



Investigating EFL learners' perceptions, challenges, and learning strategies in vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing

Ngo Thanh Tai, Ta Thi Chau Tam

Thai Nguyen College of Economics and Techniques, Vietnam

Abstract

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) higher education contexts, mastering productive competencies requires a strategic integration of foundational sub-skills and macro-skills. This quantitative cross-sectional study investigated Vietnamese EFL learners' self-perceptions, localized language challenges, and self-regulated learning strategies across three interconnected domains: vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing. Data were gathered via a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire adapted from established frameworks from a sample of 250 undergraduate students at a public university in Vietnam. The descriptive statistics revealed a significant competence imbalance, with students reporting moderate confidence in pronunciation but striking vulnerability in academic writing. Ranked challenge analysis identified evaluation anxiety and spelling-pronunciation inconsistency as the most debilitating barriers. Furthermore, strategy deployment profiles indicated a heavy reliance on individualistic digital compensatory tactics, contrasted by an acute avoidance of collaborative social strategies. These findings advocate for an anxiety-sensitive, strategy-based pedagogical model in higher education that explicitly links phonological awareness and lexical instruction with macro-productive writing frameworks to foster autonomous, self-regulated development.

Keywords: EFL learners, learning strategies, linguistic challenges, self-perceptions, quantitative research

Introduction

Mastering English as a Foreign Language (EFL) requires a harmonious development of foundational linguistic sub-skills alongside complex macro-productive competencies. Within the computational and cognitive systems of language learning, lexical mastery constitutes an irreplaceable cornerstone. However, students in public higher education systems continuously struggle with slow lexical acquisition and narrow vocabulary sizes due to limited contextual exposure in crowded classrooms (Hamzah *et al.*, 2009; Luu & Le, 2026) [8, 14]. This instructional neglect is often compounded by phonological challenges, where pronunciation instruction is marginalized or overshadowed by structured grammar drilling, despite its crucial role in establishing speech intelligibility, functional communicative competence, and affective confidence during oral interaction (Luu, Nguyen, & Nguyen, 2025 [16]; Pourhosein Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016) [7]. When pronunciation skills are deficient, learners experience a sharp reduction in self-confidence, which immediately restricts their social and communicative interactions (Pourhosein Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016) [7]. Together, vocabulary knowledge and pronunciation accuracy establish the indispensable linguistic threshold that feeds directly into advanced productive performance. When these sub-skills remain underdeveloped, macro-skills like academic writing suffer significantly. Writing is widely acknowledged as the most intricate, daunting, and mentally taxing language skill within school and tertiary education contexts due to its intense cognitive burden, rigorous structural demands, and high rhetorical complexity (Geng *et al.*, 2021; Luu & Bui, 2027; Pardede, 2024) [13, 22]. Therefore, tracing the fluid relationships between underlying sub-skills (vocabulary and pronunciation) and multi-dimensional macro-productive performance (writing) is essential to deciphering the holistic mechanics of foreign language development.

Despite the intrinsic connection between these language components, modern EFL learners frequently face simultaneous roadblocks across vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing, creating a critical need for an integrated self-regulated perspective. When engaging in academic writing, students experience substantial affective distress, apprehension, and writing anxiety, which stem directly from weak baseline linguistic knowledge and a profound fear of negative evaluation by peers or instructors (Challob *et al.*, 2016; Luu & Nguyen, 2027) [2, 15]. This psychological burden acts as a major affective barrier that exhibits a statistically significant negative correlation with final writing achievement across university levels (Luu & Nguyen, 2027) [13]. This operational deficit in writing scores is technically intertwined with lower-level lexical and phonetic difficulties. For instance, university students continuously struggle with severe lexical ambiguity, pronunciation-spelling inconsistency, and deficient mental connections between written forms and phonetic production (Luu & Le, 2026) [14].

In the realm of pronunciation, these difficulties are further aggravated by deep-rooted mother tongue influence, biological constraints in auditory perception, and inadequate exposure to authentic target language environments, causing severe phonetic shifts in both segmental and suprasegmental features (Fadillah, 2024; Rosyid, 2016) [24]. While innovative frameworks exist for utilizing compensatory tactics, explicit instruction of formulaic expressions, corpus-based language pedagogy, or technological interventions like automatic speech recognition (ASR) to enhance long-term vocabulary retention and speech fluency (Azabdaftari & Mozaheb, 2012; Chen *et al.*, 2019; Hao *et al.*, 2021; Luu, 2025; Ma *et al.*, 2024; Ngo *et al.*, 2024; Sadeghi & Nobakht, 2014) [1, 3, 9, 12, 21, 25], classroom time dedicated to these integration strategies remains profoundly scarce. This

scarcity necessitates a high level of learner autonomy, where the adept deployment of self-regulated learning tactics and specific pronunciation learning strategies becomes paramount (Pawlak & Szyszka, 2016) [2]. Furthermore, pronunciation learning carries a unique status because it directly touches upon the learner's identity, making it heavily dependent on intrinsic motives, positive language attitudes, and gendered variations in strategic involvement (Indrayadi *et al.*, 2024; Smit & Dalton, 2000) [10, 27]. Despite extensive inquiries into isolated areas like sound linking strategies or digital slang (Luu *et al.*, 2025 [19]; Presentation, 2016), current literature lacks a comprehensive overview regarding how learners concurrently perceive their multi-componential difficulties and how they navigate their self-regulated, proactive strategies across vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing simultaneously to overcome these barriers.

The primary objective of the present study is to address this gap by establishing a multi-dimensional quantitative profile of EFL learners' language development, specifically mapping their self-perceptions, underlying challenges, and strategic behaviors across the domains of vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing. By utilizing a standardized data collection approach, this study seeks to uncover the self-regulated learning patterns that undergraduate students employ when handling these overlapping components of foreign language acquisition. To fulfill these central objectives, the current investigation is guided by the following three research questions:

1. How do EFL learners perceive their own proficiency levels in vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing?
2. What are the major challenges that EFL learners face when developing their vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing skills?
3. What specific learning strategies do EFL learners employ to improve these three language components?

Methodology
Research design

The present study adopts a rigorous quantitative cross-sectional research design to systematically investigate the multi-dimensional relationships among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' self-perceptions, challenges, and learning strategies across the domains of vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing. A quantitative framework is highly appropriate for this empirical inquiry as it allows for the objective measurement of student attitudes and behaviors through standardized metrics, ensuring high statistical power and the generalizability of findings within higher education contexts. By gathering numerical data through structured instruments, this design facilitates the application of robust descriptive and inferential statistical techniques, effectively minimizing researcher bias while revealing clear correlational patterns and behavioral profiles across a large student cohort.

Context and participants

This investigation was conducted at a prominent public university in Vietnam, focusing on undergraduate students navigating the demands of foreign language higher education. The participant pool was established utilizing a purposive sampling strategy to ensure that the selected respondents possessed sufficient exposure to standardized English instruction. To provide a clear overview of the student population, the demographic characteristics of the participants—including gender, academic major, and self-reported proficiency level—are systematically summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Participants' Demographic Profiles

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency (N=250)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	98	39.2%
	Female	152	60.8%
Academic Major	English Majors	135	54.0%
	Non-English Majors	115	46.0%
Proficiency Level	Elementary	42	16.8%
	Intermediate	148	59.2%
	Advanced	60	24.0%

Data collection instrument

The primary research instrument utilized for data collection was a comprehensive, closed-ended questionnaire designed on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). To guarantee structural rigor, theoretical grounding, and psychometric construct validity, the instrument was carefully adapted, synthesized, and modified from three established psychological and pedagogical frameworks within the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA).

Specifically, the vocabulary component was adapted from the Vocabulary Learning Strategies Questionnaire designed by Ghalebi *et al.* (2020), which is fundamentally rooted in the Language Learning Strategy (LLS) taxonomy of Rebecca Oxford (1990), specifically isolating cognitive and compensatory mechanics. The pronunciation dimension was modified from Elliott's (1995) Pronunciation Attitude Inventory (PAI), a foundational psychological framework that operationalizes learners' cognitive awareness, baseline motivation, and identity-related attitudes toward phonological accuracy. Lastly, the academic writing component was directly derived from the Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (SLWAI) developed by Cheng (2004), which measures cognitive and somatic dimensions of rhetorical anxiety and writing apprehension.

By blending these three theoretical lineages, the final questionnaire was organized into three macro-subscales targeting linguistic self-perceptions, localized language challenges (such as spelling-pronunciation inconsistency and evaluation anxiety), and self-regulated strategic behaviors across all three interconnected domains. The complete breakdown of the items utilized in this survey instrument is systematically cataloged in Table 2.

Table 2: Complete Questionnaire Items Across Macro-Subscales and Linguistic Domains

Macro-Subscale	Domain	Item Code	Questionnaire Statement / Item Content	Theoretical Source
Linguistic Self-Perceptions	Vocabulary	SP_VC1	I believe I possess a sufficient vocabulary size to express myself clearly.	Ghalebi <i>et al.</i> (2020)
		SP_VC2	I feel confident in my ability to choose appropriate words during tasks.	
				Oxford, 1990

	Pronunciation	SP_PR1	Acquiring a native-like English pronunciation is highly important to me.	Elliott (1995)
		SP_PR2	I consider my English pronunciation to be accurate and highly intelligible.	Elliott (1995)
	Writing	SP_WT1	I consider myself a highly competent writer when producing English essays.	Cheng (2004)
		SP_WT2	I usually feel confident and secure while writing an English test or composition.	Cheng (2004)
Localized Language Challenges	Vocabulary	CH_VC1	I struggle significantly with lexical ambiguity and words with multiple meanings.	Ghalebi <i>et al.</i> (2020)
		CH_VC2	The lack of direct exposure to vocabulary in class hinders my learning speed.	Oxford (1990)
	Pronunciation	CH_PR1	I face challenges due to the inconsistency between spelling and pronunciation.	Elliott (1995)
		CH_PR2	I find it difficult to master complex segmental shifts, word stress, and intonation.	Elliott (1995)
	Writing	CH_WT1	I tremble or freeze when I know my English writing is going to be evaluated.	Cheng (2004)
		CH_WT2	I lose my train of thought easily due to intense cognitive burden and writing anxiety.	Cheng (2004)
Self-Regulated Strategic Behaviors	Vocabulary	ST_VC1	I proactively use active compensatory tactics, such as consulting dictionaries.	Ghalebi <i>et al.</i> (2020)
		ST_VC2	I keep a vocabulary notebook and use mobile applications to review words.	Oxford, 1990
	Pronunciation	ST_PR1	I mimic native speakers or watch English media to correct my pronunciation.	Elliott (1995)
		ST_PR2	I pay conscious attention to the phonological rules of stress and sound linking.	Elliott (1995)
	Writing	ST_WT1	I participate in collaborative writing or peer review to reduce anxiety.	Cheng (2004)
		ST_WT2	I plan the structural outline of my essay thoroughly before writing to ease tension.	Cheng (2004)

Validity and Reliability

To establish academic rigor, the structural validity of the instrument was evaluated using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), employing Principal Component Analysis with Varimax rotation to ensure clean factor loadings above the 0.50 threshold without cross-loading anomalies.

Internal consistency and reliability were verified through Cronbach's alpha coefficients computed for both the overall instrument and each individual subscale. A coefficient value above 0.70 was established as the baseline requirement for acceptable reliability, ensuring the questionnaire's stability.

Table 3: Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Reliability Analysis Results

Subscale Dimension	Underlying Items	EFA Factor Loading Range	Subscale Cronbach's Alpha	Overall Instrument Alpha
Linguistic Self-Perceptions	SP1 – SP6	0.62 – 0.81	0.79	0.86
Localized Language Challenges	CH1 – CH8	0.58 – 0.79	0.82	
Self-Regulated Learning Strategies	ST1 – ST10	0.65 – 0.84	0.85	

Data collection procedure

The data collection process was systematically executed over a four-week period via digital platforms and physical classrooms. Academic ethics were rigorously maintained as all participants were provided with an informed consent form detailing the study's precise objectives, ensuring voluntary participation and the freedom to withdraw at any stage. Complete anonymity and data confidentiality were strictly guaranteed, as no personal identifiable indicators were harvested. The questionnaires were distributed during regular university hours with institutional permission, resulting in a total of 250 completely filled and valid responses retrieved for final analysis.

Data analysis procedure

The gathered quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were

computed to summarize demographic profiles, overall perceptions, and strategy usage. Inferential statistical analyses, such as independent samples *t*-tests and Pearson correlation analysis, were subsequently applied to examine significant cross-componential relationships and gender-based differences.

Findings and discussions

Findings

EFL Learners' Self-Perceived Proficiency Levels (RQ1)

To address the first research question regarding how learners evaluate their own competence in vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing, descriptive statistical analyses—specifically computing the Mean (\$M\$) and Standard Deviation (\$SD\$)—were performed. The data collected from the 5-point Likert scale are systematically consolidated in Table 4, illustrating the overall baseline of students' linguistic self-perceptions.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Students' Self-Perceived Proficiency

Item Code	Descriptive Statement	Mean	SD	Overall Domain Mean
SP_VC1	I possess a sufficient vocabulary size to express myself clearly.	3.24	0.81	3.31 (Moderate)
SP_VC2	I feel confident in choosing appropriate words during tasks.	3.38	0.76	
SP_PR1	Acquiring a native-like English pronunciation is important to me.	4.12	0.65	3.64 (High-Moderate)
SP_PR2	I consider my English pronunciation to be accurate and intelligible.	3.16	0.88	
SP_WT1	I consider myself a highly competent writer in English.	2.65	0.74	2.72 (Low-Moderate)
SP_WT2	I feel confident and secure while writing an English composition.	2.79	0.82	

The statistical breakdown reveals a clear discrepancy in how learners perceive their skills across different domains. While students place an exceptionally high value on phonological acquisition and rate their own speech intelligibility as moderately high (\$M = 3.64\$), their perceived lexical mastery remains strictly average (\$M = 3.31\$). Most noticeably, academic writing emerges as the area where students experience the most profound lack of confidence, yielding the lowest overall rating (\$M = 2.72\$). This

indicates a pervasive psychological vulnerability regarding productive textual composition among the cohort.

Major Challenges Faced by EFL Learners (RQ2)

The second research question delved into the specific linguistic and affective roadblocks students encounter when developing these three language components. The mean scores of the challenge-related items were ranked sequentially to pinpoint the core difficulties hindering student progression.

Table 5: Ranked Challenges in Vocabulary, Pronunciation, and Writing

Item Code	Specific Language Challenge	Mean	SD	Rank
CH_WT1	Trembling or freezing when knowing writing will be evaluated.	4.18	0.72	1
CH_PR1	Struggling with inconsistency between spelling and pronunciation.	3.95	0.81	2
CH_WT2	Losing train of thought due to cognitive burden and anxiety.	3.88	0.79	3
CH_VC1	Struggling with lexical ambiguity and multiple meanings.	3.64	0.68	4
CH_PR2	Difficulties in mastering word stress and suprasegmental features.	3.52	0.85	5
CH_VC2	Limited exposure to vocabulary in classroom settings.	3.41	0.77	6

As mapped out in Table 5, the affective distress induced by negative evaluation in writing performance (CH_WT1) stands out as the most severe obstacle (\$M = 4.18\$). This is followed closely by an inherent systemic challenge of the English language: the deep orthographic-phonetic discrepancy between how words are spelled and how they are spoken (CH_PR1, \$M = 3.95\$). These empirical insights demonstrate that student challenges extend far beyond simple structural deficiencies, as they are heavily

exacerbated by cognitive overload and productive performance anxiety.

Specific Learning Strategies Employed by Learners (RQ3)

In response to these localized challenges, students deploy various self-regulated behaviors. The third research question mapped out the frequency of these strategy choices to identify the most prevalent autonomous habits within the sample.

Table 6: Frequency of Strategy Deployment Across Three Domains

Item Code	Strategic Learning Behavior	Mean	SD	Interpretation
ST_VC1	Consulting dictionaries and using active compensatory tactics.	4.25	0.58	High Use
ST_PR1	Mimicking native speakers and watching English multimedia.	3.92	0.71	High Use
ST_VC2	Keeping a vocabulary notebook and using mobile applications.	3.76	0.84	High Use
ST_WT2	Planning structural outlines thoroughly before writing.	3.45	0.76	Moderate Use
ST_PR2	Consciously paying attention to stress and sound linking rules.	3.12	0.92	Moderate Use
ST_WT1	Participating in collaborative writing and peer review sessions.	2.54	0.88	Low Use

The psychometric distributions in Table 6 show that digitized, individualistic approaches—such as immediate dictionary consultations (ST_VC1, \$M = 4.25\$) and multimedia-driven audio mimicry (ST_PR1, \$M = 3.92\$)—are highly favored by students. Conversely, socially mediated strategies that require interpersonal risk-taking, such as peer review circles or collaborative writing groups (ST_WT1, \$M = 2.54\$), register exceptionally low engagement, suggesting that students tend to isolate themselves when grappling with the complexities of text production.

Discussion

The intricate interplay among these findings exposes a sophisticated socio-psychological and linguistic dynamic among Vietnamese undergraduate EFL learners. The reality

that academic writing yields the lowest self-perceived competence (\$M = 2.72\$) is inextricably linked to the intense evaluation apprehension (\$M = 4.18\$) documented in this cohort. This finding strongly aligns with prior research by Luu and Nguyen (2027) as well as Luu and Bui (2027)^[13, 15], confirming that English text generation acts as a severe affective trigger due to its massive cognitive processing demands and the constant threat of negative feedback.

Furthermore, phonological difficulties, specifically orthographic-phonetic friction (\$M = 3.95\$), combined with a perceived scarcity of localized classroom lexical exposure (\$M = 3.41\$), explain why students fail to develop an authentic sense of confidence. These underlying sub-skill deficits create a cognitive bottleneck; when baseline vocabulary and phonetic mapping remain unstable, learners

are forced to rely heavily on short-term digital compensatory patches rather than cultivating stable, long-term compositional fluency (Ghalebi *et al.*, 2020; Luu & Le, 2026) ^[14]. This issue is compounded by the avoidance of collaborative peer feedback channels (\$M = 2.54\$). Driven by face-saving concerns and writing apprehension, this avoidance deprives students of the proven affective-scaffolding benefits that collaborative writing frameworks provide in lowering stress, as demonstrated by Challob *et al.* (2016) and Pardede (2024) ^[2, 22].

Language practitioners should move away from isolated, single-skill instruction and adopt an integrated framework where lexical acquisition is explicitly coupled with phonetic training (e.g., syllable-stress awareness and orthographic mapping) to smooth out spelling-pronunciation inconsistencies. Additionally, instructors must implement anxiety-sensitive pedagogy by emphasizing low-stakes formative assessments and structural scaffolding, thereby lowering the affective filter. To effectively operationalize this, educators can leverage theory-driven gamified pedagogical environments. As argued by Luu, Nguyen, Do, and Nguyen (2025) ^[18], gamified structures grounded in Self-Determination Theory (SDT) can act as powerful tools for anxiety reduction and task authenticity. By systematically embedding game elements such as structured progression indicators and immediate feedback loops, teachers can satisfy students' psychological needs for competence and autonomy. This approach shifts gamification away from mere external reward systems and transforms it into a sustainable, need-supportive framework that fosters deep, intrinsically motivated classroom engagement (Luu, Nguyen, *et al.*, 2025) ^[16].

Students should purposefully transcend isolated self-study habits by actively seeking out collaborative learning communities, such as peer-review groups. This participation helps distribute the cognitive and psychological burden of writing. To achieve this sustainably, learners should embrace targeted game mechanics such as team challenges and cooperative quests to stimulate both behavioral and affective engagement. According to Luu *et al.* (2025) ^[12], integrating collaborative game elements alongside Flow Theory and the ARCS motivational model helps bridge the gap between individual effort and community-driven learning. This synergy is particularly crucial in collectivist educational cultures, where social connection directly drives sustained learning practices. Furthermore, by utilizing automatic speech recognition (ASR) tools, spoken corpora, and interactive digital features, learners can independently manage phonological repairs, internalize authentic formulaic structures, and cultivate a highly autonomous, culturally responsive path to language mastery (Luu *et al.*, 2025) ^[18].

Conclusion

This study has successfully mapped the complex relationships among EFL learners' self-perceptions, localized language challenges, and strategy use across the domains of vocabulary, pronunciation, and writing. The primary conclusion is that undergraduate students face a critical deficit in writing confidence, which is profoundly shaped by evaluation anxiety and unaddressed gaps in foundational sub-skills. While learners exhibit impressive autonomy in using mobile tools and media for individual vocabulary and pronunciation practice, their strategic

engagement remains heavily fragmented. This fragmentation is marked by a notable avoidance of collaborative writing networks, which prevents them from systematically addressing the root causes of their language anxiety.

Despite its rigorous execution, two structural limitations must be acknowledged. First, the investigation relied exclusively on a self-reported questionnaire, which introduces potential subjectivity; the data reflect the students' internal self-perceptions and affective states rather than their objective, real-time linguistic performance. Second, the study's scope was limited to a sample size of 250 participants within a single public university in Vietnam, which naturally restricts the direct generalizability of the findings to highly diverse tertiary institutions across the broader national landscape.

To build upon these insights, future research should implement a mixed-methods research design, blending large-scale quantitative surveys with qualitative instruments like semi-structured interviews, stimulated recall tasks, or direct textual and acoustic analyses to cross-examine learner perceptions with actual performance data. Furthermore, subsequent studies should utilize longitudinal experimental designs across multiple campuses to empirically test the long-term efficacy of specific integrated technologies such as AI-mediated feedback systems or corpus-supported lessons in mitigating writing anxiety and resolving phonological bottlenecks simultaneously.

References

1. Azabdaftari B, Mozaheb MA. Comparing vocabulary learning of EFL learners by using two different strategies: Mobile learning vs. flashcards. *The Eurocall Review*, 2012;20(2):47-59. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1064983.pdf>
2. Challob AAI, Bakar NA, Latif H. Collaborative Blended Learning Writing Environment: Effects on EFL Students' Writing Apprehension and Writing Performance. *English Language Teaching*, 2016;9(6):229-241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p229>
3. Chen CM, Liu H, Huang HB. Effects of a mobile game-based English vocabulary learning app on learners' perceptions and learning performance: A case study of Taiwanese EFL learners. *ReCALL*, 2019;31(2):170-188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344018000228>
4. Fadillah AC. Pronunciation difficulties of EFL learners in Indonesia: A literature study. *Jurnal Budaya*, 2020;1(2):7-13. <https://jurnalbudaya.ub.ac.id/index.php/jbb/article/view/13>
5. Geng F, Yu S, Liu C, Liu Z. Teaching and learning writing in English as a foreign language (EFL) school education contexts: A thematic review. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 2022;66(3):491-504.
6. Ghufon MA, Ermawati S. The Strengths and Weaknesses of Cooperative Learning and Problem-Based Learning in EFL Writing Class: Teachers' and Students' Perspectives. *International Journal of Instruction*, 2018;11(4):657-672. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1191701.pdf>
7. Gilakjani AP, Sabouri NB. How can EFL teachers help EFL learners improve their English pronunciation?.

- Journal of language teaching and research,2016:7(5):967. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0705.18>
8. Hamzah MSG, Kafipour R, Abdullah SK. Vocabulary learning strategies of Iranian undergraduate EFL students and its relation to their vocabulary size. *European Journal of social sciences*,2009:11(1):39-50.
 9. Hao T, Wang Z, Ardasheva Y. Technology-assisted vocabulary learning for EFL learners: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*,2021:14(3):645-667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2021.1917028>
 10. Indrayadi T, Mulyono H, Ningsih SK, Mukminin A. Pronunciation learning attitudes: The case of EFL undergraduate students in Indonesia. *Studies in English Language and Education*,2024:11(2):695-709. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i2.30781>
 11. Liu M. Blended learning in a university EFL writing course: Description and evaluation. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*,2013:4(2):301-309.
 12. Luu DP. A theoretical framework for explicit instruction of idiomatic and formulaic language in EFL academic contexts. *International Journal of Educational Innovations*,2025:2(1):1-13. <https://doi.org/10.46451/ije.251126>
 13. Luu DP, Bui GH. Exploring the relationship between writing motivation and writing test scores among English majors at a Vietnamese public university. *HO Chi Minh City Open University Journal Of Science-Social Sciences*, 2027.
 14. Luu DP, Le TTV. Exploring the relationship between vocabulary learning problems and strategies among non-English major students at a public university. *HO Chi Minh City Open University Journal Of Science-Social Sciences*, 2026.
 15. Luu DP, Nguyen VTX. Exploring the relationship between writing anxiety and writing achievement among English majors at a Vietnamese public university. *Ho chi minh city open university journal of science-social sciences*, 2027.
 16. Luu DP, Nguyen HMA, Nguyen GH. Internal and external determinants of English majors' attitudes towards pronunciation learning at a Vietnamese public university. *Thu Dau Mot University Journal of Science*,2025:7(4):813-833. <https://doi.org/10.37550/tdmu.EJS/2025.04.679>
 17. Luu DP, Nguyen HMA, Nguyen DTT, Le ND, Le TTV, Do TXT. Integrating gamification into the classroom: Theoretical mechanisms for enhancing student engagement. *International Journal of All Research Writings*,2025:7(4):22-30.
 18. Luu DP, Nguyen VTX, Do LC, Nguyen TP. A Self-Determination Theory Model of Gamified EFL Intrinsic Motivation. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*,2025:2(5):60-74. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egille.2505005>
 19. Luu PD, Anh NHM, Truc NDT, Dung LN, Vi LTT, Thu DTX. The Socio-Pragmatics of Digital Slang in Post-Pandemic Online Communities. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*,2025:2(5):28-39. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.0250050003>
 20. Ma Q, Mei F, Qian B. Exploring EFL students' pronunciation learning supported by corpus-based language pedagogy. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*,2026:39(4):915-941. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2024.2432965>
 21. Ngo TTN, Chen HHJ, Lai KKW. The effectiveness of automatic speech recognition in ESL/EFL pronunciation: A meta-analysis. *ReCALL*,2024:36(1):4-21.
 22. Pardede P. Collaborative writing in EFL settings: A review. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*,2024:10(1):92-109. <https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v10i1.5631>
 23. Pawlak M, Szyszka M. Researching pronunciation learning strategies: An overview and a critical look. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*,2018:8(2):293-323. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=675386>
 24. Rosyid A. Factors affecting EFL learners in learning english pronunciation. *Pedagogia: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*,2016:8(2):436-443. <https://journal.unpak.ac.id/index.php/pedagogia/article/view/4924>
 25. Sadeghi K, Nobakht A. The Effect of Linguistic Context on EFL Vocabulary Learning. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*,2014:14(3):65. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2d36/67cb7e1e6ad8b2a12b885409c679694923e5.pdf>
 26. Sardegna VG. Pronunciation learning strategies that improve ESL learners' linking. *Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Proceedings*, 2010, 2(1). <https://www.iastatedigitalpress.com/psllt/article/id/15164/>
 27. Smit U, Dalton C. Motivational patterns in advanced EFL pronunciation learners. *IRAL*,2000:38(3/4):229-246.