LEARNER BEHAVIOURS IN AN INTEGRATED ACADEMIC READING-INTO-WRITING TASK: AN EXPLORATORY CASE STUDY IN THE HUNGARIAN UNIVERSITY CONTEXT

Imre Fekete

Assistant lecturer, *Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest*
Language Pedagogy PhD Programme, *Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest*
fekete.imre@btk.ppke.hu

Abstract: English as a foreign language teacher trainees often write literature reviews as part of their assignments and, in some cases, these form part of their high-stakes tests. Compared to the number of publications available on how to write high quality literature reviews in the field of social sciences, studies focusing on particular aspects of learners' performance on this genre are sparse. Therefore, the aim of this exploratory case study was to report on what kinds of learner behaviours an integrated academic reading-into-writing task elicits in the case of a Hungarian EFL teacher trainee in order to trigger possible alterations to the preparatory courses and the examination task. The results suggest that the participant mostly experienced genre-specific content related problems on the sentence level, and a showed a lack of learner strategy use focusing on the content and coherence of the text. The reasons for this are partly attributed to the short training time, lack of experience, slow skills transfer, and time limit constraints. Implications of the outcomes regard the test environment and updating the content of the preparatory courses to allow for more training time. This may result in improved genre-specific knowledge and in the activation of more effective test-taking strategies.

Keywords: academic writing, literature review writing, reading-into-writing tasks, test taking strategies, learner behaviours

1 Introduction

Ever since the 2010 launch of the new English as a foreign language (EFL) and culture teacher education programme at a Hungarian university, teacher trainees are required to take a teacher trainees' language exam at the CEFR-C1 level before beginning their primary their primary or secondary school practice. This high-stakes test is the final threshold to be passed before trainees are allowed to start classroom teaching. Based on the candidates' and examiners' reflections, the component of the exam that has always been the most challenging to students is the so-called short literature review writing task. This is a special kind of reading-into-writing task in which students are required to write a 400-word-long literature review on a given topic using around ten pre-selected quotes given to them as sources. Students taking the test and instructors reviewing them often view this short literature review writing task as the most challenging part of the exam, because reading-into-writing tasks require the activation of a number of different knowledge components (Hyland, 2003), including complex genre-specific writing skills (Machi & McEvoy, 2016).

Therefore, the case study reported on in this paper aims at exploring the kinds of learner behaviours the short literature review writing task elicits from a candidate to provide a deeper understanding of the writing processes of learners as well as to identify some problem areas that should be addressed throughout the training seminars for this component of the exam. To gain a sufficiently deep understanding of as many aspects of learner behaviours as possible and to be able to suggest possible implications for teaching and testing, the research aims to answer the following research questions:

1. What kind of learner behaviours does an integrated academic reading-into-writing task elicit in the case of an EFL pre-service teacher trainee?
2. How could the learner behaviours elicited by the short literature review writing task inform the improvement of preparatory course content and exam organisation?

The main aim behind this case study was to obtain a deeper understanding of how students could be helped to improve their performance in this task that proves to be rather challenging to them, and of whether any possible alterations of the administration of the test type or the preparatory courses should be considered by the mandate holders. Literature suggests a constant, context-specific needs analysis (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016) that should be based on empirical research (Brindley & Ross, 2001; Lillis & Tuck, 2016; Weigle & Malone, 2016) as well as confirms that crafting literature reviews is a complex task as authors need to be able to synthesise existing literature and feature their own voices in the texts they author (Bruce, 2014; Kwan, 2006; Sárdi, 2020; Torraco, 2005). Taking an emergent approach to research this particular integrated academic reading-into-writing task through the eyes of one participant allows for relevance outside its narrow focus (Duff, 2012) by formulating transferable implications based on the rich data collected as part of this study regarding L2 academic English writing instruction.

2 Theoretical and empirical background

Flowerdew and Peacock (2001, p. 8) conceptualise English for Academic Purposes (EAP) as "the teaching of English with the specific aim of helping learners to study, conduct research or teach in that language." As EAP instruction mainly takes place in tertiary educational settings, arguably the main purpose of teaching EAP is to provide learners with the skills to meet the expectations of these institutions and to equip them with the knowledge to succeed (Benesch, 2001). The body of EAP research seems to confirm that "EAP is most successful when it is tailored to meet the needs of the specific circumstances of students" (Hyland, 2016, p. 19), which should be ensured by constant needs analysis (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016) and research (Brindley & Ross, 2001; Lillis & Tuck, 2016; Weigle & Malone, 2016).

Because the study aims to reveal and analyse the learner behaviours elicited by an academic reading-into-writing task to discover if any modifications should be considered regarding the preparatory courses and the test taking environment, the literature review is centred around three broader themes. First, the learner strategies of successful EAP writing will be examined, followed by a closer look at literature reviews as a genre. The last subsection of the

literature review provides insights into think-aloud protocols as a viable method for academic writing research.

2.1 Learner strategies in EAP writing

In the current professional discourse, researchers sometimes take a general approach to gain a broader understanding of the learning processes that reading-into-writing tasks require, but often specific genres or components of genres serve as the bases of research (Hirvela, 2016). Studies conducted into the writing processes of learners represent one of the key areas of English for Academic Purposes research (Hirvela, 2016). A number of theories and research methods have been established to gain insights into such processes (for an overview, see Hyland, 2002), but researching EAP with introspective analysis (such as verbal reports) and focusing on integrated skills are rather recent research interests of the field (Weigle & Malone, 2016). In integrated reading-into-writing tasks, participants performing the task use source texts as the foundations for the text they author (Flower, 1990). Learners today are mostly asked to write texts relying on reading materials as source texts; however, reading-into-writing tasks require the mastering of complex and integrated skills (Hirvela, 2016). It is also difficult for students to assess the needs of the primary reader who will judge their performance, because they are expected to show expertise while they often have limited background knowledge on the specific subject (Paltridge, 2001).

To veil their limited background knowledge, learners use a number of compensation strategies (Oxford, 1990; Peacock, 2001). Learning strategies have claimed to play a pivotal role in language learning success (Oxford, 1990) and strategy use has also been linked to success in EAP (Peacock, 2001). Oxford (1990) listed six categories of strategies learners use, namely 1) memory (designing ways of remembering effectively), 2) cognitive (doing everything to practise knowledge), 3) compensation (making up for missing knowledge), 4) metacognitive (arranging, planning, and evaluating learning), 5) affective (dealing with emotions), and 6) social strategies (cooperation with others). Out of these six strategies, the three that have mostly been linked with success are compensation, cognitive, and metacognitive strategies (Peacock, 2001, p. 272). In a research project conducted in the EAP context, Peacock (2001) concluded that learners mostly used cognitive and compensation strategies, while teachers found cognitive and metacognitive strategies to be the most useful ones their students should use.

Recent EAP discourse also moved towards identifying shared processes between second language reading and writing. In a study involving an integrated L2 writing-reading-writing task, Plakans et al. (2019) concluded by observing five common processes that were equally present when learners were working on the reading and writing components of tasks, namely 1) focusing at the word level, 2) drawing on background knowledge, 3) eliciting metacognition for comprehension, 4) rereading, and 5) summarizing (Plakans et al., 2019, p. 24). The students who used synthesizing techniques to a greater extent scored higher on the test than those who spent more time thinking about specific words and how to put together sentences (Plakans et al., 2019). Thus, mastering and using a variety of learner strategies (Oxford, 1990; Peacock, 2001; Plakans et al., 2019) are not only advantageous for learners regarding specific skills, but strategies can be successfully transferred to other skills, as well.

2.2 Literature reviews as a genre

Along with the purposes of EAP instruction to be most learner-centred, EAP research has also focused on specific genres. In this context, genre is defined as "a particular type of communicative event which has a particular communicative purpose recognised by its users, or discourse community" (Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, p. 15). One of the main purposes of genre analysis is to research topics such as delivering presentations, summarizing techniques, referencing techniques, or authoring literature reviews in order to use the implications of such studies to better the education provided for students (Lillis & Tuck, 2016). Teaching and learning about genres is at its best when they are taught with sufficient context and the focus is on "demystifying" (Paltridge, 2001, p. 58) texts in order to teach learners how to construct them to meet the demands of specific discourse communities. It is also important to remark that a single genre can have "a set of communicative purposes" (Swales, 1990a, p. 58) as opposed to just one, which also signals their complexity.

No matter how complex they are, having to read, interpret, and author texts based on sources (i.e., writing literature reviews) is found to be one of the most common tasks at the graduate level. Cooper and Bikowski (2007) concluded that in the field of social sciences, humanities, and arts, only 12% of classes were without written assignments, and 53% of the assignments were library research papers. The second most frequent writing task type was article or book reports, making up 29% of all written assignments (Cooper & Bikowski, 2007). More specifically, Hungarian English majors are frequently required "to write English academic texts in their literature, linguistics, history, applied linguistics, or language pedagogy courses" (Csizér & Tankó, 2017, p. 390). As Hyland (2003) specifies, L2 learners should activate five kinds of knowledge to be successful in writing L2 texts. These are 1) content knowledge of the ideas and concepts in the topic area the text will address, 2) system knowledge of the syntax, lexis, and appropriate formal conventions, 3) process knowledge of how to prepare and carry out a writing task, 4) general knowledge of the communicative purposes of the genre and its value in particular contexts, and 5) context knowledge of readers' expectations, cultural preferences, and related texts. Thus, learners are expected to mediate between the source texts, synthesize them, and add their own ideas or draw their own conclusions, bearing in mind the culturally conditioned norms and traditions of the genre in terms of content and language use.

Literature reviews serve the purposes of reviewing, critiquing, and synthesizing literature by objectively reporting on where the professional discourse stands on a specific topic (Bruce, 2014; Torraco, 2005). Although integrative literature reviews are considered to be a separate "form of research" (Torraco, 2005, p. 356), the genre is still less often addressed in EAP research (Kwan, 2006). Crafting literature reviews is, nonetheless, a complex and demanding process. Part of what makes this process difficult to learn for students is the fact that the model texts they usually see are end results, and the tiring drafting, redrafting, and writing processes, along with the influence of feedback received on the text, remain unseen. Swales (1990b, p. 46) calls this phenomenon the hidden, out-of-sight, or "occluded" nature of academic texts. With focusing more on teaching students how to be researchers as opposed to how to imitate genres by accessing end products only (Hyland, 2016; Paltridge, 2001), the processes of writing academic texts might become clearer to learners, thus resulting in improved knowledge regarding the genre.

Machi and McEvoy (2016) identified six key steps to writing effective literature reviews that are most likely to meet the expectations of the primary readership. These are 1) selecting a topic by recognising and defining the problem, 2) developing the tools for argument by creating a process for solving the problem, 3) searching the literature, collecting and organising the information, 4) surveying the literature to discover the evidence and build findings, 5) critiquing the literature and drawing conclusions, and 6) writing the review to communicate and evaluate the conclusions. This final writing stage should ideally encompass what the authors call "writing to understand" (Machi & McEvoy, 2016, p. 136) and "writing to be understood" (p. 150), which signals that using sources as the bases of unearthing problem areas is indeed a complex process, where authors are not only required to interpret them, but they have to be aware that their text needs to meet the standards of the genre dictated by the expert readers (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Paltridge, 2001).

A requirement that candidates of the short literature review writing task have to meet is to work out their own ideas while also synthesizing the secondary sources. By definition, literature reviews feature the authors' own voice, as their function is to critique and synthesize knowledge while establishing niches (Bruce, 2014; Kwan, 2006; Sárdi, 2020; Torraco, 2005). In a study involving the content analysis of the masters' theses of 10 Hungarian EFL teachers, Sárdi (2020) calculated the number of times authors referred to themselves in their texts using manifestations of the first person singular (*I, me, my*) or the first person plural (*we, us, our*) personal, object, and possessive pronouns. The lowest and highest number of self-references in one thesis was four and 32 instances, and the proportion of using first- and second-person self-references was two thirds to one third, respectively (Sárdi, 2020). Sárdi (2020) also observed that most self-references regarded the notion of thesis-writing (67.8%), that is, talking about the authors' own research and conclusions based on the literature reviewed.

2.3 Think-aloud protocols and criticality in EAP research

Researching academic writing tasks frequently relies on the method of verbal reports (Hyland, 2002). Think-aloud protocols (TAPs) require participants to constantly verbalise their thought processes while simultaneously doing a writing task. TAPs have been criticised for disrupting participants' natural inner thought processes by asking them to verbalise often automatized actions; however, TAPs have been widely used, as outsider observations prove to be rather unreliable (Bowles, 2010; Hyland, 2002). Participants are trained before TAPs to help them understand how and what processes to vocalise. One of the most frequent training methods preceding TAPs is the method of Ericsson and Simon (1984; revised edition in 1993), which has been offered as an example of TAPs (Bowles, 2010) and is being used to conduct academic writing research to date (for example by Plakans et al., 2019). To better ensure the reliability of TAP-based research, a frequently used method to bridge the previously mentioned shortcomings is the removal of time limit constraints to allow the participant to take as much time as needed, which arguably results in more reliable data.

The purpose of conducting research into student writing processes is seen as a key element of programme and course content development (Brindley & Ross, 2001; Lillis & Tuck, 2016; Weigle & Malone, 2016). As Lillis and Tuck (2016, p. 34) claim, "criticality is key to any pragmatism centred on writers' desires for meaning-making as well as on academic success;" therefore, how and what is taught and how and what is assessed in the form of assignments or tests should be bases of close, critical scrutiny. Thus, it is the researchers' duty to participate in discussions about what should be changed to facilitate student success, and how (Lillis & Tuck, 2016). As Paltridge (2001) remarked, writing courses should be designed with students' level in mind so as not to design tasks to fail, but rather tasks for success. Therefore, this exploratory case study was designed to discover how students could be further aided in the short literature review writing task by identifying what problem areas they encounter through focusing on what learner behaviours the academic reading-into-writing task in question elicits in the case of an EFL pre-service teacher.

3 Research design

In order to answer the proposed research questions, an exploratory case study was designed that involved one focal participant (Duff, 2012) and several data collection methods (a think-aloud session, the researcher's field notes, two follow-up interviews, and two drafts written by the participant) to be introduced in this subsection.

3.1 The research setting

The short literature review reading-into-writing task is a component of the EFL teacher trainees' language proficiency exam administered by a university. Exam papers are compiled by instructors of the EFL teacher education programme, including the head of the programme, who is also the instructor of the students' Academic English course. The exam is divided into several sections detailed in Table 1. Students take the first and the second components of the exam on day one, and then they move on to the third component, which is under scrutiny in this research study, on day two. The idea to administer the written component of the exam on two separate days had been requested by the students. Candidates finish with components four and five on the third and final day of the examination process. Students who fail to meet the minimum requirements (see Details column, Table 1) of any of the components drop out of the exam and lose their chance to continue the examination process. A final requirement is to collect at least 60% of the total points.

Component	Name	Description	Details
1.	Use of English	Tasks similar to the Cambridge English Advanced (CAE) exam, CEFR level C1+.	minimum 60% total: 66 points time: 60 minutes
2.	Reading	Reading 1 – Task 1: topic sentence match Reading 1 – Task 2: reading comprehension questions that require short answers Reading 2 – Task 1: explaining vocabulary items based on context Reading 2 – Task 2: writing a short, guided summary of Reading 2	minimum 40% total: 40 points time: 75 minutes
3.	Short literature review reading-into-writing task	Students receive a topic and 8 to 12 source cards. Students are asked to discuss a topic that might be one section of a hypothetical literature review as part of an academic paper. The text needs to be ca. 400 words long. Students are instructed to work out their own definitions in comparison with those by others, quoting them as appropriate. Students are also instructed to use APA referencing and not to necessarily include all the sources provided.	minimum 40% total: 50 points time: 90 minutes
4.	Speaking 1: presentation	Students deliver a 15-minute-long presentation with visuals on a research paper of their choice from the field of language pedagogy and answer some follow-up questions. Students prepare for the presentation at home.	minimum 40% total: 50 points time: approx. 15-20 minutes
5.	Speaking 2: instruction giving	Students draw a classroom activity sheet and prepare to give instructions on a required level (A2, B1, or B2). These activities are usually grammar games in the form of sentence chains or short board games, etc. Candidates deliver their instructions to fellow candidates, who are expected to act as instructed. Points are awarded by two raters.	minimum 40% total: 50 points time: approx. 10 minutes for preparation and 10 minutes for delivery
6.	Speaking 3: discussing a pedagogical problem	Students draw a situation card in pairs. The cards feature a classroom-related pedagogical problem (e.g., what to do with students who are too loud?). The candidates discuss the problem as if they were colleagues. Points are awarded by two markers.	minimum 40% total: 50 points time: approx. 10 minutes in pairs, no preparation

In order to pass the exam, students need to collect at least 60% (= 184 points) of the total 306 points.

Table 1. Components of the EFL teacher trainees' language competence exam

The first such exam was administered in 2012 following a three-year pilot in Academic English courses, where the test type and the descriptors had been developed by the programme director of the EFL teacher education programme. The descriptors are continuously being altered and rephrased, but these developments are typically minor changes.

There are multiple reasons for the inclusion of a mini-literature review writing component as an academic writing task in the teacher trainees' language competence exam. Firstly, the students routinely read academic literature and write texts in academic prose (coupled with spoken academic presentations) during their studies but receive formal instruction in those only in the Academic English course preceding the exam. Secondly, the masters programme is designed to train professionals who are aware that if they encounter problems in their classrooms, theoretical and empirical research is available to provide answers to their questions. Thirdly, future teachers are required to interpret and critically judge the literature (and any materials) they consult before blindly putting their implications into practice. Fourthly, future teachers should be able to synthesize the ideas found in reliable sources (Torraco, 2005). Furthermore, selected students might hand in a language pedagogy thesis, in which they are required to write up a literature review chapter, by which time it is highly advantageous if they are familiar with the specifics of the genre (Hyland, 2016).

There are various courses that prepare students for component 3 of the examination, yet it continuously proves to be very challenging for learners. Students take this at the end of their seventh semester, after they have already participated in a number of general and specific academic English courses. One course that is especially aimed at helping students succeed, Academic English, is required to be taken in semester seven. In this course, instruction includes teaching writing techniques specific to writing literature reviews, and throughout the course of the semester, students enrolled in the course work on and finally hand in three practice literature review exam texts. This third, last practice text was selected to conduct this research project closes to the actual examination.

The instructor of the Academic English course played a key role in the development of this project. She agreed to using the third practice paper (Reményi, 2019) to be the basis of the data collection, and the student volunteering to participate was motivated by gaining the experience of being in an exam situation, and later on she was provided feedback on her text and had the chance to revise it before submission. To maximise authenticity, data for this study were collected before the instructor of the Academic English course revealed the details of this third topic that students would have to submit as their third practice assignment.

3.2 The participant

A total number of six students from the Academic English group were purposefully selected and invited to participate in this project anonymously and voluntarily. The participant, Eszter (pseudonym) volunteered first and remained the only volunteer. Interestingly, after receiving one-to-one detailed feedback on her text produced in this study, Eszter reported an increasing interest among her peers towards the research project.

Eszter is in her fourth year of studies to become a teacher of EFL and Culture and Hungarian Literature and Grammar in secondary education. Her mother tongue is Hungarian, and English is her first foreign language. She is a typical student enjoying academic success; she is neither the most nor the least successful student among the candidates for the EFL teacher trainees' language competence exam. She was purposefully selected by recommendation of the

instructor of the Academic English course in question, after the students of the course had already handed in two short literature reviews. Eszter was also an ideal participant because she is quite verbal and outspoken.

3.3 Methods of data collection and analysis

To reveal and understand Eszter's learner behaviours while working on her short literature review writing task, she was asked to participate in a think-aloud data collection session while working on the exam task in a realistic exam setting. Eszter took part in a 15 minutes long training session with the researcher before the TAP started, following the protocol of Ericsson and Simon (1993, also used by Plakans et al., 2019). The TAP session was audio recorded, while the researcher was also taking notes. Eszter was asked to talk constantly. No help or instructions were given to Eszter during the TAP, with the exception of asking her to speak up whenever she remained silent for a couple of minutes.

Minutes after the TAP, an unstructured interview was recorded with Eszter in which the researcher asked her to clarify some issues that emerged during the TAP recorded in the researcher's field notes, and she was asked to reflect on her feelings about her success and the techniques and procedures she used to do the task. Then, a third, final semi-structured interview was recorded in which Eszter provided feedback on her draft while exchanging some questions with the researcher about the text. Besides the three recordings and the researcher's field notes, the two texts (the first draft that was produced on the spot, and the second draft that was handed in as a seminar paper) were also used as data sources. Both drafts one and two were commented on and marked by the researcher and a fellow colleague who volunteered to be the second reader of the drafts following the assessment practice of the exam component. The exam task and the drafts are included in the Appendices (Appendix A: Exam task, Appendix B: Draft 1, Appendix C: Draft 2). The types of data collected for this project are summarized in Table 2.

Data source	Type of data source	Collected through	Details	Methods of data analysis
1. Think-aloud session	Qualitative	Voice recording	Length: 2h 22m	Themes analysis.
2. Researcher's field notes	Qualitative	Handwritten notes	4 A/4 notepad pages	
3. Interview after the think-aloud session	Qualitative	Voice recording	Length: 15m	
4. Feedback session on Draft 1	Qualitative	Voice recording	Length: 1h 4m	
5. Draft 1	Qualitative	Handwritten test paper	368 words of body text	
6. Draft 2	Qualitative	Final Word document	444 words of body text	

Table 2. Data sources and details

4 Results and discussion

In the following sections, data will be presented and analysed with a special focus on learner behaviours. Some data sources (the drafts) are only discussed to triangulate behaviour with performance. The interviews and the TAP, with the exception of quoting from the sources or the drafts, mostly took place in Eszter's mother tongue, Hungarian; therefore, the reported speech is used to refer to Eszter's utterances. Whenever Eszter is quoted, her utterances are translated from Hungarian to English, and the phrases she uttered in English are signalled by italics.

4.1 Data source 1: The think aloud session

Eszter started her writing process by immediately looking at the given topic of the exam task, which was *language learner beliefs*. She commented that the topic sounded difficult because at first she had to write a short literature review on *the good language learner*, and then on *the good language teacher*, and this topic sounded more complex compared to the first two. Eszter also expressed a slight uncertainty about how to proceed when the topic was revealed to her:

> Well, to begin with, I'll read the sources to find out what this [whole task] is all about, what the title is, huh, okay, so the topic is *language learner beliefs*, this is not an easy topic… I'll start by reading the sources, is that okay? (Eszter)

She started working by selecting the sources she preferred and thought would be ideal to include in her literature review from the task sheet. While reading the sources, she noted that the structure of the review needed to be considered even before the writing process, as it had to have a good introduction and conclusion. Eszter read all sources twice and tried to find connections between them, and re-read the sources again, but this time only the selected ones.

Before she started working on the introduction, Eszter outlined her composition by numbering the source cards on the task sheet and putting the numbers in columns that could be included in her paragraphs. She later found this problematic, because she only noted down numbers, and missed noting down the keywords. Later, she started underlining key concepts in the sources so as not to waste more time having to re-read them completely.

Even though Eszter was given all the time she needed to complete the task, it became clear soon enough that she was constantly worried about time. Before starting to write her first paragraph, she expressed this concern three times. Another issue that surfaced soon was that Eszter gave herself almost no time for thinking carefully before she acted whenever she encountered a problem. If she was not sure how to continue her text, Eszter started doing something else; for example, she checked the time, counted how many words she had already written, or started working on another paragraph. Then, typically, when she encountered another problem, she went back to the first problem, decided that it might not be a problem after all, reassured herself, and accepted something she had not been contented with in the first place.

The participant also showed instances of problem solving by resignation: when Eszter could not come up with a synonym she liked for "found" as a reporting word, she started working on another paragraph, but when she wanted to quote a second source, she again wanted to use the word "found" as a reporting verb. This resulted in accepting "found" as a reporting word to be used in the text whereas she originally disliked it, which resulted in leaving out space for a reporting word to be used for the second one. Later, the blank was filled by "writes." Another example is the phrase "another factor." When Eszter wrote in her text that "age is another factor," she immediately suspected that she had already used it, even though she did not. Later, she wrote "another factor to be considered," but because no alternative came to her mind, she kept the repetition, even though she was aware that it should be avoided.

Whenever she encountered a problem, it clearly disrupted Eszter's thinking processes as far as the content of the text was concerned. She mentioned that content is of utmost importance to her, yet she frequently ran into problems with reporting and linking words. Surprisingly, she sometimes accepted initial solutions she had disliked because she did not want words to be crossed out in her paper. She reasoned that cross outs would look inappropriate, and as such, should be avoided even if the cost was to leave something undesirable in the text.

Some other worries also surfaced early in the writing process. While working on the first paragraph of her text, Eszter noted that she did not like sources that featured book chapters as quotations, sources with multiple authors, and in-text citations of secondary sources because including them in the references (both in-text and end-text) is time-consuming. These three reasons were frequent in selecting and deselecting sources, whereas ideally source selection should have been content oriented: "Oh great, what a good source [ironically], someone is quoting someone else, we don't like this because all this should be written down [in the references list]" (Eszter).

Having completed the introduction, Eszter counted how many words she had already written and explained that she wanted her paragraphs to be of the same length. She appeared to set the limit to the introductory paragraph. Before moving on to the second paragraph, she summarised her state of affairs: 1) the next paragraph was going to be an easy one as the sources she wished to use could be referred to in a short manner, 2) she had a gap in the first paragraph (a reporting word) that needed to be filled, 3) she was in need of additional sources in later paragraphs other than those originally selected because of the contents of the introduction, and 4) she worried about how to connect the first and second paragraphs logically.

While working on the second paragraph, Eszter realised that one of the initially selected sources did not fit into the logic of the text, and she had to start searching for another one. When no other source seemed relevant, she decided to use only one source in the paragraph and interpret it using more words than she had wanted because she failed to link or connect it to other sources. She spent considerable time on brainstorming synonyms to "likely" in the paragraph, and finally used "prone to" as an alternative.

Before the third paragraph, Eszter counted the number of words again and reported that she would have to pay close attention to 1) sounding academic, 2) using better reporting words, and 3) using more than one source in future paragraphs. She had no intention of changing

anything related to these three issues in the paragraphs she had already written. Although it occurred to her that she should go back to working on the style of her first two paragraphs, she rejected this possibility because of time constraints. Eszter ended up referring to one source in the third paragraph and was determined to use more in the forthcoming ones.

At this point, she decided to find two sources that could easily be contrasted because she had not combined sources in any of her previous paragraphs except for the introduction. She found two sources: one about male learners and their beliefs and a similar text about female learners. She initially outlined the fourth and the fifth paragraphs to be one longer paragraph, but she later divided them into equally long paragraphs. Before contrasting the two sources, she started questioning whether gender could really determine language learning success, and she interpreted these beliefs mentioned by the researchers as conclusions of empirical research rather than two examples of male and female beliefs. In other words, by misunderstanding the sources, she interpreted and presented beliefs as facts. She felt that what the authors wrote should be questioned, but if she were unable to argue for or against these sources, she would accept them as they are because she could not question the source contents. She regarded the sources as authoritative even though she realised that she did not agree with them.

After a final word count, Eszter realised that she could end her literature review with a conclusion. It became quite clear that she was still worried about time, but she had no intention of going back to any of her previous paragraphs, especially not to the introduction. She decided to conclude her literature review with a source urging the observation of language learner beliefs by teachers, because if learner beliefs are identified, it might result in choosing more effective teaching practices. At this point, Eszter revealed that although direct quotes are easy, sometimes it is difficult to continue the sentences after them; therefore, she prefers paraphrasing. Paraphrasing a source in this paragraph again required Eszter to find a synonym for the reporting word "found," and later she used "discovered" because she did not realise that she had already used it in the introduction.

Having finished the composition, Eszter re-read the piece and commented on her performance. She said that there were some sentences in the text that made no sense, and she made some minor changes (e.g., changed modal verbs). She also remarked again that she did not want to make major changes because crossing out words would look bad, and her text would not remain visually appealing. She sometimes said that she needed to find a solution to make sense of a sentence with the least modifications made to it. Initially, Eszter wanted to lengthen the conclusion because the composition was ca. 370 words long, but then she remembered that usually a +/–10% difference is tolerated from the required number of words:

> I've put down that *beliefs are hard to change* but here instead of *hard* I could have used something *fancier,* for example *difficult,* but I won't cross it out now. […] Sometimes I wonder if it is better to cross something out and write something new or I should try to continue the sentence as it is, but then it won't necessarily make sense, but at least it will be finished and there are no crossing outs. (Eszter)

It can be concluded that writing the short literature review was a rather complex task for Eszter, despite the training she had received. She quickly and resourcefully selected the sources

she was planning to use, but she was constantly worried about a number of factors. She almost exclusively worked linearly; she only changed one or two words or spelling mistakes in the paragraphs she declared finished. Stress factors mainly included the time limit, the word count, the paragraph lengths, using appropriate academic English style (by finding synonyms), using quotations properly, and making sure that she did not misinterpret the sources. It seemed that she was aware of the structure she should follow and the fact that the text needs to be academic in style, yet as time went by, she constantly accepted solutions she herself was unhappy with at first. Such external factors like having to cross out words from the text or the outlook of her text worried her as much, if not more than more than producing the actual content of the text. Eszter also struggled with questioning or disagreeing with the sources. In the end, she handed in her composition without having worked out her own views on what language learner beliefs are, nor did she dare to question any of the sources. To illustrate holistically how Eszter used up her time, Table 3 was created as a timeline.

Starting time	Phase	Time spent on phase	Paragraph length
0:00:00	reading the task and the source texts twice	12 mins	
0:12:00	outlining the text	4 mins	
0:16:00	re-reading selected sources only	3 mins	
0:19:00	started writing up the introduction (paragraph 1)	2 mins	
0:21:00	moving on to writing up paragraph 2	5 mins	
0:26:00	writing up the introduction (paragraph 1)	28 mins	76 words
0:54:00	writing up paragraph 2	18 mins	81 words
1:12:00	writing up paragraph 3	15 mins	56 words
1:27:00	writing up paragraph 4	12 mins	60 words
1:39:00	writing up paragraph 5	13 mins	45 words
1:52:00	started writing up the conclusion (paragraph 6)	7 mins	
1:59:00	re-reading the whole text, minor changes	6 mins	
2:05:00	writing up the conclusion (paragraph 6)	4 mins	50 words
2:09:00	writing up end-text references	11 mins	
2:20:00	final look at the text, handing it in	2 mins	complete text: 368 words

Table 3. Draft 1 timeline

4.2 Data sources 2 and 3: Interviews after the think aloud session

A short, 15-minute follow-up interview based on the researcher's field notes (Data source 2) was recorded with Eszter directly after the TAP to reveal the reasons behind her behaviours. She said that she had attended three different courses addressing writing literature reviews; however, all three of them were in the same semester, right before she had to take the exam. One course dealt with general academic English; one with use of English, where the professor made brief references to the literature reviews; and one that was specifically aimed at conducting and writing up short research. She said that it might have helped her if she had started writing literature reviews earlier, preferably at least a semester earlier.

Eszter noted that she saw progress in her academic writing skills, but more time and practice would be needed to be less anxious about this task. She added that her first literature review was more like an argumentative essay. The second review included too many personal additions, and it was difficult for the reviewer to separate her ideas from the source text ideas, perhaps because shortly before writing the second review, they had studied about how the author's voice is traceable in Academic English texts. After the TAP, she felt that as a result of the feedback she received on her first two reviews, her third text became more academic, but her personal opinion was not present in it, although she was aware that it should have been included. She admitted that some more time and practice would have been needed to be more confident in how to author a proper literature review with her opinion included:

> I wrote the first *literature review* as an essay, and now thinking about it, it was obviously not good, because I basically wrote an *argumentative essay*, but then Professor X brought a book review to class and we analysed the functions of the sentences [where the author presents own claims] […] based on that I wrote the second *literature review* where it was not clear what was my claim and what was claimed by the author of the source, and here [in this third text] I made source use explicit but my opinion is not included at all. (Eszter)

She also expressed that when it came to the literature review writing task, she had to be more focused on writing up a good literature review with content focus, yet her main worries usually were the time limit and the word count. She added that she was expected to write up a review in 90 minutes whereas at home she typically spends 150 minutes on writing a review of the same length with the help of her notes and the Internet. Additionally, students in the Academic English seminar were asked to peer-review each other's literature reviews, and Eszter found this rather challenging at the beginning because she felt that she is in no position to judge the quality of a literature review, having authored none or just one of them. Her desire was that in the Academic English seminar, among the other useful writing activities that they already do, more literature reviews were scrutinized and commented on with the help of the instructor introducing them to the assessment criteria:

> *Peer review* is very important, but as long as you don't know what a *literature review* is, you cannot *peer review* someone else's. […] There is a *set of criteria* based on what you have to check if something is in the text or not [provided by the instructor of the preparatory course], and while you are reading the text you base the *peer review* on your own opinion, which won't help your peer if you don't even know how to write a *lit review*. (Eszter)

Consequently, Eszter revealed that according to her, literature reviews were important because practising them could help her write her thesis, and they also improved her critical thinking skills. She felt that she needed more practice, more time, and a slower pace of learning in regard to how crafting a literature review, because all three courses addressing this task were in the semester that ended with this exam. She also felt that more time and practice would allow her to feel more confident in judging the quality of her and her peers' work, as she started to feel

progress in her literature review writing skills based on the feedback she received from instructors.

4.3 Data source 4: Feedback session on Draft 1

Approximately a week after the think aloud session, Eszter was invited to a follow-up interview. The interview was one hour and four minutes long and consisted of three major parts: 1) a semi-structured interview about Eszter's particular learner behaviours when writing the first draft (15 minutes), 2) a feedback session on her draft (30 minutes), and 3) an unstructured Q&A session to answer Eszter's remaining questions and concerns (19 minutes).

In the semi-structured interview part, Eszter was asked to share her opinion on some of her recurring learner behaviours observed in her first draft. First of all, she was asked about the time and word count constraints. Eszter reported that she was not worried about time in the actual exam, because the TAP sometimes resulted in her forgetting some of her thoughts and disrupting her thinking flow: "It was a little bit stressful being recorded, sometimes I forgot what I wanted to write while I was talking, when I won't have to talk, it will probably save me at least half an hour" (Eszter).

She was also planning to perform faster by writing more literature reviews at home before the actual exam; however, she added that there are no additional past papers available to her, and even if she authors more texts, feedback is not going to be provided on those. She said that the reason she seemed worried about the word count was that when she is in a flow, she typically writes more than allowed. Eszter added she was aware that her first draft was under 400 words, but she did not want to spend more time working on it, even though she said that she should have worked on style and coherence more.

Eszter was also asked to comment on her drafting. At first, she outlined her literature review by numbering the sources and grouping the numbers into paragraphs, but she soon found out that not putting any keywords next to the numbers resulted in forgetting why she selected the particular sources. Eszter said that she is planning to jot down or underline keywords from the sources she selects the next time; however, she feels that there would be no time to write an actual draft with fully constructed sentences, and she plans to continue to work linearly.

When asked about her problem-solving strategies related to language use (such as using formal structures, avoiding repetition, and using a variety of reporting verbs), Eszter said that she had not been aware of the fact that many times she later accepted solutions she had initially disliked:

> I don't specifically recall this, but I sometimes do that when I'm under time pressure, however, here there was no time pressure, yet in the second hour I felt that I should finish, I should not sit there for a third hour even if I felt I could do much better. It also depends on your mood, I wrote a 300-word in class essay earlier in which I only had punctuation mistakes and the whole thing came in a flow, I didn't even have to go back in the text and deal with problems. (Eszter)

She attributed this phenomenon to be the result of time constraints, and she remarked that if it had not been for the TAP, she might have been quicker in brainstorming linking and reporting verbs. She added that there were a number of external factors that pressured her, such as time and word count, and that it was sometimes difficult to juggle everything she was expected to do in her head. By juggling, she meant having to pay attention to content, selecting and synthesizing sources, academic language, time, and word count.

Eszter also noted that having to write a literature review on a topic and sources pre-selected to her proved to be her biggest challenge. Although she found it acceptable to pre-select a topic and sources for the candidates of the exam, she noted that when it came to her own short research project in an earlier seminar, she found it easier to collect and select literature for herself. She also found it disturbing that in the preparation seminars, she was soon asked to produce a complete literature review, whereas she felt that she mostly struggled with smaller units of her text, such as linking, reporting, and academic style. She then quickly added that she gained confidence in paraphrasing ideas and using the APA referencing style because they had practised that extensively. Eszter expressed that she saw no point in having to copy the end-text references after her literature review from the task sheet because they were already presented on the task sheet itself; she did not have to know end-text referencing for the exam. She said that having to copy the references in this way was only another worrying factor that burned time.

Throughout the feedback session on her first draft, Eszter mainly asked questions about academic style, reporting words, quotation techniques, and her own voice in her text. She was reassured that the layout and the referencing in her text were good, and she asked to brainstorm some more appropriate reporting verbs. Eszter and the interviewer then proceeded to collect reporting verbs that can describe the function of the information being reported more specifically, such as when an author discusses a definition ('defines, states, conceptualises'), results ('reported, found, discovered, observed'), or implications ('highlights, emphasises, urges for, suggests'). Eszter also sought confirmation for using direct quotes only for definitions and concepts, even though in her first draft she did not use any direct quotes.

The discussion about referring to quotes soon resulted in a Q&A session about her own voice in a literature review. She had mentioned in the post-TAP interview that she was insecure about presenting her own ideas and questioning somebody else's. Even though the instructions for the short literature review writing task require candidates to work out their own views about topics, Eszter did not dare to include her own because she said that she was no authority on the subject. She also feared that contradicting certain sources based on her own opinion would be held against her. She added that these insecurities might stem from the fact that she knows little about the details of the topic under scrutiny in the exam papers, and this was the reason why she misinterpreted learner beliefs presented by two sources as empirical facts: "If something is not explicitly included in the source, I don't know how much I could add to it even though I think the *importance of grammar* [as claimed by one of the sources] is not that important" (Eszter).

Finally, Eszter felt that her confidence in writing a good literature review could be boosted by a more bottom-up approach to writing up a literature review. In her view, instead of being required to author a complete short literature review, a slower approach should be taken

with more focus on learning about the norms of academic English, reporting and linking within the specific genre, quotation styles, and comparing and contrasting ideas. In the exam task, she felt that she was not confident enough to work with the topic.

The issues above reflect a perceived lack of authenticity by Eszter. As previously discussed in the literature review, knowledge is the first element of Hyland's (2003) L2 writing model, yet candidates for the exam meet very specific topics for the first time. Even though candidates are EFL teacher majors and the topics are always selected from those that are discussed in the language pedagogy foundation course ending in an exam that the students pass by the time of the Academic English preparatory course, having to immerse in a selected topic based on sources proved to be a big difficulty for Eszter. The exam task starts with surveying the literature pre-selected to the candidates, which is the fourth step in a literature review writing process according to Machi and McEvoy (2016), following selecting the sources, developing the argument, and selecting the literature.

4.4 Data sources 4 and 5: Drafts 1 and 2

In exchange for volunteering for the research project, Eszter was promised feedback on her first draft as well as her second one. In order to see if the one-hour feedback session (Data source 3) resulted in an improved text based on the assessment of the reviewers, the researcher and a second blind reviewer evaluated her drafts using the assessment criteria of the actual exam task. Apart from the researcher, the blind reviews were provided by two additional faculty members (one co-rating Draft 1 and one co-rating Draft 2 with the researcher) who have taken part in the evaluation of such texts since the launch of this examination.

Because the focus of this research was to observe Eszter's learner behaviours, the points awarded to her by the two reviewers are detailed to support the claims of the Conclusions of this paper. The evaluations are presented in Table 4, and the drafts are included in the Appendices. When comparing the drafts, one should not forget that the second text was authored using a word processor at home, whereas the first one was handwritten during a think-aloud session, thus the environment in which the two drafts were authored in are very different. Still, it is worthwhile comparing the two sets of scores to confirm that personalised feedback focusing on Eszter's very own text and a rewrite following the feedback session resulted in a major increase (+ 8.25 points in average) in the exam points.

Criterion (max. 5 points each)	Draft 1		Draft 2	
	Reviewer 1	**Reviewer 2**	**Reviewer 1**	**Reviewer 2**
1. Genre-specific content features	1.5	2	4	4
2. Content	1.5	2	4	4
3. Organisation	2.5	3.5	5	5
4. Accuracy	2.5	3	3	3
5. Appropriacy	3	3	5	4
TOTAL POINTS	11	13.5	21	20
	Average: 12.25		Average: 20.5	

Table 4. The evaluations of Draft 1 and Draft 2 (pass mark: 10 points)

5 Conclusions

Based on the data collected concerning the learner behaviours an integrated academic learning to writing task may elicit in the case of an ELF pre-service teacher, a number of conclusions can be drawn. It was shown that the candidate worked linearly. Areas in which the candidate was most confident in received particular scrutiny in the preparatory courses, namely paraphrasing and using the APA referencing style, as well as areas that were not genre-specific, such as the organisation of the text.

Problem areas included genre-specific features, such as 1) the use of formal academic English style, 2) linking words, and 3) the use of reporting verbs. Based on Eszter's behaviours, it seems that more time is needed to develop these skills; the development should follow a more bottom-up approach and should start at least a semester earlier. Candidates might need more time and practice to become accustomed to working with pre-selected texts, because at first they themselves need to become acquainted with the topic they receive. Candidates also need more time to develop skills to incorporate their own voice in the text, because they do not dare question the sources or add their own ideas to their reviews. This might be overcome by providing more practice opportunities and personalised feedback.

An additional problem area was Eszter's concern with the purpose of a literature review. Based on the data collected, it seemed as though the participant had little idea why she was required to write a literature review and why the literature review was part of a high-stakes examination process. Although it is entirely based on the participant's observations and might not be the case, preparatory courses should be sure to further highlight or emphasise the role of literature reviews in real-life purposes, such as demonstrating knowledge in a certain field, positioning one's own research, identifying gaps in research, discovering shortcomings of works through critical analysis, and synthesizing knowledge (Bruce, 2014; Kwan, 2006; Sárdi, 2020; Torraco, 2005). Familiarizing exam candidates with the roles and functions of literature reviews more vocally might result in solving a number of problems by shifting their focus from secondary factors to content-related issues. This could be achieved by focusing more explicitly on the development of learners' paraphrasing, summarizing, and synthesising skills to ensure that the focus remains on the rhetorical goals of writing the literature review (Tankó, 2019) as opposed to the technicalities of EAP writing.

The time and word count of the literature review task are issues that should receive scrutiny, as these factors seem to interfere with the task focus of the candidates, which questions the validity of the test instrument (Knoch & Elder, 2010). Learners might focus too much on external factors (Oxford, 1990; Peacock, 2001) resulting in authoring a text they are not contented with. The time limit is also troublesome (Knoch & Elder, 2010) because it leaves no time for proper drafting. Interestingly, it seems that the participant of this study was aware of all the factors that hindered her work, but was resigned to the fact that they cannot be changed because of time limit and word count constraints, or lack of familiarity with the topic of the review. On the other hand, those areas that were covered more directly in preparatory courses resulted in more confident learner behaviour, such as paraphrasing and referencing. A specific problem area is the need for copying end-text references from the task sheet to the exam paper in handwriting, which appeared to be aimless this way. It might be worth considering printing the

list of the end-text references and asking the candidates to simply mark the ones they used in their texts.

Consequently, based on this case study, the following factors may be argued to be in need of greater attention by the mandate holders of this reading-into-writing task: 1) the organisation and content of the preparatory courses, 2) the time limit provided for the test, and 3) how content-specific knowledge of the candidates could be ensured that would result in more confident test-takers. With these considered, learners might be able to 1) focus more on language and contents, and 2) author better quality texts more confidently, because it seems that they can identify the shortcomings of their texts and are aware of the problem areas well before they even have to hand in their high-stakes exam text for evaluation.

It must be mentioned that this study included only one participant. Although the participant was purposefully selected by nomination of the instructor of the Academic English course after the submission of two short literature reviews, the findings of the research should not be generalised. Still, the findings might be transferable to other teaching contexts because of the rich and various types of data collected. The study managed to fulfil two very important purposes: 1) it revealed what types of learner behaviours are present during an integrated academic writing task, and 2) it proposed ways in which the mandate holders could revise the content of the preparatory courses and the test-taking environment. It might be advantageous to research tests and test elements (such as an academic writing task) more closely from a holistic approach, looking not only at test-taking strategies, but also at the content of the preparatory course, evidence of skills transfer, and the test-taking environment.

Possible directions of future research could be replicating the study with more participants and more literature review writing test papers, researching test construct validity by comparing the administration of the test type with and without time limit constraints (Knoch & Elder, 2010), and frequently and repeatedly analysing the needs of learners (Bocanegra-Valle, 2016). By involving more participants in the future, results could be compared and contrasted. If data reached a saturation point, individual learner differences (such as gender differences suggested by Oxford, 1990; Peacock, 2001) and common problem areas could be identified that would result in empirically sound conclusions which could lead to changes proposed and implemented in the exam or in the preparatory courses for candidates.

References

Benesch, S. (2001). *Critical English for academic purposes: Theory, politics and practice.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bocanegra-Valle, A. (2016). Needs analysis for curriculum design. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 560–576). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657455

Bowles, M. A. (2010). *The think-aloud controversy in second language research.* Routledge.

Brindley, G., & Ross, S. (2001). EAP assessment: Issues, models, and outcomes. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 148–166). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524766

Bruce, I. (2014). Expressing criticality in the literature review in research article introductions in applied linguistics and psychology. *English for Specific Purposes, 36,* 85–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.06.004

Cooper, A., & Bikowski, D. (2007). Writing at the graduate level: What tasks do professors actually require? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6,* 206–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.008

Csizér, K., & Tankó, Gy. (2017). English majors' self-regulatory control strategy use in academic writing and its relation to L2 motivation. *Applied Linguistics, 38*(3), 386–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amv033

Duff, P. A. (2012). How to carry out case study research. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide* (pp. 74–94). Wiley-Blackwell.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1984). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data*. MIT Press.

Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data* (Revised edition). MIT Press.

Flower, L. (1990). The role of task representation in reading-to-write. In L. Flower, V. Stein, J. Ackerman, M. J. Kantz, K. McCormick, & W. C. Peck (Eds.), *Reading to write: Exploring a cognitive & social process* (pp. 35–75). Oxford University Press.

Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). Issues in EAP: A preliminary perspective. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 8–24). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524766

Hirvela, A. (2016). Academic reading into writing. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 127–138). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657455

Hyland, K. (2002). *Teaching and researching writing.* Longman.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing.* Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2016). General and specific EAP. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 17–29). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657455

Knoch, U., & Elder, C. (2010). Validity and fairness implications of varying time conditions on a diagnostic test of English academic writing proficiency. *System, 38*(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.006

Kwan, B. S. C. (2006). The schematic structure of literature reviews in doctoral theses in applied linguistics. *English for Specific Purposes, 25,* 30–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.06.001

Lillis, T., & Tuck, J. (2016). Academic Literacies: A critical lens on writing and reading in the academy. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 30–43). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657455

Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). *The literature review: Six steps to success*. Corwin Press.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). Styles, strategies, and aptitude: Connections for language learning. In T. Parry & C. W. Stansfield (Eds.), *Language aptitude reconsidered* (pp. 67–125). Prentice Hall Regents.

Paltridge, B. (2001). Linguistic research and EAP pedagogy. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 55–70). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524766

Peacock, M. (2001). Language learning strategies and EAP proficiency: Teacher views, student views, and test results. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 268–285). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524766

Plakans, I., Liao, J., & Wang, F. (2019). "I should summarize this whole paragraph": Shared processes of reading and writing in iterative integrated tasks. *System, 40,* 14–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2019.03.003

Reményi, A. Á. (2019). *Text production test paper on language learner beliefs* [Measurement instrument].

Sárdi, Cs. (2020). „Óriások vállán álltam." A szerzői identitás megjelenése angol nyelvpedagógiai szakdolgozatokban ["Standing on the shoulders of giants:" Author identity in Hungarian students' MA TEFL theses]. In Á. Fóris, T. M. Pintér, Sz. Szoták, & D. M. Tamás (Eds.), *Nyelv, kultúra, identitás I. Terminológia, lexikográfia, fordítás [Digitális kiadás] [Language, culture, identity I. Terminology, lexicography, translation] [Digital edition].* Akadémiai Kiadó. https://doi.org/10.1556/9789634545354

Swales, J. (1990a). *Genre Analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. (1990b). Occluded genres in the academy: The case of the submission letter. In E. Ventola & A. Maureen (Eds.), *Academic Writing* (pp. 45–58). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.41.06swa

Tankó, Gy. (2019). *Paraphrasing, summarising and synthesising skills for academic writers: Theory and practice (2nd rev. ed.).* Eötvös University Press.

Torraco, R. J. (2005). Writing integrative literature reviews: using the past and present to explore the future. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*(3), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1534484305278283

Weigle, S. C., & Malone, M. E. (2016). Assessment of English for Academic Purposes. In K. Hyland & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for Academic Purposes* (pp. 608–620). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315657455

APPENDIX A: Text production test paper on language learner beliefs (Reményi, 2019)

TEXT PRODUCTION
Time: 90 minutes

In this part of the exam, you are going to write a subchapter of a literature review as a part of an academic paper. It is supposed to be cca. 400 words, plus the references list.

What are "language learner beliefs?" What are they like? Are they advantageous or disadvantageous for successful learning? What should a teacher do about them?

Write a literature review as a chapter of a paper on your research about language learning beliefs. Work out your own definition in comparison with those by others (listed below), quoting them as appropriate. Remember to add a list of your references at the end, APA-format. You do not need to insert all sources into your discussion.

Horwitz's (1999, p. 563) results show that, according to foreign language (FL) students' beliefs, age plays a role in FL learning aptitude.	Pintrich and De Groot (1990, pp. 37-38): learners who perceive their studies as important or interesting show higher degrees of perseverance in their work.
'Language learners' beliefs' refer to what a person knows about learning in general, or, more specifically, language learning (Wenden, 1999, p. 435). Beliefs play a role when decisions are made or strategies are developed in relation with language learning.	Knowledge of students' beliefs about language learning may provide language educators with a better understanding of their students' "expectations of, commitment to, success in and satisfaction with their language classes" (Horwitz, 1999, p. 568).
Beliefs play a decisive role in language learners' success, failure and experiences (Cotterall, 1999, p. 493). By being informed about their learners' beliefs teachers can adopt 2a more sensitive approach to the organization of learning opportunities" (Cotterall, 1999, p. 494) in their lessons.	Beliefs are quite a stable factor, persistent, hard to change and intertwined with basic personality traits. They "act as very strong filters of reality" (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005, p. 3, quoting Arnold 1999, p. 256) so even if experience seems to contradict beliefs, beliefs remain basically unchanged.
Siebert's (2003) found males rated their own fellow citizens' abilities more highly, and believed that a language could be learnt in a shorter time than women did. More male than female students also believed that the learning of grammar was the most important part of language learning, and that practising with audio-visual material was crucial.	"if students develop or maintain misconceptions about their own learning, if they attribute undue importance to factors that are external to their own action, [...] they are not likely to adopt a responsible and active attitude in their approach to learning and may never become autonomous" (Victori & Lockhart 1995, p. 225).
Language learner beliefs are "general assumptions that students hold about themselves as learners, about factors influencing learning and about the nature of language learning" (Victori & Lockhart, 2005, p. 224).	Bacon and Finnemann (1992) found that the women in their study were more motivated, more open to authentic input and had a more positive attitude to target language speakers.
Participants seemed to agree "that making mistakes is a natural part of language learning, that different people learn languages in different ways and that language learning takes a long time." They "indicated their willingness to adopt and accept responsibility for employing a range of key language learning strategies such as analysing needs (Item 9), setting goals (Item 18) and planning their learning" (Cotterall 1999, p. 507-508).	"the concept of language learning beliefs […] is a highly useful notion for practical purposes. […] creating realistic learner beliefs is an important motivational strategy, and periodically administering [a related questionnaire] to groups of learners is a valuable means of raising their awareness of the nature of language learning" (Dörnyei 2005, p. 217).

References

Arnold, J. (1999). Affect in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bacon, S. M., & Finnemann, M. D. (1992). Sex differences in self-reported beliefs about foreign language learning and authentic oral and written input. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 471–495.

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, M. (2005). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications and new research directions. TESLJ-EJ, 9(1).

Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: What do learners believe about them? System, 27, 493-513.

Dörnyei, Z. (2005). The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition. Mahwah, NJ - London: Erlbaum.

Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: A review of BALLI studies. System, 27, 557-576.

Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E.V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 33-40.

Siebert, L.L. (2003). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning. The ORTESOL Journal, 21, 7-39.

Victori, M., & Lockhart, W. (1995). Enhancing metacognition in self-directed language learning. System, 23, 223- 234.

Wenden, A. L. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics. System, 27: 435-441.

APPENDIX B: Draft 1

Draft 1: Language Learnr Belief's: A Literature Review

There is a number of existing literature on language learner beliefs. Arnold (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005, p. 3, quoting Arnold 1999, p. 256) highlights the importance of personality traits being intertwined with beliefs, furthermore Horwitz (1999, p. 563) emphasizes the role of age. Besides age, Siebert (2003) found that men were more efficient, than women in learning a language, although Bacon and Finnemann (1992) discovered that women had more motivation and willingness to use authentic input.

Beliefs are hard to change, despite having contradicting experiences, writes Arnold. (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005, p. 3, quoting Arnold 1999, p. 256). Experiences might change our outlook on life, but our beliefs are likely to remain the same. From a teacher's point of view this is the source of great difficulty. Students are prone to failure if their beliefs differ from their teacher's. Therefore, teachers are advised to bear this information in mind when trying to introduce new language learning strategies.

In addition to beliefs remaining the same, age is another factor, which has a great impact on the learner's aptitude, highlights Horwitz's (1999, p. 563). This is highly relevant for both teachers and learners. An elderly learner might not have the aptitude needed for quicker progress, although a younger child might make faster progress than expected.

Another factor to be considered is the learner's sex. Siebert (2003) concluded, that men are faster when it comes to acquisition, and more male students emphasised the importance of

grammar. The results of Siebert's (2003) study shows that the more successful sex believed grammar to be the number one method of learning and this contradicts today's approach towards language teaching.

In contrast to the previously mentioned study, Bacon and Finnemann (1992) discovered that women had more motivation than men and more willingness towards authentic input. Interestingly, the two studies together seem to question the usefulness of authentic input and communication with the target language speakers.

In conclusion, Horwitz (1999, p. 568) describes language learning beliefs as a source to provide language educators a better understanding of their students' ideas and experiences. Therefore, teachers are inclined to find out as much information as possible about their language learner's beliefs, since it might lead to quicker progress.

References

Arnold, J. (1999). *Affect in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bacon, S. M., & Finnemann, M. D. (1992). Sex differences in self-reported beliefs about foreign language learning and authentic oral and written input. *Language Learning, 42*(4), 471–495.

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, M. (2005). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications and new research directions. *TESLJ-EJ, 9*(1).

Horwitz, E.K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: A review of BALLI studies. *System, 27*, 557-576.

Siebert, L.L. (2003). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning. *The ORTESOL Journal, 21*, 7-39.

APPENDIX C: Draft 2

Draft 2: Language Learner Belief's: A Literature Review

There is much existing literature on language learner beliefs. According to Wenden (1999, p. 435) language learner beliefs are the individual's knowledge about language learning in general. Learners have different notions and ideas, when it comes to acquiring a language. Horwitz emphasises the role of age, while Siebert found, that men and women have different beliefs towards language learning. Moreover, Bacon and Finnemann (1992) examined the controversy in motivation between the two genders. Based on the sources reviewed, language learning beliefs are the various ideas, which learners possess about the process of learning a language.

Beliefs are hard to change, despite having contradictory experiences, claims Arnold (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005, p. 3. quoting Arnold 1999, p. 256). Consequently, there is little likelihood of learners shaping their beliefs for the better, even when encounters would indicate otherwise. Furthermore, Cotteral (1999, p. 494) emphasised that it is of high importance, that teachers find out as much information as possible about their learner's beliefs, so they can adopt a more sensitive approach, when designing materials. It is essential, that teachers take their learners' beliefs into account, since it might result in faster progress.

Horwitz (1999, p. 563) states, that FL students believe age to be one of the factors, which have a great impact on aptitude. Hence, a more mature learner might not have the aptitude, that is, the natural ability to make faster progress. However, slower progress with more mature learners can be attributed to the belief mentioned previously. As seen above, beliefs are influential factors, and they can influence learning both positively and negatively.

Another component to be examined is the learner's gender. Siebert (2003) concluded that men rated their own abilities more highly than of women's. Male learners also emphasised grammar as the key to progress. In contrast, Bacon and Finnemann (1992) discovered that women had more motivation and more willingness towards authentic input. Interestingly, the two studies together seem to question the usefulness of authentic input and communication with target language speakers. However, this is questionable, and drawing a conclusion from it would be inadvisable, since the first research only examined male learner's beliefs and there is no data on actual success rates.

In conclusion, language learner beliefs are the divergent assumptions learners inherently possess about language learning in general. Moreover, these can be the source to provide language educators a better understanding of their students' ideas (Horwitz 1999, p. 568). From a teacher's point of view, beliefs can be exploited in the learning process, but they can also be the source of hindrance, when they are materialised as misconceptions. Hence, it's the teacher's responsibility to discover the learner's belief and act accordingly.

References

Arnold, J. (1999). Affect in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bacon, S. M., & Finnemann, M. D. (1992). Sex differences in self-reported beliefs about foreign language learning and authentic oral and written input. Language Learning, 42(4), 471–495.

Cotterall, S. (1999). Key variables in language learning: What do learners believe about them? System, 27, 493-513.

Horwitz, E. K. (1999). Cultural and situational influences on foreign language learners' beliefs about language learning: A review of BALLI studies. System, 27, 557-576.

Siebert, L. L. (2003). Pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs about foreign language learning. The ORTESOL Journal, 21, 7-39.

Wenden, A. L. (1999). An introduction to metacognitive knowledge and beliefs in language learning: Beyond the basics. System, 27, 435-441.