 26, 2026
Revised: April 24, 2026
Accepted: May 26, 2026

***Corresponding author:**
Hendi Hidayat, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon

Abstract

Intertextuality is central to academic writing yet remains one of the most overlooked and underdeveloped competencies in instructional practice. Students are often taught to follow citation rules but are rarely guided to engage sources as part of a dialogic process of meaning-making. This study proposes a multidimensional framework of intertextual competence, developed through an integrative synthesis of 65 theoretical and empirical studies spanning applied linguistics, writing pedagogy, and discourse studies. The framework identifies four core dimensions: cognitive, linguistic, sociocultural, and instructional. Each dimension is defined by specific indicators that capture how students interpret, integrate, and transform textual voices within academic discourse. Findings suggest that intertextual competence extends beyond citation accuracy, encompassing rhetorical reasoning, authorial positioning, and the capacity to negotiate epistemic agency. The framework offers pedagogically actionable insights for designing instruction and assessment that support academic voice development, particularly in EFL and multilingual contexts. This study is especially relevant for writing instructors, curriculum designers, and researchers in applied linguistics seeking to cultivate dialogic, critically engaged academic writers.

Keywords: intertextuality, academic writing, dialogic theory, competence framework, critical literature review.

To cite this article (Gaya APA Edisi 7th): Hidayat, H., (2026). Assessing Intertextuality: Toward a Competence Framework for Dialogic Meaning-Making in Academic Writing. https://doi.org/10.54213/flip

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) International License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Introduction

Intertextuality has gained prominence as a foundational concept in academic discourse, emphasizing that meaning is not produced in isolation but emerges through dialogic relations among texts. Drawing on the works of Bakhtin and Kristeva, intertextuality is viewed as a process of negotiating voices, positions, and ideologies across time, genres, and discursive communities (Bakhtin, 1981; Kristeva, as cited in Allen, 2011). This relational view of language challenges traditional models of writing as autonomous expression and situates academic writing as a site of continuous meaning reconstruction through intertextual engagement (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2015; Hodges, 2015).

In practice, however, many EFL learners struggle to enact intertextuality meaningfully. A preliminary classroom-based inquiry at *UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon* involving 24 undergraduate students in an Academic Writing course revealed recurring difficulties. Students frequently produced surface-level paraphrases, omitted attribution in source-based writing, and inserted source ideas without critical transformation or alignment with their arguments. One common example involved copying terminology from journal articles without adapting it to the students' thesis or audience expectations. In another instance, students blended unrelated sources in one paragraph without signalling contrast or cohesion. These patterns indicate not only linguistic limitations but also gaps in cognitive processing and discourse awareness.

Intertextual engagement requires more than citation accuracy. It demands an ability to interpret authorial stance, evaluate source credibility, and integrate ideas into one's own argumentative framework. Yet, academic instruction tends to reduce this complexity to rules of referencing and plagiarism avoidance (Hu & Lei, 2016; Çelik & Razı, 2023). As a result, students develop fragmented skills that fulfill formal criteria without enabling dialogic thinking or disciplinary voice (Zhang & Wang, 2024; O'Neill, 2024). This situation calls for a pedagogical reconceptualization of intertextuality not as a textual feature, but as a competence that can be developed, assessed, and supported.

Three key research clusters offer valuable but partial insights. First, dialogic theory provides the philosophical underpinning that situates writing as social interaction (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2015; Hodges, 2015). Second, studies on EFL writing difficulties emphasize paraphrasing, summarization, and citation as core challenges, especially for novice writers (Keck, 2010; Hirvela & Du, 2013; Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes, 2024). Third, recent digital and multimodal studies explore how learners appropriate and resemiotize knowledge across media and languages (Ronan, 2015; Visser et al., 2018). However, few of these strands explicitly synthesize the cognitive, linguistic, and sociocultural dimensions that underpin students' intertextual meaning-making in academic writing.

There remains a lack of a pedagogically grounded framework that defines intertextual competence as a multi-dimensional construct. Building on Snyder's (2019) argument that integrative literature reviews are vital for theory development, this study aims to fill the conceptual gap by bringing together diverse but complementary perspectives. While earlier works discuss the role of textual integration and academic identity as Farrelly (2020) Zhang & Wang (2024), they rarely operationalize intertextuality in terms that are pedagogically actionable and assessable.

This article proposes a framework of intertextual competence comprising three core dimensions. The cognitive dimension involves awareness of intertextual relationships and the ability to synthesize multiple perspectives. The linguistic dimension refers to

students' control over source integration, lexical transformation, and discourse signalling devices. The sociocultural dimension addresses students' understanding of genre conventions, authorial stance, and disciplinary norms. These dimensions are deeply interrelated, as effective intertextual practice requires students to shift between roles as readers, writers, and knowledge participants (Bullo, 2017; Ronan, 2015).

This conceptualization offers both theoretical refinement and pedagogical utility. Theoretically, it redefines intertextuality not as static text-to-text correspondence, but as dialogic competence situated in knowledge practices. Pedagogically, it provides a diagnostic lens for identifying students' writing needs and designing targeted instructional interventions. For institutions such as *UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon*, where digital and asynchronous learning environments are prominent, the framework supports the development of self-regulated, critically aware academic writers (Wahyuni & Arieffiani, 2022).

By reimagining intertextuality as a measurable competence, this study responds to a pressing pedagogical challenge. It moves away from punitive models of source use toward a developmental paradigm that values meaning-making, voice, and disciplinary participation. Such a framework holds potential to reshape how writing is taught and assessed in EFL and multilingual contexts, and contributes to broader conversations on academic literacy in the digital age.

Research Methods

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative-conceptual approach using a critical literature review method, aimed at developing a conceptual framework of intertextual competence in academic writing. This method is chosen due to its alignment with the theoretical and synthetic nature of the research, namely identifying and formulating dimensions and indicators of competence based on dialogic theory, intertextuality studies, and empirical findings from various higher education contexts.

Type and Design of the Study

This research is a conceptual study focusing on theoretical analysis and literature synthesis. Instead of collecting primary data, it analyses relevant academic works discussing intertextuality, dialogism, and academic writing published between 2010 and 2025. This approach follows the integrative literature review framework of Torraco (2005) and Snyder (2019), which enables the systematic and critical integration of theories and empirical findings across studies.

Data Sources

The data sources in this study include:

1) Reputable international and national journal articles discussing theories of intertextuality, dialogism, and academic writing practices;
2) Empirical studies that assess or develop intertextual competence in higher education contexts;
3) Conceptual or theoretical papers that contribute to understanding the cognitive, linguistic, and social dimensions of intertextuality.

The literature selection was conducted purposively, based on the following criteria: thematic relevance, recency (published between 2010–2025), and contribution to the development of competence models or writing pedagogy. In addition to recent sources, this study also integrates foundational theoretical works that remain central to the development of dialogic and intertextual frameworks. Although published

prior to 2010, these texts continue to underpin much of the contemporary discourse on academic literacy and meaning-making. Their inclusion is guided by conceptual significance rather than recency, and they are accessed through more recent interpretative scholarship to maintain relevance and coherence within the current academic landscape.

Data Analysis Techniques

The data were analysed through three stages:

1) Thematic Coding: Identifying key concepts, competence dimensions, and intertextual indicators that recurrently appear in the literature;
2) Theoretical Mapping: Organizing key concepts into dialogic categories (e.g., heteroglossia, dialogism), socio-cultural categories (e.g., genre, identity, social positioning), and pedagogical categories (e.g., assessment, scaffolding, writing strategies);
3) Conceptual Synthesis: Constructing a conceptual framework of intertextual competence that integrates cognitive, linguistic, social, and pedagogical aspects, while proposing implications for academic writing instruction.

Validity and Trustworthiness

The validity of the review was ensured through:

1) Clear criteria for literature selection;
2) Theoretical triangulation by integrating dialogic, intertextual, and academic literacy perspectives;

An audit trail of the analysis, including documentation of the analytical stages and justification for the synthesized framework.

Results and Discussion

This study set out to identify the core dimensions and indicators of intertextual competence in academic writing, as reflected in dialogic and intertextual theory. Utilizing a qualitative-conceptual design and following the integrative literature review framework of Torraco (2005) and Snyder (2019), the analysis proceeded through three interrelated stages: thematic coding, theoretical mapping, and conceptual synthesis. The data corpus consisted of theoretical and empirical literature published between 2010 and 2025, complemented by foundational works by Bakhtin and Kristeva that continue to inform the field.

The analysis revealed four core dimensions underpinning intertextual competence: Cognitive, Linguistic, Sociocultural, and Instructional Context. These dimensions encompass both the internal capacities and the external scaffolds that shape students' ability to engage with, transform, and integrate textual voices within academic discourse. Each dimension is accompanied by key indicators that operationalize its presence in student writing, and each is grounded in a convergence of theoretical constructs and empirical validation. The framework is presented in Table 1 below, offering a synthesized model to guide further research and pedagogical innovation.

Table 1. Dimensions and indicators of intertextual competence in academic writing

Dimension	Description	Key Indicators	Supporting Sources
Cognitive	Emphasizes the ability to identify dialogic relationships among texts, assess ideological positions, and synthesize	• Interpreting ideological stance and authorial positioning	Bakhtin (1981, 1986, in Bhat, 2013); Kristeva (1980, in Allen, 2011); Bullo (2017); Snyder (2019); Ronan

	perspectives. It reflects heteroglossia, dialogic positioning, and conceptual blending.	• Evaluating dialogic and heteroglossic voices • Synthesizing interrelated perspectives into coherent meaning	(2015); Flower and Hayes (1981); Bazerman 2004
Linguistic	Focuses on learners' competence in textual integration, paraphrasing, citation, and cohesive discourse construction across genres and modalities.	• Transforming source texts via paraphrasing and summarizing • Accurate citation and attribution • Use of discourse markers, intertextual reference chains, and modal cohesion	Keck (2010); Hu & Lei (2016); Çelik & Razı (2023); Ronan (2015); Davis & Morley (2015); pecorari 2003; Hirvela, A. & Du, Q. (2013).; Shi, L. (2004).
Sociocultural	Reflects the awareness of academic genres, disciplinary discourse, authorial identity, and interdiscursivity within institutional and epistemic settings.	• Dialogic positioning of voices within genre expectations • Constructing authorial identity in response to academic discourse • Awareness of power, ideology, and discourse hybridity	Fairclough (2015); Hodges (2015); Zhang & Wang (2024); Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes (2024); Kristeva (1980); Theresa Lillis dan Ken Hyland
Instructional Context *(Supporting Condition)*	Captures the pedagogical, institutional, and cognitive scaffolds that shape student intertextual performance and awareness.	• Responsiveness to feedback and instruction • Awareness of rhetorical purpose and genre expectations • Engagement with writing tasks, academic integrity, and paraphrase training	O'Neill (2024); Snyder (2019); Çelik & Razı (2023); Liu et al. (2016); Wingate (2012)**;** Driscoll et al. (2019)

1) Cognitive Dimension of Dialogic Reasoning and Interpretive Synthesis in Academic Writing

Cognitive intertextual competence represents a critical dimension of academic literacy, involving not only the capacity to comprehend and cite but also to interpret, evaluate, and synthesize discourse as ideologically situated. Bakhtin's (1981; 1986) concepts of dialogism and heteroglossia, position every utterance as part of an ongoing dialogue, while Kristeva's (1980 in Allen, 2011) theory of intertextuality emphasizes that texts are mosaics shaped by prior voices. These foundational perspectives affirm that academic writing is not a neutral act but a response embedded in discursive and ideological networks.

Flower & Hayes (1981) deepen this view by modeling writing as a goal-directed cognitive process, where writers constantly orchestrate planning, translating, and reviewing in response to rhetorical problems. Their work demonstrates that composing involves recursive operations of generating, organizing, and evaluating knowledge, often shaped by the writer's evolving goals and dialogic engagement with prior texts. In this light, intertextuality is not merely linguistic re-use but a dynamic epistemic practice,

requiring what they describe as the capacity to "regenerate goals" in light of what is learned through writing (p. 381). This recursive goal-setting mirrors the intertextual act of repositioning source voices to serve one's own argumentative intent.

Bazerman (2003) further clarifies that intertextuality is not just a matter of which texts are cited, but how they are used to position oneself in relation to others. He argues that "each time someone else's words are used in a new context, the earlier words are recontextualized, and thereby given new meaning" (p. 90). Thus, the cognitive task is not just to borrow but to transform, a form of critical reasoning that demands awareness of ideological, rhetorical, and disciplinary positioning. Intertextual reasoning, in this sense, becomes a form of intellectual negotiation.

Yet these theories are not without critique. Farrelly (2020) argues that early models of intertextuality insufficiently account for absences, the silencing of certain voices through citation omission. This point is made tangible in the frequent exclusion of Indigenous scholars or Global South epistemologies in Western academic syllabi, a trend that Canagarajah (2013) critiques as epistemic colonialism. Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes (2024), in a qualitative study of doctoral students, demonstrate how such exclusion shapes the construction of academic identity and limits dialogic participation. Their findings resonate with Wodak's (2009) distinction between intertextuality and interdiscursivity, showing how marginal texts are often excluded from dominant genres and academic gatekeeping mechanisms.

Understanding these ideological dynamics requires cognitive operations such as stance detection, ideological mapping, and dialogic positioning. Snyder (2019) argues that advanced writers treat sources as rhetorical positions rather than containers of facts, while Ronan (2015) shows that students must develop sensitivity to authorial intention and positionality. Davis & Morley (2015) extend this by emphasizing how intertextual practice involves not only linguistic re-use but also critical evaluation of voice, stance, and argumentative trajectory. Hu & Lei's (2016) quantitative study reveals that such cognitive discernment varies across disciplinary and linguistic backgrounds, with L2 teachers showing differing thresholds for identifying legitimate versus transgressive intertextuality. This contrasts with the mixed-methods findings of Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes (2024), who emphasize identity negotiation over rule adherence.

Synthesis lies at the peak of intertextual cognition. (Fairclough & Fairclough (2015) describes it as "recontextualization," a process in which texts are not simply repeated but transformed to serve new rhetorical and epistemic purposes. Keck (2010) and Tardy (2009) show that writers who synthesize successfully exhibit both linguistic dexterity and conceptual control. Tardy (2022), in a longitudinal intervention study, found that students who engaged in structured metacognitive reflection such as articulating their reasons for selecting and interpreting sources produced more nuanced and original syntheses. Metacognition supports not only surface-level writing strategies but also epistemological awareness and dialogic flexibility (Liu et al., 2016; O'Neill, 2024).

This process echoes what Flower & Hayes (1981) call "goal redefinition," whereby new insights lead writers to modify their rhetorical direction mid-composition. Bazerman (2003) similarly refers to the writer's ability to "reposition" their voice within an intertextual landscape, where citation becomes a means of ideological alignment or resistance (p. 94). Both models affirm that synthesis is more than combination; it is a generative act of authorship.

From a pedagogical standpoint, fostering this competence demands more than mechanical instruction. Structured activities such as intertextual maps, synthesis scaffolds, and ideological critique workshops allow students to trace relationships

among texts and interrogate whose knowledge is being privileged. O'Neill's (2024) five-year action research project demonstrates that when students are socialized into academic communities through discussion and reflection, they shift from source imitation to source negotiation. Similarly, Çelik & Razı (2023) show that explicit instruction in intertextual ethics reduces plagiarism and enhances rhetorical sophistication in EFL classrooms.

In the digital era, citation practices are increasingly shaped by algorithmic structures. Search engines and databases often promote texts with high citation counts, inadvertently reinforcing dominant discourses and narrowing the range of voices students engage with (Kuznetsov et al., 2022). This algorithmic curation raises new challenges for intertextual competence, particularly in terms of access, visibility, and ideological framing of what is "relevant" or "authoritative." As Bazerman (2003) cautions, such systems can amplify existing hierarchies by "shaping the intertextual possibilities available to writers" (p. 85).

In sum, cognitive intertextuality must be understood as both an intellectual discipline and a critical literacy. It involves discerning not only what a text says, but why it says it, how it aligns or diverges from other voices, and what discursive traditions it affirms or resists. The integration of foundational theories, contemporary critiques, and pedagogical strategies makes clear that teaching intertextual competence is not simply about improving writing. It is about cultivating scholars who think dialogically, write ethically, and engage knowledge as a site of both inquiry and transformation.

2) *Linguistic Dimension of Textual Integration and Intertextual Literacy in Academic Writing*

The linguistic dimension of intertextuality in academic writing involves a nuanced orchestration of citation, paraphrasing, cohesive devices, and rhetorical positioning. This competence signifies a writer's ability to ethically and effectively integrate external sources into their own discourse, constructing meaning across genres and modalities. Such integration is not merely linguistic but also deeply ideological, shaped by institutional expectations, disciplinary norms, and evolving digital ecologies.

Paraphrasing, for instance, often appears deceptively simple but in practice demands advanced cognitive and linguistic control. Keck (2010) identifies paraphrasing as a complex and effortful activity, particularly for L2 writers, who must balance fidelity to source meaning with syntactic and lexical originality. Hu & Lei (2016) support this view, revealing that perceptions of legitimate paraphrasing vary across academic disciplines and are influenced by writers' experience and training. These findings underscore the importance of instruction that moves beyond mechanical rewording to address the nuanced rhetorical and disciplinary dimensions of intertextuality. In this context, Çelik & Razı (2023) propose an integrative pedagogical model that combines rhetorical, mechanical, and ethical instruction. Their study demonstrates that explicit training in intertextual strategies reduces plagiarism and enhances the clarity, coherence, and argumentative strength of students' academic texts.

However, linguistic integration cannot be fully understood without considering the role of digital and AI-mediated tools. While Visser et al,(2018) emphasize computational mapping of intertextual relationships across corpora, generative tools like ChatGPT have transformed how students engage with source texts. These technologies blur the line between assistance and automation, offering paraphrasing and summarization functions that can scaffold L2 writers' efforts—but also risk reducing intertextuality to surface-level manipulation. As Hirvela & Du (2013) observe, when

paraphrasing is taught as a decontextualized technique to avoid plagiarism rather than as a tool for meaning-making, students may focus more on lexical substitution than on rhetorical integration. Likewise, institutional dependence on plagiarism detection software can reinforce a reductive view of intertextuality as a matter of matching words rather than constructing arguments. O'Neill (2024) critiques this techno-centric approach, arguing that it neglects the dialogic and critical functions of citation in academic discourse.

These shifts also bring into focus deeper ideological tensions surrounding intertextual norms. Fairclough & Fairclough (2015) and Hodges (2015) rightly argue that linguistic choices in academic writing are never neutral but are embedded in power structures that regulate whose voices are heard. Citation conventions and genre expectations often privilege dominant epistemologies, marginalizing those that do not align with Anglo-American academic norms. As Shi (2004) found, L2 students especially those in high-stakes academic contexts—tend to rely heavily on textual borrowing, not out of dishonesty, but due to linguistic insecurity and limited awareness of citation conventions. Her study showed that Chinese students writing summaries borrowed more than 50% of their texts verbatim without attribution, while native English speakers referenced even short strings of borrowed text. This contrast underscores the role of linguistic and cultural capital in shaping who can perform "legitimate" intertextuality.

Pecorari (2003) expands this understanding by framing patchwriting as a developmental strategy rather than an ethical failing. Many L2 writers, she explains, operate within the tension between using source texts as linguistic models and negotiating their own voice. Her data show that most L2 students exhibit opaque intertextuality not because of intent to deceive, but due to challenges in discourse control, such as distinguishing between their voice and that of the source. As such, instructional practices must account for the fact that linguistic integration is both a literacy challenge and a cognitive apprenticeship.

Culturally and pedagogically, citation itself is ideologically loaded. Hirvela & Du (2013) highlight how students like Wendy see paraphrasing as an opportunity to acquire academic register, while others like Chuck treat it as a purely linguistic task. Both cases illustrate how intertextual competence entails not only syntactic manipulation, but also metalinguistic awareness of stance, authority, and dialogic interaction. Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes (2024) show how doctoral students internalize institutional expectations that prioritize linguistic conformity over authorial presence. Their study reveals that students often emulate established academic prototypes at the expense of developing their own scholarly identity.

To address these dynamics, pedagogical models must move beyond rule-based instruction. Ronan (2015) advocates for a dialogic approach to source use, treating intertextuality as a collaborative space where writers engage in negotiated meaning-making. Davis & Morley (2015) emphasize the strategic reuse of disciplinary language to scaffold students' entrance into academic discourse communities. Yet, moving beyond mimicry requires scaffolded, reflective strategies. Corpus-based learning, for example, enables students to analyze authentic texts and observe genre-specific citation patterns. Guided rewriting, wherein learners iteratively transform source texts through increasingly abstract paraphrasing stages, fosters rhetorical flexibility and textual ownership. Such practices not only demystify intertextuality but also empower students to make informed, ethical, and strategic language choices.

Ultimately, linguistic intertextuality must be recognized as both a cognitive skill and a socially situated literacy practice. It entails the ability to navigate the linguistic

mechanics of paraphrasing and citation while also reflecting critically on how these practices are shaped by institutional ideologies and power relations. As Bazerman (2003) notes, the way writers recontextualize others' words reveals their stance and ideological positioning within academic conversations. Successful academic writers do not merely comply with intertextual norms; they redefine them through conscious rhetorical agency. In this light, fostering intertextual competence is not about enforcing compliance, but about cultivating dialogic participation, helping students move from reproduction to authorship, from rule-following to knowledge-building.

3) Sociocultural Dimension of Genre Awareness, Authorial Identity, and Disciplinary Positioning

The sociocultural dimension of intertextual competence has profound pedagogical implications, particularly in multilingual and postcolonial academic contexts. In such spaces, students are not merely acquiring skills but are navigating systems of meaning governed by discourse norms, institutional ideologies, and epistemic authority (Fairclough, 1992; Lillis & Turner, 2001). If writing is a form of social participation as Bakhtin (1981) suggested, a "link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances" then instruction must transcend the mechanics of citation and grammar to foster critical genre awareness.

This awareness entails helping learners not only to reproduce disciplinary conventions but also to question, negotiate, and reshape them, recognizing that "genres provide interpretive frames" but remain open to "innovation and manipulation" (Hodges, 2015). Lillis & Turner (2001) frame student writing as a space of regulation and desire, where access to dominant literacy practices is often constrained by unspoken norms and sociolinguistic hierarchies. Students must be mentored not merely in writing, but in participating critically in the knowledge-making practices of their disciplines.

One pedagogical approach aligned with this vision is critical genre analysis, in which students engage with model texts to examine how power, identity, and legitimacy are constructed intertextually. Hodges (2015) highlights that genres are not static templates but dynamic configurations of speech chains and ideological residues. Hyland (2005) reinforces this by demonstrating how metadiscourse shapes a writer's voice, balancing assertion with collegial respect an act that "locates propositions in the concerns and interests of the discipline." Through genre analysis, students can investigate whose voices are centered and whose are erased, and how these patterns reflect regimes of truth (Foucault, 1980; Fairclough & Fairclough, 2015).

Mentor-text studies offer a complementary method. By examining how experienced writers position their voices in relation to prior research, students develop an understanding of intertextuality not as formulaic citation, but as a strategic, identity-laden act. Zhang & Wang (2024) show that novice academic writers initially rely on direct intertextuality, but gradually shift to indirect appropriation, signaling maturation in both rhetorical agency and authorial identity. This progression echoes Lillis & Turner's (2001) observation that student writing is an ongoing negotiation between institutional expectations and the writer's own representational desires.

To support this developmental arc, reflective writing tasks, such as intertextual commentaries or source-mapping exercises can cultivate metacognitive awareness. Bullo (2017) conceptualizes intertextuality as a blending space where cognitive, affective, and evaluative processes converge. Encouraging students to reflect on how and why they choose, transform, or blend voices fosters not just technical proficiency but critical

consciousness what Ronan (2015) calls the ability to "appropriate and transform meaning across modalities" in ways that are both dialogic and agentive.

However, sociocultural competence cannot be separated from intersectional realities. Writing practices are shaped by asymmetries in symbolic capital, linguistic legitimacy, and geopolitical access (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2015; Lillis & Turner, 2001; Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes, 2024). Emerging scholars from the Global South, racialized backgrounds, or non-dominant gender identities often face gatekeeping in aligning with dominant academic norms (O'Neill, 2024). The challenge, then, is not just to teach the "rules," but to interrogate who made them, for whom, and at what cost. As Hodges (2015) notes, intertextuality is a lens through which we can trace how elements "from elsewhere" circulate, are recontextualized, and either legitimated or marginalized in the construction of knowledge.

Moreover, academic communication today increasingly involves digital and multimodal intertextuality. As Ronan (2015) and Forceville (2012) point out, students now produce meaning through infographics, hyperlinks, and digital platforms, engaging in "re-semiotization" where text, image, and code blend to form layered meanings. Hyland 's (2005) model of metadiscourse remains relevant in this context, offering tools for analyzing stance, engagement, and evidentiality across modalities. Teaching intertextual competence today must embrace these expanded literacies, preparing learners to navigate remix culture ethically and critically.

Ultimately, cultivating sociocultural intertextual competence is not a matter of "avoiding plagiarism" or "using more sources"it is about inducting students into the dialogic, ideological, and relational fabric of academic knowledge. As Kristeva (1980) cited in Allen (2011) famously observed, "the text is a permutation of texts, an intertextuality," and the author is never solitary but always situated—responding, reshaping, remembering. Writing pedagogy, therefore, must become a site of critical apprenticeship, where students not only learn to inhabit the academy but also to reimagine it through their own voices, affiliations, and epistemic commitments.

4) Instructional Context of Pedagogical Mediation and the Formation of Intertextual Awareness

To operationalize the development of intertextual competence, instruction must move beyond mechanistic citation training and address writing as a dialogic, situated, and socially scaffolded process. Pedagogical interventions that are explicit, recursive, and reflective can significantly influence how students internalize intertextual norms and exercise authorial judgment. As Wingate (2012) argues, instruction often obscures the centrality of argument by focusing on surface features, leading students to misunderstand what academic writing truly demands. Instead, writing pedagogy must begin from the requirement to build an argument, treating all other aspects as subsidiary to this epistemic aim.

Effective strategies include the use of intertextual source mapping, in which students identify how scholarly authors incorporate, reframe, or resist prior texts within academic writing. Critical genre analysis tasks, where learners deconstruct journal articles to examine positioning, modality, and discourse markers, also provide entry points into disciplinary identity formation. These methods encourage students to see writing as a performative act of membership in epistemic communities. Driscoll et al. (2019) found that such genre-aware approaches fostered metacognitive reflection and rhetorical decision-making, particularly when students wrote for authentic audiences.

Çelik & Razı (2023) provide compelling empirical evidence for these interventions. In their study of undergraduate EFL students, explicit instruction in rhetorical, mechanical, and ethical intertextuality combined with formative feedback led to statistically significant reductions in plagiarism and improvements in synthesis. Their findings affirm that when students are mentored into the logic of scholarly dialogue, rather than merely punished for missteps, they grow in rhetorical control and ethical agency. Similarly, O'Neill (2024) demonstrates that embedding intertextual instruction within disciplinary content fosters transfer and deepens students' sense of scholarly voice.

These pedagogical strategies align with the theoretical foundation of dialogism. As Bakhtin (1981) reminds us, every utterance is a response to prior utterances, and meaning is shaped through interaction. Ronan (2015) builds on this, illustrating how dialogic intertextuality enables students to co-construct meaning across modalities and contexts. Students do not merely repeat source content but transform it, appropriating language to serve expressive and epistemic needs. This echoes Kristeva's (1980) vision of the text as a "permutation of texts"a dynamic mosaic rather than static reproduction (Allen, 2011).

The instructional context thus must center metacognitive and rhetorical awareness. Wingate (2012) notes that vague imperatives like "add more argument" are ineffective without grounding in clear models and scaffolded practice. Driscoll et al. (2019) similarly underscore that nuanced genre understanding arises when students are asked to justify rhetorical choices, analyze positioning, and reflect on their audience. Indeed, genre is not merely a form but a "social action" in Miller (2015), and intertextual competence entails learning to act within those social rhetorics.

Assessment practices must evolve accordingly. Traditional plagiarism detection tools, like Turnitin, identify surface similarity but fail to capture dialogic depth or transformation of voice. Instead, formative portfolio assessment featuring annotated drafts, source justifications, and reflective commentary offers a richer lens on intertextual growth. As Calle-Arango & Ávila Reyes (2024) argue, academic identity formation is deeply linked to how students develop and articulate intertextual repertoires over time.

Institutional contexts, however, present constraints. In under-resourced environments, dialogic pedagogy is challenged by large class sizes, limited infrastructure, and policy inconsistencies (Hu & Lei, 2016). Nonetheless, scalable scaffolds peer review protocols, reflective journals, and AI-assisted formative feedback can partially bridge this gap while broader ecosystems mature.

In conclusion, the instructional context is not ancillary to intertextual development but constitutive of it. Where instruction is transparent, dialogic, and participatory, students are more likely to see writing not as a formula to master but as a space of epistemic agency. As Driscoll et al. (2019) affirm, genre knowledge flourishes through writing for real audiences, engaging sources as interlocutors, and cultivating metacognitive self-awareness. When we teach with this vision, intertextuality becomes not only a skill but a scholarly habit of mind.

Conclusion

This study has proposed a multidimensional framework of intertextual competence in academic writing, integrating cognitive, linguistic, sociocultural, and instructional dimensions grounded in dialogic and intertextual theory. By synthesizing theoretical constructs with empirical insights from diverse educational contexts, the study

reconceptualizes intertextuality not as a mechanical act of citation but as a dynamic and situated literacy practice. The framework responds to longstanding pedagogical gaps by offering actionable indicators for both instruction and assessment, with implications for improving EFL writing pedagogy, supporting academic identity formation, and advancing epistemic agency in multilingual classrooms. Ultimately, this conceptualization invites educators to reframe writing instruction as an ethical, rhetorical, and dialogic apprenticeship into disciplinary discourse.

For future researchers, this study opens several promising directions. First, the proposed framework invites empirical validation through classroom-based interventions, portfolio assessments, or corpus analysis across disciplines and linguistic backgrounds. Second, longitudinal studies could examine how intertextual competence evolves over time and under varying instructional conditions, particularly in digital or AI-mediated learning environments. Third, scholars may expand the sociocultural dimension to account for intersectional experiences of race, class, language, and geographic location in academic writing. Finally, there is a need for design-based research that co-develops instructional tools such as reflective journals, intertextual maps, and genre analysis protocols in close collaboration with teachers and learners. In pursuing these paths, researchers will not only extend the utility of the framework but also contribute to more inclusive, dialogic, and transformative models of academic literacy.

Funding

This research was funded by the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia through the Litapdimas Research Grant Program in 2024, with support from the Institute for Research and Community Service (LP2M), UIN Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon**.**

References

Allen, G. (2011). *Intertextuality*. routledge.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *No Title* (M. Holquist (ed.)). University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *No Title* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist (eds.)). University of Texas Press.

Bazerman, C. (2003). Intertextuality: How texts rely on other texts. In *What writing does and how it does it* (pp. 89–102). Routledge.

Bullo, S. (2017). Investigating intertextuality and interdiscursivity in evaluation: The case of conceptual blending. *Language and Cognition*, *9*(4), 709–727.

Calle-Arango, L., & Ávila Reyes, N. (2024). 'I always prefer to quote well-known people': identity negotiations while constructing Ph. D. students' intertextual repertoire. *Language and Education*, *38*(6), 951–968.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2013). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *48*(1), 40–67.

Çelik, Ö., & Razı, S. (2023). From transgressors to authors: promoting EFL writing through academic integrity integrated instruction. *System*, *117*, 103101.

Davis, M., & Morley, J. (2015). Phrasal intertextuality: The responses of academics from different disciplines to students' re-use of phrases. *Journal of Second Language*

Writing. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374315000077

Driscoll, D., Paszek, J., Gorzelsky, G., Hayes, C., & Jones, E. (2019). Genre Knowledge and Writing Development: Results From the Writing Transfer Project. *Written Communication*, *37*, 074108831988231. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088319882313

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Polity Press.

Fairclough, N., & Fairclough, I. (2015). Textual analysis. In *Routledge handbook of interpretive political science* (pp. 186–198). Routledge.

Farrelly, M. (2020). Rethinking intertextuality in CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *17*(4), 359–376.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition & Communication*, *32*(4), 365–387.

Forceville, C. (2012). Creativity in pictorial and multimodal advertising metaphors. In *Discourse and Creativity* (pp. 113-132.).

Foucault, M. (1980). *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews*. Cornell University Press.

Hirvela, A., & Du, Q. (2013). "Why am I paraphrasing?": Undergraduate ESL writers' engagement with source-based academic writing and reading. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *12*(2), 87–98.

Hodges, A. (2015). Intertextuality in discourse. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 42–60.

Hu, G., & Lei, J. (2016). Plagiarism in English academic writing: A comparison of Chinese university teachers' and students' understandings and stances. *System*, *56*, 107–118.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(2), 173–192.

Keck, C. (2010). How Do University Students Attempt to Avoid Plagiarism? *Writing & Pedagogy*, *2*(2), 193–222.

Kuznetsov, I., Buchmann, J., Eichler, M., & Gurevych, I. (2022). Revise and resubmit: An intertextual model of text-based collaboration in peer review. *Computational Linguistics*, *48*(4), 949–986.

Lillis, T., & Turner, J. (2001). Student writing in higher education: Contemporary confusion, traditional concerns. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *6*(1), 57–68.

Liu, G.-Z., Lin, V., Kou, X., & Wang, H.-Y. (2016). Best practices in L2 English source use pedagogy: A thematic review and synthesis of empirical studies. *Educational Research Review*, *19*, 36–57.

Miller, C. (2015). Genre as Social Action (1984), Revisited 30 Years Later (2014). *Letras & Letras*, 56–72. https://doi.org/10.14393/LL63-v31n3a2015-5

O'Neill, G. (2024). Tackling illegitimate intertextuality through socialization-An action research project. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *69*, 101371.

Pecorari, D. (2003). Good and original: Plagiarism and patchwriting in academic second-language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *12*(4), 317–345.

Ronan, B. (2015). Intertextuality and dialogic interaction in students' online text construction. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, *64*(1), 379–397.

Shi, L. (2004). Textual borrowing in second-language writing. *Written Communication*, *21*(2), 171–200.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, *104*, 333–339.

Tardy, C. M. (2009). Press 1 for English': textual and ideological networks in a newspaper debate on US language policy. *Discourse & Society*, *20*(2), 265–286.

Tardy, C. M. (2022). English for academic purposes. In *Handbook of Practical Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 55–67). Routledge.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples. *Human Resource Development Review*, *4*(3), 356–367.

Visser, J., Duthie, R., Lawrence, J., & Reed, C. (2018). Intertextual correspondence for integrating corpora. *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2018)*.

Wahyuni, E. S., & Arieffiani, D. (2022). Google Classroom as A Web-based Instruction in Teaching English Writing and Speaking during Covid-19. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, *5*(1), 1–19.

Wingate, U. (2012). Using Academic Literacies and genre-based models for academic writing instruction: A'literacy'journey. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *11*(1), 26–37.

Wodak, R. (2009). *Discursive construction of national identity*. Edinburgh University Press.

Zhang, L., & Wang, J. (2024). To be like a "scholar": a study on the construction of authorial identity of Chinese EFL learners in academic writing: an intertextuality perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1297557.