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Abstract

This PhD research proposal is aimed to investigate Indonesian graduate students’ academic writing challenges in Hungarian Higher Education. The study will closely look at students’ experiences and writing development. The experience will highlight challenges and potential solutions, attitude about studying English academic writing in a non-native English-speaking environment, and teachers’ feedback to improve their writing. On the other hand, writing development will examine students’ progresses during their university year of master study focusing on their lexical density and abstraction, the patterns of development as well as the differences between the language features used by students with higher (C1) and lower (B2) proficiency levels.

Based on these purposes, two hypotheses are built. 1) Pursuing master programmes in a non-native English speaking environment will have an impact on students’ academic writing. 2) Corpus-based analysis provides concrete evidence relating to the use of lexical density and abstraction of Indonesian graduate students’ L2 English academic text development. To answer these hypotheses, six questions are built; *1) What challenges do Indonesian graduate students face in English academic writing? 2) How do they tackle these challenges? 3) Is the general hypothesis that studying master programmes in a non-native English speaking environment will have an impact on academic writing evidence? 4) Is the general hypothesis that Indonesian L2 English learners develop in the use of lexical density and abstraction across the university years supported by corpus-based analysis evidence? 5) How does corpus-based analysis demonstrate the use of informational density as well as abstraction in the development of academic writing? 6) How are the patterns of development mediated by students with higher (C1) and lower (B2) proficiency levels?*

The method employed in this research is a mix-method (qualitative and quantitative) study. The participants involved in this study will be 7 MSc and MA graduate students at Social Science faculty at three different universities in Hungary. They are studying International Relations, Social Integration, and Regional and Environmental Economics. The data will be collected through semi-structured interview with the students and 6 teachers at the university and submitted and marked texts during their university year. Data collection procedures will be initialled by contacting the Indonesian student association in Hungary, sending the invitation, receiving and confirming the schedule for the interview. The Interview transcription and coding will be relied on Web Speech API demonstration and ATLAS.ti Corpus-based analysis including Coh-Metrix and SeoScout, will be used to analyse the data. Eventually, this study will apply statistical quantification by employing a parametric T-test to perform the progress.

1. **INTRODUCTION**

In the past decades, English has become the global lingua franca in many areas of life including Higher Education (Crystal, 2003). As a consequence, English is now used by both native and non-native speakers for teaching, learning and research purposes in different fields of study all over the world (Langum & Sullivan, 2017b). The importance of quality in academic text production at the university level has been given focused attention. It can be seen that academic excellence and strong competition among the learners tend to be part of that setting. Existing literature has maintained that writing is one of the considerable indicators that play a vital role and make students successful in their graduate academic studies (Braine, 2002, p. 65), (Neill et al., 2019). Wu (2019, p. 2) describes the benefits of English prevalence in academic publication as a common language, fostering cultural and linguistic background diversely, and exchange new scientific knowledge. However, producing an academic English text imposes some constraints on students who speak English as a second (L2) or a foreign language (Hyland, 2009, p. 172; Widodo, 2000, p. 1). Unlike in English speaking countries where the linguistic environment is fully supported naturalistically, those who study in a non-English environment seem to place "linguistic injustice" and "unfair disadvantage" into perspective (Hyland, 2016; Langum & Sullivan, 2017).

The increasing number of Indonesian students enrolled at the Hungarian universities is due to the Stipendium Hungaricum Scholarship (SH) program. This scholarship is a fully-funded program provided by the Hungarian government under the framework of inter-governmental bilateral between Hungary and Indonesia. In the 2018-2019 academic year, 28 universities in Hungary took part in the scholarship program offering more than 460 programs with medium instruction of English (Tong, 2020). The scholarship programme includes bachelor, master, doctoral, one-tier master, and partial studies. To date, there are roughly 150 Indonesian students have enrolled at Hungarian university and they are in general registered in master and doctoral programmes.

Being international students in a non-native English-speaking environment, Indonesian graduate students are confronted with academic writing. An empirical study by Subandowo (2020), for example, reported that students enrolled in higher education in Hungary face challenges dealing with time management, linguistic issues, E-learning platforms, plagiarism, writing processes, and writing strategies. The study also showed that students faced limited access to English books in the university library. Moreover, Azizah and Budiman (2017) also confirmed that the most difficult aspect in academic writing experienced by Indonesian scholars is the ways to make knowledge claim including supporting claims. In another case, Lax noted that many international students who are enrolled at the university poorly prepared for the demands of academic writing (2002). He indicated that international students seem to be familiar with grammar rules, but they tend to have limited practice writing in English.

Taking into account a major education concern in higher education, the focus of attention is given to the development of academic writing (see e.g. Crossley, Kyle, & McNamara, 2016; Staples et al.,2016; Zhu, 2004). The development of academic writing is seen through students’ progress during their study at the university. The students in the university courses are required to produce academic writing tasks from general to specialized, discipline-specific writing (Nesi & Gardner, 2012). It is a fact that academic writing tasks are a fundamental requirement for graduate students to achieve academic success. In addition, writing a quality English text across disciplines seems challenging for L2 graduate students studying in a non-native English speaking environment. The students need to deal with academic writing characters including genre, register, as well as linguistic features (see Hyland, 2003).

Specific regard for linguistic features, Fang (2005) examined some characteristics of scientific writing. The study found that lexical density and nominalization like abstraction are fundamentally classified into special features in scientific texts. Furthermore, Nasseri (2021) distinguished the level of text density based on EFL, ESL, and L1 English groups. The study showed that EFL group students dominantly produce a low amount of phrasal complexity, ESL group students produce more nominal complexity, and L1 English group students' texts contain a great amount of informational density. Furthermore, Staples et al. (2016) argued that texts written by History and Engineering students contain high density in terms of noun phrases. Considering these characteristics, a developmental study focusing on lexical density and nominalization shows signs of promising future investigation in English academic texts.

Although some research studies have conducted an investigation into challenges and development of academic writing, no previous research has explicitly examined both challenges and developmental sequence of linguistic features in academic writing of Indonesian graduate students enrolled in the Hungarian Higher Education. This investigation is intended to enable examination of Indonesian L2 English students’ experiences as well as academic writing development focusing on informational density and abstraction during their master study. Moreover, this research study leads to channel a new direction for measuring L2 English academic writing in a novel context.

1. **LITERATURE REVIEW**
	1. **English as a medium instruction in higher education**

The use of English as a lingua franca (ELF) has been the main means of academic communicative situations over the world due to the acceleration of globalization (Crystal, 2003). These circumstances have significant relations with the increased introduction of English as a medium instruction (EMI) at the higher level of education institutions in many countries around the world. Julie Dearden (2016) defines that "EMI is the use of the English language to teach academic subjects in countries or Jurisdictions where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English". The definition drives at a point that EMI in English L1 environment or English-dominant environment may not be considered EMI because the medium language is English. Given that English is used in a non-native speaking environment, however, it considers relevant to EMI.

EMI is being used by many institutions to an increasing extent in all levels including universities (see e.g. H. Coleman, 2011; J. Coleman, Hultgren, Li, Tsui, & Shaw, 2018; Macaro, Curle, Pun, An, & Dearden, 2018). It aims to promote both students and faculty members' mobility to make them competitive and employable in international settings as well as to achieve attractive and reputable institutions. In addition, Macaro et al. (2018) explain that the growing phenomena of EMI in higher educations establish obvious connections with institutional aspects involving a perceived internationalization, foreign student attraction due to the decreasing enrolment number of home students through demographical changes, national cuts in higher education investment, the competition between state and private sectors, and the use of English as the international language, expressly in the domain of research publications.

It has become a fact that more and more universities get ready to put in an offer of both undergraduate and graduate programmes through the medium of English (Doiz, Lasagabaster, & Sierra, 2014). One study by Björkman (2011) examined the trend of the increasing use of English as a lingua franca as the medium of instruction for higher educations in continental Europe and elsewhere. The study reported new group learners who predominantly need the medium of English to communicate with speakers from other first language backgrounds. Another study by Petzold and Berns (2000) investigated that English is being increasingly used in Hungary as a significant medium in education and has a major impact on its learning, especially in Budapest higher education. The study found students at the university have had contact with English through up-to-date information by reading a variety of texts including professional journal articles, reference works, and textbooks (p.22).

* 1. **Academi writing**

Writing refers to a skill that is required by a language learner in a variety of contexts for the whole of his or her life. It includes writer's ability in composing something that could be documented and using that particular language in a wholesome manner (Mohajeri, M. & Ketabi, 2013). This means that the learner needs to be able to convey to the readers with clarity, coherence, logic, and conciseness and straight to the point. L2 English students at the university level, for example, must have this skill because they are in need of writing academic texts including summaries, essays, research reports, article reviews as well as theses and dissertations which are part of their assessments. A study by Gebhardt & Rodrigues (1989) reported that good writing skills support someone’s academic success, whether writing up research reports, preparing research papers, or taking essays test.

Academic writing, even so, greatly differs from personal writing because of its own set of rules and practices. The word “academic” means having to do with higher education or college career (Russell & Cortes, 2012; Irvin, 2010). Biber and Gray (2016) say that the language of academic writing is peculiar, not only different from everyday speech, but also different from most other registers of English. Tardy (2005) defines academic writing as “transformation of knowledge” including readers’ persuasion, significance, and credibility. Hyland (2002) explains academic writing as “an act of identity” conveying disciplinary content as well as a representation of the writer. Hartley (2008, p.4), for example, mentions that characteristics in an academic text not only deals with unnecessarily complicated, pompous, long-winded, technical, impersonal, authoritative, humourless, elitist, and excludes outsiders but can be also appropriate in specific circumstances as well as easier for non-native speakers to follow. Taş (2010), on the other hand, states that academic writing is not merely a linguistic process, but recognition in the social community they write for. Academic writers according to Xu and Zhang (2019) need to confine their writing to disciplinary norms and conventions by choosing particular discursive features. Similarly, Staples et al. (2016) argue that academic writing deals with planned and edited language as well as specific in a concise format. Hence, academic writing is a process in which the ideas are organized in certain rules to convey a writer representation of disciplinary contents.

Students at the university level are of importance to write academic papers. It indicates that writing is an essential skill that students are in need of in their academic lives. Al-Zubaidi (2012) argues that academic writing at the university level is relevant to students’ success. Wilson and Glazier, (2011) also state that successful foreign language learners in English writing will have better chances and benefits in their life-long careers. Irvin (2010) points out that students who produced a successful piece of writing depended largely upon their representation of writing tasks including an essay, thesis or dissertation. On the other hand, Paltridge and Starfield (2007) argued that thesis writing is a challenging process especially for L2 English students due to limited language proficiency for critical thinking, genre and social knowledge.

* 1. **L2 English academic writers**

The term “second language writer” refers to anyone who is writing or learning to write in a language other than their native languages (Matsuda & Silva, 2020). It consists of both second and foreign language writers as well as writers who are writing in their third, fourth, fifth language, and so forth. As second language writers, they seem to encounter some constraints, including language, strategy, and culture (Hyland, 2003). They do not only learn to write, but second language writers acquire second language structures (Matsuda & Jablonski, 2000). Apart from the second language grammar, L2 writers necessitate developing their language proficiency and genre knowledge as well.

Another definition of second language writers classified by Matsuda and Silva (2020) refers to *foreign language writers*. It indicates writers who are writing in languages in which the target language is not popular. This type of writer can be grouped into two general categories, which are EFL writers and other foreign language writers. It becomes evident that the distinction between EFL and other foreign language is significant even they investigate the same academic unit. The main reason for the distinction is based on the status of English language as the dominant language of universal communication, especially in academic discourses. As a result, with the dominance of English as a *lingua Franca* of scholarly communication, writing in academic contexts for graduate students and researchers has been a major emphasis on many applied linguistics studies.

* 1. **Challenges to L2 English academic writers in a non-native English speaking environment**

It is a fact that English has been the dominant language in higher education both native and non-native English speaking environment. This situation affects various sectors involving academic writing and research publication both undergraduate and graduate students ( see e.g. Baily, 2011; Langum & Sullivan, 2017; Singh, 2015; SO & Lee, 2013; Swales, B. Feak, & Arbor, 1995; Swales & Feak, 1996). For students studying in a native-English environment, they may be in receipt of benefits because English is the dominant language. Meanwhile, the scholars enrolled at the university in a non-native English speaking environment tend to experience "linguistic injustice" and "unfair disadvantages" in writing academic texts (Hyland, 2016b; Langum & Sullivan, 2017a). They make every effort to write English academic texts including reading materials, class assignments, adaptation, language settings, education and culture, and social relationships in the academic environment.

In recent decades L2 English academic writing has been of concern to many linguists in a non-native English speaking environment particularly dealing with constraints and challenges. Phothongsunan argued that higher students in a non-native English speaking country find a greater challenge in English writing including discursive, non-discursive and other challenges (2016, p. 682). Discursive challenges are of concern to language and context connecting to well-structured paragraph, vocabulary, citation, as well as making reference. Non-discursive essentially, on the other hand, links with plagiarism, motivation, emotional and psychological factors. Other challenges have a major deal with lack of support in conducting research from college. Additionally, Hyland (2016) points out that non-native English speakers seem to face some constraints including time investment, effort and money, and have greater difficulties when writing in English.

Braine (2002) identified that writing assignments at the university contained detailed, highly instructed instruction indicating a key role assessment. As a result, non-native English students face challenges to interpret the assignments in order to obtain teachers' expectation. Furthermore, Braine (2002) considered that Non-NES graduate students tend to impose preconceived classification of academic tasks or to focus only on narrow aspects of the academic milieu such as writing tasks or teachers' viewpoints or to ignore the contexts in which the task are assigned and carried out. The research also reveals that a sound relationship between the advisor and advisee play a key role in a research project to the writing of the thesis. In this case, the students are entitled not only to expect a high proficiency level in English and the ability to use appropriate learning strategies but to determine social skill. Further, the explicit instruction in academic writing seems to be crucial for more accomplishing course work, research, and thesis writing.

An interview study by Okamura (2006, p. 73) showed that “Japanese researchers tend to consider for using two set strategies; focusing on reading academic texts in their field (subject), and mastering English speakers’ language use (language-oriented strategies)”. Another interview study carried out by Mukminin et al., (2015, p. 1403) mentioned the experience of Indonesian students academic writing socialization in public university setting illustrating the cultural backgrounds, internalization language rules, broken English grammar, and lack of institutional, social supports, and lecturers’ help due to higher power distance”. In addition, a survey on of EFL students’ attitudes to academic writing conducted by Setyowati and Sukmawan, (2016, p. 367–376) pointed out that some students viewed writing as stressful and difficult to follow while other felt interesting and challenging. Furthermore, the study revealed several efforts to improve their writing by practice writing, reading a lot for knowledge and ideas, and using diary writing. In addition, the Non-NES graduate students in Asia must operate in environments where they are able to use their L1 for research and communication with their teachers and peers, and yet must read and write in English (Braine, 2002, p. 66).

A contributive research study conducted by Langum and Sullivan (2017) investigated how a narrative inquiry approach directs the study of experiences and voices of the early doctoral students in Sweden, under the faculty of humanities. The report claims "the overriding of deficit and commonality" emerged. The theme deficit which has categorized into two sub-themes such as hesitancy and distance seems dominant in the narration studies. The hesitancy reveals that insecure communication and idea translation into English are experienced by the doctoral school students. Additionally, thinking in their L1 and writing in L2 will create the feeling of textual incoherence. The distance shows the lack of control and remoteness when producing English text. As a consequence, the weakness of academic writing in English merely reflects the weakness of the academic writing of the native language. Hence, Langum and Sullivan highlighted a developed sequence workshop and literacy of academic writing. Not only the students' constraints become a basis for discussion, but the lack of experience in writing English by the supervisor takes part in narration as well. Similarly, Dong (1998) and Widodo (2000, p. 105) stated that the teachers or advisors serve an important role in the writing process. Casanave and Hubbard (1992) encompassed that teachers of graduate courses in Humanities, Social Sciences, Science, and Technology attempt to assess students' texts through global features of writing involving the quality of content and the development of topic ideas. They asserted that non-native English speakers have greater problems with the use of appropriate vocabulary, grammatical accuracy and correctness of punctuation/spelling.

A survey study carried out by Dong (1998) indicated the impact of language, cultural differences and educational background and the difficulties on thesis/dissertation writing. Actual research on non-native graduate students writing difficulties and how the faculty assists these students in their thesis/dissertation writing is sparse. Likewise, the study reveals that non-native English learners articulate their need for help with article citation, paragraph organization, logical presentation, idea developing, conclusion drawing, chapter outline, and avoidance of plagiarism. In addition, both non-NES learners and supervisor do not pay much attention to the student dilemma and other resources that might cope with students' constraints in academic writing. On the other hand, a non-NES needs to explore the social context of writing and investigates the local discourse community. AlMarwani's (2020) study on Arabic TESOL students, for example, also found that students face difficulties when writing an academic proposal. The difficulties involve language skills, academic writing skills, and source managing skills. Furthermore, their L1 Arabic background which is more advanced than English, students are most likely affected by their sociocultural literacy practices and made their English academic writing problematic. In similar fashion, the research undertaken by Kaur and Singh (2015) analysed that the international non-NES graduate students have shown that writing the literature review, methodology and findings/analysis section, using appropriate academic style, writing coherent paragraph, and expressing ideas in correct English are difficult.

In conclusion, the foregoing studies are seen to be the fact that non-native English students face challenges to deal with many aspects not only language issues, but also they have to obtain a successful academic life.

* 1. **Informational density and abstraction in academic Texts**

Recently, research studies focusing on English academic text assessments have been given attention by writing researchers (see e.g. S. Crossley, 2020; Fang, 2005; MacIntyre, 2019; M. K. Russell, 2014). Most of the studies are aimed to investigate the indicator of academic text quality through linguistic features. Biber (1996) establishes that linguistic features in academic writing tend to be specific and technical compared to spoken interactions. In this case, the use of lexical complexity in academic texts shows the richness of lexical density. Laufer and Nation (1995) define lexical density as the proportion of content words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs in a text. Halliday describes lexical density as the kind of complexity that is typical of written language (1985, p.62). In addition, Read (2007) states that lexical density represents a proportion of lexical items in the form of information and ideas in written texts. In this sense, the density of a formal text like academic writing is higher than informal texts (see e.g., Biber, 1996). It is worth noting that lexical density is shown to be relevant to abstracts because they contain condensed nature and word limit that helps writers express key ideas clearly (see e.g., the discussion in Nasseri & Thompson, 2021).

A number of studies focusing on lexical density have been a considerable concern by applied linguists. The findings come up with the results that lexical density values are higher in higher English proficiency levels and English L1s. Nasseri and Thompson (2021), for instance, examined the differences in lexical density and abstract diversity in English L1 and L2 (both EFL and ESL) academic writing. The study showed that the EFL group produced the least lexically dense and diverse texts compared to ESL students, while English students produce more and more sophisticated phrasal complexity that makes their texts contain a higher informational density. Kim (2004) argued that lexical density is a strong predictor of academic writing proficiency. He also analysed a corpus of college essays written by Korean students in a cross-sectional study to distinguish proficiency levels based on CEFR. Similarly, Gregori and Clavel (2015) noted that the texts produced by higher English proficiency levels students contain high lexical density. On the other hand, a study by Linnarud (1975) showed that texts written by L1 English speakers contain a high lexical density than Swedish speakers.

In addition to linguistic features, an area of research study on abstraction has been a great concern in academic writing assessment. It seems to argue that language features in academic texts are different from the language used for taking to mean everyday life experiences. Academic writing tends to have nominal characteristics (see e.g., Biber, 1996; Biber & Gray, 2016). These characteristics are to differentiate academic writing not only from conversation but also from fiction, making reading academic writing difficult for college students either graduate or undergraduate students (Parkinson, 2020). Likewise, Vande Kopple (2004) asserts that a higher proportion of nouns in academic texts is a key role to gain informational density.

Biber and Gray (2016) point out that linguistic features in the field of humanities contain highly specialized vocabularies including abstraction. Hyland, (2009a, p.7) states that the process in writing involves assumption between the writer and reader. This assumption in academic writing may be in a form of abstraction. The abstraction makes non-specialist readers difficult to understand the contents of the texts. Moreover, Fang (2005) describes that nominalization in a scientific text deals with abstraction. The abstraction involves turning process from either verbs or adjectives into participants as expressed by nouns. This abstraction is considered as one of special features in scientific texts and as an especially powerful resource to synthesize or abstract information into entities in subsequent discussion.

* 1. **Academic writing development**

There has been a great deal of discussion in recent years about English proficiency as well as academic writing development based on linguistic features point of view (see e.g., Gregori-Signes & Clavel-Arroitia, 2015; Staples et al., 2016). In the case of academic writing development, lexical density and abstraction serve as valuable indicators for examining first and second language academic writing development. Laufer and Nation's (1995) study reported that lower English proficiency level students produce more frequent words than higher English proficiency level students who write more and more sophisticated vocabulary across the study. A mixed-method study by Pessoa, et al. (2014) investigated a 4-year longitudinal study of students' challenges and development in academic literacy at English-medium university in Qatar. The study gave an account that students face challenges during the first semester in relevance to limited vocabulary knowledge as well as difficulties understanding the genre expectations and style of English academic writing. However, the corpus-based text analysis revealed that the use of academic register, elaboration, and reasoning is increased across the university year.

More than that, a comprehensive study across disciplines, genres, and level of L1 English writing development carried out by Staples et al.,(2016) highlighted that the use of phrasal features including nouns and nominalization increased during the level of study. Furthermore, they also indicated that premodiffying nouns are used more frequently in the Life and Physical Sciences, nouns, nominalization and attributive adjectives are used most frequently in the Social Sciences, and Arts Humanities of genetives and prepositional phrases. Parkinson and Musgrave's (2014) comparative study between EAP and MA students showed that MA students make a greater proportion of nouns than EAP students. Besides, a corpus study by Johansson (2009) showed the track of lexical density development from four groups of students including 10-year olds to university students. The finding shows that the development of lexical density is commonly found in 17-year-olds students. They are in many ways to compete with the adults in writing in terms of lexical dense vocabulary.

1. **Research Design**
	1. **Aims**

This research proposal is aimed to investigate challenges in academic writing of Indonesian graduate students enrolled in Hungarian Higher Education. The study will closely look at the following issues;

1. Students’ experiences in academic writing

The topic will be focused on an investigation into challenges when writing academic texts and potential solutions to tackle these challenges, attitudes toward these challenges as well as teachers’ feedback to improve their writing.

1. Students’ writing development

The development of academic writing will highlight writing development of lexical density and abstraction across the university study, patterns of writing development, and the difference between lexical density and abstraction used by students with higher (C1) and lower (B2) proficiency levels.

* 1. **Research hypotheses**

Two research hypotheses are built;

1. *Pursuing master programmes in a non-native English speaking environment will have an impact on students’ academic writing.*
2. *Corpus-based analysis provides concrete evidence relating to the use of lexical density and abstraction of Indonesian graduate students’ L2 English academic texts development.*
	1. **Research Questions**

Based on the previous discussion, the questions concerning Indonesian L2 English graduate student’s challenges in academic writing are formulated as follows:

1. *What challenges do Indonesian graduate students face in English academic writing*
2. *What are the practices to overcome these challenges?*
3. *Is the general hypothesis that studying master programmes in a non-native English speaking environment will have an impact on academic writing evidence?*
4. *Is the general hypothesis that Indonesian L2 English learners develop in the use of lexical density and abstraction across the university years supported by corpus-based analysis evidence?*
5. *How does corpus-based analysis demonstrate the use of informational density as well as abstraction in the development of academic writing?*
6. *How are the patterns of lexical density and abstraction in writing development mediated by students with higher (C1) and lower (B2) proficiency levels?*
	1. **Methods**

Qualitative and quantities study designs are proposed to answer the formulated questions. Semi-structured interviews are provided to endorse the qualitative study and the interview coding will be transcribed and analysed through Web Speech API Demonstration. and ATLAS.ti application. Meanwhile, the quantitative study will include corpus-based analysis like Coh-Metrix, SeoScout and SPSS software to perform parametric T-test. Cohmetrix and SeoScout are to obtain the frequency of informational density abstraction. The T-test, on the other hand, is to examine the difference value between two independent variables like level of study and English proficiency.

* 1. **Participants**

There are a total of 7 selected students in the 2019/2020 academic year, enrolled at Hungarian universities with English as a medium instruction. They are studying International Relations, Social Integration, and Regional and Environmental Economics. The students’ English proficiency levels are at the B2 level upon admission. All students will be participated in three different interview sections and send one essay for each semester. On the other hand, this study is designed to have another interview with 6 teachers from the university where the students are studying.

* 1. **Data collection method**

To gain the data, three different sessions of semi-structured interviews with the students and one session with the teachers will be conducted from the fall 2020 semester until spring 2022. The interview will be held in either online and offline sessions and lasted for approximately one hour. In the case of text analysis, 28 texts with at least 1,500 words will be sent by all students through emails. The texts are writing assignments that have been submitted and marked by their teachers.

* 1. **Data collection procedure**

The procedures in data collection will be classified into three major steps. The first step is to make a contact with the Indonesian Student Association in Hungary (*PPI Hongaria*) in order to sort out participants from the student's database. The second step is to send the invitation and explain the goal of this project. In the last step, students accepted to participate in the project will send their confirmation via Whatsapp or email and sign in a letter of consent. At the same time, students are asked to send their submitted and marked essays by their teachers.

* 1. **Data analysis technique**

The analysis technique for this mixed-method study will be described fully in the following diagrams.

1. Qualitative data analysis technique
2. Quantitative data analysis technique

**Past and Future Timetable**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Activity | 2019/2020 |
| Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb  | Mar | Apr | May | June  | July  | Aug  | sep |
| Drafting proposal  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing proposal  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attending the 1st Doctoral School conference  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Narrowing research topic in academic writing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collecting the information from the Indonesian student association |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attending the 2nd Doctoral School conference |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revising research questions, methodology |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Designing interview question list, piloting interview, collecting documents including students’ essays (1st and 2nd semesters) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interviewing with students part 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revising data collection technique, drafting a letter of consent, and reviewing suitable tools for corpus data analysis  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building literature |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
| Activity | 2020/2021 |
| Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb  | Mar | Apr | May | June  | July  | Aug  | sep |
| Revising interview questions  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Second pilot project * Transferring document files to selected corpus analysis tools
* Coding
* Analysing and reflecting
 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contacting students to send their third-semester essays  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revising interview questions for university staff participants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attending the conference: Qualitative approach :  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interviewing students part 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transcribing  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELTE-EdiTE Conference: Qualitative approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attending the 3rd Doctoral School Conference: Quantitative approach  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transcribing and coding using ATLAS.ti |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attending 28 Hungarian Applied Linguistics conference  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation for complex examination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interviewing students part 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transcribing students interview  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Literature review  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  | 2021/2022 |
| ACTIVITY  | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb  | Mar | Apr | May | June  | July  | Aug  | Sep |
| Interviewing university teachers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transcribing teachers’ interview  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyzing the results of data collection and classifying the findings  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Writing Dissertation  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Building literature |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |
|  | 2022/2023 |
|  | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb  | Mar | Apr | May | June  | July  | Aug  | Sep |
| Finishing and submitting final defence  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Working on revision  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Graduating as a PhD student |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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