

STUDENT AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC ENGLISH WRITING IN RUSSIA

Donna Bain Butler¹, Elena Trosclair², Yalun Zhou³, Michael Wei⁴

¹Fulbright Specialist in Applied Linguistics/TEFL, American University Washington College of Law, USA

E-Mail: ddbutler@wcl.american.edu

²Ural State Law University, Yekaterinburg, Russia

³Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

⁴University of Missouri-Kansas City, USA

Abstract. *Culturally-embedded educational context defines how students learn to write academic papers in professional school disciplines that include engineering, law, social and economic sciences. Explicit standards, implicit understandings, and contrasting student/teacher perceptions influence how academic writing and research may be learned, taught, and assessed. Our study discloses findings from culture-specific academic writer research in Russian educational context that does not explicitly teach academic writing at the tertiary level. The focus is Russian student (N=153) and teacher (N=52) perceptions of academic English writing with meanings and interpretations compared. Research uncovers Russian academic context and cultural norms for first language (L1) Russian academic writing that may remain implicit or transfer for students and teachers composing in foreign-language (L2) English, at home or abroad. This research is important because it informs written language use for English teachers and other professionals such as economists, engineers, lawyers, and scientists: that is, professionals in any research discipline where English may be taught and used for academic or career purposes. Characterizations are made for (a) native academic culture, (b) academic English writing, (c) strategies for academic English writing, (d) composing for academic purposes, and (e) metaphors for academic English writing.*

Key words: *student/teacher perceptions; ESP/EAP in Russia; academic English writing; cultural, linguistic, professional competencies*

1. INTRODUCTION

Research shows that international students bring different cultural norms¹ and literacy practices² when writing academic papers for higher education degrees in English speaking countries. In searching for possible causes of academic writer difficulties international students are known to face, we found a paucity of research investigating perceptions of academic writing in first language (L1) and second language (L2)

¹ Donna Bain Butler, Yalun Zhou and Michael Wei, "When the culture of learning plays a role in academic English writing," *ESP Across Cultures* no. 10 (2013): 55-74 [Special issue: Academic English Across Cultures] Melinda Reichelt. "Defining 'good writing': A cross-cultural perspective." *Composition Studies* 1 no. 31 (2003): 99-126.

² Helen Snively, "Coming to terms with cultural differences: Chinese graduate students writing academic English." (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1999).

instructional contexts. The current study supports Kobayashi and Rinnert's insightful suggestion to explore L2 English writers' L1 background so that higher-level writing instructors are aware of L1 academic influence in L2 academic writing.³ In this study, we investigate Russian students' and teachers' perceptions of L2 academic English writing.

Habits of critical thinking and clear communication define competency (proficiency) in academic writing in any language. More needs to be known about "cultural nuances, firsthand encounters, and the perceptions, meanings, and interpretations" of students and teachers in contexts where English is taught and learned well as a foreign language.⁴ Also, more needs to be known about academic English writing across disciplines and how it is (not) taught at professional levels. According to Korotkina, "Russian teachers of English are reluctant to teach writing because it is time-consuming and complicated, because it is completely new to them, and because teacher training courses on writing are still hardly available. Moreover, ESL teachers in non-linguistic universities are typically disregarded as researchers, discriminated financially, and looked down on by disciplinary professors."⁵ This experience is shared by two co-authors of this article who teach ESP/EAP in Russian and U.S. legal education contexts. Language learner motivation is known to be affected by internal and external factors that include institutional hierarchies and disciplinary power structures that have no interest in or knowledge of academic writing as a developmental process (in any language). Issues of power and difference in ESL academic writing⁶ are generally not addressed in U.S. legal education unless there are charges of plagiarism, which can be a regular occurrence.

Professional educators both in Russia and the U.S. typically do not understand EAP as "the teaching of English with the aim of helping learners to study, conduct research or teach [or work] in that language."⁷ The result may be teacher-centered, rather than learner-centered, academic course syllabi that hamper students academically and professionally by not meeting learner development needs with course goals and student learning outcomes that include academic English research papers, theses, and dissertations. Academic writing is a tool for learning and assessment in U.S. higher education but not necessarily part of the educational curriculum in other countries like Russia, neither in L1 Russian nor in L2 English. At the very least, writing research papers in U.S. academic context means students must (a) analyze, synthesize and evaluate disciplinary research, and (b) describe, compare, contrast, and/or critically examine disciplinary content.

³ Hiroe Kobayashi and Carol Rinnert, "High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, no. 11 (2002): 91-116.

⁴ Catherine Marshall and Gretchen Rossman, *Designing Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1999), 137.

⁵ Irina Korotkina, "Academic writing in Russia: Evolution or revolution?" Social Science Research Network (SSRN), 2014: 6, < <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2435130> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2435130> > (accessed 8 August 2014).

⁶ Suresh Canagarajah, "Addressing issues of power and difference in ESL academic writing." In J. Flowerdew and M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press (2001): 117-131.

⁷ John Flowerdew and Matthew Peacock, *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 8.

2. RESEARCH CONTEXT

Most Russian legal writers (including prominent ones) need knowledge of clarity in academic writing and a system for presenting arguments, according to our Russian co-author who deals with Russian and English language submissions for a Russian law journal. The general problem is that legal writers in Russia tend to use (and re-use) language that is often dense and incomprehensible, with long sentences overloaded with subordinate clauses and stylistic errors. Russian law school postgraduates, moreover, have repeatedly complained about the lack of training in writing course papers and articles in Russian, while Russian law school professors complain about students' poor writing qualities in terms of structure and argumentation. This dilemma may be supported by Russian law school administrators who leave no room in the curricula for legal writing, the emphasis being on substantive law rather than on legal learner skills for analyzing and communicating about the law. As in the U.S., quality is not a professorial or administrative issue but the personal responsibility of students assumed to "know how to write" before they get into law school.

This dilemma is replicated for international graduate students in the U.S. who are thought to need grammatical remediation, academic support, and/or individual tutoring instead of high-level, systematic, writing instruction to produce quality research papers, theses, and dissertations in their chosen discipline. The fact that international students originate from different cultures of learning may be ignored or overlooked in U.S. law schools and other graduate programs that profess professional (vs. general) competency. Students, faculty, and staff typically believe international student writing problems to be more grammar-related than culturally determined; they are generally not aware of differences in academic or legal writing across cultures. They do not help students realize the origins of their problems so students can learn and develop as writers.

Educational context is defined in this article as the English language education of Russia and academic English writing "rarely taught as a specialized course aimed at developing students' writing skills for their academic or professional career."⁸ The institutions of Russian higher professional education selected for this research include three universities of the Ural-Siberian region of Russia: (1) a pedagogical university (students and teachers), (2) a law school (teachers), and (3) a polytechnical university (teachers). An overview of the system of degrees, standards, and requirements in Russian higher professional education, along with information about the universities as instructional context for research participants, is helpful in understanding and evaluating the research results.

3. RUSSIAN CONTEXT: NATIONAL DEGREES AND STANDARDS

For many years, the Specialist's degree, which requires 5 years' course of study at the tertiary level, has existed in the Russian system of higher professional education. After Russia joined the Bologna process⁹ of integrating into the international educational space in 2003, however, a two-level degree system consisting of Bachelor's and Master's

⁸ Korotkina, 6.

⁹ The official site of the European Commission, accessed 8 August 2014, http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/higher-education/bologna-process_en.htm

degrees was introduced into Russian higher education. These two degrees are currently replacing the Specialist's degree.

According to Article 43 of the Russian Constitution, "The Russian Federation shall establish federal state educational standards and support various forms of education and self-education."¹⁰ The Russian Ministry of Education and Science is in charge of drafting and developing these federal state educational standards (FSES), including those in higher professional education for Bachelor's and Master's degrees. Every Russian educational institution is required to follow these standards.

The first federal educational standards in Russia were introduced in 1992 when the Federal Law "On Education" was adopted. Since then, the Law on Education has been revised several times. The current version came into force on September 1, 2013¹¹ and now the third generation of federal state educational standards is being implemented in the Russian higher professional education.¹²

The third generation of FSES has taken a competency-based approach that is focused on general cultural and professional competencies contained in a particular standard for a particular degree. These standards have been criticized by the pedagogical community in Russia for their inflexibility and vague wording of the competencies. Some of the competencies in the standards are not supported by courses to be taught. The list of the required courses is also determined by the standards.

None of the standards includes any mention of academic writing skills or courses in any language. However, some of their requirements can be read to imply some writing skills; for example, in the standard for jurisprudence Bachelor of Laws (LLB) degree, graduates must possess "strong oral and writing skills" in Russian (general cultural competency 4).¹³

An exception to the requirement to follow federal standards was made for the federal universities (such as Moscow and Saint Petersburg State Universities) and National Research Universities (NRUs), which can develop their own educational standards. These institutions are among the most advanced higher education schools in Russia. Some of them have already developed academic writing courses or created academic writing centers; for example, Saint Petersburg University offers a selective course in Academic Writing in English for Masters of Sociology,¹⁴ and the Higher School of Economics in Moscow has established an Academic Writing Center¹⁵ and teaches courses in Academic

¹⁰ The Constitution of the Russian Federation (in English), accessed 8 August 2014, <http://www.constitution.ru/en/10003000-03.htm>

¹¹ Federal'ny zakon Rossiiskoi Federatsii "Ob obrazovanii" [The Federal Law of the Russian Federation "On Education"], December 29, 2012, No. 273-FZ, *Rossiiskaya Gazeta [Russian Gazette]*, 31 December 2012, accessed 8 August, 2014, <http://www.rg.ru/2012/12/30/obrazovanie-dok.html> (in Russian)

¹² The third generation of FSES has been implemented in Russia since 2009. See the official site of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, <http://минобрнауки.рф/> (in Russian)

¹³ Federal'ny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Yurisprudentsiya (bakalavr) [The Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Jurisprudence (Bachelor's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_10/prm464-1.pdf (in Russian)

¹⁴ The course is taught by Dr. Luidmila Kuznetsova. The site of the Faculty of Sociology, Saint Petersburg State University, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.european-studies-st-petersburg.com/Dr--Lyudmila-Kuznetsova-Node_14304.html

¹⁵ The Academic Writing Center at the HSE aims to help its students develop academic writing skills both in English and Russian. The site of the HSE AWC, accessed 8 August 2014, http://academics.hse.ru/writing_skills

Writing for Bachelors' and Masters' degree students. In 2013, Moscow State University, together with the Fulbright Program in Russia and the Russian Association for American Studies, organized a summer school called "Academic Writing: Russian and International Experience."¹⁶

Unfortunately, at the level of decision-makers in the Russian system of higher professional education, there is no awareness of how necessary strong writing skills are in the global professional environment. As previously alluded to, there is evidence about resistance to change in this area.

The lack of strong writing skills is especially obvious in such areas as writing dissertations and articles for professional journals. In 2013, Igor Fedyukin, a former Deputy Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation and a holder of a Ph.D. from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, complained about the low quality of academic articles and dissertations in terms of the language usage and structure. He also pointed out that "specialized academic writing centers" should be established at higher educational institutions in order to teach "academic writing in the internationally recognized format."¹⁷ Unfortunately, Fedyukin has since resigned, so there may be less support in the Russian Ministry of Education at this time to the idea of introducing academic writing courses.

3.1. Significance

Nevertheless, like in the rest of the world, the educational landscape in Russia is changing due to internationalization, the growing demand from students who need to study and work in English, and the need for scientists and researchers to publish in English. A graduate school of economics in Moscow recently hosted a series of seminars on composition and writing center pedagogy, for example.¹⁸ According to Korotkina, "academic writing is rapidly gaining a momentum, and... consolidation with international colleagues to conduct systematic research" is needed.¹⁹

The significance of this research for teacher practice includes deeper understanding of cross-cultural issues in academic English writing as they relate to notions of (a) L2 composition, (b) plagiarism, (c) "advanced academic literacy"²⁰ for non-native speakers (NNS), and (d) professional development for teachers, professors, academic journal editors, and international program administrators.

¹⁶ Fulbright Summer School in the Humanities. The site of the Department for Discourse and Communication Studies in the School of Philology of Moscow Lomonosov University, accessed 8 August 2014, <http://discours.philol.msu.ru/index.php/summer-school-current-eng/11-summer-school/109-school-2013-eng>

¹⁷ Interview of Igor Fedyukin, Deputy Minister of Education and Science of the RF. "Many Russian dissertations do not stand up to scrutiny" (in Russian), *Snob.ru*, 22 January (2013), accessed 8 August 2014, <http://www.snob.ru/selected/entry/56786>

¹⁸ New Economic School (NES): in Russia known as the "Russian Economic School" — *Российская экономическая школа, РЭШ*—a graduate school of economics in Moscow, Russia.

¹⁹ Korotkina, 2.

²⁰ George Braine, "Academic literacy and the non-native speaker graduate student." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* no. 1 (2002): 59-68.

3.2. Purpose

This is a descriptive research study exploring how academic writing is perceived by a purposeful sampling of Russian university students (N=153) and teachers (N=52).

Conducted by a research team of ESL and EFL academic writing scholars and editors, our study explores five research questions from two perspectives: (a) Russian student writer perceptions and metaphors for academic English writing, and (b) Russian teacher perceptions and metaphors for academic English writing. The research questions (RQ) we discuss and report on are the following:

1. What are student and teacher perceptions of native academic culture in Russia?
2. What are student and teacher perceptions of academic English writing in Russia?
3. What are student and teacher perceptions of strategies for academic English writing in Russia?
4. What are student and teacher perceptions of composing for academic purposes in Russia?
5. What are student and teacher metaphors for academic English writing in Russia?

3.3. Limitations

Two limitations apply to this study that uses a research-based questionnaire (survey) to collect data. First, any type of self-report is subject to the limitations of the individual reporting. Second, the relatively small sample size of Russian participants (students =153 and teachers =52) means that generalizations can only be made with caution and not to Russian culture at large.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Design of study

Through a primarily quantitative approach, this descriptive research explores 153 Russian students' perspectives of academic English writing (N=153). In their study of foreign language English and translation, students do some writing (e.g., letters) but no academic writing. Even though academic writing is not taught in student participants' educational institution, all students have to do some academic writing (e.g., course papers) in Russian, whereas foreign languages and translating majors sometimes have to submit their course or graduation work in English.

A research-based questionnaire investigating key issues influencing academic English writing was used with participants. Key issues under investigation were: (a) native academic culture, (b) academic English writing, (c) strategies for academic English writing, (d) composing for academic purposes, and (e) metaphors for academic English writing.

The purpose was to disclose Russian students' and teachers' understandings of academic English writing, compare their perceptions, and discern any gaps in knowledge or understanding that pertain to cultural, linguistic, and/or professional competency. Suggestions for ESP/EAP teachers, based on the research results, are given.

4.2. Data collection procedures

One of our co-authors teaches in Russia and has direct access to research participants through Russian teaching colleagues. After being oriented about the data collection instrument and mobilizing teaching faculty to report on the Russian teaching/learning context, Russian colleagues administered our reliable survey in their universities. The survey instrument is named the *Academic English Writing Questionnaire*.²¹

Data collection took place at one sitting, lasting approximately 30 minutes. Participants were asked to complete one questionnaire in their English class. Authors' questionnaire allowed students and teachers to reflect on their academic culture and to identify actions intentionally employed (called "strategies") for academic English writing. All questionnaire items included definitions for participants. Russian colleagues were not expected to interpret the questionnaire items or definitions for research participants.

4.2.1. Risks and benefits

There are no known risks for participants in this tradition of research, but there are known benefits. First, participants will be more aware of culture for academic writing. Second, participants will be more aware of what strategies they themselves are using, as well as what other strategies they might learn how to use while writing an assignment using academic English. Other benefits include the following: (3) students will consider levels for composing that help them develop as academic English writers; (4) teachers will learn more about the writing process strategies of their students; and (5) the applied fields of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) will gain context-specific information relevant to NNS writing strategies' instruction.

4.3. Participants

One hundred and fifty-three (N=153) students from a Russian pedagogical university, whose majors were English or Translation Studies, participated in this research. They ranged in age from 17-21 and were 1-5 year undergraduate students.

Fifty-two EFL teachers from three Russian universities also participated (N=52). Teachers (instructors, professors) work either in a technical university (N=33), a law school (N=15), or a pedagogical university (N=4).

4.4. Why the selection was made

The research population is unique because it is professional, allowing for comparison of highly trained students and teachers who have had no specialized training in academic writing, with Russian national English curricula determining academic cultural context for the study. This context for students and teachers is described below.

²¹ Bain Butler, Zhou and Wei, 71-72.

4.5. Education context for students and teachers

4.5.1. *Risks and benefits (N=153)*

The pedagogical university research site offers students a degree in teaching foreign languages and translation studies, with undergraduates studying English for 4 (Bachelor's degree) or 5 (Specialist's degree) years. A number of specialized subjects are taught in English.

Students were asked to fill out the questionnaire during their classes in English. Their curriculum includes a course in English language writing during their 1st and 2nd years, but that course does not generally go beyond writing short essays, letters and spelling dictations. Under- and post-graduates must submit and defend graduation papers and course papers yearly. Sometimes they are written in English, but no academic writing course (in English or Russian) is offered.

The standards for those majoring in Pedagogy²² say that Bachelor's students must be proficient in one foreign language to be able to get and evaluate professional information from foreign sources (general cultural competency 10). Those studying for the Master's degree must "be ready for professional communication in Russian and foreign languages (general cultural competency 1).

According to the FSES of higher professional education for Linguistics majors,²³ Bachelors' and Masters' degree students are required to possess "the culture of oral and written speech" (general cultural competency 7) and the system of linguistic knowledge about foreign languages they study (professional competency 1). Master's degree holders must also have good oral and writing skills (professional competency 3), know the rules of intercultural and professional communication in a foreign language environment (professional competency 5), be aware of major academic discourse peculiarities in Russian and foreign languages (professional competency 6), know "how to create academic written works—dissertations, articles, reports, reviews, etc." (professional competency 41). The standards are vague, however, in terms of the essence of writing skills in Russian or foreign languages.

In addition to one hundred and fifty-three students (N=153), four pedagogical university faculty (N=4) from this university participated in the research.

²² Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Pedagogika (bakalavr) [the Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Pedagogy (Bachelor's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_11/prm46-1.pdf (in Russian); Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Pedagogika (magistr) [the Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Pedagogy (Master's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-minobr/mo/Data/d_10/prm35-1.pdf (in Russian)

²³ Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Linguistika (bakalavr) [the Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Linguistics (Bachelor's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_10/prm541-1.pdf (in Russian); Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshego professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Linguistika (magistr) [the Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Linguistics (Master's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_10/prm540-1.pdf (in Russian)

4.5.2. Russian teacher participants (N=52)

Technical university faculty participating in this research (N=33) come from one of the so-called National Research Universities (NRU) with the opportunity to develop their own educational standards. The university's foreign languages departments offer 2-year ESP courses for students majoring in: Natural Science and Mathematics, Humanities, Applied Physics and Engineering, Electrophysics and Electronic Equipment, Economics and Management, Mechanical Engineering, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Thermal Power Engineering, Computer Science and Engineering. Some technical courses for 3rd and 4th year undergraduates and for Master's degree students are taught in English.

Their federal state educational standards, e.g., for machine building majors,²⁴ include the requirement to train students in oral and written communication skills and expect graduates to be able "to create and edit texts in their area of expertise" in Russian (general cultural competency 14 for Bachelor's degree students and general cultural competency 9 for future Masters). Regarding foreign languages, Bachelor's degree holders must be able to use a foreign language for everyday communication and communicate in social situations (general cultural competency 15). Master's degree holders are expected to be able to use a foreign language for business communication (general cultural competency 9). Every student must write and defend a course paper once a year, usually in Russian, which is a general requirement in almost all higher educational institutions.

Within the curriculum of this technical university, some academic English exercises and assignments (writing reports, essays, letters, describing places, etc.) are part of ESP courses,²⁵ helping students develop their skills in English for writing a graduation paper. Bachelor's degree students and Master's degree students are both required to prepare and defend about 20% of their degree work in English. However, no consistent course in academic writing in English or Russian is taught there.

Law school faculty (N=15) also completed the questionnaire. The law school curriculum offers a 1-year course in general and legal English for 1st year undergraduates, a Bachelor of Laws (LLB) degree, and a 1-year selective course in legal English for those studying for a Master of Laws (LLM) degree. Both courses include writing assignments (e.g. letters, essays, career résumés), but they are too short to incorporate academic writing instruction.

The FSES for law students²⁶ require that law schools teach their undergraduates all necessary skills for professional communication in a foreign language like English

²⁴ Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshogo professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Mashinostroyeniye (bakalavr) [The Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Machine Building (Bachelor's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_09/prm538-1.pdf (in Russian); Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshogo professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Mashinostroyeniye (magistr) [the Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Machine Building (Master's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_09/prm555-1.pdf, (in Russian)

²⁵ See: the description of exercises and assignments aimed at developing academic writing skills of Master's degree students at Tomsk Polytechnical University as part of an ESP course: O.M. Demidova. Razvitiie umenii akademicheskogo pis'ma magistrav neyazykovogo vuza [Developing Academic Writing Skills of Students in a Master's Non-Linguistic Degree Program at a Higher Educational Institution]. *Molodoi uchenyi* Academic Journal. no.1, (2014): 510-516 (in Russian), ISSN: 2072-0297, accessed 8 August 2014, <http://www.moluch.ru/archive/60/8848/>

²⁶ Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshogo professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Yurisprudentsiya (bakalavr) [The Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Jurisprudence

(general cultural competency 13), while postgraduates (Master's degree holders) must be fluent in Russian and a foreign language for business communication (general cultural competency 4).

No course in academic writing in Russian is taught there either, even though federal standards require that LLB graduates possess "strong oral and writing skills" in Russian (general cultural competency 4). Undergraduates must submit a course paper every year and a graduation paper (in Russian). Although few, some undergraduates have written and defended their degree work products in English.

4.6. Survey instruments

The Academic English Writing Questionnaire was used to collect the data. This is a 50-item survey instrument, comprised of 48 closed (objective) items and two open-ended (essay-type) items. It is a reliable survey instrument intended to discern perceptions among students and teachers across academic cultures with a view to clear critical thinking in academic English writing and advanced language use in ESP/EAP.

4.7. Validity and reliability

Procedures were implemented to ensure the validity and reliability of this study. For content validity, we consulted a variety of teachers (some with international experience), the research literature, and target group members for relevance, representativeness, and exactness of wording. A validity check with Russian colleagues disclosed "no objections" about questions or results.

After data collection, we used the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21 to analyze the reliability of the questionnaire. Cronbach's Alpha was .884 for the students' questionnaire, indicating that the data collection instrument has high reliability. For teachers, we used SPSS 22 to analyze survey reliability. Cronbach's Alpha was .837 for the teachers' questionnaire, indicating high reliability also. The total number of teachers is 52, but some rows in the tables below do not add up to 100% because some data from some teachers are not available.

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, RESULTS, AND DISCUSSION

Our survey instrument reliably investigated five key issues related to ESP/EAP pedagogy: that is, learning and teaching academic English writing that involves critical thinking and clear communication as in a research paper, thesis, or dissertation. They are (a) native academic culture, (b) academic English writing, (c) strategies for academic English writing, (d) composing for academic purposes, and metaphors for academic English writing.

(Bachelor's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_10/prm464-1.pdf (in Russian); Federal'ny gosudarstvenny obrazovatel'ny standart vysshogo professional'nogo obrazovaniya. Yurisprudentsiya (magistr) [The Federal State Educational Standard of the Higher Professional Education for Jurisprudence (Master's Degree)]. Documents of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, accessed 8 August 2014, http://www.edu.ru/db-mon/mo/Data/d_10/m1763.pdf (in Russian)

5.1. Student and teacher perceptions of native academic culture

The first research question has to do with student and teacher perceptions of native academic culture. Statements No. 1 to 12 from the Academic English Writing Questionnaire (below) were used to answer Research Question 1: What are student and teacher perceptions of native academic culture in Russia?

Russian students' and teachers' answers are tallied as follows: 1S stands for Statement No. 1 Students' answer and 1T stands for Statement No. 1 Teachers' answer and so on, up to Statement No. 12 in the table below. Each of the questionnaire items is addressed individually after the table where participants' responses are described, compared, and discussed.

Table 1

Answers/ Statements	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
1S		12.4%	11.8%	60.8%	15%
1T		7.7%	3.8%	59.6%	28.8%
2S	2%	11.8%	31.4%	46.4%	8.5%
2T		11.5%	26.9%	48.1%	13.5%
3S	1.3%	1.3%	9.8%	35.9%	51.6%
3T		1.9%	5.8%	40.4%	51.9%
4S	0.7%	10.5%	34.6%	45.1%	8.5%
4T	1.9%	17.3%	32.7%	44.2%	3.8%
5S		5.2%	26.8%	49%	19%
5T		3.8%	11.5%	59.6%	25%
6S		5.9%	31.4%	49%	13.7%
6T			26.9%	51.9%	21.2%
7S	2%	19.6%	34.6%	30.7%	13.1%
7T	1.9%	11.5%	51.9%	26.9%	7.7%
8S	6.5%	20.3%	35.9%	26.8%	9.8%
8T	9.6%	28.8%	19.2%	38.5%	3.8%
9S	2.6%	14.4%	47.1%	30.75	5.2%
9T	1.9%	17.3%	53.8%	21.2%	1.9%
10S	2%	9.8%	25.5%	47.1%	15.7%
10T		7.7%	5.8%	57.7%	28.8%
11S	0.7%	6.5%	19%	39.9%	33.3%
11T		3.8%	15.4%	50.0%	30.8%
12S	2%	4.6%	25.5%	42.5%	24.2%
12T		7.7%	13.5%	59.6%	19.2%

Statement 1: Different cultures and disciplines have different kinds of texts and writing styles

More than 75% of students and 88% of teachers agree with this statement, with more teachers than students strongly agreeing with it. Students are more likely than teachers not to know or have an opinion, and students are more likely to disagree that different cultures and disciplines have different kinds of texts and writing styles.

Statement 2. Standards for what is considered good academic writing are established by culture.

Regarding standards, 55% of students and 62% of teachers agree with this statement, with more teachers than students strongly agreeing with it. Approximately 30% of teachers and of students “neither agree nor disagree,” however, and approximately 12% of both “Disagree.” Standards for what is considered good academic writing across academic cultures may not be known, understood, or discussed by all teachers or students.

Statement 3. Writing well in my native language is very important in my native academic culture.

Overwhelmingly, most students and most teachers chose “Strongly agree” and “Agree” to Statement No. 3. Fewer than 10% of students and 6% of teachers had no opinion or point of view. There is general agreement that writing well in native Russian language is very important culturally.

Statement 4. Academic writing in my native culture is knowledge telling or stating knowledge.

Approximately half the students and the teachers agree with this statement although a significant number of both claim not to know or have an opinion. Further, 17% of teachers and 11% of students disagree that academic writing in native Russian culture is knowledge telling. Discussion of when academic writing is knowledge telling may be warranted: for example, when writing objective results for scientific research.

Statement 5. Academic writing in my native culture is knowledge transforming or deepening the level of understanding to include analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of research.

More than 60% of students and 70% of teachers agree that academic writing is transformational and requires more than knowledge telling, with more teachers than students strongly agreeing. A significant number of students (27%) neither agree nor disagree, however, suggesting that deeper understanding of academic writing as knowledge transforming may be warranted.

Statement 6: Revising is a very important stage of writing in my native academic culture.

More than 60% of students and 70% of teachers agree on the importance of revising in Russian academic culture. Close to 30% of both neither agree nor disagree, however, suggesting that further discussion of revising may also be warranted, as in a professional ESP/EAP writing class or workshop.

Statement 7: Academic writers in my native culture need a controlling idea for writing.

Half the teachers neither agree nor disagree that academic writing needs a main idea or controlling thesis statement, whereas student opinion is more varied. However, 40% of students 35% of teachers do agree that native Russian culture requires a controlling idea for academic writing. Deeper discussion of thesis statements, arguments, claims, and presentation of main ideas in academic writing seems warranted.

Statement 8: Academic writers in my native culture borrow other writers' ideas randomly because knowledge is the common property of human beings, not personal intellectual property.

Most students chose “Neither agree nor disagree” to this statement, whereas most teachers chose agree. Further, 38% of students and 27% of teachers chose “Disagree.” Results suggest a need to clarify ideas related to textual borrowing, citation, and plagiarism for students and for teachers.

Statement 9: Academic writers in my native culture let readers infer the meaning of their writing rather than express their meaning directly or explicitly.

Close to half the students and half the teachers chose “Neither agree nor disagree” when responding to this statement. This idea also needs clarification for students and for teachers. More students (36%) than teachers (23%) agree that the responsibility for text comprehension rests with the reader rather than with the writer. Discussion of reader versus writer responsibility in Russian academic culture seems warranted, especially when it contrasts with foreign language (e.g., English) academic writing.

Statement 10: Good academic writers in my native culture refer to authoritative sources in their writing.

Most students and most teachers agree with this statement, although 26% of students neither agree nor disagree. Responses suggest that Russian teachers might do more to address citation as a cultural and linguistic issue in academic writing.

Statement 11: Good academic writing in my native culture means working hard for clear meaning.

Both students (73%) and teachers (80%) overwhelmingly agree that clear academic writing means hard work in Russian culture.

Statement 12: Academic writing in any culture is a socialization process because to do it well, one must learn from others.

Both students (67%) and teachers (79%) overwhelmingly agree that good academic writing requires learning from others, regardless of culture. However, 25% of students respondents are unclear, suggesting a need for more socialization by teachers and more knowledgeable others.

5.1.1. Answer to Research Question 1

Overall, perceptions of native academic culture are fundamentally the same for Russian students as for Russian teachers. Most students (52%) and most teachers (52%) chose “Strongly agree” to statement No. 3, “Writing well in my native language is very important in my native academic culture.” This belief may provide foundation for the other statements describing academic writing in native Russian academic culture.

In contrast, most students and most teachers chose “Neither agree nor disagree” for statements No. 7 and No. 9 which refer to the need for a controlling idea in academic writing and for directness or explicitness in written communication. Uncommitted responses suggest that such issues may need clarification both for Russian students and for Russian teachers of English.

With respect to native academic culture, the key difference between the two sets of Russian participant responses rests with Statement 8: “Academic writers in my native culture borrow other writers’ ideas randomly because knowledge is the common property of human beings, not personal intellectual property.” Most teachers chose “Agree” whereas most students chose “Neither agree nor disagree.” This difference suggests a possible disconnect between the two research populations as to the nature and purpose of textual borrowing in Russian academic culture and how to approach an academic writing task in academic Russian context, distinct from academic English context.

This contrast also points to a difference between Russian and U.S. approaches to academic writing. In U.S. academic context, for example, academic writers need a controlling idea (thesis, claim, or argument) for academic writing that is usually expressed

at the outset of a paper, scholarly article, or business communication. Good academic writers need to make their point of view explicit and their meaning clear for the reader. In other words, the onus for clear communication rests with the writer in U.S. academic context, not with the reader as may be the case in Russian academic culture. Writer versus reader responsibility is a cross-cultural literacy issue which needs explication for EAP teachers as well as for international students crossing cultures of learning, written language use, and foreign language English teaching.

5.2. Student and teacher perceptions of academic English writing

The second research question has to do with Russian perceptions of academic English writing. Statements from 13-16 and 44 -45 (below) were used to answer Research Question 2: What are student and teacher perceptions of academic English writing in Russia?

Russian students' and teachers' answers are tallied as follows: 13S stands for the thirteenth Statement Students' answer and 13T stands for the thirteenth Statement Teachers' answer, and so on. Each item is addressed individually after the table, as before, and participants' responses are described, compared, and discussed.

Table 2

Answers/ Statements	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
13S	2%	11.1%	27.5%	49%	10.5%
13T		13.5%	28.8%	42.3%	13.5%
14S	0.7%	8.5%	28.8%	47.7%	14.4%
14T		3.8%	13.5%	53.8%	32.7%
15S	0.7%	3.3%	15.7%	46.4%	34%
15T			3.8%	57.7%	34.6%
16S	5.9%	17%	26.8%	37.3%	12.4%
16T	1.9%	9.6%	25%	46.2%	17.3%
44S	3.9%	5.2%	5.9%	34.6%	49.7%
44T		5.8%	15.4%	51.9%	23.1%
45S	1.3%	4.6%	9.2%	26.1%	58.2%
45T		1.9%	7.7%	50%	40.4%

Statement 13: Academic writing in English involves a different process from writing in my native academic language.

Sixty percent (60%) of students and teachers chose "Agree" or "Strongly agree" to this statement. A significant percentage of both groups neither agree nor disagree, however, with more than 10% in each group disagreeing. Results suggest that writing process is an issue worth discussing in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 14: Effective and efficient academic writing in English involves conscious use of strategies.

Approximately 50% of each group agree with the conscious use of strategies for effective and efficient academic writing in English, with 33% of teachers strongly agreeing. Strategies have been shown to have an effect on academic English writing with

the possibility for negative transfer as well as positive transfer, so these should also be discussed in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 15: Academic writing in English is a complex process because it involves learning from source text as well as communicating what I learned to a highly educated reader.

Most participants—80% of students and 92% of teachers—agree with this statement. Academic writing is a complex process, especially in a foreign academic language like English.

Statement 16: I have been taught how to write using authority from printed (and electronic) sources.

More teachers than students agree that they have been taught how to write from sources but a significant percentage (25%+) of each seem unsure; 23% of students and 12% of teachers, furthermore, say they have not been taught how to write using authority from printed (or electronic) sources. More needs to be done in this area. Writing from authoritative sources is an important competency, especially for graduate students in any language.

Statement 44: Writing well in English is important for my studies in graduate school.

Overwhelmingly, both students (84%) and teachers (75%) agree with this statement. 50% of students chose “Strongly agree” suggesting that they might embrace English language writing instruction for academic purposes if it were relevant to their needs. More than 10% of teachers are uncertain.

Statement 45: Writing well in English is important for my career or profession.

Similarly, 84% of students and 90% of teachers agree with this statement, suggesting that both might embrace English writing for career-specific purposes. More than 10% of students are uncertain or do not agree.

5.2.1. Answer to Research Question 2

In sum, differences are not salient in student versus teacher perceptions of academic English writing except when writing with authority from printed and electronic sources (Statement 16). Most teachers choose “Agree” to all statements associated with this research question. Most students choose “Agree” to Statements No. 13-16. For Statements No. 44 and 45, most students chose “Strongly agree” suggesting that they embrace English writing for academic and for career purposes.

5.3. Student perceptions of strategies for academic English writing

The third research question has to do with student writer perceptions of strategies for academic English writing. Statements 17-39 (below) were used to answer Research Question 3:

What are student and teacher perceptions of strategies for academic English writing in Russia?

Russian students’ and teachers’ answers are tallied as follows: 17S stands for Statement No. 17 students’ answer and 17T stands for Statement No. 17 Teachers’ answer and so on, up to Statement No. 39 in the table below. Each of the questionnaire items is addressed individually after the table where participants’ responses are described, compared, and discussed.

Table 3

Answers/ Statements	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
17S	2%	9.8%	28.1%	37.3%	22.2%
17T		1.9%	11.5%	51.9%	34.6%
18S	0.7%	4.6%	4.6%	41.2%	48.4%
18T			1.9%	44.2%	53.8%
19S	1.3%	20.3%	20.9%	32%	24.8%
19T	1.9%	13.5%	21.2%	40.4%	23.1%
20S	3.3%	15%	32%	32%	17.6%
20T	1.9%	9.6%	23.1%	53.8%	11.5%
21S	0.7%	3.9%	19.6%	45.1%	29.4%
21T			3.8%	63.5%	32.7%
22S	3.3%	17%	30.1%	32.7%	16.3%
22T		7.7%	23.1%	53.8%	15.4%
23S	2.6%	26.8%	35.3%	25.5%	7.8%
23T	5.8%	40.4%	40.4%	13.5%	
24S	2%	9.2%	15.7%	52.9%	19.6%
24T		13.5%	28.8%	44.2%	13.5%
25S	7.2%	20.9%	13.7%	45.8%	11.8%
25T	1.9%	23.1%	34.6%	40.4%	
26S	1.3%	6.5%	22.9%	48.4%	20.3%
26T	1.9%	7.7%	34.6%	55.8%	
27S	2%	14.4%	41.8%	36.6%	5.2%
27T	3.8%	15.4%	23.1%	50%	5.8%
28S	2.6%	22.2%	26.1%	40.5%	8.5%
28T	5.8%	19.2%	26.9%	32.7%	13.5%
29S	2.0%	12.4%	30.1%	47.7%	7.8%
29T		11.5%	32.7%	40.4%	9.6%
30S	5.9%	17%	36.6%	33.3%	7.2%
30T		36.5%	36.5%	23.1%	1.9%
31S	3.9%	10.5%	35.3%	40.5%	9.2%
31T		13.5%	40.4%	42.3%	3.8%
32S	5.9%	32%	25.5%	30.1%	5.2%
32T	3.8%	15.4%	15.4%	51.9%	11.5%
33S	2%	13.7%	22.2%	39.9%	20.9%
33T		9.6%	26.9%	44.2%	19.2%
34S	0.7%	3.9%	25.5%	49%	20.3%
34T		5.8%	13.5%	61.5%	19.2%
35S	1.3%	5.2%	16.3%	61.4%	14.4%
35T		9.6%	15.4%	67.3%	7.7%
36S	1.3%	22.2%	32.7%	33.3%	9.8%
36T	5.8%	44.2%	17.3%	28.8%	1.9%
37S	2%	9.2%	34%	45.8%	8.5%
37T		7.7%	26.9%	59.6%	5.8%
38S	0.7%	10.5%	32%	44.4%	11.8%
38T	1.9%	9.6%	30.8%	50%	5.8%
39S	1.3%	7.2%	32%	46.4%	11.8%
39T	1.9%	7.7%	26.9%	59.6%	1.9%

Statement 17: I always consider my purpose, audience, and level of formality for writing.

Most students and teachers chose “Agree” to this statement although a significant number of students were not sure. Purpose, audience, and level of formality for writing are important topics for discussion in the ESP and EAP classroom for all genres (kinds) of writing.

Statement 18. As I write in English, I concentrate on both the content and on the language.

Most students and teachers chose “Strongly agree” to Statement No.18 suggesting competence with content and with language use.

Statement 19. I prefer to concentrate on the content first, before concentrating on my language use.

Most students and teachers strongly agree with this statement suggesting more focused attention on content before language use. This strategy for composing and revising is well documented in the L2 writing research literature. However, 20% of students disagree that they use this strategy.

Statement 20. My sentences are not too long or complex so they can be immediately understood.

Students chose equally between “Agree” and “Neither agree nor disagree” to Statement No. 20 suggesting the need for explication of differences between Russian and English syntax and style in academic writing. Most teachers, however, agree with this strategy for clear communication in writing; they may take more responsibility for clarity in their writing and thinking than students.

In U.S. academic culture, for example, it is the writer—not the reader—who is responsible for meaning in academic English writing. This is why advanced techniques for revising and editing are taught at the professional level.

Statement 21. When I revise, I pay attention to how ideas are connected in my sentences, in my paragraphs, and in the sections of my writing assignment or paper.

Most students and teachers agree or strongly agree with this statement although 20% of students are unsure. Revising for coherence and cohesiveness are issues to be discussed in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 22. I like to have criteria for assessing the quality of my writing in stages: that is, pre-writing, drafting, and revising.

Students are less likely to agree with this statement than teachers. Perhaps if they were being taught or graded on the quality of their writing, they would agree.

Statement 23. I like to follow my original plans without revising them.

Most students chose “Neither agree nor disagree” to Statement No. 23 whereas most teachers chose equally between “disagree” and “Neither agree nor disagree.” Planning as a metacognitive function is another issue well documented in the L2 writing research literature. The efficacy of planning is something students should know about and practice.

Statement 24. When I do not understand an academic writing assignment, I ask the professor for clarification.

Most students and teachers chose “Agree” although a significant percentage of teachers “neither agree nor disagree.” The wording of this statement could have been a factor in teacher responses.

Statement 25. Sometimes I ask my classmates to clarify the writing task for me.
Most students and teachers chose “Agree.”

Statement 26. I generate ideas by thinking about what I have written and by making associations.

Most students and teachers chose “Agree” to this statement but a significant percentage of both were unsure (“neither agree nor disagree”). Notions of knowledge transforming vs. knowledge telling are relevant to academic research and writing.

Statement 27. I refine my ideas by interacting with people at different stages of my writing.

Most students chose “Neither agree nor disagree” to Statement No. 27 while more than a third agreed with it. Similarly, most teachers agreed although a significant percentage were unsure. Interaction with peers and more knowledgeable others is another strategy that many students and professionals find useful.

Statement 28. I improve my English academic writing by speaking about my work to others.

Although most students and most teachers agreed, many disagreed or were unsure about the efficacy of professional or peer review.

Statement 29. I re-use language from source text in English academic writing.

Most students and most teachers chose “Agree” although 30% of both chose “Neither agree nor disagree.” Language re-use and how to do it referencing authority is an important topic in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 30. My first draft is usually close to my final one.

Although most were unsure, a third of students agreed with this statement. In contrast, most teachers chose equally between “Disagree” and “Neither agree nor disagree.” Revising is an issue of writing pedagogy to be explored in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 31. I correct language-related issues only after revising my ideas.

Whereas 40% of students agreed, 40% of teachers either agreed or were unsure. This contrast suggests another issue to be discussed in the ESP/EAP classroom: that is, revising content versus revising language use. Foreign language students not fluent in the L2 academic language might need to discuss revising for accuracy, brevity, and clarity in academic writing.

Statement 32. When revising a paper, I leave it for several days to have an objective perspective of my own writing.

Half the teachers agreed with this statement whereas the student responses varied: 1/3 agreed or strongly agreed, 1/3 disagreed, and others were unsure. Student disagreement may reflect the situation of university students generally: that is, students usually have to work under severe time constraints that may affect their motivation and ability to produce quality.

Statement 33. When revising, I examine each idea again and see how it is developed within each paragraph or paragraph block (section).

Although 60% of both research populations “Agree” or “Strongly agree” with this statement, a significant percentage of students and teachers are unsure. Revising for content (idea) development within paragraph blocks, with or without subheadings, is a strategy worth discussing in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 34. I consider various ways of organizing ideas, depending on my purpose, such as comparison and contrast, cause-effect, problem and solution, pros and cons.

At least seventy percent (70%) of students and teachers agree or strongly agree with this statement. However, a significant percentage of students seem unsure. Paradigms for organizing ideas may need to be made explicit in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 35. I paraphrase information in English by putting source material into my own words.

Most students and teachers chose "Agree," with more students than teachers strongly agreeing.

Statement 36. I summarize information in English simply by reducing source text.

Whereas most students agreed or were unsure, most teachers disagreed with this strategy for composing.

Statement 37. I summarize information in English complexly by selecting and reorganizing source text.

At least 60% of both populations agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. A significant percentage of both students and teachers chose "Neither agree nor disagree" suggesting attention to summary in the ESP/EAP classroom.

Statement 38. I synthesize information in English by combining and connecting source text.

More than half of both research populations agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, but approximately 1/3 of both students and teachers chose "Neither agree nor disagree." Synthesizing, distinct from summarizing, may need to be discussed in the ESP/EAP classroom depending on the kind of academic writing being discussed.

Statement 39. I analyze information in English by reflecting and breaking down source text into its parts.

Approximately 60% of students and teachers seem familiar with analysis in academic English writing by choosing "Agree" or "Strongly agree" to this statement. However, a significant percentage of both seem unsure; how to go about analyzing foreign-language source text may need to be discussed in the ESP/EAP classroom.

5.3.1. Answer to Research Question 3

In sum, most student and teacher participants seem knowledgeable about academic English writing strategies and the cognitive academic language skills needed for drafting: that is, paraphrase, summary, synthesis, and analysis. Using these skills effectively and efficiently is part of ESP/EAP writing pedagogy.

5.4. Student perceptions of composing for academic purposes

The fourth research question has to do with student writer perceptions of composing for academic purposes. Based on William Grabe's research,²⁷ statements 40-43 were used

²⁷ William Grabe, "Notes toward a theory of second language writing." In *On second language writing*, edited by T. Silva and P. K. Matsuda, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (2001): 39-58.

to answer Research Question 4: What are student and teacher perceptions of composing for academic purposes in Russia?

Russian students' and teachers' answers are tallied as follows: 40S stands for Statement No. 40 students' answer and 40T stands for Statement No. 40 Teachers' answer and so on, up to Statement No. 43 in the table below. Each of the questionnaire items is addressed individually after the table where participants' responses are described, compared, and discussed.

Russian students' answers are tallied as follows:

Table 4

Answers/ Statements	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
40S	0.7%	9.8%	30.7%	46.4%	11.1%
40T	3.8%	9.6%	48.1%	32.7	3.8%
41S	2%	6.5%	18.3%	56.9%	15.7%
41T	1.9%	3.8%	36.5%	48.1%	7.7%
42S	1.3%	4.6%	30.7%	48.4%	14.4%
42T		1.9%	26.9%	59.6%	11.5%
43S	2%	15%	36.6%	39.2%	6.5%
43T		7.7%	44.2%	38.5%	5.8%

Statement 40. I write to state knowledge in English by listing, repeating, or paraphrasing source text.

Most students chose "Agree" to this statement, but most teachers chose "Neither agree nor disagree." Teachers may not need to rely on this level of academic English composition although 1/3 responded that they do.

Statement 41. I write to understand, remember, summarize simply, or extend notes in English to myself.

More than 70% of students and 50% of teachers chose "Agree" or "Strongly agree" to this statement. The kinds of writing participants do in English may differ, note taking being more of a student activity.

Statement 42. I write to learn, problem-solve, summarize complexly, or synthesize information in English.

Most students and most teachers chose "Agree" although a significant percentage of both appear not to engage in this level of English composition.

Statement 43. I write to critique, persuade, or interpret evidence selectively and appropriately in English.

Most students chose "Agree" followed by "Neither agree nor disagree" in contrast to teachers who chose "Neither agree nor disagree" followed by "Agree." The high number of uncommitted responses in both research populations suggests that more can be done at this highest level of academic English composition.

5.4.1. Answer to Research Question 4

Academic English composition may be less complex when seen from different levels of writing purpose, as statements related to this research question show. For example, statements 40-41 relate to knowledge telling whereas statements 42-42 relate more to knowledge transforming. These are competence related constructs for academic English composition. The fact that most students agree to all statements suggests a certain level of competence in English for academic purposes, but this survey shows that more can be done to advance writing proficiency (competence).

5.5. Student metaphors for academic English writing

Statements 46-50 were used to answer Research Question 5: What are student and teacher metaphors for academic English writing in Russia? These statements had to do with comparisons for academic English writing and the possible influence of strategies and culture.

Russian students' and teachers' answers are tallied as follows: 46S stands for Statement No. 46 students' answer and 46T stands for Statement No. 46 Teachers' answer and so on, up to Statement No. 48 in the table below. Each of the questionnaire items is addressed individually after the table where participants' responses are described, compared, and discussed.

Russian students' and teachers' quantitative answers are tallied as follows:

Table 4

Answers/ Statements	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neither agree nor disagree	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
46S	3.9%	9.2%	26.1%	35.9%	24.2%
46T		5.8%	17.3%	53.8%	23.1%
47S	3.9%	17.6%	30.7%	34%	12.4%
47T	5.8%	21.2%	34.6%	30.8%	5.8%
48S	0.7%	9.2%	19%	40.5%	28.8%
48T	3.8%	15.4%	32.7%	28.8%	17.3%

Statement 46. I am like an architect when I write in English because I plan, draft, and then edit my own work.

Most students chose "Agree" or "Strongly agree" to this statement, as did teachers. A significant percentage of students seem unclear about engaging systematically in the writing process, however.

Statement 47. I am like a laborer when I write in English because I slowly build and correct my language as I write.

Responses for students and for teachers were split between "Agree" and "Neither agree nor disagree" with regard to this statement. Although it may be laborious, the actual process of writing may be analyzed or broken down for discussion in the ESP/EAP classroom so that academic English writers know they have options. Conscious choice can help transform novice L2 writers into competent (proficient) ones. Strategies can also help NNS students find a voice in academic writing.

Statement 48. I am like an artist when I write in English because I re-work and revise my writing as I go along rather than follow a strict plan or outline.

Most students chose “Agree” or “Strongly agree” in contrast to most teachers who chose “Neither agree nor disagree” to Statement No. 48. Agreement for teachers (46%) was lower than for students (69%) suggesting that students need to know more about metacognition and the planning process for academic English writing.

5.5.1. Answer to Research Question 5

The fact that most students agreed to all the statements related to this research question suggests some indifference and/or variety with the writing process when they chose 2 or 3 metaphors with equal emphasis. In contrast, teacher responses were more nuanced and less redundant.

Student participant responses to the open-ended questions (Statements 40 and 50) below provide deeper insight into how students see themselves as academic writers and how they describe their processes of writing in academic English.

5.5.2. Open-ended (essay-type) responses for students

With respect to Statement 49, similar words or comparisons fall into 3 broad categories. As academic English writers, Russian student participants see themselves as creators, professionals, or amateurs (N=92). The creators’ group was most prominent. See Table 5 below.

Table 5 Students’ academic English writer descriptors

<i>Metaphors</i>	<i>Number (N)</i>
Creators /thinkers/artists/actors	47
Professionals /skilled craftsmen/managers	29
Amateurs /unskilled craftsmen/explorers	16

With respect to Statement 50, words or comparisons describing the process of writing in academic English also fall into 3 categories. For Russian students, the process of academic English writing is described with word classes that include present continuous verbs. See below.

Table 6 Students’ academic English writing processes

Verbs – present continuous	building, discovering, growing, cooking, exploring, swimming, doing something well, drilling, deepening knowledge, producing, working hard for clear meaning, creating, composing, drawing, being cunning/dreaming
Adjectives/ Adverbs	difficult, purposive, long and hardworking, lot of time and effort, interesting and useful, easier in Russian than in English, absorbing, laborious and fascinating, not as easy as it seems, fun, diligent, variable, carefully choosing ingredients and proportions, problem solving, word-expressing, as busy as a bee
Nouns	construction, unknown land, proper result/product, difficult process/task, hard work, accuracy and communication, mix of knowledge and imagination, imagination work, process of creation and inspiration, improvisation, creation, work of art

5.5.3. Open-ended (essay-type) responses for teachers

Most teachers did not respond to the open-ended questions so teacher responses are not statistically significant. Of those who did respond to Statement 49 (N=19), however, categories of responses were the same and fell into roughly the same order as student participant responses: creators/designer (N=6); professionals/manager (N=4); and amateurs/explorer (N=4). See comparison below.

Table 7 Teachers' academic English writer descriptors

<i>Metaphors</i>	<i>Number (N)</i>
Creators /thinkers/artists/actors	6
Professionals /skilled craftsmen/managers	4
Amateurs /unskilled craftsmen/explorers	4

In addition to these categories, individual teacher participants saw themselves as analyst, scientist, editor, collector, and martyr (N=5).

With respect to Statement 50, words or comparisons describing the process of writing in academic English for teachers (N=10) also fell into the same categories as students. See Table 8.

Table 8 Students' academic English writing processes

Verbs – present continuous	composing, developing/creating an academic product, refreshing of all my knowledge of English
Adjectives/Adverbs	long preparation, hard work
Nouns	creation, creativity, adaptation, systematization [of] performance

Like the students, teachers used the present continuous tense for verbs (category #1). One teacher answered “don't know,” but because the questionnaire items extend from empirical research, this response may suggest that metaphors for academic writing were adequately covered in statements 46-50 to answer Research Question (RQ) #5.

6. CONCLUSION

Survey responses show that writing well in English is considered very important by Russian university students and teachers—for their career and profession (RQ#2). Findings also show that students and teachers have high regard for writing strategies that bridge the gap between conscious knowledge of English language use and unconscious habits for writing production (RQ#3). The importance of planning is emphasized. There are many kinds of writing strategies, but metacognitive strategies like planning have been found very useful in the research literature for student writers to manage and control their processes of learning and communicating. Focusing on student writer processes, rather than on student writer product, is a learner-centered approach to teaching and learning academic writing that develops competence and professional writing proficiency in any language.

This research further shows that finding one's voice in academic English writing can be creative, professional, and exploratory within a process that is active, information additive, and creative—even if difficult and time consuming for NNS learners (RQ#5). Responses show that competence (proficiency) in academic English writing is also related to the constructs of knowledge telling and knowledge transforming (RQ#4) that may have to be taught in accordance with students' disciplinary product requirements. Explicit instruction may be necessary to develop students' cognitive academic language skills (e.g., paraphrase and summary) in English, necessary for advancing academic literacy and writing research articles, theses, and dissertations.

Lastly, perception research associated with this study indicates that student and teacher perspectives of L1 and L2 academic writing can inform upper level academic writing instruction across academic cultures and disciplines of learning. Upper level writing instructors, such as ESP/ EAP professionals in English-medium institutions, can benefit from such research when making important pedagogical decisions that link teaching to student learning and self-efficacy.²⁸ ESP/EAP teachers can ensure student progress with explicit instruction and discussion of student perceptions of academic English writing process and product.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank our Russian colleagues who helped to make this research possible:

Tamara Petrashova, Associate Professor, Candidate²⁹ of Philological Sciences, Head of the Student and Staff Language Training Monitoring Department, Tomsk Polytechnical University, Tomsk, Russia.

Elena Nadtocheva, Associate Professor, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Department of the English Language, Ural State Pedagogical University, Yekaterinburg, Russia.

Maria Yugova, Associate Professor, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Head of the English Language Section, Department of Foreign Languages and Culture of Speech, Ural State Law University, Yekaterinburg, Russia.

REFERENCES

- Bain Butler, Donna, Yalun Zhou, and Michael Wei. "When the culture of learning plays a role in academic English writing." *ESP Across Cultures* no. 10 (2013): 55-74 [Special issue: Academic English Across Cultures].
- Bandura, Albert. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman, 1997.
- Braine, George. "Academic literacy and the non-native speaker graduate student." *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* no. 1 (2002): 59-68.
- Canagarajah, Suresh. "TESOL at 40: What are the issues?" *TESOL Quarterly* 1 no. 40 (2006): 9-34.

²⁸ Albert Bandura, *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control* (New York: Freeman), 1997.

²⁹ Candidate of Sciences is the first Russian academic degree with no U.S. or European equivalent. Sometimes it is seen as similar to a Ph.D. degree. The next higher degree is Doctor of Sciences.

- Canagarajah, Suresh. "Addressing issues of power and difference in ESL academic writing." In J. Flowerdew and M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press (2001): 117-131.
- Flowerdew, John, and Matthew Peacock. *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Grabe, William. "Notes toward a theory of second language writing." *On second language writing*, edited by T. Silva and P. K. Matsuda, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates (2001): 39-58.
- Kobayashi, Hiroe, and Carol Rinnert. "High school student perceptions of first language literacy instruction: Implications for second language writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, no. 11(2002): 91-116.
- Korotkina, Irina. "Academic writing in Russia: Evolution or revolution?" Social Science Research Network (SSRN). 2014. <<http://ssrn.com/abstract=2435130> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2435130>> (8 August 2014).
- Marshall, Catherine, and Gretchen Rossman. *Designing Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1999.
- Reichelt, Melinda. 2003. "Defining 'good writing': A cross-cultural perspective." *Composition Studies* 1 no. 31 (2003): 99-126.
- Snively, Helen. *Coming to terms with cultural differences: Chinese graduate students writing academic English*. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1999.