

Faculty feelings as writers: relationship with writing genres, perceived competences, and values associated to writing

Liliana del Pilar Gallego Castaño¹ · Montserrat Castelló Badia² · Antoni Badia Garganté³

© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2015

Abstract This study attempts to relate faculty feelings towards writing with writing genres, perceived competences and values associated to writing. 67 foreign languages faculty in Colombia and Spain voluntarily filled in a four-section on-line questionnaire entitled *The Writing Feelings Questionnaire*. All the sections were Likert Scale type. The first, *Affective dimension*, consisted of a list of bipolar adjectives (feelings) associated to writing; the second, *Genres*, asked about frequency of use of written genres; in the third one, *Competences*, faculty evaluated their perceived proficiency in writing competences; in section fourth, *Good writing*, faculty valued good writing characteristics. Exploratory factor analyses were performed and subsequently, data were related through a co-occurrence analysis. Results showed a three-factor structure for the four sections, associating: (a) writing to *feelings of demanding standards of writing, satisfaction and importance*; (b) genres to *research writing, technical writing and narrative writing*; (c) perceived writing competences to the *management of formal and technical mechanisms, discursive mechanisms* and in a less percentage, *composition processes competences*; and (d) good writing to *data-driven content information, argumentative procedures and rhetoric mechanisms*. Correlations showed that perceived proficiency in writing competences was related to all feelings. Besides, participants conceived writing as demanding, but also as

✉ Liliana del Pilar Gallego Castaño
liliana.gallego@ucaldas.edu.co

Montserrat Castelló Badia
Montserratchb@blanquerna.url.edu

Antoni Badia Garganté
tbadia@uoc.edu

¹ Department of Foreign Languages, University of Caldas, Calle 65 26-10, Manizales, Caldas, Colombia

² Department of Psychology, Ramon Llull University, Paseo San Gervasi, 47, T2-02, 08022 Barcelona, Spain

³ Department of Psychology and Education Sciences, Open University of Catalonia, Rambla de Poblenou, 156, 08018 Barcelona, Spain

important and satisfactory in their profession. In conclusion, being conscious of the importance of writing a specific genre and perceiving as competent writers are the variables that lead faculty identity to devote time and energy to increase their production of research writing genres.

Keywords Affective dimension · Faculty writing · Feelings · Writing genres · Writing competences · Faculty identity

Introduction

Many faculty relevant practices are inextricably related to writing, which, in turn, has been extensively conceptualized as a constitutive part of academic and professional identity (Castelló and Iñesta 2012), since it *conveys a representation of the self* (Ivanič and Camps 2001). More specifically, research has demonstrated the usefulness of writing for faculty to explore feelings understood as one of the components of identity (Badia et al. 2014; Bazerman 1995; Beijaard et al. 2004).

Studies about reflective writing through the use of genres such as diaries, written commentaries, autobiographies, narratives and professional reflections have proved to help faculty understand their professional lives (Hargreaves 2001; Shapiro 2010; Zembylas 2005). Some others have highlighted the role that feelings like *commitment, care, courage, compromise and fragmentation of personal time* play in their profession (Day and Leitch 2001). However, in most of those studies, writing is conceived as a tool to express, explore or regulate feelings; it is hard to find studies focusing on feelings associated to faculty writing. This is the aim of this particular study: to find out feelings that faculty experience when writing in the academic context and to explore their relation to the use of writing genres, perceived competences and values associated to their own writing. The questions guiding the current study are:

- (1) To what extent are feelings towards writing associated with the use of different genres, perceived writing competences, and values attributed to good writing?
 - a. What feelings do Faculty experience towards writing?
 - b. What kind of genres do Faculty affirm to write?
 - c. In which aspects do faculty perceive themselves as competent writers?
 - d. What are the values they relate to good writing in their discipline?
- (2) Is there any relationships between feelings toward writing, writing genres, perceived competences, and values attributed to good writing?

In what follows, after conceptualizing the notion of genre as a goal-oriented and cultural activity, we review research focusing on feelings associated to research writing and to the use of different genres, as well as on writing competencies and values. The section on literature review emphasizes the strengths of some recent studies but also discuss some of the gaps that our study aims to address. Then, the empirical study is reported.

Literature review

Based on the notion of genre as a goal-oriented, cultural and purposeful activity (Halliday 1985), which is linked to social actions and recurring situational demands (Miller 2009), several proposals have relied on purpose identification as a way to keep genres linked to the objectives and characteristics of the activities in which subjects participate and give them meaning (Bakhtin 1981; Bazerman 1981; Bazerman 1994; Bazerman and Prior 2004; Camps and Castelló 2013; Chitez and Kruse 2012; Freedman et al. 1994; Lea and Street 1998; Nesi and Gardner 2012; Robinson-Pant and Street 2012; Russell and Yañez 2003). The recent work of Nesi and Gardner (2012), wherein genres are grouped into families that are differentiated on the basis of their purposes, is a paradigmatic example. Besides analyzing texts, these authors interviewed teachers in order to understand the specific purposes as well as the circumstances of production of each of the genres. This information allowed them to develop a comprehensive proposal respectful with the notion of genres as social acts.

Studies focusing on feelings associated to research writing and to the use of different genres are scarce and have just been developed with doctoral, post-doctoral students, and early career researchers, whose context and writing practices share similarities with those of novice faculty. In this area, Lonka et al. (2014) have focused on Ph. D. students' conceptions of writing and dysfunctional or negative feelings. Based on an extensive survey, their results pointed out that experiencing problems in writing, such as blocks and procrastination, perfectionism, and seeing writing as the result of an innate ability, were related to negative feelings such as *stress, anxiety, lack of interest and exhaustion*.

From a more qualitative perspective, Cameron et al. (2009) related the role of feelings in Ph. D. and Post-docs as novice writers at the university to the development of know-how and the strengthening of the self as writers. Findings showed novice academics' scarce experience in writing produced feelings of *dread, doubt, anxiety and fear*, and that, in general, writing was perceived as a *difficult and challenging* process. Those authors also emphasized the usefulness of discussing one's feelings about one's writing to increase novice writers' awareness regarding what *good writing* really meant in order to reduce the negative feelings that appeared associated to the lack of knowledge. They also claimed that academics are familiar with criticism but not with creativity, which also could contribute to increasing *insecurity, anxiety and fear*. Authors suggested generating more discussions about other more positive writing feelings such as *absorption, excitement, breakthrough, accomplishment and success*.

Similarly, Carlino (2012) studied how feelings arose and evolved during writing, by means of analyzing reflective notes produced by doctoral students participating in a writing course. Results pointed out that learning to write involves experience of deep feelings, both positive and negative, and also that having awareness of those feelings as part of writing helped doctoral students increase writing competence and motivation to write, dismissing negative feelings.

The few studies that have focused their interests in faculty writing and feelings have also associated writing practices and identity development to writing values and perceived competences. In this area, some studies from an ethnographical perspective, have pointed out that dealing with new genres, such as e-mails, one of the most common genres of faculty's everyday writing, is an issue of meaning construction of new practices that appear to be associated to specific values, which enable faculty to express academic identity and reflect on their role (Lea and Stierer 2000, 2009; Lee 2013). From a similar perspective, a

recent study focusing on the value of writing undertaken in higher education to writing for professional practice in social work concluded that there is currently no clear progressive link between academic writing and the writing in professional contexts (Rai and Lillis 2013). From these studies, and based on the analysis of social, policy and university changes, new genres are identified as emerging associated to specific values and new practices in academia, mostly in the social (*narrative genres*) and bureaucratic areas (*technical forms and academic activity reports*) (Lee 2013; Robinson-Pant and Street 2012).

Writing values have been also associated to competences and cultural practices and the term *writing culture* has been introduced to refer to those educational genres, instructional practices, expectations and required writing competences that influence writing acculturation (Corcelles et al. 2015; Chitez and Kruse 2012; Prior and Bilbro 2012). However, to our knowledge, there is a lack of studies connecting what we know about writing feelings and associated values to writing practices and perceived writer's competences (Prior and Thorne 2014).

To conclude, research has shown a certain relationship between faculty's feelings and writing of different genres, not only scientific genres. However, this relationship has been scarcely explored and little is known regarding whether the variety of genres used by faculty can be associated to specific and particular feelings. This study aims at contributing to this knowledge.

Method

Participants and procedure

Participants in this study included 67 faculty of foreign languages who worked in different universities in Colombia and Spain. Research-intensive universities in both countries were contacted. Faculty working in foreign language departments in Colombia and Spain hold a degree as bachelor and master or a Ph. D. degree in foreign language education. Consequently, they teach either language or language didactics and pedagogy for pre-service and in-service language teachers. None of them receive training in research or writing support

Table 1 Characteristics of the participants

Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	24	35.8
Female	43	64.2
Age		
20–29	7	10.4
30–39	21	31.3
40–49	21	31.3
50 or more	18	26.9
Academic degree		
Bachelor	13	19.4
Master	39	58.2
Doctorate	15	22.4

for publishing their own research although they are considered experts in their discipline and are expected to conduct research and publish it. Country rankings of academic publications situate Colombia in the position 53 in the world and Spain in the 10 place. However, all universities included in our study share similar ranking publication positions in both countries (between the first and the twenty-fifth). Thus, participants from these universities were intentionally selected on the basis of the following criteria: working as a university teacher, teaching not only language subjects but also subjects related to teaching and didactics of foreign languages, having Spanish as a mother tongue, having led or participated in research projects and published their work in the last 5 years. Table 1 summarizes the main characteristics of the participants:

The *Writing and Feelings Survey* was administered online. A letter explaining the study was sent via e-mail to 311 foreign language faculties both in Spain and Colombia, who were previously selected on the basis of the aforementioned criteria. Participants were given a deadline of one month to answer the questionnaire. After that, two more e-mails were sent as reminders. From those e-mails, 67 foreign language faculties (21.54 % out of the 311 professors convoked) responded to the invitation. All the respondents agreed voluntarily on their participation and the anonymity of their data was guaranteed.

Instrument

The instrument used for collecting data was the *Writing and Feelings Survey*, which resulted from the adaptation of two existing instruments: *Teacher Assessment and Critical Incidents, EPIC* (Badia et al. 2014) and *Academic Writing Survey* (Castelló et al. 2012; Chitez and Kruse 2012). Content validity was assessed by four judges, experts in teaching foreign language who knew the aims of the study as well as previous instruments characteristics. The new instrument—*Writing and feelings Survey*—included four sections that are described below.

Section 1

Affective dimension, which consisted of a list of 23 initial pairs of opposite adjectives describing feelings towards writing (semantic differential list of adjectives). The list was adapted from EPIC list of feelings related to teaching (Badia et al. 2014). Semantic differential scores were collected using a scale ranging from 1 to 7. Participants scored each pair of adjectives as observed in Table 2.

Section 2

Genres, which includes nineteen genres (19) adapted from previous questionnaires (*Academic Writing Survey*) (Castelló and Mateos 2015; Chitez and Kruse 2012) and Nesi and Gardner (2012) classification of family genres used at the university. Participants were

Table 2 Scoring example Section 1

	Extremely	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Extremely	
Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive

asked how often they used those genres. The response scale was a Likert type, with 5 alternatives: 1, never; 2, occasionally; 3, sometimes; 4, often; 5, very often.

Section 3

Writing competences, which consists of a list of 14 competences related to writing and again, adapted from the *Academic Writing Survey*. Faculty were asked how confident they felt with those competences. The response scale was a Likert type, with 5 alternatives: 1, Not confident at all; 2, Hardly confident; 3, Not sure; 4, Confident; 5, Totally confident.

Section 4

Good Writing, which refers to values associated to writing (12 items) and also was adapted from *Academic Writing Survey*. Participants were asked to assess how important are some specific aspects in their own writing. The response scale was a Likert type, with 5 alternatives: 1, Not important; 2, fairly important; 3, relatively important; 4, Important; 5, Very important.

Faculty were asked to answer the items included in these four scales thinking about their experience in writing (both) in native and second language. They were encouraged to point out those cases in which their answers could differ when writing in their native or second language. No differentiation was made by any of the participants.

Data analysis

As a first step of the data analysis, four exploratory factor analyses (EFA) were carried out to reduce variability of those items included in each section. In each of these four EFAs, a non-orthogonal solution with oblique rotation (Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization) was calculated, due to the fact that there were significantly correlated factors of each section (i.e., $r > 0.22$). In a second step, Pearson correlations were used to establish the relationships between the factors' scores of feelings about writing and the factors' scores in writing genres, perceived competences, and values associated to good writing.

Results

University teachers' feelings about writing

As shown in Table 3, analyses resulted in 11 pairs of adjectives designated to report the faculty' feelings with respect to writing: *ungrateful/grateful*, *bad/good*, *sad/happy*, *difficult/easy*, *heavy*, *light*, *complex/simple*, *demanding/soft*, *superficial/deep*, *secondary/prior*, *weak/strong*, and *ill time/convenient*.

Principal component analysis revealed a three-factor structure, representing the types of faculty's feelings about writing ($KMO = 0.694$ and a significant Bartlett test, $p = 0.000$), reaching an acceptable explained total variance of 63.40. Each factor showed an acceptable reliability, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.81 (FF1), 0.82 (FF2), and 0.58 (FF3), respectively. Table 3 shows the rotated component matrix with the set of selected pairs of adjectives.

The items grouped in the first factor that accounts for the 29.69 % of the variance, referred to the following adjectives: *ungrateful/grateful*, *bad/good*, and *sad/happy*. Based

Table 3 Faculty feelings about writing

	Mean	SD	FF1	FF2	FF3
FF1. Feelings related to degree of satisfaction when writing	5.66	1.47			
Ungrateful–grateful	5.40	1.91	0.877	−0.140	0.025
Bad–good	5.97	1.59	0.845	−0.237	0.203
Sad–happy	5.61	1.67	0.813	−0.171	0.331
FF2. Feelings related to demanding standards of writing	2.78	1.33			
Difficult–easy	2.82	1.95	−0.319	0.856	−0.149
Heavy–light	3.22	1.59	−0.158	0.854	−0.134
Complex–simple	2.08	1.44	−0.112	0.786	0.023
Demanding–soft	2.99	1.55	−0.112	0.737	0.287
FF3. Feelings related to importance of writing	5.92	0.92			
Superficial–deep	5.61	1.63	0.369	−0.131	0.706
Secondary–prior	6.70	0.65	−0.075	0.134	0.703
Weak–strong	5.63	1.50	0.123	0.000	0.683
Ill time–convenient	5.75	1.50	0.419	−0.154	0.571
FF. Total scale	4.79	0.87			

Means, standard deviations and factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis of Faculty feelings associated to writing ($n = 67$)

Representative factor loadings are in boldface

SD standard deviation

on their meaning, the acknowledgement of a benefit derived from writing activity (*ungrateful/grateful*); assessment of writing quality as non-beneficial or advantageous (*bad/good*); and writing gratification (*sad/happy*), we labelled this factor *Feelings related to degree of satisfaction when writing*.

The second factor that accounts for the 20.42 % of the variance was shaped by a group of 5 pair of adjectives: *difficult/easy*, *heavy/light*, *complex/simple*, and *demanding/soft*. Based on their meaning, those items can be related to writing effort (*difficult/easy*; *demanding-soft*); the weight of difficulty that participants attributed to writing (*heavy/light*); and writing complexity (*complex/simple*). Consequently, we decided to call this factor *Feelings related to demanding standards of writing*.

Lastly, factor loadings grouped the third factor accounts for the 13.28 % of the variance, in four pairs of adjectives: *superficial/deep*, *secondary/prior*, *weak/strong*, and *ill time/convenient*. Meanings of these adjectives can be related to writing relevance (*superficial/deep*; *secondary/prior*); writing weight (*weak/strong*); and appropriateness (*ill time/convenient*). Taking into account these meanings we named this factor *Feelings related to importance of writing*.

From Table 3 it is clear that *Feelings related to importance of writing* ($M = 5.92$; $SD = 0.92$) and *Feelings related to degree of satisfaction when writing* ($M = 5.66$; $SD = 1.47$) receive the highest scores from faculty as compared to *Feelings related to demanding standards of writing* ($M = 2.78$; $SD = 1.33$). At the item's level, *secondary/prior* ($M = 6.70$; $SD = 0.65$), *bad–good* ($M = 5.97$; $SD = 1.59$), and *Ill time–convenient* ($M = 5.75$; $SD = 1.50$) receive the highest scores, while *complex–simple* ($M = 2.08$; $SD = 1.44$), *difficult–easy* ($M = 2.82$; $SD = 1.95$), and *demanding–soft* ($M = 2.99$; $SD = 1.55$) receive the lowest scores.

Genres written by foreign Language Faculty

As shown in Table 4, analyses resulted in 11 genres written by foreign Language Faculty: *Research project, literature review, research papers, case study, research problem, reflections about personal experience, narrative memoirs, Log Books/learning diaries, written exam, taking notes, and technical reports.*

Principal component analysis showed an acceptable three factor structure (KMO = 0.766 and a significant Bartlett test, $p = 0.000$), that accounts for 65.04 % of the total variance. Each factor showed an acceptable reliability, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.88 (FW1), 0.65 (FW2), and 0.59 (FW3). Table 4 displays the rotated component matrix with the set of selected items.

The first factor, labeled "Research writing", accounts for the 36.37 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing genres: *Research project, literature review, research papers, case study and research problem.* Faculty use their knowledge about the aforementioned genres to produce scientific articles, which are a manifested need and demand in their field. This type of writing encodes a systematic and standardized writing.

The second factor was labeled *Narrative writing, and* accounts for the 16.72 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing genres: *Reflections personal experience, narrative memoirs, and Log Books/learning diaries.* Based on their meaning, those writing genres can be related to research as well but inside the university—it probably implies classroom research—and strategies assumed by them or demanded by others (authorities, institution or administration) to share what they have done to the academic community.

Table 4 Genres written by foreign language Faculty

	Mean	SD	FW1	FW2	FW3
FW1. Research writing	2.98	1.07			
Research project	3.02	1.34	0.906	0.222	0.206
Literature review	3.15	1.23	0.843	0.182	0.221
Research papers	3.33	1.36	0.826	0.079	0.028
Case study	2.54	1.20	0.766	0.189	-0.129
Research problem	2.85	1.35	0.759	0.286	0.333
FW2. Narrative writing	2.39	0.87			
Reflections personal experience	2.93	1.20	-0.023	0.791	0.193
Narratives memoirs	2.13	1.13	0.320	0.744	0.137
Log Books/learning diaries	2.10	1.08	0.218	0.738	0.104
FW3. Technical writing	3.25	1.00			
Written exam	3.96	1.32	0.041	-0.048	0.761
Taking notes	3.37	1.37	0.087	0.304	0.745
Technical reports	2.43	1.34	0.457	0.386	0.668

Means, standard deviations and factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis of genres written by foreign language Faculty ($n = 67$)

Representative factor loadings are in boldface

SD standard deviation

The third factor, called *Technical writing*, accounts for the 11.94 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing genres: *Written exams*, *taking notes*, and *technical reports*, and can be related to institutional—and in some cases—professional demands, such as evaluative reports on the performance of students in a particular subject or in the teaching practicum or a report on the implementation of specific curricular practices.

From Table 4 it is clear that *Technical writing* ($M = 3.25$; $SD = 1.00$) receives the highest scores from faculty as compared to *Research writing* ($M = 2.98$; $SD = 1.07$) and *Narrative writing* ($M = 2.39$; $SD = 0.87$). At the item's level, *written exams* ($M = 3.96$; $SD = 1.32$), *taking notes* ($M = 3.37$; $SD = 1.37$), and *research papers* ($M = 3.33$; $SD = 1.36$) receive the highest scores, while *Log Books/learning diaries* ($M = 2.10$; $SD = 1.08$), *narrative memoirs* ($M = 2.13$; $SD = 1.13$), and *technical reports* ($M = 2.43$; $SD = 1.34$) receive the lowest scores.

Writing and perceived writing competences

As observable in Table 5, analyses resulted in eight perceived writing competences by foreign Language Faculty: *expressing accurately*, *finding the right style*, *arguing a topic critically*, *writing a bibliography*, *citing correctly*, *inserting and integrating tables and graphs*, *assessing the impact of a text on reader*, and *handling writing problems and writing crises*.

Principal component analysis showed an acceptable three factor structure ($KMO = 0.716$ and a significant Bartlett test, $p = 0.000$), that accounts for 73.95 % of the total variance. Each factor showed an acceptable reliability, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.83 (FC1), 0.67 (FC2), and 0.81 (FC3). Table 5 shows the rotated component matrix with the set of selected items.

The first factor, called *management of discursive mechanisms*, accounts for the 42.30 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing

Table 5 Writing and perceived writing competences

	Mean	SD	FC1	FC2	FC3
FC1. Management of discursive mechanisms	3.89	0.79			
Express accurately	4.02	0.88	0.900	0.097	0.342
Finding the right style	3.76	1.00	0.839	0.194	0.415
Arguing a topic critically	3.90	0.86	0.834	0.233	0.335
FC2. Management of formal and technical mechanisms	4.00	0.78			
Writing a bibliography	4.03	1.07	0.125	0.851	0.167
Cite correctly	4.16	0.81	0.476	0.811	0.108
Inserting and integrating tables and graph	3.79	1.11	0.041	0.681	0.289
FC3. Management of composition process	3.60	0.94			
Assessing the impact of a text on reader	3.33	1.04	0.383	0.187	0.908
Handling writing problems and writing crises	3.87	1.01	0.425	0.279	0.891

Means, standard deviations and factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis of writing and perceived writing competences ($n = 67$)

Representative factor loadings are in boldface

SD standard deviation

competences: *expressing accurately, finding the right style, and arguing a topic critically*. Based on their meaning, those writing competences can be related to the *management of discursive mechanisms* focused on convincing others by means of a clear and comprehensive text.

The second factor, called *Management of formal and technical mechanisms*, accounts for the 18.79 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing competences: *Writing a bibliography, citing correctly, and inserting and integrating tables and graphs*. Based on their meaning, those writing competences can be related to what texts should accomplish to reach an academic audience.

The third factor, called *Management of composition process*, accounts for the 12.86 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing competences: *Assessing the impact of a text on reader, and handling writing problems and writing crises*. Based on their meaning, those writing competences can be closely related to the *management of the composition process*, which includes the *impact of processes and outputs on readers and also on writers*.

From Table 5 it is clear that *Management of formal and technical mechanisms* ($M = 4.00$; $SD = 0.78$) and *Management of discursive mechanisms* ($M = 3.89$; $SD = 0.79$) receive the highest scores from faculty as compared to *Management of composition process* ($M = 3.60$; $SD = 0.94$). At the item's level, *citing correctly* ($M = 4.16$; $SD = 0.81$) and *writing a bibliography* ($M = 4.03$; $SD = 1.07$) receive the highest scores, while *assessing the impact of a text on reader* ($M = 3.33$; $SD = 1.04$) and *finding the right style* ($M = 3.76$; $SD = 1.00$) receive the lowest scores.

Values attributed to good writing

As observable in Table 6, analyses resulted in 9 values attributed to *good writing* by foreign Language Faculty: *Clear thematic structure, basing the text on sources, using*

Table 6 Values attributed to good writing

	Mean	SD	FG1	FG2	FG3
FG1. Argumentative procedures	4.69	0.44			
Clear thematic structure	4.79	0.41	0.886	0.081	0.445
Basing the text on sources	4.63	0.62	0.862	0.000	0.223
Using convincing arguments	4.64	0.51	0.804	0.185	0.244
FG2. Rhetoric mechanisms	3.83	0.65			
Creative ideas	4.21	0.86	0.083	0.828	-0.004
Simple comprehensive language	4.24	0.80	0.290	0.699	0.200
Figurative language	3.05	0.99	-0.079	0.656	-0.032
FG3. Data-driven content information	4.78	0.35			
Supporting arguments with evidence	4.75	0.59	0.255	-0.027	0.802
Terminological accuracy	4.78	0.42	0.177	0.117	0.747
Critical thinking	4.81	0.40	0.289	0.014	0.613

Means, standard deviations and factor loadings for exploratory factor analysis of values attributed to good writing ($n = 67$)

Representative factor loadings are in boldface

SD standard deviation

convincing arguments, creative ideas, simple comprehensive language, figurative language, supporting arguments with evidence, terminological accuracy, and critical thinking.

Principal component analysis revealed an acceptable three-factor structure (KMO = 0.680 and a significant Bartlett test, $p = 0.000$), which accounts for 61.26 % of the total variance. Each factor showed an acceptable reliability, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.80 (FG1), 0.56 (FG2), and 0.55 (FG3). Table 6 shows the rotated component matrix with the set of selected items.

The first factor, called *Argumentative procedures*, accounts for the 30.60 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing competences: *Clear thematic structure, basing the text on sources, and using convincing arguments.* Based on their meaning, those writing values referred to—in the participants' perception—the procedures that should characterize good writing in their discipline.

The second factor, called *Rhetoric mechanisms*, accounts for the 17.51 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing competences: *creative ideas, simple comprehensive language, and figurative language.* Based on their meaning, those writing conceptions/values can be related to what faculty perceive as important when writing in their discipline.

The third factor, called *Data-driven content information*, accounts the 13.15 % of the variance. The items grouped in this factor referred to the following writing values: *Supporting arguments with evidence, terminological accuracy, and critical thinking.* Based on their meaning, those writing values referred to aspects required to produce good academic texts from the participants' viewpoint.

From Table 6 it is clear that *Data-driven content information* ($M = 4.78$; $SD = 0.35$) and *Argumentative procedures* ($M = 4.69$; $SD = 0.44$) receive the highest scores from faculty as compared to *Rhetoric mechanisms* ($M = 3.83$; $SD = 0.65$). At the item's level, *critical thinking* ($M = 4.81$; $SD = 0.40$), *clear thematic structure* ($M = 4.79$; $SD = 0.41$), and *terminological accuracy* ($M = 4.78$; $SD = 0.42$) receive the highest scores, while *figurative language* ($M = 3.05$; $SD = 0.99$), *creative ideas* ($M = 4.21$; $SD = 0.86$), and *simple comprehensive language* ($M = 4.24$; $SD = 0.80$) receive the lowest scores.

Relationship between feelings towards writing, genres, perceived writing competences, and values attributed to good writing

Factors emerged from previous analysis were correlated in order to find relationships between variables. Results are summarized in Table 7.

In the total score of faculty feelings about writing there is a trend towards a significant and positive correlation with the all writing competencies, called *Management of discursive mechanisms* ($r = 0.34$), *Management of formal and technical mechanisms* ($r = 0.20$) and *Management of composition process* ($r = 0.27$). These results suggest that perception of writing competencies might be related to faculty feelings attributed to writing. In other words, faculty consciousness of their writing competences might suggest experiencing positive feelings towards writing.

Feelings related to the *degree of satisfaction when writing* are only significant and positively correlated with *Management of discursive mechanisms* ($r = 0.20$). Writing is then perceived as satisfactory only when faculty perceive themselves as able to manage discursive mechanisms required in academic writing.

Table 7 Faculty feelings towards writing genres, about writing and perceived writing competences, and values attributed to good writing ($n = 67$)

	FF	FF1	FF2	FF3	FW1	FW2	FW3	FC1	FC2	FC3	FG1	FG2
FF	–											
FF1	0.80 ^b	–										
FF2	0.67 ^b	0.22	–									
FF3	0.59 ^b	0.35 ^b	0.09	–								
FW1	0.18	0.17	–0.07	0.32^b	–							
FW2	–0.04	0.03	–0.07	–0.06	0.23	–						
FW3	–0.13	0.06	– 0.33^b	0.02	0.28 ^a	0.28 ^a	–					
FC1	0.34^b	0.20	0.24^a	0.29^a	0.31 ^b	0.23	0.08	–				
FC2	0.20	0.11	–0.03	0.45^b	0.36 ^b	0.02	–0.01	0.26 ^a	–			
FC3	0.27^a	0.15	0.17	0.28^a	0.41 ^b	0.04	0.25 ^a	0.49 ^b	0.28 ^a	–		
FG1	0.16	0.10	–0.03	0.32^b	0.17	–0.14	0.07	0.31 ^a	0.27 ^a	0.31 ^a	–	
FG2	–0.03	0.08	–0.11	–0.04	0.15	0.28 ^a	0.51 ^b	0.13	–0.03	0.24	0.12	–
FG3	0.19	0.14	0.04	0.26^a	0.12	–0.03	0.05	0.42 ^b	0.29 ^a	0.18	0.34 ^b	0.05

Significant values are boldface

FF, total scale; FF1, degree of satisfaction when writing; FF2, demanding standards in writing; FF3, importance of writing; FW1, research writing; FW2, narrative writing; FW3, technical writing; FC1, management of discursive mechanisms; FC2, management of formal and technical mechanisms; FC3, management of composition process; FG1, argumentative procedures; FG2, rhetoric mechanisms; FG3, data-driven content information

^a $p < 0.05$; ^b $p < 0.01$

Feelings related to the *demanding standards of writing* are significant and positively correlated with *Management of discursive mechanisms* ($r = 0.24$), and are significant and negatively correlated with *Technical writing* ($r = -0.33$). Again, this means that the *management of discursive mechanisms* is associated with faculty's feelings of writing as a highly *demanding activity*. Additionally, faculty frequently use technical writing which is not perceived as demanding.

Feelings related to the *importance of writing* are significant and positively correlated with *Research writing* ($r = 0.32$), *Management of discursive mechanisms* ($r = 0.29$), *Management of formal and technical mechanisms* ($r = 0.45$), *Management of composition process* ($r = 0.28$), *Argumentative procedures* ($r = 0.32$), and *Data-driven content information* ($r = 0.26$). This means that the importance attributed to writing is linked and varies with the faculty's perception of their own competencies in writing, their conceptions of good writing and, at the same time, it is associated to writing genres such as articles or research based-genres.

Discussion and conclusions

The general aim of this study was to explore the feelings that Faculty experience when writing in the academic context by examining them, their writing genres preferences, perceived writing competences as well as values associated to writing.

A first consideration that emerged from results has to do with the type of feelings that faculty associated to writing. The three factors of feelings offer evidence that writing is perceived as a *satisfactory* and *important activity*, although *demanding*. As for *feelings of demanding standards of writing*, results indicate that foreign language faculty are conscious of and conceive writing as a demanding skill and also as a difficult and complex activity, echoing previous research on the topic that confirmed the challenging nature of writing (Cameron et al. 2009; Castelló 2007; Russell and Cortes 2012; Teberosky 2007). Results also indicate that most of the participants felt *satisfaction* with writing and recognized it as *important*, both feelings that tend to be less reported in previous research. Moreover, although writing was considered *beneficial* in the sense that faculty perceived it as *gratifying* and *good*, they also declared it to be *time-consuming* and accordingly, *stressful*, as mentioned (Cameron et al. 2009; Lonka et al. 2014; Shapiro 2010). As pointed out, the fact that in our study feelings have been grouped in three factors help us to better understand the complex interplay of feelings and writing. This is one of the contributions of this study that enables to avoid simple interpretations and facilitating more adjusted explanations regarding how writing particular genres can be associated to specific feelings.

Regarding writing genres, the second consideration is linked to the necessity to explore them in context. The factors that emerged in our results provide information of faculty use of three types of writing genres linked to research purposes (e.g. *research projects* and *research papers*), sharing disciplinary and technical knowledge (e.g. *written exams* and *technical reports*), and writing for oneself and others or narrative writing (e.g. *reflections on personal experience* and *narrative memoirs*). Those meaningful groups of writing genres confirm once again that writing genres at the university should always be studied according to their purpose and linked to a specific context or activity (Bazerman 1994; Camps and Castelló 2013; Chitez and Kruse 2012; Freedman et al. 1994; Halliday 1985; Miller 2009; Lea and Street 1998; Nesi and Gardner 2012; Robinson-Pant and Street 2012; Russell and Yañez 2003). The frequency of use of more *technical writing* related to teaching activity (*written exams* and *taking notes*) than *research* and *narrative writing genres* in the Faculty of our sample reinforces the idea of a teacher who conceives teaching as the focus of her/his profession and probably as one of the most relevant dimensions of faculty identity. This is probably a very particular characteristic of our sample in which participants seem to be in transition from a prevailing position as teachers to a new position as researchers, and consequently have to move their writing practices towards research based-genres.

A third consideration is provided by results related to perceived writing competences. Participants perceived themselves as more competent in the management of *formal and technical mechanisms* and in using *discursive mechanisms* such as *citing correctly*, *writing a bibliography* or *expressing accurately* than in the management of *composition processes*. This seems to be a clear manifestation of participants' focus in mastering structural aspects needed to reach an academic and comprehensive text for the audience. However, the lack of management of composition processes might impede faculty to get an impact on readers. Consequently, these results provide insights into the need of developing writing training programs addressed to faculty, specially centered in composition competences so that they can be able of positioning, making visible the author's voice in the text, and the readers' implication.

Regarding *values attributed to good writing*, results lead us to think that faculty are aware of the importance of *data-driven content information* and *argumentative procedures* in front of using *rhetoric mechanisms*. However, faculty might probably fail to minimize

the importance of *supporting arguments with evidence*, which is a clear need in academic contexts and a requirement of the academic community.

If we relate results from *feelings towards writing* with frequent *writing genres*, *perceived competences*, and *values attributed to good writing*, a significant picture appears. It seems that faculty can experience positive feelings towards writing only when they feel competent in doing so. Therefore, awareness of proficiency in competences in writing can lead faculty to feel satisfaction when writing and consider it important and useful in their profession, although they also experienced it as a highly demanding activity.

Moreover, results help us notice that faculty might write specific research genres, such as articles, more frequently, if they feel writing is important, perceive themselves as competent writers and value data-driven content information and the appropriate use of argumentative procedures as part of what good writing should include. This is a relevant finding that should be tested in future studies. It might be referred to as a phenomenon that has to do with what we could call the *Conditional use of Genres*, whereby awareness of the *importance of writing* a specific genre and perceiving themselves as competent writers, are the underlying variables that lead faculty to devote time and energy to increase their production of research writing genres. This would be in line with some previous studies that have also pointed out the relationship between productivity and well-being (Lonka et al. 2014), which can be related to *feelings of utility (importance)* and *satisfaction in writing*.

Within the educational implications of the study, it seems advisable to design training proposals aimed at helping faculty to be aware of, and deal with, the feelings associated to research writing, in order for them to be able to cope with these genres requirements. Furthermore, the awareness of the *importance of writing* can be enhanced by reflecting with faculty (for instance, in writing groups and seminars), and highlighting the existing but sometimes not perceived connections between professional and academic community.

We also acknowledge the limitations of this study. Firstly, the sample was intentional and results may vary depending on particular characteristics of the participants. However, the distribution of the sample was representative in age, experience and academic background of Foreign Language faculty in both countries. Secondly, this study relied upon faculty perceptions of their writing experiences and we have not accessed their real practices. Future studies could address the relationship between perceived feelings and competences and writing practices by assessing them directly in context with a qualitative perspective. Finally, we are aware that although our sample size (67) is acceptable and adequate because factor loadings are strong (Fabrigar et al. 1999), future studies with larger samples are needed to confirm these results.

In spite of those limitations, we considered that this was a first attempt to map the relationship between feelings towards writing, and faculty's perceptions are important in order to drawn on this relationship. Moreover, this study went beyond previous research that concentrated only in establishing any relation between feelings and general academic writing or between feelings and only some particular genres, competences, or good writing. Firstly, as suggested in previous studies that claim to include a great variety of feelings, we went beyond the usually discussed feelings of *stress* and *anxiety* (Cameron et al. 2009) by using a semantic list of bipolar adjectives, giving participants the possibility of weighting positive and also negative feelings. Secondly, the possibility of studying and grouping a variety of genres from the perspective of their own users identified the variety of written practices present in professional contexts more accurately. Thirdly, if we advocate that writing is a difficult and complex skill, it seems reasonable to continue asking teaching

staff about their feelings, *perceptions of writing competences* and *writing values*, which is considered in only in a small number of studies (Chitez and Kruse 2012).

Conclusively, from the perspective of the affective dimension, the identity of foreign language faculties as writers depends more on *satisfaction* and *importance of writing* specific genres and less on academic community demands. For the participants in this study, writing reportedly played a crucial role in their professional lives; however, they also hold that writing, particularly research writing, is *complex, demanding, time-consuming* and consequently *stressful*.

Deeply rooted in the primary purpose of the study, the aim to contribute to develop in-service training courses and proposals for the faculty's improvement of their writing practices was present. From the discussed results, we consider that these proposals, especially in what concerns to research writing, should adopt a comprehensive approach focusing not only on competences, but also on attributed values, and feelings associated to writing.

References

- Badia, A., Meneses, J., & Monereo, C. (2014). Affective dimension of university professors about their teaching: An exploration through the semantic differential technique. *Universitas Psychologica*, 13(1), 161–173. doi:10.11144/Javeriana.UPSY13-1.adup.
- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bazerman, C. (1981). What written knowledge does: Three examples of academic discourse. *Philosophy of the social sciences*, 11(3), 361–387.
- Bazerman, C. (1994). Systems of genres and the enactment of social intentions. In A. Freedman & P. Medway (Eds.), *Genre and the new rhetoric* (pp. 79–101). London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Bazerman, C. (1995). Response: Curricular responsibilities and professional difference. In J. Petraglia (Ed.), *Reconceiving writing, rethinking writing instruction* (pp. 249–259). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bazerman, C., & Prior, P. (Eds.). (2004). *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analyzing texts and textual practices*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), 107–128.
- Cameron, J., Nairn, K., & Higgins, J. (2009). Demystifying academic writing: Reflections on emotions, know-how and academic identity. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(2), 269–284.
- Camps, A., & Castelló, M. (2013). La escritura académica en la universidad. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria*, 11(1), 17–36.
- Carlino, P. (2012). New genres in the academy: Issues of practice, meaning making and identity. In M. Castello & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies. Studies in writing* (24). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.
- Castelló, M. (2007). El proceso de composición de textos académicos. In *Escribir y comunicarse en contextos científicos y académicos: Conocimientos y estrategias* (pp. 47–82). Barcelona: Grao.
- Castelló, M., & Iñesta, A. (2012). Texts as artifacts-in-activity: Developing authorial identity and academic voice in writing academic research papers. In M. Castelló & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 179–200). Bingley: Emerald group Publishing Limited.
- Castelló, M., Mateos, M., Castells, N., Iñesta, A., Cuevas, I., & Solé, I. (2012). Academic writing practices in Spanish universities. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 10(27), 569–590.
- Castelló, M., Mateos, M. (2015). Las representaciones de profesores y estudiantes sobre la escritura académica en las universidades españolas. *Cultura y Educación*, 27(3).
- Chitez, M., & Kruse, O. (2012). Writing cultures and genres in European higher education. In M. Castelló & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing: Selves and texts in academic societies. Studies in writing series* (Vol. 24, pp. 151–175). Bingley: Emerald Group.
- Corcelles, M., Oliva, A., Castelló, M., & Milian, M. (2015). Writing at university. Are we on the same page? *Cultura y Educación*, 27(3).
- Day, C., & Leitch, R. (2001). Teachers' and teacher educators' lives: The role of emotion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(4), 403–415.

- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272.
- Freedman, A., Adam, C., & Smart, G. (1994). Wearing suits to class simulating genres and simulations as genre. *Written Communication*, 11(2), 193–226.
- Halliday, M. A. (1985). *An introduction to functional linguistics* (p. 94). London: Edward Arnold.
- Hargreaves, A. (2001). The emotional geographies of teachers' relations with colleagues. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35(5), 503–527.
- Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(1), 3–33.
- Lea, M. R., & Stierer, B. (2000). *Student writing in higher education: New contexts*. Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Lea, M. R., & Stierer, B. (2009). Lecturers' everyday writing as professional practice in the university as workplace: New insights into academic identities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(4), 417–428.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. V. (1998). Student writing in higher education: An academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2), 157–172.
- Lee, I. (2013). Becoming a writing teacher: Using “identity” as an analytic lens to understand EFL writing teachers' development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 330–345.
- Lonka, K., Chow, A., Keskinen, J., Hakkarainen, K., Sandström, N., & Pyhältö, K. (2014). How to measure PhD students' conceptions of academic writing? *Journal of Writing Research*, 5(3), 245–269.
- Miller, J. (2009). Teacher identity. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to language teacher education* (pp. 172–181). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2012). *Genres across the disciplines: Student writing in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Prior, P., & Bilbro, R. (2012). Academic enculturation: Developing literate practices and disciplinary identities. *University Writing, Selves and Texts in Academic Societies*, 19–32.
- Prior, P., & Thorne, S. L. (2014). Research paradigms: Product, process, and social activity. In E.-M. Jakobs & D. Perrin (Eds.), *Handbook of writing and text production* (Vol. 10, pp. 31–54). The Mouton de Gruyter Handbooks of Applied Linguistics Series. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rai, L., & Lillis, T. (2013). ‘Getting it Write’ in social work: Exploring the value of writing in academia to writing for professional practice. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(4), 352–364.
- Robinson-Pant, A., & Street, B. (2012). Students' and tutors' understanding of ‘new’ academic literacy practices. *University Writing: Selves and Texts in Academic Societies*, 24, 71.
- Russell, D. R., & Cortes, V. (2012). Academic and scientific texts: The same or different communities? In M. Castelló & C. Donahue (Eds.), *University writing. Selves and texts in academic societies* (pp. 3–18). Emerald: Bingley.
- Russell, D. R., & Yañez, A. (2003). Big picture people rarely become historians: Genre systems and the contradictions of general education. In C. Bazerman & D. Russell (Eds.), *Writing selves/writing society: Research from activity perspectives* (pp. 331–362). Retrieved May 21, 2014, from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/russell/.
- Shapiro, S. (2010). Revisiting the teachers' lounge: Reflections on emotional experience and teacher identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 616–621.
- Teberosky, A. (2007). El texto académico. In M. Castello (Ed.), *Escribir y comunicarse en contextos científicos y académicos. Conocimientos y estrategias* (pp. 17–46). Barcelona: Grao.
- Zembylas, M. (2005). Three perspectives on linking the cognitive and the emotional in science learning: Conceptual change, socio-constructivism and poststructuralism. *Studies in Science Education*, 41, 91–116.