Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională
ISSN: 2066-7329 | e-ISSN: 2067-9270
Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2020, Volume 12, Issue 4, pages: 87-102 | https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.4/335

Students' Perspectives on Academic Writing in European Higher Education (Based on 2019 Erasmus Teaching Experience in Slovak and Hungarian University)

Olena HUNDARENKO[1]

[1] Department of English language and literature, faculty of Humanities, University of Zilina, Zilina, Slovakia, gundarenko@gmail.com

Abstract: Although studies on the approaches and methods of teaching Academic Writing in university classroom are extensive, comparative studies on students' evaluation of the classroom strategies and techniques applied are still scant. Therefore, this research implies a quantitative study based on comparative analysis of Slovak and Hungarian EFL learners' responses on a special questionnaire in English Academic Writing. The objective of the study was to explore senior university students' attitude to the academic writing tasks, specificity of a writing program at the university, its advantages and disadvantages; to evaluate their own writing abilities and provide recommendations concerning feedback and writing instructions in class along with the ways of their improvement. It accords to the area of study on effective writing assignments, techniques and methods involved in everyday practice in Central European universities, which can make academic writing both a productive and joyful tool in English language acquisition process.

Keywords: *academic writing skills; EFL students; questionnaire; comparative analysis.*

How to cite: Hundarenko, O. (2020). Students' Perspectives on Academic Writing in European Higher Education (Based on 2019 Erasmus Teaching Experience in Slovak and Hungarian University). *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala, 12*(4), 87-102. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.4/335

1. Introduction

This paper draws on European staff exchange study which enabled broader outlook on university EFL students' viewpoints on what facilitates their academic writing development.

Academic writing is often overlooked as an individual discipline in many institutions of learning. Instead, some elements of writing are introduced within EFL programs, and students do not get a coherent and elaborate scaffolding while mastering this discipline within their program. Based on Odena and Burgess's viewpoint, academic writing enhancement is not even a key strategy across research degree programs. It means that academic writing is meant to be developed independently (Odena & Burgess, 2012). However, the Researcher Development Framework (CRAC, 2012) records academic writing as a core discipline for research students. This is unfortunately not echoed in research degree programs with the focal point on methods training.

Furthermore, it is a generally comprehended truth that learners who are trained in a professional communication environment will exemplify better interpersonal communication skills, where writing constitutes an inseparable component of a learner's domain knowledge and literacy (Khan, 2016; Leláková & Bačová, 2015). Instructors are expected to train students on how to generate and organize ideas, how to use suitable grammar and vocabulary, how to draft, avoid plagiarism, use correct register (Hundarenko, 2019), how to begin and end, and how to proofread and edit a piece of writing. Thus, developing writing skills embodies today a very relevant and vast research field.

There is an impressive number of publications on developing writing skills in a contemporary EFL classroom (Brisk, 2014; Burgess et al., 2006; Fairbairn & Winch, 2011; Hedgcock, 2010; Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009; Thomson & Walker, 2010; etc.). Extensive research has been done on causes of writing apprehension or anxiety and blocking, which can shed considerable light on students' resistance to writing tasks (Cheng, 2004; Daly & Miller, 1975; Hanna, 2010; Kara, 2013). Important studies have also been completed on students' feedback and its effectivity for further enhancing writing skills (Khan, 2016; Seker & Dincer, 2014; Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009; Lee, 2007; Narciss, 2008; Parr & Timperley, 2010). Moreover, scholars emphasize that writing skills are to be considered when choosing an appropriate functional style in an act of communication (Lacková, 2004).

However, most pieces of advice and suggestions as the outcome of the EFL classroom explorations emerge from the authors and supervisors' stance. Thus, the students' standpoint is often left behind.

This inquiry is grounded on so-called students' "voice (Leitch et al. 2007). It implies that solely students' viewpoint is a focal point of the research disregarding any other ones. Hence, in this paper we aim to expose students' perspectives on academic writing in European Higher Education in order to later improve teacher-student treatment of classroom feedback and to elaborate further resources which might facilitate the unfolding of academic writing feedback across EFL program, originally at the department of English language and literature, the university of Zilina, Slovakia.

2. Research questions

This study is done with the following objectives: *How do senior Slovak and Hungarian university students assess academic writing significance/ applicability in their classroom? How do they evaluate their own academic writing skills? Do they connect efficient writing skills with future career?*

3. Relevance of the study

This study is one of a few inquiries based on focused comparative EFL students' replies within Central European universities. Much of the valuable research done targeted mainly either native learners' or international L2 learners, which can fall into different student populations under the label "L2 writers": international (visa)students, resident immigrants, "Generation 1.5. learners", EFL and ESL students, etc. (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009). International L2 learners are of a special attention to scholars (Cimasko & Reichelt, 2011a, 2011b); Ferris, 2009; Leki, 1992; Reid, 2006; Roberge et al., 2009; Valdés, 1992) as their social, cultural, economic backgrounds might have a great impact on their academic life thus constructing a substantial field of investigation for linguists.

The niche of our research or its focal point has been Central European university EFL students who study English on an extensive program – those were Hungarian by origin or Slovak by origin students with a few exceptions of international ones who for Erasmus purposes joined the investigated groups as a part of a short-term exchange programs.

In long-term, our study contributes to existing research on how to make academic writing an effective tool of language acquisition. We hope that this research will assist both teachers and learners to apprehend the priorities of writing in EFL university classroom. Furthermore, it is aimed at

identifying and later managing writing apprehension, which as a main cause of negative attitude to academic writing can hinder the performance of learners.

4. Research methodology

A. Research Design

This study employs a quantitative research design.

One of the salient features that defines a quantitative research is that it is more numerical compared to its counterpart - the qualitative research. Moreover, quantitative research paper deals with collecting data using the extent measures in addition to statistical tools that going to be analysed objectively. Since quantitative data will be measured mathematically/statistically and hence analysed objectively, almost all experts are prone to see the same results and analyse them identically contrasted to qualitative data that is analysed subjectively (International Research, 2018).

Thus, data collection method requires from the researcher to choose a sample of audience also known as the target segment that matches the objectives of the research paper to collect the data required. Further, the main objective of a quantitative research paper is to build the relationship between the cause and effect of different factors of a certain problem (International Research, 2018).

The main advantage of the questionnaires is that they are affordable: they are not expensive compared to the other data collection tools. Furthermore, the questionnaire allows a surveyor to reach large audience and achieve reliable feedback if administered to the right audience (Payne, 2012).

Due to the quantitative nature of questionnaires, it eases the analysis process and makes the comparison with other research papers clearer and less complicated. Therefore, data will be very easy to visualise and comprehend (SurveyAnyPlace, 2019; QuestionPro, 2019).

Finally, the questionnaire is considered to be the best data collection tool that keeps the anonymity of respondents for them to be at ease and maximises the reliability and credibility of responses (SurveyAnyPlace, 2019). Hence, the aim of this questionnaire was to provide each participant (anonymously) with the same questions in the same order. This, in our opinion, furthers a comparative analysis of sample subgroups and ensures confidence in their unbiased nature.

B. Participants

This study incorporated two groups of Central European higher education recipients: Slovak and Hungarian students (both majoring in EFL programs):

The group of Slovak students included 14 participants (10 female and 4 male ones) of the age range between 22-26. Those were the students getting their master's degree in the field of Humanities at the university of Zilina, Zilina, Slovakia.

The second group was composed of 9 Hungarian students (7 female and 2 male ones). The age range is 21-24. Those bachelor's degree students were majoring in the Humanities at the Institute of English and American Studies, Eszterházy Károly University, Eger, Hungary.

Alongside the research, selected Slovak and Hungarian EFL students were inquired to get the perspectives on academic writing as part of their curriculum: to study benefits and disadvantages of its teaching, to get understanding of writing apprehension if such; to conclude on the instructions and feedback students might prefer in their studying process – altogether to become more aware of the current situation of academic writing skills development in a Central European university classroom.

C. Data Collection

Data collection was at two different departments of Humanities of EU universities: The University of Zilina, Zilina, Slovakia and the Eszterházy Károly University, Eger, Hungary. The aim was to obtain data from more European higher learning establishments, which could have been possible thanks to Erasmus staff exchange program in spring 2020. However, due to COVID 19, all business trips abroad have been cancelled, and this limited the data collection process. Initially, it was planned to involve at least three different groups of Central European students representing the curricular at geographically and culturally linked and at the same time diverse locations (Slovakia, Hungary and Poland as primarily aimed) to have more objective results due to socio-cultural and of course educational peculiarities of investigated groups.

Hence, having 23 questionnaires at hand facilitated the research with further prospection of enhancement and elaboration. Both groups filled in the questionnaire forms in October and November, 2020. The Slovak group was filling out the questionnaire during a regular class in Advanced academic writing at the faculty of Humanities of the home university of Zilina. The

Hungarian group was completing it during the Academic writing workshop once on Erasmus staff exchange program in Eger, Hungary.

All the questionnaires were filled in one time with each student in the set groups anonymously. The questionnaire was composed in the English language because based on the study objectives *only* EFL students were involved into the research.

5. Results and discussions

The questionnaire consisted of a few parts:

1) General information which required personal data (age, gender, language/s, degree, department and major/minor subjects of an applicant).
2) General questions on writing in study programs (length and number of courses employing writing, number of graded papers in writing and peculiarity of a study program – individual or collaborative one).
3) Specific questions on writing (this part consisted of 37 heterogeneous questions which were aimed at identifying students' attitude to writing as a part of university curriculum, their self-assessing their own writing skills and integrating writing into their future career perspectives).
4) Writing instruction section (students had to choose and prioritize given options on writing instruction improvement in the university classroom).

Part 3 and part 4 of the questionnaire comprised closed-ended questions which were intended to provide precise, clearly identifiable, and easily classified answers.

For further convenience, we will call Slovak students as Group A and Hungarian students as Group B. The information on the participants has been provided in the section above (see Participants). Thus, a focal point of this part is on sections 3 and 4 of the questionnaire. All statements were purposefully positive declarative to get a clearer picture on the overall "value" of writing in different academic settings. Section 3 was rated by participants on a scale between 1 to 5 (from strongly disagree to strongly agree). Having analyzed all the replies of both groups, we arrived at the conclusion that this scale can formally be divided into a positive one (from strongly agree to agree) and a negative one (from strongly disagree to disagree), and uncertain, which, in our humble opinion, won't deviate or somehow distort the results. Our primary goal was to see what role writing

plays in each applicant's life, and how they personally evaluate it: positively (Pos.), uncertain (Uncert.) or negatively (Neg.).

Section 4 of the questionnaire was pinpointed at the role of instruction in writing in applicants' academic life. However, due to some formal reasons, we decided to explain and interpret it in our next research paper.

For logical and concise approach to data collection, we have decided to divide 37 questions of section 3 into a few *thematic groups:*

THEME A (the broadest one – 20 statements): the questions are focused on personal attitude to writing in general and evaluation of personal writing skills within academic setting; on fair and decent approach toward completion writing tasks; on being involved into different writing activities; on technical aspects of writing.

THEME B (8 statements): the questions are centered on "more advanced" writing tasks within curriculum and their evaluation.

THEME C (4 statements): the questions are aimed at connecting writing with future career of an applicant.

THEME D (5 statements) of the questionnaire based on one of the most challenging aspects of teaching writing in an EFL classroom – feedback – will be discussed along with writing instructions in the next research paper. They require special attention.

A) Theme A (see table 1 below) incorporated a few technically focused questions necessary to acquire a general understanding of students' perspectives on their writing skills as such. The purpose of this section of the research was twofold: first, to investigate the learners' attitudes to their academic writing skills and, second, to conclude by implications possible reasons of under-evaluation of their own writing potential within university curriculum.

Having interpreted the results of this section of the questionnaire, we can conclude that both Groups A and B expressed more positive opinions (from 43% to 93%) on their basic writing skills and strategies applied. They replied affirmatively that *they enjoy writing, like jotting down their thoughts, mainly complete even the most difficult assignments, connect good writing skills with academic success in other disciplines, put a lot of effort into writing and revise their writing before submitting it.* However, *grammar, punctuation, vocabulary choice and spelling* are among main causes of anxiety thus postulating weaknesses of the students from their own viewpoint.

Surprisingly, a few statements were treated in quite a heterogeneous manner within investigated groups: e.g. Slovak students expressed more interest in expansion of writing opportunities in classes (42,86%) while

Hungarian students showed little interest in it at all (11,11%). In addition, another statement *Before writing smth, I always give it a thought and plan it* was rather positively evaluated by Slovak students (71,43%) and almost neglected by Hungarian ones (22,22%). However, when it came to grading, Hungarian students displayed more ambition there – the statement *I want A in the class for my writing task* was affirmed by the majority of Hungarian students (66,67%) and only a small number of Slovak ones (14,29%). Similar situation is with the following utterance *I write as well as others* (55,56% of the Hungarian students completely agreed to it, while only 28,57% of the Slovak participants showed their affirmation, with higher index of uncertainty though – 64,29%). This might be explained by belonging to different cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Consequently, it is principal for educators to investigate crosslinguistic differences that may impact students' writing (including linguistic and rhetorical knowledge that might transfer).

Based on the results achieved, further research might focus on a qualitative analysis which can aim at pinpointing reasons for writing anxiety (which was not our goal here). We can predetermine that among possible causes might be writing itself, teacher/s, coursebook/s, discipline, etc. Different learners can claim that they have writing anxiety due to the lack of previous experience and lack of habit of writing. Moreover, they may think that they have a poor command of English. If the coursebook does not have sufficient examples and exercises and does not provide clear explanations for the students, it may become another reason for failure. Undoubtedly, a teacher's role should not be underestimated in shaping students' attitudes toward writing (Palmquist & Young, 1992). By training students to work harmoniously and productively in teams, teachers can manage to consume valuable class time, as can collaborative activities (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009). Without training, intervention, and accountability, students may go off-task. Hence, teachers should not be surprised if they encounter resistance when require students to complete tasks such as brainstorming, freewriting, peer response, and so on. The value of these activities may not be immediately apparent to some of their students, and teachers should be ready to explain their philosophies and approaches.

Henceforth, there is an ongoing need for much more outreach to, and training for, faculty in the disciplines about the needs and abilities of L2 students in their classes.

Table 1. THEME A. Students' perspectives on their basic writing skills

Writing	Group A			Group B		
Statements	Neg.	Uncert.	Pos.	Neg.	Uncert.	Pos.
I enjoy writing.	21,43%	14,29%	64,29%	22,22%	22,22%	55,56%
I like to write down my thoughts.	14,29%	14,29%	71,43%	11,11%	33,33%	55,56%
I use correct grammar in my writing.	7,14%	50,00%	42,86%	11,11%	44,44%	44,44%
I complete any writing task even a challenging one.	0,00%	7,14%	92,86%	11,11%	0,00%	88,89%
Being a good writer will assist me in academic progress.	0,00%	14,29%	85,71%	11,11%	22,22%	66,67%
I write as well as other students.	7,14%	64,29%	28,57%	0,00%	44,44%	55,56%
I write more than the minimum on writing tasks.	28,57%	28,57%	42,86%	33,33%	22,22%	44,44%
I devote much effort into my writing.	7,14%	35,71%	57,14%	0,00%	0,00%	100,00%
I can clearly express myself writing.	0,00%	35,71%	64,29%	0,00%	55,56%	44,44%
I easily focus on what I am writing.	21,43%	28,57%	50,00%	33,33%	22,22%	44,44%
I like classes involving a lot of writing.	50,00%	28,57%	21,43%	100,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Before writing smth, I always give it a thought and plan it.	28,57%	0,00%	71,43%	33,33%	44,44%	22,22%
To make an A on a writing assignment is crucial for me.	42,86%	14,29%	42,86%	0,00%	11,11%	88,89%

I revise my writing before submitting an assignment.	7,14%	14,29%	78,57%	11,11%	0,00%	88,89%
Punctuation is easy for me.	14,29%	50,00%	35,71%	22,22%	55,56%	22,22%
I would appreciate more opportunities to write in classes.	35,71%	21,43%	42,86%	55,56%	33,33%	11,11%
I practice writing to advance my skills.	42,86%	21,43%	35,71%	33,33%	22,22%	44,44%
I want A in the class for my writing task.	78,57%	7,14%	14,29%	0,00%	33,33%	66,67%
Spelling is easy for me.	14,29%	21,43%	64,29%	22,22%	22,22%	55,56%
Choosing the right word is easy for me.	14,29%	35,71%	50,00%	44,44%	44,44%	11,11%

B) The results of Theme B (see table 2) did not dismay or surprise us a lot. In general, students are apt by their nature to choose the easiest way of resistance by selecting simpler or less challenging tasks with, of course, a few exceptions to the rule. As we can see from Table 2, both groups A and B displayed little interest in extra writing activities: negative answers vary from very low to almost 90%, while positive ones score between very low and about 60%. Creative writing assignments are viewed more affirmatively compared to others (between 44 and 57% positive replies). These statistics once again signify a "biased" attitude to writing as this skill/task/ requires too much extra effort and time; thus, it is often treated as boring and uninteresting as it is done independently in contrast to most speaking classroom assignments (Metruk, 2018a). All this should instigate more investigation and publications on causes and prevention or elimination methods/techniques/strategies of this almost "stereotypical" writing treatment. Writing should be not only a challenging academic activity but rather a fun one (Hundarenko 2019, p. 72)

Table 2. THEME B. Students' perspectives on "more advanced" writing skills

Writing Statements	Group A			Group B		
	Neg.	Uncert.	Pos.	Neg.	Uncert.	Pos.
I like to participate in written online discussions.	71,43%	7,14%	21,43%	88,89%	11,11%	0,00%
It is not difficult at all for me to write good essays.	0,00%	64,29%	35,71%	33,33%	44,44%	22,22%
I enjoy creative writing assignments.	35,71%	7,14%	57,14%	44,44%	11,11%	44,44%
I enjoy writing assignments that challenge me.	35,71%	21,43%	42,86%	33,33%	55,56%	11,11%
I enjoy writing literary analysis papers.	42,86%	35,71%	21,43%	44,44%	11,11%	44,44%
I enjoy writing research papers	50,00%	28,57%	21,43%	44,44%	33,33%	22,22%
I would prefer writing an essay to answering multiple-choice questions.	35,71%	21,43%	42,86%	77,78%	11,11%	11,11%
I am motivated to write in my classes.	42,86%	28,57%	28,57%	33,33%	44,44%	22,22%

C) Thought-provoking was to observe the students' prospective vision of writing in relation to their future career. Hence, most of the Slovak students (Group A) give it a credit (>64%), meanwhile the Hungarian Group (B) reacted to a job-related question with the lower index: >44,44% (table 3). Interestingly, they evaluate career-related questions with writing accompaniment as uncertain prospective (same 44,44%). That might mean that either students have not decided yet concerning their future career choice or they still under-evaluate writing skills. This issue might construct

another area of research as this "writing uncertainty" is alarming. From personal experience in the US, a student demonstrates a writing portfolio at a job fair event at the end of the year, where he or she can get a job from potential employers who are used to attending such university occasions. Moreover, an application to any academic international program of exchange (AACC, Fulbright, the Edmund S. Muskie, the Future Leaders Exchange, and others) requires effective writing skills to successfully compete and get through the first few stages of the program/s. Only the final stage of most of exchange programs requires oral presentation and brainstorming discussions with the professionals. Hence, undoubtedly, to become competitive and acknowledged, one should develop writing skills along with speaking ones (Metruk, 2018b), as being good at this but not at that one can create a lacuna that might cause many failures in today's rather competing world of professionals. However, this idea should be nurtured within university curriculum (preferably even since high school time), and a teacher of wring should unwrap possible prospections of this discipline rather than cultivate and foster students' apprehension to it. This is a hard but cutting-edge strategy of an EFL teacher: "We would add to these assertions that many, and perhaps most, L2 graduate students also need and deserve extra writing support to complete their degree requirements and launch their academic or professional careers" (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009, p.31).

Table 3. THEME C. Writing and its prospective role in the future career of an applicant

Writing Statements	Group A			Group B		
	Neg.	Uncert.	Pos.	Neg.	Uncert.	Pos.
My future success also depends on good writing skills.	7,14%	14,29%	78,57%	0,00%	22,22%	77,78%
Becoming a better writer is important to me.	7,14%	28,57%	64,29%	0,00%	44,44%	55,56%
Becoming a better writer will assist me in my career.	0,00%	28,57%	71,43%	0,00%	33,33%	66,67%
Becoming a good writer is significant in holding a good job.	0,00%	21,43%	78,57%	11,11%	44,44%	44,44%

6. Conclusions and implications

This paper has incorporated the objectives, methodology and results of the study to contribute to the research in elaborating most effective and operative tools of teaching academic writing within university EFL setting. Although there are a lot of inquiries in this research area, still there is an evident need of getting a broader view on a classroom writing from students' standpoint. Only collaborative approach of instructors and students might give fruitful results in this endeavor, since many factors play a crucial role starting from teachers' direct and clear instructions, motivation, constructive feedback to students' incentives as a power source and their evident prospective vision on the need of this literacy tool ("the end weighs" rule).

Hence, the next important step of the research might be the identification of methods and utensils which can be gears and instigators while motivating students to write. Our aim is to discourage rote-memorization and encourage real learning and positive feedback which might take a while; however, every effort is worth an affirmative outcome.

Overall, developing academic writing skills is profoundly important not only for finalizing thesis or diploma works but rather for increasing the employability of graduates who must demonstrate their expertise at prospective job interviews and be skillful at preparing reports, reviews, portfolios and other pieces of writing (Burgess et al., 2006; Jackson, 2007). Hence, it is principal to understand in today's educational reality that academic writing as a separate discipline should aim at true personal development of both a teacher and a student, where a learner in this context turns into an "active co-constructer of knowledge" and a teacher becomes a "co-learner and a facilitator" (Khan, 2016). Moreover, broad discussions of student groups (international students such as Erasmus, for example), ESL students, resident immigrant students, or others) and institutional contexts can be helpful in an increasingly diverse and complex educational environment (Hedgcock & Ferris, 2009).

References

Brisk, M. E. (2014). *Engaging students in academic literacies*. New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2015.12.003

Burgess, H., Sieminski, S., & Arthur, L. (2006). *Achieving your doctorate in education*. London, UK, and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cheng, Y. S. (2004). A measure of second language writing anxiety: Scale development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 313-335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.07.001

Cimasko, T., & Reichelt, M. (2011a). Introduction. In T. Cimasko & M. Reichelt (Eds.), *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices* (pp. vii-xii). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press. https://doi.org/10.1558/wap.v5i1.151

Cimasko, T., & Reichelt, M. (Eds). (2011b). *Foreign language writing instruction: Principles and practices.* Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

Daly, J. A., & Miller, M. D. (1975). Apprehension of writing as a predictor of message intensity. *The journal of psychology, 89* (2), 175-177. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1975.9915748

Fairbairn, G., & Winch, Ch. (2011). *Reading, writing and reasoning.* 3rd ed. Maidenhead: OU.

Ferris, D. (2009). *Teaching college writing to diverse student populations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/ 10.3998/mpub.263445

Hanna, K J. (2009). *Student Perceptions of Teacher Comments: Relationships Between Specific Aspects of Teacher Comments and Writing Apprehension Theses and Dissertations*. 895. https://commons.und.edu/theses/895

Hedgcock, J. & Ferris, D. R. (2009). *Teaching L2 composition: purpose, process, and practice.* 3rd Edition. Routledge.

Hedgcock, J. (2010). Theory-and-practice and other questionable dualisms in L2 writing. In P. K. Matsuda (Ed.), *Practicing theory in second language writing* (pp. 229-244). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Hundarenko, O. (2019). Challenges of teaching academic writing skills in ESL classroom (Based on international teaching experience). *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 11(4), 70-83. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/158

International Research. (2018). *What is Quantitative Research*? https://www.sisinternational.com/what-is-quantitative-research/

Jackson, Ch. (2007). *Recruiting PhDs: what works?* Careers research and advisory centre. www.vitae.ac.uk

Kara, S. (2013). Writing anxiety: a case study on students' reasons for anxiety in writing classes. *Anadolu journal of educational sciences international, 3*(1), 103-111. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ajesi/issue/1528/18750

Khan, S. (2016). Process writing instruction and assessment. *Langlit*, *2*(3), 788-794, https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B1bFkBuNuRivdlZvUFdXQzd2VGs/view?usp=sharing

Lacková, M. (2004). Prelínanie funkčných štýlov [Blending of functional styles]. *Nové trendy vo vyučovaní cudzích jazykov na vysokých školách.* - Nitra: Univerzita Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, 2004.

Leláková, E. & Bačová, B. (2015). Development and innovation of curriculum in foreign language. *Advances in social sciences research journal*, 2(1), 61-68. https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.21.644

Lee, I. (2007). Feedback in Hong Kong secondary writing classrooms: Assessment for learning or assessment of learning? *Assessing writing*, *12*, 180-198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2008.02.003

Leitch, R., Gardner, J., Mitchell, S., Lundy, L., Odena, O., Galanouli, D. and Clough, P. (2007). Consulting pupils in assessment for learning classrooms: the twists and turns of working with students as co-researchers. *Educational action research*, *15* (3): 459–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790701514887

Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: a guide for teachers.* Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Metruk, R. (2018a). "West" or "Vest"? Pronunciation of English consonants [w] and [v] in the utterances of Slovak EFL speakers. *Journal of language education, 4*(2), 24-29. https://doi.org/10.17323/2411-7390-2018-4-2-24-29

Metruk, R. (2018b). Comparing holistic and analytic ways of scoring in the assessment of speaking skills. *The journal of teaching English for specific and academic purposes, 6*(1), pp. 179–189. https://doi.org/10.22190/JTESAP1801179M

Narciss, S. (2008). Feedback strategies for interactive learning tasks. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Van Merrieünboer, & M. P. Driscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (3rd ed., pp. 125-143). New York: Erlbaum.

Odena, O., & Burgess, H. (2012). *An exploration of academic writing development across research degrees: the students' perspective.* Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association (BERA) Annual Conference, Manchester, September 4–6.

QuestionPro. (2019). *Questionnaire: Definition, Examples, Design and Types.* https://www.questionpro.com/blog/what-is-a-questionnaire/?fbclid=IwAR3xCRyalqQfUxkfYWkACQSP92AMFezbeC2VnHzs-XnGQRDRuwhzB9wI6Sk

Parr, M. J., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing Writing*, 15, 68-85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2010.05.004

Payne, A. R. (2012). *Development of the academic writing motivation questionnaire.* Master's thesis, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA.

http://purl.galileo.usg.edu/uga_etd/payne_ashley_r_201212_ma

Palmquist, M., & Young, R. (1992). The notion of giftedness and student expectations about writing. *Written communication*, 9, 137-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088392009001004

Reid, J. (2006). *Essentials of teaching academic writing.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Roberge, M. M., Siegal, M., & Harklau, L. (Eds.). (2009). *Generation 1.5 in college composition*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Seker, M., & Dincer, A. (2014). An insight to students' perceptions on teacher feedback in second language writing classes. *English language teaching*; 7(2) http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/33271

Thomson, P., & Walker, M. (2010). *The Routledge doctoral supervisor's companion*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Valdés, G. (1992). Bilingual minorities and language issues in writing: Toward professionwide responses to a new challenge. *Written communication,* 9, 85-136. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088392009001003

SurveyAnyPlace. (2019). 10 Advantages and Disadvantages of Questionnaires. https://surveyanyplace.com/questionnaire-pros-and-cons/