

Process genre approach to L2 academic writing: An intervention study

Svetlana Hanusova – Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova – Marie Lahodova
Valisova – Marketa Matulova

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2020.13.04.03

Abstract

The paper presents the research study of academic writing of Czech university students in an English Language Teacher Education study program. The authors apply an interdisciplinary approach integrating the perspectives of linguistics and language pedagogy in the evaluation of the design of the Academic Writing course and its impact on the development of students' academic writing skills. Adopting a process genre approach (Badger, White, 2000) to writing instruction as a key design principle, our study combines the genre analysis framework (Swales, 1990) and the intercultural rhetoric perspective (Connor, 2004) to design an innovated academic writing course for graduate students focusing on developing critical thinking skills and context-aware writing. The course, informed by an analysis of the academic writing needs of the students, aimed at familiarizing them with the rhetorical structure of academic texts with a focus on the genre of the Master's thesis and at introducing them to the academic writing conventions in the area of soft sciences. Piloted in 2019, the course was implemented as a blended course, where the contact sessions were complemented by online support in VLE Moodle. Apart from analyses of written texts, classroom writing, and homework tasks, it also included discourse editing tasks and peer-reviewing with peer-reviewer feedback and teacher feedback. We believe that our research findings will shed light on the potential of academic writing courses based on the process-genre approach to contribute to the enhancement of the quality of English academic texts by non-native academic writers, and specifically Czech graduate students.

Key words: academic writing, blended learning, process-genre approach, needs assessment, discourse completion tasks

Introduction

The need to study and research written academic discourse from an intercultural perspective stems from the overall globalization of the academic environment and the increasing role of English as the dominant language of academic communication. As a result, the ways in which academic knowledge is presented and disseminated have changed considerably, with a significant impact on most epistemological and educational traditions in Europe (see Bennett 2014; Burgess, Martin-Martin, 2008; Connor, 2004, 2011; Suomela-Salmi, Dervin, 2009; Swales, 1997). To reach an international audience, multilingual researchers and students from different European academic communities must present their knowledge and communicate with readers through English as a lingua franca, which means adapting the written academic discourse to common Anglophone conventions in this field. It is therefore not surprising that the teaching and learning of academic writing skills in English have recently become central issues of interest for numerous linguistically and pedagogically oriented studies dealing with the assessment of non-native writers' performance in terms of genre, disciplinary and cross-cultural variation, which are intended to inform the designing of courses aimed at developing students' communicative competence in an academic setting (e.g. Duszak, 1997; Hyland, 2002a; Hewings, 2006; Paltridge, Starfield 2007; Neff-van Aertselaer, 2013; Muller, Gregoric, Rowland, 2017; Badenhorst, 2018; Jones, 2018; Link, 2018; Van der Loo, Kraemer, Van Amelsvoort, 2018; Hsiao, 2019; Maher, Milligan, 2019).

This intervention study aims at contributing to this line of research by investigating the development of the English-medium academic writing of Czech university graduate students. Adopting a process-genre approach (Badger, White, 2000) to writing instruction, we combined the genre analysis framework (Swales, 1990) and the intercultural rhetoric perspective (Connor, 2004) to design an innovative academic writing course for graduate students.

The development of the innovative course of Academic Writing followed the principles of the cyclical process of curriculum design (Graves, 2000) and was based on the findings of corpus-based and genre research and a needs analysis survey focusing on students' target linguistic needs (Hutchinson, Waters, 1987).

To report the instructional writing intervention in a systematic way, the reporting system of Rijlaarsdam and colleagues (2018), further developed by Bouwer and De Smedt (2018), was employed. The key elements of the system include: the context (the aim of the intervention, target group, contextual factors), the theoretical and/or empirical rationale, and key design principles of the intervention at the macro-level (instructional focus, instructional mode, sequencing of instructional activities) and at the micro-level (instructional activities, learning activities and instructional materials) (Bouwer, De Smedt, 2018: 122 -127).

An additional aim of the study is to monitor the students' progress and their reflection on their learning experience during the course.

Context

The target group is represented by students in the Master's degree program of English Language Teacher Education in the Czech Republic whose mother tongue is Czech and who are to complete their study program with the defense of a Master's thesis written in English.

All the participants study English as a foreign language, and they are advanced users of English at the C1 level according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (2001). Some of the students completed their Bachelor's degree program at our university, while others came from other universities, mainly in the Czech Republic. A majority of the students wrote a Bachelor's thesis in English, but there were also students whose Bachelor's thesis was written and defended in the Czech language.

The participants took an innovative course of Academic Writing, which was offered as a required course in the first year of their study program. It was delivered by one of the authors of the text, who was also the course designer in the spring semester of 2019. The course was taught exclusively in English, and also all the data in this study were collected in English.

As the Czech speaking students often struggle with the conventions of academic writing in English, we decided to assess their needs via a questionnaire survey and analyze their academic texts prior to the course. The course for graduate students was designed as a blended one (contact sessions supplemented with e-learning support in the Virtual Learning Environment Moodle). It represented the main writing support for graduate students as Czech universities do not offer services of centralized writing centers that are common at many universities worldwide. However, the fact that the course is embedded in the study program and therefore is discipline-specific can be seen as an advantage (cf. Wingate, 2010).

Prior to the intervention, a needs analysis survey and analysis of Theme patterns and Theme realisations in Master's theses written by students in the ELTE study program and defended at the Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University between the years 2010 and 2018 were carried out.

The results of the analysis of Master's theses indicated that graduate students have an awareness of the crucial role that the theme zone plays in the build-up of discourse

coherence; however, they show a strong tendency to use only simple and two-component Theme patterns (textual + topical, and interpersonal + topical), generally overuse textual Themes (e.g. *firstly, however, for example*) and underuse interpersonal Themes (e.g. *surprisingly, to my mind, of course*) (Dontcheva-Navratilova et al., 2020). This suggests that the Master's theses of Czech graduate students show typical features of learner discourse, especially as far as the overuse of textual Themes is concerned (e.g. Adel, 2006; Gao, 2016; Wei, 2016; Chang, Lee, 2019), while the underuse of interpersonal Themes may be affected by linguacultural factors (Cmejrkova, Danes, 1997). These findings indicate that students' writing skills in the area of writer-reader interaction and persuasive argumentation need to be further enhanced.

The needs analysis was realized by means of a questionnaire survey inspired by similar instruments in published studies (Xudong et al., 2014; Chitez et al., 2015; Link, 2018). The questionnaire was filled in by 67 graduate students. The results revealed that the students are well aware of the importance of academic writing skills related to the organization of the text, flow of the argument, and linguistic aspects but seem to underestimate some key aspects, including the expression of authorial stance and engagement with the reader and other advanced argumentative skills (for details see Jancarikova et al., 2020). Therefore, we decided to focus not only on the aspects that the students identified as crucial for their academic writing skills development but also on the aspects mentioned above that, in our view, fall under students' unconscious incompetence (Huang, 2010: 533).

Whereas before the innovations, the focus of the Academic Writing course was mostly limited to academic vocabulary, formality, and citation styles, after the needs analysis and thematic analysis of the Master's theses, we decided to adopt a process-genre approach and prioritize the teaching and learning of rhetorical moves, coherent argumentation and writer-reader interaction focusing on Anglophone academic writing conventions of disciplines and genres within soft sciences.

The intervention aimed at enhancing students' academic writing skills, i.e. their ability to use English appropriately in writing for academic purposes and to conform to the rhetorical conventions of academic English when writing course assignments and Master's theses. It specifically focused on building authorial identity and communicating with the readers, writing argumentative texts using the problem-solution and cause-effect patterns, critical evaluation of sources, and references to sources. The students were encouraged to abide by the Anglophone academic style conventions in terms of formality, writer-reader interaction, academic vocabulary, and phraseology. They were expected to be able to apply the appropriate rhetorical structure of the genre of a Master's thesis. As future teachers of English as a foreign language, they were also supposed to be able to transfer the new knowledge and skills into teaching writing in English lessons at lower secondary schools and work with relevant academic genres.

Genre structure, coherent argumentation, the build-up of a credible authorial persona, and engaging with the reader are essential aspects of academic writing seen as a "persuasive endeavor" in which the writer's ability to develop an argument, step into the text and develop an appropriate relationship with readers is indispensable for the acceptance of the writer's claims and findings by readers (cf. Hyland, 2001). However, these aspects of academic writing are typically regarded as more challenging by students as they presuppose a greater degree of self-confidence and exposure to academic texts. Since successful academic writing presupposes the use of rhetorical and language choices which are established in the discursive practice of a specific disciplinary community and which this community finds convincing (Hyland, 2008), it is necessary to introduce graduate students to the academic writing conventions that they need to follow when they aspire to write their Master's theses and complete their university studies.

Theoretical framework

Academic writing of Czech speakers of English

Academic writing of non-native speakers of English has been at the center of researchers' attention for decades. The tension between pragmatic EAP (emphasizing the necessity for non-native speakers of English to comply with the conventions of Anglo-American writing) and critical EAP (claiming that academic discourse practices are socially constructed and can be challenged and /or changed by non-native authors) has been largely dealt with by corpus-based critical pragmatism, which distinguishes between conventions that should never be flouted (such as substantiating arguments or avoiding plagiarism) and those that can be open to challenge (e.g. use of personal pronouns) (Clark, 1992 in Harwood, Hadley, 2004: 367). It is this critical pragmatism that was adopted as the approach underlying the decisions made when designing the innovated course of Academic Writing. This approach allows the instructor to raise the students' awareness of the Anglophone academic writing conventions that are generally expected in English-medium academic discourse, while at the same time leaving them the possibility to make contextually motivated choices when they endeavor to bridge the gap between the Czech academic writing conventions in which they have been socialized and the Anglophone writing norms which are dominant in globalized academia.

Academic writing in the university context is situated within the expectations of the community (Link, 2018: 4). In our case, the clash of the expectations stemming from the standards of Czech academic writing, and on the other hand, the principles of Anglophone academic writing had to be considered. Dontcheva-Navratilova dealt with the divergences between the two academic discourse communities in her research (e.g. 2013, 2014, 2018). The main contrasts between the literacy traditions of the respective communities (drawing on previous research (e.g. Chamonikolasova, 2005; Cmejrkova, 1996; Duszak, 1997; Staskova, 2005) are illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1: Academic discourse traditions: Czech vs. English (Dontcheva-Navratilova, 2014: 42)

Anglophone academic discourse	Czech academic discourse
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• competitive large discourse community• explicit discourse organisation• strict discourse norms• negotiation of meaning• interactive, dialogic• reader-oriented• marked authorial presence	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• small discourse community avoiding tension• low on explicit discourse organisation• absence of strict discourse norms• conceptual and terminological clarity• low-interactive, monologic• writer-oriented• backgrounded authorial presence

The Czech academic discourse tradition handles discourse organization and writer-reader communication differently from the Anglophone tradition. Therefore, these aspects may be most significantly affected in the academic texts of Czech authors writing in English. Dontcheva-Navratilova concludes that “under the pressure of the Anglophone center the English-medium discourse of Czech linguists is undergoing substantial change giving rise to ‘hybridizing forms’ which reflect the tension deriving from intercultural clashes” (2014: 42).

Process genre approach

The process genre approach proposed by Badger and White (2000) that was adopted for the purpose of the course design represents a synthesis of positive features of three recent approaches to writing instruction, namely the product approach, the

process approach, and the genre approach. The process and product approaches to writing instruction, prevailing at the end of the 20th century, were challenged by genre approaches in the last decade of the century (e.g. Swales, 1990). Whereas product approaches perceived writing as primarily dependent on linguistic knowledge comprising appropriate use of academic vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devices (Pincas, 1982 in Badger, White, 2000: 153), process approaches emphasized the stages of writing, including planning, drafting, revising and editing. The fact that neither of them paid appropriate attention to the context and purpose of writing led to the development of genre approaches that conceive writing as a social practice. Badger and White see them as an extension to the product approach as the students are encouraged to use their knowledge of the language, content, and context to produce written discourse for communication in a specific context and for a specific purpose. They are instructed to imitate model texts and consciously apply rules. The process genre approach draws on all of the approaches discussed above. Similarly to the product, process, and genre approaches, writing involves knowledge about language, knowledge of context and purpose of writing, and skills in using language. The process genre approach can be seen as a learner-centered approach as teachers are encouraged to act in a flexible manner, accommodating the needs of the specific group of learners. Corpora of target texts and charts for illustrating generic structures are used as key instructional materials. When facing a lack of knowledge, the learners are expected to rely on three sources: the teacher, other learners, and examples of the target genre (Badger, White, 2000: 159).

Empirical research review

When looking for relevant research studies focusing on academic writing in connection with the process genre approach, genre analysis framework, critical thinking skills, and student feedback in the context of course innovation, course design, and teacher education, we searched the Web of Science for papers from the years 2010 – 2020. The search yielded 193 papers, out of which 20 were relevant. An additional seven papers were found on Google scholar.

Most studies dealing with courses of academic writing were set in the context of academic writing in English, some of them focusing explicitly on non-native speakers of English (Min, 2016; de Armijos, 2016, 2017; Ho Pham, 2019; Ravari, Tan, 2019; Murray, Yamamoto, 2019; Plakhotnik et al., 2020). However, also some studies referring to academic writing in languages other than English were found to be relevant (e.g. Boscolo, Arfe, Quarisa, 2007; Van der Loo, Krahmer, Van Amelsvoort, 2018). Most papers reported small-scale studies, dealing with one cohort of students attending a course of academic writing. We primarily included the studies that focused on graduate students, but we also refer to some studies focusing on undergraduate students, which are inspiring for our research for some reason (e.g. Wingate, 2010).

Experimental and quasi-experimental studies of an interdisciplinary character often focused on individual differences among learners. Some dealt with learner beliefs (Boscolo, Arfe, Quarisa, 2007), self-efficacy (Plakhotnik et al., 2020), while others focused on metacognition of the learners as the ability to plan, control, monitor, and critically evaluate their learning (de Armijos, 2016; Negretti, 2017).

Learner beliefs as an example of cognitive factors were researched in an intervention study that presented a course of academic writing for undergraduate psychology students in Italy (Boscolo, Arfe, Quarisa, 2007). The authors followed a pre-test post-test design focusing not only on the performance of the students in writing but also on the development of students' beliefs about academic writing. Whereas the writing performance improved considerably after the intervention, the beliefs remained basically untouched. Negretti (2017) employed the framework of calibration from educational psychology to investigate the relationship between the accuracy of

graduate students' metacognitive judgments and the quality of their texts. She observed that the more successful authors of academic texts also displayed more accurate metacognitive judgments that were deeper and better aligned with external requirements. The alignment included genre awareness and also the students' ability to meet the course criteria and objectives.

Plakhotnik et al. (2020) explored writing self-efficacy in management students at an English-Medium Instruction university in Russia. They identified factors that contribute to the increase in self-efficacy of the students after a relatively short course of academic writing (seven sessions in seven weeks), including writing research papers in groups and explicit focus on research and genre of writing rather than the development of English as a second language.

A number of studies analyzed different instructional methods, principles, and technologies suitable for academic writing development. Van der Loo, Krahmer, and Van Amelsvoort (2018) employed experimental design in the context of a course of Dutch for academic purposes and compared observational learning and learning by doing. Their results indicate that observational learning has potential in academic writing courses. For learners who were identified as revisers (as opposed to planners), learning by observation was even more effective than learning by doing. It is noteworthy that observational learning does not have to entail reading high-quality texts only. Reading and analyzing texts of other learners also counts as observational learning. Xu and Li (2018) also emphasized the benefits of learning through reading and analyzing journal articles, which they employed in their academic writing program in China rooted in the process genre approach. They reported progress in their students' critical understanding of the genre of disciplinary-specific academic writing.

The value of explicit instruction in genre writing and the potential to improve academic writing skills even after an intervention of a relatively limited length was emphasized in studies focusing on different international contexts at the tertiary level. Muller, Gregoric, and Rowland (2017) measured the improvement in the accuracy of ESL doctoral students after only 16 weeks of support and identified substantial gains. Rakedzon and Baram-Tsabari (2016) evaluated the improvement of students' academic writing and popular science writing as a result of attending an academic writing course. They concluded that even a single genre intervention might facilitate progress in genre writing. Boscolo, Arfe, and Quarisa (2007) and de Armijos (2017) also reported improvements in writing performance after a relatively short intervention. Having come to similar conclusions, Xu and Li (2018) maintain that the traditional focus on advanced linguistic skills in academic writing courses should give way to the explicit teaching of disciplinary genres. In the same vein, Murray and Yamamoto (2019) speak about "developing the act of writing" (2019: 1) rather than focusing on presumed language deficiencies.

The suggestions proposed by Hsiao (2019) are even more specific. She emphasized the value of explicit teaching of authorial stance, starting from developing the students' awareness of different linguistic resources that express evaluation, maintaining that the students should not just rigidly follow "certain patterns as templates to construe evaluative stances and ignore evaluation as dialogic and dynamic in context" (2019: 180).

Link (2018) discussed graduate writing workshops focusing on writing dissertations. She emphasized that it is vital to tailor writing support to the needs of the learners as identified by a rigorous needs assessment. She carried out needs assessment involving both students and the faculty (resulting in some striking differences between the views of these two stakeholder groups). For the design of the writing workshops, she draws on Merrill's instructional theory of writing (2018: 375), which promotes five principles: focusing on solving a real-world problem, activation

of existing knowledge, demonstration of new knowledge, application of new knowledge, and integration of new knowledge into the learner's world.

Some of the authors focused on academic writing support or courses provided exclusively online. Cotos, Link, and Huffman (2017) employed the method of data-driven learning (DDL) and its impact on genre writing. They employed a web-based platform containing an English language corpus and investigated what the impact of the work with corpora on genre learning and writing improvement is. The findings show that both native and non-native writers benefit from work with corpora, especially in rhetorical, formal, and procedural aspects of genre knowledge. Stanchevici and Siczek (2019) converted a face-to-face course of English for Academic Purposes into a fully online mode and compared its effectiveness. They claim they achieved comparable outcomes in both versions of the course.

Formative feedback and peer feedback were recurrent topics in a number of studies (e.g. Wingate, 2010; Muller, Gregoric, Rowland, 2017; Odena, Burgess, 2017; Huisman et al., 2018; Ho Pham, 2019).

Wingate (2010) studied the impact of formative feedback in the context of an academic writing module in an undergraduate program of applied linguistics. She found out that the feedback the instructors provided had an impact on the students' writing skills. However, not all students in her study improved, which led her to investigate the reasons for engagement or non-engagement with the feedback. The interviews with the students revealed that the factors decisive for the uptake were motivation based on the enjoyment of the course and self-perception of the students as writers. Wingate also maintains that the quality of feedback is highly important, especially for students with low motivation and a low self-perception who can be easily discouraged by the feedback that is not comprehensible and sensitive.

Supervisor feedback emerged as one of the dominant themes in the interviews with doctoral and graduate students in the research study realized by Odena and Burgess, (2017). The generative model of academic writing development the authors proposed with the data from in-depth interviews with students included three components: tailored feedback, personal resilience, and support network. In order to be perceived as beneficial, the supervisor's feedback had to be tailored to suit the changing learning needs of the students and scaffold independent thinking development.

The studies of Huisman et al. (2018) and Ho Pham (2019) focused specifically on peer feedback. Huisman et al. (2018) analyzed the influence of providing feedback and receiving feedback in their quasi-experimental study. They concluded that both providers and receivers benefitted in a comparable way as both processes had a positive impact on students' performance in an authentic academic writing assignment. Ho Pham (2019) investigated the effects of a lecturer's model e-comments on graduate students' peer e-comments and the effects of a lecturer's and peer comments on writing revisions. Based on their findings, they recommend that instructors should provide model feedback comments to inspire more beneficial peer feedback that focuses more on global issues than specific details. The fact that the study did not reveal any statistically significant differences in the effects of the lecturer's feedback and peer feedback on writing revisions suggests that it is worth training and inspiring students to be able to provide high-quality feedback, which can contribute to revisions of texts in the same way as the lecturer's feedback. At the same time, dependency on the feedback from the instructor will be reduced.

As follows from the above review of research, teaching academic writing is a highly specialized field, which poses specific demands on the quality of the instructors. Xu and Li (2018) and Plakhotnik et al. (2020) recommend that attention should be paid to the nomination of the instructors. The instructors should not only have a background in advanced English, but they should also have experience with

writing research reports, and they should be offered in-service training to be able to cope with the challenging requirements of academic writing instruction.

Description of the intervention: the innovated course of Academic Writing at the Faculty of Education of Masaryk University

In order to present the intervention systematically, the guidelines of Rijlaarsdam et al. (2018) and Bouwer and De Smedt (2018) were followed. After presenting key design principles that include the context, the macro level, and micro-level components are specified.

Key design principles of the innovated course were rooted in the process-genre approach (Badger, White, 2000) and inspired by Graves' (2000) concept of the cyclical process of curriculum development. According to Graves, the key components of the curriculum development include the conceptualization of content, needs assessment, formulations of goals and objectives, materials development, assessment plan, and organization of the course (2000: 4). After completing the cycle, the course evaluation, which yields suggestions for improvements, should be realized. Graves claims the curriculum development cycle has no fixed starting point, but it is vital to go round the whole cycle without omitting any items and repeat the cycle multiple times so as to develop the course in stages.

The starting point for the innovated course of Academic Writing was needs analysis, comprising a questionnaire survey and a linguistic analysis of Master's theses. The formulations of the course objectives were based on needs analysis. The course overtly focused on the Master's thesis as the most complex piece of writing that the students produce during the course of their studies.

The connections between communicative purpose(s) of the text, the audience students address, and the rhetorical strategies and language necessary to achieve these purposes were made explicit throughout the course. The choices and existing cross-disciplinary, cross-genre, and cross-cultural variations were stressed. At the same time, a critical approach allowing students to challenge and deviate from patterns in valued texts was built in. The teacher acted as an adviser and facilitator, scaffolding students' learning and encouraging their creativity.

The course assessment followed the principles of assessment for learning (Black, William, 1998; Black et al., 2003), which is inherently formative. The formative aspects were achieved by the continuous character of the assessment and peer feedback and peer assessment, which contributed to the students being actively involved.

The last key component of Graves' cycle, course evaluation, is described in Section 5 of this paper.

The components of the course at **the macro level** include the content, the model, and the sequence of intervention (Bouwer, De Smedt, 2018: 122 -127). The content is specified in the syllabus of the innovated course of Academic writing and includes the following areas:

1. Academic writing - context, conventions, approaches. The genre of a Master's thesis.
2. Writing Introductions. General-specific openings and thesis statements
3. Writing the Thesis statement. Personal vs. impersonal stance.
4. Writing the Literature review. Citing sources.
5. Coherent information flow - topic development.
6. Describing data and method. The problem-solution pattern
7. The cause-effect pattern. Coherent information flow - connectors.
8. Reporting results and findings. Presenting arguments, expressing stance.
9. Writing the Conclusions. Comparison and contrast.

10. Writing the Summary.

The course was delivered as a blended course with a certain number of contact sessions (12 for combined students and 24 for full-time students) and e-learning support in VLE Moodle.

The course enabled a combination of learning by observation and learning by doing (cf. also Van der Loo, Krahmer, Van Amelsvoort, 2018). In the contact sessions, each module of the course focused on a specific section of the Master's thesis as a genre. The teacher explained and discussed with the students the purpose of each Master's thesis section and provided students with model texts for analysis. Specific rhetorical patterns, such as the problem-solution and the cause-effect patterns, were presented, discussed, and practiced, focusing on specific language resources associated with them. In the full-time study group, the contact sessions comprised a group writing component for producing the first draft of a text representing (a part of) the target Master's thesis section, while text editing and producing a second draft was assigned as a homework task. Preparation for contact sessions also included focused practice aiming at enhancing the writing skills of students in the area of expressing stance, personality, and impersonality and creating a cohesive text.

In VLE Moodle the teacher presented study materials providing students with model texts, guided writing modules, focused language practice, and reference to online sources, such as citation style guides, the Academic Wordlist, and the Academic Phrase Bank. An important component of the Moodle course was the Workshop module in which students produced texts which were then peer-reviewed by a randomly selected student and assessed by the teacher, who also provided feedback on the peer-review. The course comprised three Workshop modules focusing on different types of writing assignments (see Table 2 for details). The students were instructed that peer reviews should focus on the following criteria:

- The length of the text
- Content corresponding to the title
- The typical rhetorical organization of the section
- Logical structure and coherent flow of the text
- Well organized paragraphs
- Written academic English (e.g. grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, spelling, punctuation)

They also allocated points for each item (0 – 10 points), and the overall average number of points was calculated by the online system. The instructor promoted the principles of formative feedback, especially the importance of comprehensibility and sensitivity (cf. Wingate, 2010).

To pass the course, the students were required to produce all three writing assignments and provide peer feedback to a classmate randomly selected for each of the assignments. Each student received formative feedback from a classmate and the course instructor. At the end of the semester, they took a final credit test that also served as a post-test (see Section 5 for the description of the test).

The **micro**-level includes specific instructional activities, learning activities, and instructional materials (Bouwer, De Smedt, 2018: 122 -127). The micro-level components reflect Merrill's design principles described above (Section 3). The existing knowledge of the students is activated when performing a real-world task (writing a section of a Master's thesis), new input is demonstrated and immediately practiced in a guided activity and afterward applied and integrated into the students' world.

Table 2: Academic writing course: micro-level specification

Micro component	level	Activity/material	Specification
Instructional activities		Input and focused language practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of sections of Master's theses • Rhetorical moves • Linguistic markers of rhetorical moves • Linguistic devices for expressing evaluation, personality, citations, cohesion etc.
		Offering a variety of model texts	Research articles in the fields of linguistics, literature, cultural studies and didactics Academic theses in the fields of linguistics, literature, cultural studies and didactics
		Peer feedback training	Instructions provided in writing (Workshop module in Moodle) and discussed in the contact session.
		Comments on peer feedback	The instructor checked the assessment in the Workshop module and provided comments in writing.
Learning activities		Group writing	For full-time students only: producing a first draft of a text representing (a part of) the target Master's thesis section, while text editing and producing a second draft was assigned as a homework task.
		Preparation for contact sessions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moves analysis of sample sections of Master's theses/research articles • Analysis and writing of cause-effect, problem-solution and comparison and contrast texts • Guided practice of linguistics markers of personality, evaluation, stance and reader engagement
		Writing assignment 1	Writing a short introduction to an essay.
		Writing assignment 2	Guided writing aiming at producing a literature review section on the basis of summaries of secondary sources provided by the teacher (cf. Swales – Freak, 2012).
		Writing assignment 3	A discourse editing task asking the students to create a well-formed coherent text of a 'bare text' (cf. Fetzer, 2018) provided by the teacher.
		Peer feedback and assessment	Students provide peer feedback in the Workshop module in Moodle to randomly chosen classmates. Three sets of feedback in total.
Instructional materials		Recommended reading	SWALES, J. – FEAK, C. 2012. Academic Writing for Graduate Students. Essential Tasks and Skills. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. PALTRIDGE, B. – STARFIELD, S. 2007. Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Supervisors. London & New York: Routledge. PALTRIDGE, B. et al. 2009. Teaching Academic Writing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. DE CHAZAL, E. – Moore, J. 2013. Oxford EAP. A Course in English for Academic Purposes. Oxford: Oxford University Press. HAMP-LYONS, L. – HEASLEY, B. 1998. Study Writing: A Course in Written English for Academic and Professional Purposes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
		The Academic Wordlist	https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/lals/resources/academicwordlist
		Exercises for the Academic Wordlist	http://www.englishvocabularyexercises.com/AWL/id21.htm
		Academic Phrase Bank	http://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/describing-trends/
		Purdue Online Writing Lab	APA, MLA, Chicago – Formatting and Style Guide of Purdue University
		Model texts	Research articles, academic thesis

Evaluation of the course: Results (tests, feedback, teacher's reflection)

In order to evaluate the benefits of the innovated course of Academic Writing we aimed at obtaining data from the course participants and the course instructor. Apart from comparing the participants' performance in academic writing before and after the course, we were also interested in their perception of their progress and the benefits of the course. As peer feedback is still far from common in ELTE study programs, we were especially interested in their opinions on the

experience with peer feedback from the point of view of the provider as well as the receiver.

To capture a wide range of the key aspects for the course evaluation, the following questions were formulated:

Research questions

1. Did the course contribute to the improvement of the students' academic writing skills?

If so, in what aspects of academic writing did they improve the most?

2. Did the students perceive that the course contributed to the improvement of their academic writing skills?

If so, what was the aspect of academic writing they perceived that they improved the most in?

3. Did the students benefit from the peer and teacher's feedback in the module Workshop in the Moodle course?

Research methods

In order to guarantee triangulation of the data and methods, the innovated course was evaluated by 3 different procedures: first, the students took a pre-test and a post-test. Second, they were asked to fill in a feedback questionnaire, including scales and open-ended questions. Third, the course instructor observed how the students reacted to the innovated procedures and tasks, monitored their progress in the major tasks in the Workshop and their approach to peer assessment, and took field notes.

The pre-test and post-test were largely identical. The pre-test written in the preceding semester was part of the needs analysis, and the post-test was written as a final credit test.

The pre-test and post-test comprised five sub-tests focusing on the same aspects of academic writing. The first sub-test was aimed at assessing the progress of students in the use of linking adverbials (i.e. textual themes) so as to produce a coherent text and it comprised multiple-choice and error-correction components. The second sub-test targeted the use of attitudinal markers (i.e. interpersonal themes) via editing. The third sub-test focused on sentence transformations conveying different levels of (im)personality, thematic development, cohesive relations and nominalization. The fourth component of the text was a multipurpose cloze focusing primarily on the function of textual and interpersonal themes in building up a cohesive and coherent text. The final and most complex component of the pre- and post-test was a discourse editing task aimed at assessing the ability of students to understand the argumentative chain in a 'bare' text and their ability to add the necessary elements so as to produce a coherent well-formed text. This component tested the meta-awareness of the students, their use of language structures, and their ability to employ evaluation markers and cohesive devices appropriately in the academic context.

The feedback questionnaire consisted of four parts. The first and second parts were inspired by the questionnaire that Link (2018) used in her study of Canadian university students. We already used these parts in the needs analysis questionnaire, the results of which have been reported in Jancarikova et al. (2020). In the needs analysis, the students were presented with statements concerning different aspects of academic writing and were asked what importance they attributed to different aspects of academic writing in relation to course and degree completion. In the feedback questionnaire, the students were presented with the same lists of statements, but they were asked to state how the innovated course of Academic Writing helped them improve in and understand the same areas. They were supposed to indicate their answers on five-point Likert scales. The third part of the questionnaire was devoted to the experience of the students with the module of the Workshop in Moodle that was used as e-learning support of the innovated course and

enabled peer feedback. The last part focused on the general satisfaction of the students with the course. The questions in this part were formulated as open-ended. The students were asked about the strengths of the course and aspects that could be improved.

The research sample included 49 students in the Master's degree program who participated in the obligatory course of Academic Writing in the 1st year of their studies. The students whose mother tongue was not Czech were excluded.

Out of the 49 students, 15 were full-time students, and 34 were combined students. All of them were asked to fill in the feedback questionnaire after they completed the course. The number of complete questionnaires was 42 (14 full-time students and 28 combined students), which means the return rate was 85.7 %. Forty-seven students out of 49 took part in both the pre-test and the post-test.

Data analysis

We used SPSS Version 23 to process the data from the pre-test, the post-test, and the feedback questionnaire. The parameters of the sample including the criteria of exclusion and inclusion in the sample, were controlled in order to make the decisions about the analyses. The non-parametrical Wilcoxon signed-rank test was employed for the comparison of pre-test and post-test results, as the sample did not meet the requirements for parametrical t-tests.

The answers from the feedback questionnaires were grouped into several factors. The internal consistencies of the factors identified in the scales were estimated using Cronbach's alpha, and the average values for each factor, and each item was calculated. The results of the open-ended questions in the feedback questionnaire and the field-notes were analyzed qualitatively using thematic analysis and constant comparison.

Results

Differences between the pre-test and post-test

The comparison of the results of the pre- and post-test showed that the students improved their performance in the test significantly (the average score rose from 71% to 79%, $p=0.000$).

As for the comparison of the particular sub-tests, a rather surprising result is the lower score of sub-test 1 (textual themes) in the post-test (92% to 80%, $p= 0.006$). We assume it was caused by the fact the subtest tasks were relatively easy, and the students were highly successful already in the pre-test. A significant improvement was identified in sub-test 3 focusing on linguistic aspects targeted in the course (59% to 80%, $p= 0.000$) comprising sentence transformations conveying different levels of (im)personality, thematic development, cohesive relations and nominalization, and in sub-test 5 (discourse-editing task aimed at meta-awareness, evaluation markers, and cohesive devices, 66% to 76%, $p=0.001$). We find it very important that the course contributed to students' improvement in the discourse editing task, which we perceive as the most complex task, reflecting the multifaceted nature of academic writing, including reading comprehension, indicating rhetorical moves, and creating a complete, well-formed coherent text which complies with the principles of Anglophone academic writing.

Other differences between the students' performance in the pre- and post-test were not statistically significant.

It ought to be mentioned that the role of tests was only supplementary as the potential of testing the skills necessary for graduate academic writing by discrete items is limited. Most test tasks only indicate how students perform in partial aspects.

The most important part of the test was the last subtest – a discourse editing task, which replicated a writing task introduced in one of the Workshop modules.

Table 3: Comparison of pre-test and post-test results

		Mean score	Std. Deviation	Wilcoxon p-value
Sub-test 1	Pre-test	92	10.7	0.006
	Post-test	80	18.1	
Sub-test 2	Pre-test	76	26.7	0.999
	Post-test	79	14.7	
Sub-test 3	Pre-test	59	17.9	0.000
	Post-test	80	15.7	
Sub-test 4	Pre-test	91	8.4	0.728
	Post-test	89	14.4	
Sub-test 5	Pre-test	66	13.9	0.001
	Post-test	76	15.2	
Total	Pre-test	71	7.5	0.000
	Post-test	79	8.3	

Participants' feedback

Development in academic writing

The first two parts of the feedback questionnaire concerned different aspects of academic writing. The respondents reported on how the innovated course of Academic Writing helped them develop aspects on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5). For the reduction of dimensionality, the target aspects of academic writing were grouped into eight factors and verified the internal consistency of the factors by Cronbach's alpha (α) test. The values of Cronbach were satisfactory for all eight factors, ranging from 0.631 to 0.783.

The evaluations of the respondents were relatively high for all factors, which indicates that the students perceived the course as beneficial for the development of different aspects of their academic writing skills. The factor with the highest average scores was *Linguistic aspects* (\bar{x} =4.25), which aggregated 'the use of appropriate transitions to connect ideas'; 'information and text components'; 'the demonstration of standard written English' and 'the demonstration of facility with a range of vocabulary appropriate to the topic'. While most of these aspects pertain to general academic writing skills highlighted in most style guides and academic writing courses, the use of appropriate transitions and information processing (coherent flow of ideas) were prominent components of the course that the students found beneficial as they extended their repertoire of resources for connecting ideas to include non-finite clauses, demonstratives and shell nouns apart from the frequently overused linking adverbials.

The contribution of the course to the development of the factors of *Research Methodology* (\bar{x} =4.19) and *Argumentation* (\bar{x} =4.18) was also perceived as highly positive, followed by *Contextualisation* (\bar{x} =4.12) and *Formal requirements concerning text structure* (\bar{x} =4.0).

Research Methodology included aspects of identifying an area that needs to be addressed by research, introducing the research purpose, and explaining steps taken in the research study. *Argumentation* concerned 'writing on the topic and staying on topic without digressions'; 'using relevant reasons and examples to support a position or an idea'; 'organizing writing in order to convey major and supporting ideas' and 'compiling findings into a clearly connected argument'. These results are supported by personal communications of students to the instructor suggesting that the course participants appreciated the focused instruction on the move structure of the individual sections of a Master's thesis and advice and practice in organizing their

arguments following the problem-solution, cause-effect, and comparison and contrast patterns.

Contextualisation concerned ‘using background knowledge, reference, non-text materials, and other sources to support ideas, analyze, and refine arguments’; ‘effectively summarising and paraphrasing the works and words of others’ and ‘demonstrating knowledge of the topic’. During contact sessions, it became apparent that the students did not realize the full potential of citations to display knowledge, support their claims, compare their findings to previous research, and claim contributions to disciplinary knowledge. Considerable improvement was also achieved in their skills to paraphrase and summarise previous studies relevant to their work.

Formal requirements concerning text structure included the ability to produce a required written assignment of an expected length appropriate to the topic and to structure a Master’s thesis.

Evaluation ($\alpha=3.93$) and *Meta-awareness* ($\alpha=3.87$) are two factors with slightly lower average scores. From our point of view, both of these factors include key aspects that appeared to be underestimated by the respondents during the needs analysis stage (‘take an evaluative stance towards existing literature’; ‘provide an extended analysis of your results through an interpretative and evaluative angle’; ‘convey personal viewpoints and evaluate previous and own research to construct arguments’; ‘communicate my own understanding and interpretation of the results’). During the needs analysis stage, we concluded that “the overall results for the *Evaluation* factor seem to suggest that students do not have sufficient awareness of the importance of evaluation in academic writing and are likely to lack the skills necessary for the expression of stance, and as the last factor below indicates, of engagement with the reader” (Jancarikova et al., 2020). These results may reflect the reluctance of students to step into their texts and express their personal view; it may also stem from previous instruction stressing the role of impersonality and objectivity in academic writing recommended by numerous style manuals (cf. Bennett, 2009), which ignore the rhetorical tradition and recent developments in Anglophone academic writing (cf. Cottrell, 2003; Hyland, 2002a, 2002b; Flowerdew, 2012).

In the same vein, *Meta-awareness* ($\alpha=3.87$), targeting the awareness of the audience, seemed to be underestimated by the course participants in the needs analysis carried out prior to the course. Even though the innovated course focused explicitly on its development, the students probably perceived their development in the area of meta-awareness as less significant than in most of the other areas. This factor includes seven aspects: ‘show the value of your research’; ‘indicate how the findings add to existing knowledge in the field’; ‘persuade readers of the credibility of your work’; ‘identify the intended audience/readers and their expectations’; ‘acknowledge limitations of your work’; ‘show awareness of audience needs and write to a specific audience’ and ‘expand the meaning of findings outside my own research’. Although the students were systematically exposed to expert academic texts and writing practice in order to enhance their competencies in the given area, they still perceived that the course contributed to their development in other areas more than that of *Meta-awareness*. The underestimation of the meta-awareness factor may be due to the level of expertise of graduate students, who, similarly to numerous novice writers, do not feel entitled to claim credit for their work and perhaps think that indicating limitations may reduce the value of their work. The examination context identifying the supervisor and the second reader as the main audience of the Master’s thesis perhaps explains why the students are cautious in addressing their readers in a more explicit way.

The last position of the factor called *Presentation of findings* ($\alpha=3.4$) is not surprising as transforming data into results and designing clear visual representations

of data in tables and figures are rather technical issues that were not the main focus of the course.

The Workshop module

The third part of the questionnaire was aimed at the students' perception of the Workshop module offered in VLE Moodle. The students were asked to estimate how the tasks they fulfilled in the Workshop module contributed to their understanding of how to write their Master's theses while complying with the principles of Anglophone academic writing and how they benefitted from peer feedback, both in the roles of providers and receivers.

The respondents reported on how the Workshop module in the innovated course of Academic Writing helped them develop the above-mentioned aspects on a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree (1) to Strongly agree (5). Similarly to the first two parts of the feedback questionnaire, the evaluations of the respondents were relatively high for all items (min. \bar{x} =3.9, max. \bar{x} =4.5), which indicates the students appreciated the Workshop module and perceived its value for the development of their skills. There was an interesting difference between items 1 – 5 related to the Master's thesis (\bar{x} =4.2) and items 6 – 10 related to peer feedback (\bar{x} =4.4). The participants rated the benefits related to peer feedback higher. Concerning the items related to peer feedback, at least 50% of the students always opted for "strongly agree," and nobody opted for "strongly disagree". They reported that they found inspiration when reading their classmates' assignments, benefitted from identifying strengths and weaknesses in their classmates' assignments, improved their skills in peer assessment, improved in providing feedback to others, and benefitted from receiving feedback from their classmates.

Course assessment by the students

The last section of the questionnaire included open-ended questions concerning overall satisfaction with the course, the strengths of the course, and suggestions for improvement. 50% of the respondents claimed they were very satisfied, 40 % were satisfied, and 10% provided uncertain or unclear answers.

As for the strengths, the students most often mentioned the practical character of the course (16 comments). Peer evaluation was also mentioned very frequently (13 comments). The Workshop module was appreciated as well, although some students also commented on the high demands of the tasks in the module. Two comments emphasized the benefits of the course for teaching practice, specifically for the development of skills necessary for correcting their students' written work and providing feedback.

The suggestions for improvements yielded fewer contributions. The only dominant aspect was lack of time, which some respondents wanted to solve by allowing more time for tasks and/or for feedback or dividing the course into two semesters. Some suggested reductions in the number of tasks. Two respondents said they would appreciate an even less theoretical course, and two wanted more focus on the Master's thesis. Individual respondents suggested offering the course in the Bachelor's degree program, more focus on textual linkers, and more examples of academic texts.

Discussion and conclusion

Our findings indicate that the intervention had a positive impact on the development of the academic writing skills of Czech graduate students. Their academic writing skills improved as a result of the intervention, even if the length of the intervention was relatively limited. The innovated Academic Writing course aiming at equipping the students with the skills vital for writing a successful Master's thesis can be understood as a single genre intervention, which is regarded as

beneficial for the improvement of genre writing (cf. Boscolo, Arfe, Quarisa, 2007; Rakedzon – Baram-Tsabari, 2016; Muller, Gregoric, Rowland, 2017; Xu, Li, 2018). Despite the small scale and prevalingly qualitative character of this research, our findings have outlined several common patterns in the development of university students' academic writing skills, which concur with the findings of previous research and thus allow for tentative conclusions.

The progress of the students was evidenced by the overall score of the post-test and also by the perceptions of the students that they shared in the feedback questionnaire and by the perceptions of the instructor. The instructor's insights generally concur with the students' feedback in indicating considerable progress in the students' understanding of the rhetorical structure of the Master's thesis, improvement in the linguistic aspect of academic writing, and better awareness of the differences between the Czech and Anglophone academic writing conventions, which enables students to make conscious choices when writing academic texts in English. At the same time, the instructor also acknowledged the existence of time constraints, which should be taken into consideration when adapting the course to students' needs.

The improvement was statistically significant in the sub-test focusing on linguistic aspects targeted in the course and in the discourse editing task, which was a complex sub-test focused on meta-awareness, evaluation markers, and cohesive devices. Whereas the improvement in the factor of *Linguistic aspects* was also reported by the students in the feedback questionnaire, the factors of *Meta-awareness* and *Evaluation* reached somewhat lower scores. These results, as well as the instructor's comments, indicate that the students did not fully appreciate their relevance for academic writing, which was also identified in the stage of needs analysis that preceded the intervention (Jancarikova et al., 2020) and the lower score in the feedback questionnaire indicates that the factors of *Meta-awareness* and *Evaluation* are not easy to understand and develop. The factor of *Linguistic aspects* appears to be more tangible for students, perhaps due to their explicit teaching, as in the case of cohesive devices and different linguistic resources that express evaluation (cf. Hsiao, 2019). We assume that the factors of *Meta-awareness* and *Evaluation* are not as easily teachable as *Linguistic aspects*, and their development in the course of Academic Writing has to be explicitly explained and justified for full appreciation of their importance (cf. also Hsiao, 2019).

The fact that linguistic aspects comprise specific details also makes them more attractive than global issues for feedback providers. Although it seems easier to focus on specific details, Ho Pham (2019) recommends that instructors or peers providing feedback should strive to comment on global issues more than specific details. The instructor of our Academic Writing course also observed that students providing peer feedback tended to focus on specific linguistic details rather than global issues and had to be reminded of the global aspects they were supposed to evaluate.

Overall, the students' evaluation of the course was very positive. They perceived the course as practically oriented and conducive to the development of their skills necessary for successful completion of their Master's thesis. From their comments, it was evident that they appreciated the key aspects of the process genre approach (Badger, White, 2000) with its learner-centredness and focus on genre writing.

The students spontaneously appreciated the opportunity of providing and receiving peer feedback. This corresponds with the conclusions of Huisman et al. (2018), who observed that both roles in peer feedback are equally beneficial. It was the role of peer feedback providers that brought multiple benefits to the students in our study. First, reading their classmates' texts enabled them to learn by observation, which was proved very beneficial also by Van der Loo, Krahmer, and Van

Amelvoort (2018). Second, by performing peer evaluation tasks, they also learned how to self-evaluate, which they confirmed in the seminar discussions with the instructor. They realized them by exposure to academic texts written by their classmates; they were better able to understand their own academic writing performance. Comparing their classmates' texts to their own enabled them to identify their own strengths and weaknesses. The last benefit can be understood as an added value in the context of English Language Teacher Education. The students understood the process of developing their skills in peer feedback and peer-assessment as an opportunity to develop their skills for providing formative feedback on writing performance to their own (future) pupils.

The suggestions for improvement formulated in the feedback questionnaire will be used for further development of the course. In the first place, the time constraints will be considered and the ways to optimize the combination of contact sessions and online support, especially in the case of the combined studies program. Another aspect that could be developed within the full-time program is group writing and editing, which can affect the beliefs of the students about academic writing. Finally, in view of the teacher training orientation of both programs, the peer-feedback component of the Workshop module may be extended to stress the importance of sensitive and detailed comments provided to peers in order to enhance the assessment skills of the teacher trainees.

Pedagogical implications

Having considered the review of recent literature and our own findings, we argue that academic writing courses rooted in the process genre approach and focusing explicitly on specific aspects of academic writing can have an impact provided that certain conditions are met. First of all, the courses have to be taught by highly qualified instructors, who are not only proficient in English but also have experience with their own research publishing (Xu, Li, 2018; Plakhotnik et al., 2020). The focus on genres should take precedence over traditional academic language development (Xu – Li, 2018; Murray, Yamamoto, 2019). Furthermore, the needs of the students have to be taken into account when designing and delivering courses and workshops (Link, 2018). Apart from linguistic needs, the psychological needs of the students also influence the course success (Hutchinson – Waters, 1987). The courses can be effectively provided that the individual differences of the students are respected and accommodated (especially those that are stable and cannot be easily modified, for example, learner beliefs, cf. also Boscolo, Arfe, Quarisa, 2007) or enhanced, if they are prone to external modifications (for example metacognition, see Negretti, 2017).

The quality of academic writing courses can be boosted by employing technology (see also Cotos, Link, Huffman, 2017; Ho Pham, 2019). Although we realize the courses can even be converted to be fully online without a negative effect on the quality (Stanchevici, Siczek, 2019), we prefer the blended variant that proved beneficial in our course. A combination of contact sessions and support in VLE Moodle, which enabled text sharing as well as other materials for self-study, observational learning, and asynchronous communication, contributed to the overall satisfaction of the graduate students, including those who followed the combined mode of the study program.

As one of the key factors in the development of students' academic writing is, without any doubt, plenty of individually tailored feedback (e.g. Wingate, 2010; Muller, Gregoric, Rowland, 2017; Odena, Burgess, 2017; Huisman et al., 2018; Ho Pham, 2019) we believe that no academic writing course can afford to go without it. Peer feedback provided in online platforms can be seen as extremely promising as it offers an opportunity of multiplying the amount of feedback an instructor is able to provide to a group of students in a course. As high-quality peer feedback requires both

initial and ongoing training, we recommend that peer training should be incorporated into academic writing courses as an integral component of the course design.

Finally, we believe that the findings of this study have contributed to our knowledge about the academic writing development of L2 university students and have evidenced the potential of courses designed on the basis of the process-genre approach to enhance learners' academic writing performance. The insights gathered from this study can inform future research into academic writing and the design of academic writing courses in various L2 university contexts.

Acknowledgement

This article is an outcome of the INTER-EXCELLENCE project LTC18015 Výzkum a výuka akademického psaní z mezikulturního hlediska (Researching and teaching academic writing from a cross-cultural perspective) financed by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic.

This project is related to COST Action CA15221 Advancing effective institutional models towards cohesive teaching, learning, research, and writing development.

Bibliographic references

- ADEL, A. 2006. *Metadiscourse in L1 and L2 English*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 9789027222978.
- BADGER, R. G. – WHITE, G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. In: *ELT Journal*, vol. 54, n. 2, pp. 153–160. ISSN 1477-4526.
- BADENHORST, C. M. 2018. Graduate student writing: Complexity in literature reviews. In: *Studies in Graduate and Postdoctoral Education*, vol. 9, n. 1, pp. 58-74. ISSN 2398-4686.
- BENNETT, K. 2009. English academic style manuals: A survey. In: *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 8, n. 1, pp. 43-54. ISSN 1475-1585.
- BENNETT, K. 2014. *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-1-349-46870-6.
- BLACK, P. – HARRISON, C. – LEE, C. – MARSHALL, B. – WILIAM, D. 2003. *Assessment for learning: Putting it into practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press. ISBN 0335212972.
- BLACK, P. – WILIAM, D. 1998. Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. In: *The Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 139-148. ISSN 1940-6487.
- BOSCOLO, P. – ARFE, B. – QUARISA, M. 2007. Improving the quality of students' academic writing: an intervention study. In: *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 32, n. 4, pp. 419-438. ISSN 1470-174X.
- BOUWER, R. – DE SMEDT, F. 2018. Introduction Special Issue: Considerations and Recommendations for Reporting on Writing Interventions in Research Publications. In: *Journal of Writing Research*, vol. 10, n. 2, pp. 115-137. ISSN 2294-3307.
- BURGESS, S. – MARTIN-MARTIN, P. (eds.). 2008. *English as an Additional Language in Research Publication and Communication*. Bern: Peter Lang. ISBN 978-3-03911-462-7.
- CHAMONIKOLASOVA, J. 2005. Comparing the structures of academic texts written in English and Czech. In: Huttova, M. (ed.) *Slovak Studies in English 1*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenskeho, vol. 1, pp. 77-84. ISBN 80-89197-27-2.
- CHANG, P. – LEE, M. 2019. Exploring textual and interpersonal Themes in the expository essays of college students of different linguistic backgrounds. In: *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 54, pp. 75-90. ISSN 1873-1937.
- CHITEZ, M. – KRUSE, O. – CASTELLO, M. 2015. *The European Writing Survey (EUWRIT): Background, Structure, Implementation, and Some Results*. (Working Papers in Applied Linguistics 9). Winterthur: ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences. ISBN 978-3-905745-79-5.

- CLARK, 1992. Principles and practice of CLA in the classroom. In: FAIRCOUGH, N. (ed.). *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman. ISBN 0582064678.
- CMEJRKOVA, S. 1996. Academic Writing in Czech and English. In: VENTOLA, E. – MAURANEN, A. (eds.). *Academic Writing. Intercultural and Textual Issues*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 90 272 5053 7.
- CMEJRKOVA, S. – DANES, F. 1997. Academic Writing and Cultural Identity: The Case of Czech Academic Writing. In: DUSZAK, A. (ed.). *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 40-62. ISBN 3-11-015249-5.
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- CONNOR, U. 2004. Intercultural rhetoric research: Beyond texts. In: *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 3, n. 4, pp. 291-304. ISSN 1475-1585.
- CONNOR, U. 2011. *Intercultural Rhetoric in the Writing Classroom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. ISBN 978-0-472-03458-1.
- COTOS, E. – LINK, S. – HUFFMAN, S. R. 2017. Effects of DDL technology on genre learning. In: *Language Learning & Technology*, vol. 21, n. 3, pp. 104-130. ISSN 1094-3501.
- COTTRELL, S. 2003. *The Study Skills Handbook*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 1403911355.
- DE ARMIJOS, K. Y. 2016. Metacognition: The Academic Writing Challenge in a research-based learning Master's program. In: CHOVA, L. G. – MARTINEZ, A. L. – TORRES, I. C. (eds.). *INTED2016: 10th International Technology, Education and Development Conference*. INTED Proceedings, pp. 304-313.
- DE ARMIJOS, K. Y. 2017. Pursuing success in EFL Academic Writing: Techniques to enhance the writing skill in undergraduate students – an action research case study. In: CHOVA, L. G. – MARTINEZ, A. L. – TORRES, I. C. (eds.). *10th International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation (ICERI2017)*, pp. 8693-8700.
- DE CHAZAL, E. – MOORE, J. 2013. *Oxford EAP. A Course in English for Academic Purposes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0194001793.
- DONTCHEVA-NAVRATILOVA, O. 2013. Authorial presence in academic discourse: functions of author-reference pronouns. In: *Linguistica Pragensia*, vol. 23, n. 1, pp. 9-30. ISSN 1805-9635.
- DONTCHEVA-NAVRATILOVA, O. 2014. The changing face of Czech academic discourse. In: BENNETT, K. *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 39-61. ISBN 978-1-349-46870-6.
- DONTCHEVA-NAVRATILOVA, O. 2018. Persuasion in academic discourse: Cross-cultural variation in Anglophone and Czech academic book reviews. In: PELCLOVA, J. – LU, W. (eds.). *Persuasion in public discourse. Cognitive and functional perspectives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 227-257. ISBN 978-90-272-0138-6.
- DONTCHEVA-NAVRATILOVA, O. – JANCARIKOVA, R. – HULKOVA, I. – SCHMIED, J. 2020. Theme choices in Czech University students' English-medium Master's theses. In: *Lingua*, vol. 243. ISSN 1872-6135.
- DUSZAK, A. (ed.). 1997. *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. ISBN 3-11-015249-5.
- FETZER, A. 2018. The coding and signalling of discourse relations in argumentative discourse: Evidence across production format. In: GOMEZ-GONZALEZ, M. A. – MACKENZIE, J. L. (eds.). *The construction of discourse as verbal interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13-44. ISBN 978-90-272-0141-6.
- FLOWERDEW, L. 2012. Grammar and the Research Article. In: CHAPELLE, C. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. ISBN 978-1-4051-9473-0.

- GAO, X. 2016. A cross-disciplinary corpus-based study on English and Chinese native speakers' use of linking adverbials in academic writing. In: *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 24, pp. 14-28. ISSN 1475-1585.
- GRAVES, K. 2000. *Designing Language Courses*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle. ISBN 0-8384-7909-X.
- HAMP-LYONS, L. – HEASLEY, B. 1998. *Study Writing: A Course in Written English for Academic and Professional Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0521534968.
- HARWOOD, N. – HADLEY, G. 2004. Demystifying institutional practices: critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. In: *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 23, n. 4, pp. 355-377. ISSN 1873-1937.
- HEWINGS, M. (ed.). 2006. *Academic writing in context. Implications and Applications*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press. ISBN 0-8264-8131-0.
- HO PHAM, V. P. 2019. The effects of lecturer's model e-comments on graduate students' peer e-comments and writing revision. In: *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, vol. 32, pp. 1-34. ISSN 1744-3210.
- HSIAO, Ch. 2019. Attitudes: Authorial stance in the review genre of Taiwanese MA graduates. In: *Journal of teaching English for specific and academic purposes*, vol. 7, n. 2, pp. 171-183. ISSN 2334-9212.
- HUANG, L. 2010. Seeing eye to eye? The academic writing needs of graduate and undergraduate students from students' and instructors' perspective. In: *Language Teaching Research*, vol. 14, n. 4, pp. 517-539. ISSN 1477-0954.
- HUISMAN, B. – SAAB, N. – VAN DRIEL, J. – VAN DEN BROEK, P. 2018. Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance. In: *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 43, n. 6, pp. 955-968. ISSN 1469-297X.
- HUTCHINSON, R. – WATERS, A. 1987. *English for Specific Purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 9780521318372.
- HYLAND, K. 2001. Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles. In: *Written Communication*, vol. 18, n. 4, pp. 549-574. ISSN 1552-8472.
- HYLAND, K. 2002a. Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 34, pp. 1091-1112. ISSN 1879-1387.
- HYLAND, K. 2002b. Options of Identity in Academic Writing. In: *ELT Journal*, vol. 56, n. 4, pp. 351-358. ISSN 1477-4526.
- HYLAND, K. 2008. Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing. In: *International Journal of English Studies*, vol. 8, n. 2, pp. 1-23. ISSN 1989-6131.
- JANCARIKOVA, R. – POVOLNA, R. – DONTCHEVA-NAVRATILOVA, O. – HANUSOVA, S. – NEMEC, M. 2020. Academic writing: A needs analysis as the initial step of an academic writing course. In: *Discourse and Interaction*, vol. 13, n. 1, pp. 42-66. ISSN 1805-952X.
- JONES, D. R. 2018. A proposed systems model for socializing the graduate writer. In: *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 43, n. 1, pp. 173-189. ISSN 1470-174X.
- LINK, S. 2018 'Scaling up Graduate Writing Workshops: From needs assessment to teaching practices. In: *Journal of Writing Research*, vol. 10, n. 2, pp 357-399. ISSN 2294_3307.
- MAHER, P. – MILLIGAN, S. 2019. Teaching master thesis writing to engineers: Insights from corpus and genre analysis of introductions. In: *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 55, pp. 40-55. ISSN 1873-1937.
- MIN, Y.-K. 2016. Rethinking ESL Service Courses for International Graduate Students. In: *TESOL Journal*, vol. 7, n. 1, pp. 162-178. ISSN 1949-3533.
- MULLER, A. – GREGORIC, C. – ROWLAND, D. R. 2017. The impact of explicit instruction and corrective feedback on ESL postgraduate students' grammar in

- academic writing. In: *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, vol. 11, n. 1, pp. A125-A144. ISSN 1835-5196.
- MURRAY, R. – YAMAMOTO, B. A. 2019. Writing retreats for Japanese second-language graduate students: beyond the language deficit model. In: *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, vol. 13, n. 1, pp. A1-A14. ISSN 1835-5196.
- NEFF-VAN AERTSELAER, J. 2013. Contextualizing EFL argumentation writing practices within the Common European Framework descriptors. In: *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 22, n. 20, pp. 198-209. ISSN 1873-1422.
- NEGRETTI, R. 2017. Calibrating Genre: Metacognitive Judgments and Rhetorical Effectiveness in Academic Writing by L2 Graduate Students. In: *Applied linguistics*, vol. 38, n. 4, pp. 512-539. ISSN 1477-450X.
- ODENA, O. – BURGESS, H. 2017. How doctoral students and graduates describe facilitating experiences and strategies for their thesis writing learning process: a qualitative approach. In: *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 42, n. 3, pp. 572-590. ISSN 1470-174X.
- PALTRIDGE, B. et al. 2009. *Teaching Academic Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. ISBN 978-0-472-03334-8.
- PALTRIDGE, B. – STARFIELD, S. 2007. *Thesis and Dissertation Writing in a Second Language: A Handbook for Supervisors*. London & New York: Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-37173-5.
- PINCAS, A. 1982. *Teaching English Writing*. London: Macmillan. ISBN 033293126.
- PLAKHOTNIK, M. S. – GIONTI, L. A. – ROCCO, T. S. – PASHKINA, M. V. 2020. Teaching management students to write research papers: A case of a Russian English-Medium instruction university. In: *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, vol. 32, n. 1, pp. 28-46. ISSN 1939-4225.
- RAKEDZON, T. – BARAM-TSABARI, A. 2016. Assessing and improving L2 graduate students' popular science and academic writing in an academic writing course. In: *Educational Psychology*, vol. 37, n. 1, pp. 48-66. ISSN 1469-5820.
- RAVARI, Z. K. – TAN, K. E. 2019. A qualitative investigation of strategies and experiences of non-native students writing master's theses. In: *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, vol. 11, n. 2, pp. 310-324. ISSN 2050-7003.
- RIJLAARSDAM, G. – JANSSEN, T. – RIETDIJK, S. – VAN WEIJEN, D. 2018. Reporting design principles for effective instruction of writing: Interventions as constructs. In: FIDALGO, R. – HARRIS, K. – BRAAKSMA, M. (eds.). *Design Principles for Teaching Effective Writing*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, vol. 34, pp. 280-313. ISBN 978-90-04-27047-3.
- STASKOVA, J. 2005. Options of identity: Authorial presence in research articles abstracts. In: HUTTOVA, M. et al. (eds.). *Slovak Studies in English 1*. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenskeho, pp. 201-207. ISBN 80-89197-27-2.
- STANCHEVICI, D. – SICZEK, M. 2019. Performance, Interaction, and Satisfaction of Graduate EAP Students in a Face-to-Face and an Online Class: A Comparative Analysis. In: *TESL Canada Journal*, vol. 36, n. 3, pp. 132-153. ISSN 1925-8917.
- SUOMELA-SALMI, E. – DERVIN, F. 2009. *Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Academic Discourse*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. ISBN 978-90-272-5437-5.
- SWALES, J. 1990. *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-33813-4.
- SWALES, J. 1997. English as Tyrannosaurus rex. In: *World Englishes*, vol. 16, n. 3, pp. 373-382. ISSN 1467-971X.
- SWALES, J. – FEAK, C. 2012. *Academic Writing for Graduate Students. Essential Tasks and Skills*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. ISBN 0-472-08856-4.
- VAN DER LOO, J. – KRAHMER, E. – VAN AMELSVOORT, M. 2018. Learning how to write an academic text: The effect of instructional method and writing

- preference on academic writing performance. In: Journal of Writing Research, vol. 9, n. 3, pp. 233-258. ISSN 2294-3307.
- WEI, J. 2016. Thematic choice in Chinese college students' English essays. In: English for Specific Purposes, vol. 41, pp. 50-67. ISSN 1873-1937.
- WINGATE, U. 2010. The impact of formative feedback on the development of academic writing. In: Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, vol. 35, n. 5, pp. 519-533. ISSN 1469-297X.
- XU, X. – LI, X. 2018. Teaching Academic Writing through a Process-Genre Approach: A Pedagogical Exploration of an EAP Program in China. In: TESL-EJ, vol. 22, n. 2, pp. 1-21. ISSN 1072-4303.
- XUDONG, D. – CHENG, L. K. – VARAPRASAD, C. – LENG, L. M. 2014. Academic Writing Development of ESL/EFL Graduate Students in NUS. In: Reflections on English Language Teaching, vol. 9, n. 2, pp. 119-138. ISSN 0219-8398.

Words: 11251

Characters: 76 137 (42,30 standard pages)

Doc. Mgr. Svetlana Hanusova, Ph.D.
Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of education
Masaryk University
Poříčí 7
603 00 Brno
Czech Republic

Doc. Mgr. Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, Ph.D.
Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of education
Masaryk University
Poříčí 7
603 00 Brno
Czech Republic

Marie Lahodova Valisova
Language Center
Masaryk University
Kamenice 5
603 00 Brno
Czech Republic

Ing. Mgr. Ph.D. Marketa Matulova
Katedra aplikované matematiky a informatiky
Ekonomicko-správní fakulta
Masaryk University
Lipová 41a
603 00 Brno
Czech Republic