1 Academic Writing in Russia Beyond Zero Point

Irina Korotkina
Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences

Before the 2010s, writing was largely considered by the Russian academic community to be the result of individual writing experience or innate talent. The term *academic writing* was used only among teachers of English and emerged in its direct Russian translation in debates triggered by the Government Decree of 2013 aimed at transforming universities into competitive global research organizations. Due to its novelty, the term was often interpreted arbitrarily; however, the debates soon involved a nation-wide audience of academics, editors, and educators, who demonstrated major concern about the poor quality of research papers written by Russian scholars. However, as in other multilingual academic communities, the problem was formulated in terms of international publications and poor knowledge of English among academics. This led to a profanation of academic writing, the multiplication of commercial services, and publications in predatory journals. The outcome of all these events is nevertheless positive because they raised awareness of academic writing as a specific set of teachable skills that may and should be developed not only in English but also in the native tongue. This awareness is still vague but likely permanent. In this chapter, I share insights based on long-term research implemented between my two doctoral dissertations on the development of academic writing in Russia, defended in 2008 and 2018. I analyze the impediments to introducing academic writing as a discipline in the national university curricula and elicit the key differences between the Russian and anglophone (globally accepted) writing traditions using the field of education as an example. Drawing from the rhetorical model of anglophone academic writing, I offer a metalinguistic approach to teaching writing, which merges anglophone methodology with the national language by focusing on the cognitive stages of rhetoric. Embracing wider audiences of educators, editors, scholars, and students, this approach can foster acceptance of the rhetorical and publishing conventions of the global academic discourse in Russia, contribute to the

DOI: https://doi.org/10.37514/INT-B.2021.1428.2.01

quality of national publications, and promote academic literacy in Russia and other post-Soviet spaces where Russian is still the lingua franca of academic communication.

Effective problem solving depends on how well the problem itself is understood. Policy analyst William Dunn (2011) points out that an error in problem structuring leads to the failure of the entire policy. When Russian educational policymakers began to analyze the problem of the diminishing status of Russian science, they defined it as the lack of international publications (Fedotov & Vasetskaya, 2013; Polikhina, 2020; Rostovtsev, 2017). Consequently, they focused their policies on research activities at universities and sought for stimuli to increase the number of quality international publications by Russian scholars. Two government decrees[1] stipulated that universities should become competitive research centers and academics should publish their research in top scholarly journals. As a result, Russia joined the "publish or perish" rush, which had by that time already embraced various geolinguistic regions (Canagarajah, 2000; Corcoran & Englander, 2016; Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014), and just like other multilingual scholars, Russian academics found themselves under institutional pressure (Dobrynina, 2019; Zborovskij & Ambarova, 2019).

The consequences of the rush, also known in Russia as "publication fever", have long been discussed by the global academic community. The necessity to publish in English and communicate with anglophone "gatekeepers" (editors and reviewers) has led to the rise of commercial services offered by language and academic brokers; multiple publications in predatory journals; and has ultimately provoked opposition on behalf of those who claim that the dominance of English threatens the national culture (Corcoran & Englander, 2016; Lillis & Curry, 2010, 2015; Rostovtsev, 2017). The shadows of Swales' (1997) "Tyrannosaurus rex" and Phillipson's (1992) linguistic imperialism crawled into the Russian academic community and lurked in national publications (e.g., Popova & Beavitt, 2017).

However, the rush brought in some really positive consequences, such as the rise of university writing centers, the spread of English for Academic Purposes (EAP), the change in the attitudes towards teaching English, and the growing interest in academic writing. This was the point at which academic writing started to emerge in Russia, and it is academic writing that has been crucial in defining the problems encountered by Russian science and education.

1 Government Decree No. 211 of 16 March 2013 and Presidential Decree No. 204 of 7 May 2018 set the goals of fostering the internationalization of science and higher education and integrating research organizations and federal universities.

Indeed, the problem of raising the quality of research, as well as the interrelated problem concerning the status of higher education, can best be defined in terms of academic writing and literacy. According to Hyland (2007, 2011), the three main factors underlying research skills include academic literacy, socialization in a specific academic discourse community, and training in academic writing. Unfortunately, the notion of academic literacy has not been embedded in Russian academic discourse, and as a consequence has never been considered in discussions of Russian higher education (Korotkina, 2018a; Smirnova & Shchemeleva, 2015). Students' socialization in discourse communities has remained rather poor due to the general dysfunction of higher education caused, among other reasons, by the traditional gap between education and science (Sukharev, 2014). For until recently research has mainly been carried out by scientific institutes or research organizations, not universities (Fedotov & Vasetskaya, 2013). However, the major factor in the dysfunction of both education and science has been that academic writing has not been included in Russian university curricula, except for basic courses within EAP programmes found mainly in leading universities (Bakin, 2013; Bazanova, 2015; Smith, 2017; Squires, 2016; see also Chapters 7, 10, and 11).

The priority of academic writing as a fundamental skill set for all university students, largely unquestioned in Western universities, has still been the matter of argument in Russia. First of all, it has been mainly viewed as a matter of individual practice and talent; secondly, teaching writing has been associated with teaching language and literature at school, which has had little to do with research (see Chapter 2); finally, the term *academic writing* has been typically connected with teaching EAP, which has been generally seen as preparation for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test. As knowledge of English among students and academics has been rather poor, teaching academic writing in English may help only a limited audience (Dobrynina, 2019; Petrashova, 2017). The idea that academic writing is a specific discipline and field of study has not yet been widely accepted (Korotkina, 2018a; Smirnova & Shchemeleva, 2015).

In this chapter, I will strongly argue that developing academic writing in a country where English has not been widely used may best be achieved in the native tongue. Teaching academic writing through clear, flexible rhetorical models adopted from the well-developed anglophone writing methodology provides a much shorter path to raising the quality of higher education and promoting Russian research results on the global stage. Indeed, learning writing in the native language will help bypass the long and slow process of mastering written English, which is, in fact, a grapholect (Bizzel, 1999), or a very specific written form of academic communication which all neophytes to

the academy should master regardless of their native tongues (Hyland, 2011). The specificity of a grapholect means that the language of academic discourse is universal and transdisciplinary, with its own rhetorical, syntactic, and lexical features, and therefore has to be taught not only to non-native but also to native speakers—regardless of which national language is used for teaching.

Establishing academic writing as a discipline in the national curriculum is obviously the most effective way to overcome the obscure, obsolete academese which still permeates the Russian publishing tradition and has caused the most problems encountered by writers who have learned writing by imitating this style. Butler et al. (2014) have noted that Russian students and teachers alike have transferred academic context and cultural norms from writing in Russian into writing in English. This happened because no other norms were made explicit to them; conversely, if the norms of anglophone rhetoric are made explicit, writers may follow them deliberately, both in English and Russian.

This idea has been strongly supported by Russian EAP experts who have viewed academic writing through the lenses of academic literacy (Smirnova & Shchemeleva, 2015) and bilingual or translingual approaches (Dobrynina, 2019; Khalyapina & Shostak, 2019; Rasskazova et al., 2017). Many Russian writers are willing to present their research results in accordance with globally accepted rhetorical conventions, but few have succeeded in breaking free from the influence of the old norms. Thus, the Russian academic community today faces the problem of fighting their own tyrannosaur rather than the English-speaking one (Korotkina, 2018c)

Throughout this discussion, I will have to refer to my reflections, which are the outcomes of a decade-long study. The complete analysis can be found in my papers (partially listed in the references), manual on academic writing in Russian (Korotkina, 2015), monograph (Korotkina, 2018b), and doctoral dissertation (Korotkina, 2019b) written during this period and aimed to inform the Russian academy rather than the global community.

To make my ideas explicit for the international reader, I will start with a brief overview of how academic writing in Russia became the focus of national and international discussion. I will then consider the factors underlying the problems of Russian researchers through the lens of rhetoric, systematize typical Russian mistakes drawing from sample papers in the field of education, and offer solutions for the problems. These solutions involve teaching writing for research publication purposes through methods which have been developed in the anglophone community—but in the learners' native tongue. I will conclude by demonstrating the benefits of such teaching in Russia and beyond.

Academic Writing in Russia: Views from the Inside and Outside

As a preamble to this section, I will refer to my own experience of getting familiarized with the notion of academic writing, which might give the reader a real insider's view of the situation. Like other Russian university teachers of English, I discovered academic writing in the mid-1990s. The discovery came upon me as a startling revelation, an abruptly obtained ability to explain things which were meant to be inexplicable. I immediately started to transfer those skills into my Russian writing, and ever since then, my most passionate desire has been to share this new knowledge with every writer in the country.

The first opportunity to share occurred in 2008, when I presented my views to Russian educators at a conference. The impact on the audience was similar to my own first impression, and I was strongly encouraged to defend the idea of academic writing in a dissertation (Russian candidate's degree in education, usually referred to as similar to the Ph.D.). I did, and in 2009 I introduced the terms *академическое письмо* (academic writing) and *академическая грамотность* (academic literacy) into the Russian educational discourse. At that time, the terms sounded so alien to Russian educators that the dissertation council discouraged me from using them in the title of the dissertation. After a long fight, I had to concede to the traditional Soviet wording, which can be approximately translated into English as "The development of professionally-oriented written communication of secondary school authorities in the process of professional development training"[2] — and this was the least horrible of all the proposed variants. Sadly, my research results were disregarded due to my being a novice in Russian pedagogy. Thus, the terms in their Russian translation remained as they were, in informal communication among Russian EAP teachers.

However, I continued the study with renewed vigor when I rediscovered writing as rhetoric and composition in 2013, when experts from the US started to seek teachers of writing in Russia (I will give details later in the chapter). This second discovery contributed to my own understanding and helped me promote academic writing further and much more successfully. My second doctoral dissertation of 2018 (Russian doctor in education) established academic writing as a new discipline and field of study which should be systematically developed in the country and introduced into university curricula and beyond. It was a comparative study titled *Theory and*

2 "Развитие профессионально-ориентированной письменной коммуникации у руководителей школ в процессе повышения квалификации."

Practice of Teaching Academic Writing in Western and Russian Universities (a close translation into English). The very difference between the two titles demonstrates the dramatic changes in the attitudes toward academic writing among Russian academics and educational policymakers that took place within just one decade.

The bitter concern among Russian academics about poor writing and research skills among students broke out into an open discussion in 2011 on the pages of the scholarly journal *Higher Education in Russia* (Kouprianov, 2011; Orlova, 2011; Perlov, 2011; Robotova, 2011; Senashenko, 2011; Stepanov, 2012; and others). The discussion followed two roundtables on academic writing organized by Arkady Perlov at the Russian State University of Humanities and Boris Stepanov at HSE University. Interestingly, I also conducted a round table on academic writing and literacy at HSE University the same year, but somehow missed the start of the discussion in the journal. However, it was the first of a series of publications in which the term academic writing was used in print by representatives of different disciplines and universities. Each of them referred to his or her own experiences and used the term according to their own intuitive understanding. The term itself in Russian was considered arguable and used in quotation marks in the titles and texts.[3]

Unfortunately, when EAP teachers joined the debate (e.g., Bakin, 2013; Bazanova, 2015; Dobrynina, 2015; Korotkina, 2013), and academic writing was defined in terms of the discipline as it has existed in Western universities, other academics ceased submitting papers on the topic. As some of the first participants later explained, they probably realized that their expertise was not professional. However, their papers were—and still are—an important source of information on how academic writing was interpreted in Russia before it became widely known.

The variety of problems raised by the first publications could be roughly divided into two issues: whether university education in Russia needs specific courses aimed at developing writing skills, and whether these skills are specific enough to be called academic writing. Some authors referred to their specific practices in teaching students to write within other courses (e.g., Kouprianov, 2011; Orlova, 2011), others pondered Russian university curricula in general (e.g., Perlov, 2011; Senashenko, 2011; Stepanov, 2012). All authors agreed that teaching Russian students to write was a major issue that needed consideration at the national level because the standards of higher education

3 In the English titles that appeared in the Russian papers, authors did not use quotation marks, so in the list of references to this chapter they are not visible.

stipulated the standards of written papers only formally but did not provide any information on how to achieve those standards.

Being unanimous about the necessity of teaching writing at university, the participants argued about the very idea of academic writing as a special set of skills. Precisely as in the case of my first dissertation, many did not accept the very term academic writing. Indeed, while it was not yet embedded, Perlov (2011) and Stepanov (2012) substituted it in their texts with academic work, which they intuitively considered more relevant to discussing research skills. Professor Robotova (2011), an expert in Russian language and literature, opposed the term on the grounds of language ambiguity: if “writing” means producing text in a language, and the word “academic” in Russian means pertaining to the highest degree of scientific knowledge (like in The Academy of Sciences), then academic writing means writing like classical scholars, which is nonsense. Kouprianov (2011), who did not oppose the term, noted that being deprived of explicit models for expressing their own ideas, Russian students attempted to imitate the style of nineteenth century classical scholars, whose works are usually studied in the first year. This problem also has been emphasized by anglophone academic writing experts (e.g., Bean, 2011; Young, 2006), so Robotova’s fears of possible misinterpretations were partially right.

An especially puzzling interpretation of the term appeared in two monographs by Vladimir Bazylev (2014, 2015). While other authors discussed the relevance of the word academic in collocation with writing, he used the word writing in quotation marks: in both titles and texts it appears as academic “writing.” One of the books had the parenthesized subtitle “theoretical aspect” (2014), the other, “methodological aspect” (2015). They opened with an overview of the above-mentioned discussion in *Higher Education in Russia*, including my own contribution and those by other EAP experts. Bazylev seemed to totally agree with us, but his books (later published as one in 2016) demonstrated a misinterpretation of writing, which he discussed in terms of the traditional Russian disciplines named “Standards of Speech,” “Methodology of Science,” and “Discourse Analysis.” These disciplines in Russia have focused on teaching reading and stylistics, so writing has been viewed as somewhat of a side effect of these courses, which partially explains the quotation marks. A more obvious (although indirect) explanation is found in the bibliography: out of 219 references, only five are in English, one of which is on stylistics, and three on discourse; the fifth is a reference to a university website. The content of the book casts doubts on the fact that the author read Hyland’s *Academic Discourse* (2009), which is one of the three; otherwise, his whole idea of writing would be different.

The only book that approached real writing in Russian was the manual From Note-taking to Dissertation by Professor Natalia Kolesnikova (2004) from the Novosibirsk State Technical University. I wondered why her terminology was so different from English, but when we met, she confessed that she did not speak English and was totally unaware of the existence of English academic writing (N. Kolesnikova, personal communication, February 5, 2009). The astonishing fact about her book was that she introduced paragraph writing with topic sentences and constructing a text of logical clusters in a way that was very close to English academic writing (in Russia, paragraphs have usually been considered mere visual divisions in page layout). Unfortunately, her book appeared to be the only positive result of my search for Russian sources. A few minor publications appeared after her book, but they generally repeated what she said and did not add much.

Probably the first account of academic writing in Russia (or rather, its absence) that became accessible to an international audience was my paper "Academic Writing in Russia: Evolution or Revolution?" (Korotkina, 2014). The study focused on potential misunderstandings in discussing writing in Russia caused by the huge gap between the anglophone and Russian understanding of writing: as rhetoric and composition—or the basic ability to write. A similar gap divided understanding of literacy, which was not—and still has not been—applied in Russia to any skill beyond basic ability to read and write. Because of this, for instance, information literacy has not been accepted as a term by Russian experts in the field, who have deliberately substituted the English term with "*информационная культура личности*" ("informational culture of an individual") (Gendina et al., 2006, p. 29).

Because Russian publications on the topic were mostly limited to the discussion described above, the only evidence I could rely on in the paper was my own experience from schooling, university education, my work as translator in science and technology, editor of a Russian scholarly issue, EFL and EAP teacher and teacher trainer, and eventually teacher of academic writing in English and Russian—the latter being a unique position. Understandably, such evidence seemed either too personal or too general to anglophone experts: at least, this is how Professor Pavel Zemliansky put it when he reviewed my first version of this paper for the journal *College Composition and Communication*, where it was not then published. Indeed, I did not even answer my own question, for neither evolution nor revolution had yet been seen. However personal or general the evidence might seem to an anglophone expert, this first account was immediately referred to in a study simultaneously conducted in Russia by a group of international researchers (Butler et al., 2014). The authors admitted the validity of my account and supported their findings with

multiple references to it. Another acknowledgement, although indirect, came when the paper reached the top ten full text downloads in several educational databases during the first four months of its publication through the Social Science Research Network (SSRN). The reason was the publish or perish rush in other geolinguistic regions (especially in Asia), the rising interest in academic writing, and the lack of publications concerning Russia.

My paper was the result of reflections that followed participation in two events, both of which took place in Moscow in 2013: a course on rhetoric and composition conducted by Olga Aksakalova and Kara Bollinger at the New Economic School, and the 16th Fulbright Summer School for the Humanities conducted by a group of U. S. professors at the Moscow State University. The leaders of the latter also published their reflections on academic writing in Russia (Schleifer et al., 2016), but their publication did not reach the international reader as effectively, probably because it was issued three years after the events and in a Russian journal.

Another study was carried out at the same time by Zemliansky and Goroshko (2016), in whose survey I participated in March 2013 as it reached me through Aksakalova and Bollinger. The study encompassed Ukraine and Russia and was published in the book Rethinking Post-Communist Rhetoric: Perspectives on Rhetoric, Writing, and Professional Communication in Post-Soviet Spaces (Zemliansky & St.Amant, 2016) along with Bollinger's (2016) account of her teaching experience at the New Economic School. All the papers in the book focused mostly on the cultural differences in writing traditions and their influences on writers' attitudes to and understanding of academic writing. They also referred to the low level of English among Russian or Ukrainian students and researchers but considered it an impediment to the development of academic writing in these countries rather than a manifestation of Swales' (1997) "Tyrannosaurus rex."

There was a later publication, however, that attempted to view Russian research papers through the lens of Phillipson's (1992) linguistic imperialism. Published in the Russian *Journal of Integration of Education* (Popova & Beavitt, 2017), the research focused mainly on the formal, cliché-based writing provoked by the spread of the Introduction, Methods and Materials, Results, and Discussion (IMRaD) format. The authors, who based their research on content analysis of 200 Russian papers in chemistry indexed in the Scopus abstracts database, claim that the format diminishes the role of the Russian language in academic discourse because writers use clichés due to their insufficient knowledge of English, and their papers sound formal and impersonal. This statement is arguable if we take into account the fact that the majority of STEM scientists have tended to write in clichés in their native languages,

and the IMRaD format established by Robert Day (Day & Gastel, 2016) half a century ago proved effective even beyond technical or natural sciences.

To provide two more arguments against the spread of English, Popova & Beavitt (2017) go on to discuss the disadvantages of teaching subjects in English through content and language integrated learning (CLIL), and the dangers of spreading the anglophone tradition of writing through the establishment of university writing centers. These arguments, however, have been fairly ambiguous because CLIL is not widely spread in Russian universities and thus could not have been considered a threat, while the information about Russian writing centers in the paper was given insufficiently and even erroneously. Sadly, Popova & Beavitt totally disregarded publications concerning the heated discussion around establishing writing centers in Russia, which by that time had already reached a peak on the pages of *Higher Education in Russia* and triggered a number of international conferences, workshops, and roundtables around the country.

The debate about writing centers started to emerge in Russian universities in the 2010s and focused on their functions due to the uncertainty of their institutional and methodological bases. First of all, creating writing centers was urged by national policies aimed at the internationalization of science and education, but their aim was defined as merely helping faculty publish internationally (Bazanova, 2015; Smith, 2017). Because of this, the audience for writing centers was mainly researchers, and students were involved only when a university ran international programs (Squires, 2016). Consequently, a contradiction emerged between the aims set by U. S. experts who came to help establish writing centers, basing their work on tutoring and writing center pedagogy (Smith, 2017) and the lack of knowledge about this pedagogy among the newly appointed Russian writing center directors and their colleagues. Besides, the hands-off approach is useless where the basics of academic writing are unknown.

Last but not least, as English was considered the only impediment for international publications, writing centers became the responsibility of EFL departments. However, teachers of English in Russian universities have been one of the least published groups of academics because most of them are educators rather than researchers, teach more academic hours and tend to be paid less than teachers in other disciplines, which leaves little space for research (see Chapter 4). As a result, the limitations on their own writing practice have hampered their efficacy in teaching others. As EAP experts are still rare and new to the academic community, teachers of English have continued to be looked down upon by other academics, and writing centers have been viewed as support units whose raison d'etre is to translate papers into English or cor-

rect language mistakes. Writers just do not understand that the reasons why editors of high-ranking international journals reject their papers is not bad English, but the lack of text organization, insufficient support, faulty argument, or the opaque academese they consider essential to use.

Reflections from the Discipline of Rhetoric

The language in which we think is invisible to communicators, and it works in unpredictable, nonlinear and mostly unspoken ways. The deeper our knowledge, the more things we skip as obvious, and the quicker we grasp complex problems. This is the way we conduct research and conceive new ideas. Even preparing to communicate ideas by text, we might not care about the language because no one sees how we strive to logically organize our thoughts, what kind of evidence we seek, or which style we are planning to use to present our ideas. These stages of writing, also referred to as metadiscourse (Flowerdew, 2013; Kwan, 2010), represent the writer's commitment to the study and are therefore core elements of academic writing, probably the most important and difficult to learn. Language is just the means to deliver ideas, and if no new knowledge is produced, a paper in whichever language is pointless. In Russia, however, such papers have still been published.

When in 2013, I found out that American experts use the term rhetoric and composition instead of academic writing and apply it in various theoretical and practical contexts (Enos, 2010; Leki, 1999; Lynn, 2010), I was amazed. Indeed, understanding writing as rhetoric presents it as a system of five stages described by the sophists and formulated by Aristotle millennia ago and recovered by compositionists (Jarratt, 1991): invention (hypothesizing or having an original idea), arrangement (organizing ideas and arguments logically), style (choosing the genre), memory (using content knowledge, literature and methodology of the discipline), and delivery (presenting it all as a text in a language).

Now it became clear why the discussion of academic writing from 2011 to 2014 revealed such diverse attitudes among Russian academics. Only the last stage of the five, delivery, involves what we traditionally understand in Russia as writing, while the cognitive stages of writing, metalinguistic per se, have not been considered as part of the writing process, but rather part of research. If writing is thus divided from research, it loses significance and remains the concern of linguists and philologists.

However, Russian academics are not to be blamed for their misunderstandings. The bimillennial path from the sophists to today's rhetoric and composition was not straight, and rhetoric lost its cognitive elements more than once (Enos, 2010; Ryan & Zimmerelli, 2009). Studying the history of

rhetoric and composition reveals the connection between the way scholars communicate knowledge and the political environment. When a society is dominated by a religion or ideology, the first two stages erode. This happened in the Middle Ages, when new knowledge had to be thoroughly wrapped in direct quotations from canonized classics, and in the Soviet times, when it had to be supported by communist rhetoric with similar direct quotations. The quality of argument depended on the number and choice of quotations (memory) and the passionate or elaborate language (style and delivery). As logic or evidence mattered little, the preferable form of debate in such societies was oral, truth was mixed up with censored fiction, and exams in universities were oral, or, if written, then based on the same censored and canonized lists of literature. Interestingly, even speaking foreign languages has depended on ideology: in the Middle Ages scholars spoke Latin and Greek, the dead languages for quoting long dead canonized classics; in the USSR, speaking any live foreign language was suspicious and even dangerous. Ideologies have kept their borders shut and have preferred dead classics to those still alive (Korotkina, 2018b).

The tragic gap between the Western and Russian writing traditions formed in the twentieth century, when the sharing of knowledge was restricted by the Iron Curtain. This was the period of rapid development of rhetoric and composition in the US and academic writing as a field of research around the world. When in the very beginning of the century, the newly created National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) started their fight against canonized lists of literature, and progressive education led to an understanding of writing as a set of intellectual and social skills that enable students to express their own views and ideas, Russia entered World War I and the revolution. In the 1920s, the USSR implemented the great social project of general public education and a literate society in all the multicultural regions of the vast country. In the 1930s, however, ideology strengthened, and while New Criticism evolved in the US, Soviet schools and universities fell under the directives of the government, all sources were censored, and ideas prescribed. Since then and until the end of the century, language was connected with literature, and literature was carefully selected (see Chapter 2). Like in the Harvard system that preceded progressive education, final exams in schools and entrance exams at universities paid special attention to compositions in which students were expected to express the prescribed ideas—and express them passionately, as if they were their own. In exam compositions and oral exams, the use of sources was forbidden, and students had to repeat what was said by teachers and memorize long quotations from canonized literature. Unfortunately, these practices—albeit so deeply and for so long embedded in

Soviet education—have not yet been paid proper attention in Russian publications: some might still consider it common practice; others, not worth consideration.

However, a century of such practices could not be overcome in a few years—or even decades, so when eventually the Soviet state collapsed, education faced too many challenges. The fall of the Iron Curtain was immediately followed by the New Media Revolution. Learning English started to be important, and the digital divide added even more problems for teachers, who were mostly born in the Soviet era and naturally reluctant to engage new trends in curricula and methodology. New rhetoric and new requirements started to form chaotically, and educational policymakers strived to find ways through this stormy sea of trouble. Educational reforms have lasted for over two decades but have been unanimously considered unsuccessful by the academic community and either severely criticized (e.g., Sukharev, 2014) or regarded as subject to major changes (e.g., Klyachko & Mau, 2015).

Discussing writing in Russia, U. S. experts in rhetoric and composition have had to bear in mind that Soviet-style literary compositions were substituted by the unified exam only in the mid-2000s (see Chapter 2 and Chapter 10), and the idea of writing centers emerged ten years ago, when they celebrated 40 years of their successful functioning in the US.

This very brief historical overview sheds light upon the factors underlying the problems of today's Russian academic writing. First, education still has remained oral in many educational contexts, with the sage on the stage and oral exams, which have required memorizing what was said by the teacher or read in a book. Writing to express one's own idea has been a novelty, and essays in the unified exams (both in Russian and English) have been taught rather formally, focusing on language cliches. It takes at least a year to encourage newcomers to university to speak out and defend their views, for their motivation to study appears perverted (Zborovskij & Ambarova, 2019; see Chapter 10). According to state standards, most written assignments in disciplines are not essays, but papers called "рефераты," in which students should simply demonstrate the scope of their reading and proper understanding of what they read. Criticism or expression of one's own ideas has not been the aim of such writing. Because of this, research papers written later have often contained too many direct quotations and unnecessary references and lack structure.

Secondly, writing has still been associated with language and literature (a problem happily overcome in the US nearly a century ago). Courses in rhetoric, interchangeably called "standards of speech" and taught at a university level as supplementary units, have often focused on speaking, editing, and reading rather than writing. Courses in Russian called "academic writing"

have also appeared as supplementary, but these have been commonly taught by professors in disciplines (for instance, faculty of psychology at the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, or sociology at the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences); they usually focus on literature search, referencing and meeting formal requirements. When teachers of Russian have been involved, they have taught courses according to their own perceptions, mainly grammar, punctuation, and accuracy (the aforementioned Natalia Kolesnikova (2004) being a rare exception).

Thirdly, although the number of Russian students with good command of English has grown rapidly, updated authentic learning materials have been used in a limited number of schools and universities where students' and teachers' social statuses have given them an opportunity to travel or study abroad. According to the English First English Proficiency Index (EF EPI) of 2020, Russia is still a country with a relatively low level of English (the 41st position among the 100 surveyed countries), and according to a national survey by the Levada-Center in 2015, only one of five Russian respondents with higher education admitted to speaking a foreign language, which is not necessarily English or good enough to read or write.

Finally, many academics in arts, humanities, and education cannot read English or do not think it necessary to read international publications in the original because their disciplines are more deeply embedded in local cultural contexts than STEM. This has significantly limited both their own research and the research skills they teach. In STEM and life sciences, reading in English has been essential for constantly checking the most recent research results obtained around the world. Language barriers fall when the information is crucial. For instance, Soviet advances in space exploration and nuclear physics were valued internationally despite the Russian language and format of publications: even restricted access did not prevent other scholars from reading them. Contrarily, the decades-long isolation of education as a discipline has led to immense problems in today's communication in the field: the Russian concepts are so different from English that they have prevented understanding.

The problem of poor citation and narrower readership in humanities and social sciences has been acknowledged by researchers on the international scale (e.g., Dunleavy, 2014), but when research is limited by national publications, the result for many is zero citations.

Another major problem has been the Russian publishing tradition. Until recently, publishing the same text under slightly modified titles in several journals was welcome, and fighting plagiarism in a country where it used to be solely understood as publishing an author's complete paper under someone

else's name seems quixotic. In 2018 and 2019, the Russian company Antiplagiarism with the support of several influential partners held two conferences titled "Plagiarism Detection" ("Обнаружение заимствований", which is in Russian abbreviated as OZ because the term plagiarism was substituted by the less radical word, "adoptions").[4] The goal of the conference was to reach consensus on understanding plagiarism and seek ways of revealing and preventing it. I participated in both conventions and was shocked to hear that the majority of plagiarized dissertations have not belonged to government officers but university lecturers.

Hence, if the problem of Russian academic writing should be defined in terms of rhetoric, the definition should start with the first two stages, invention and arrangement (producing new knowledge and organizing ideas), then style and memory (introducing international publishing conventions, publishing ethics and referencing), and then move on to delivery. As the first four are beyond, or above, national languages, they imply metalinguistic skills, which may be taught effectively in the native tongue. Surprisingly, when we get to delivery, differences between Russian and English also appear to be diminishing because learning how to use cohesion, parallel structures, and repetition of key words, or how to avoid wordiness and nominalization may be considered fairly similar in both languages.

Thinking Russian, Writing English: Reflections from Education

Education is probably the most problematic research area in Russia and other post-Soviet states today because in the Soviet era it was the key tool for educating new generations and therefore developed under the strict ideological control of the government and in deeper isolation from the global mainstream. The consequences of this isolation for Russia have not yet been systematically studied, and publications devoted to the history of Russian pedagogy tend to value the Soviet period, considering it classical, but as I argue in this section, the resulting differences in terminology and writing traditions have provided multiple examples of academically illiterate papers. Professor Robotova (2015, 2018) expresses major concern about the poor quality of papers and dissertations in Russian pedagogy, the illiteracy of writers, their careless use of terminology, and the neglect of the Russian language, which they ought to use especially well, being teachers.

I will refer to this field as a sample, but it does not mean that Russian

4 See the conference website https://ozconf.ru/oz-2020.

educators are incapable of good writing or that writers in other disciplines necessarily write better. I would also emphasize the fact that Russian education researchers are not being opposed to anglophone writers in this analysis: their papers have been analyzed in terms of the requirements of academic writing and publishing, of which they have been simply unaware. The items quoted in this section come from real publications, but the authors' names or the titles of the journals will not be revealed for ethical reasons. The material presented in this section was previously published as part of a conference paper (Korotkina, 2019a) and are part of my second doctoral dissertation (Korotkina, 2019b).

When Russian educators started to participate in international programs and projects, methodological and terminological differences caused significant misunderstandings and misinterpretations. On the one hand, Russian educators rarely know English well enough to read international journals and are not familiar with English terminology; on the other hand, they are used to their own concepts, which have been deeply embedded in national publications and supported by the established authority of Soviet and Russian scholars. To find correspondences between the two terminologies has been hard enough, but to reconsider the national system has been even harder.

The very word "education" causes problems. In Russian, the field is called педагогика (pedagogy), which is reflected in multiple derivatives, such as "doctor of pedagogical sciences," "pedagogical studies," or research, and "pedagogues" as the umbrella term for all teachers from kindergarten to the post-graduate level. The term "образование" (education) is used for institutional or political purposes, like in Ministry of Education or higher education, and there is no corresponding term for educators. As for teachers, the term derived from the similar Russian verb (to teach—учить, teacher—учитель) is applied only to primary and secondary school teachers, whereas university teachers are named by a special term, "преподаватель," with the corresponding verb. A similar distinction is made between university students (студенты) and school pupils (ученики, школьники); the latter are never called students. These discrepancies are basic and therefore the most troublesome.

Examples of misunderstandings emerge in Russian publications in English, or, more often, the translated titles and abstracts in Russian journals. Professor Sternin (2017) bitterly remarks that Russian abstracts in English have traduced Russian arts and humanities. Mechanical or word-to-word translation has been the most common reason for such terminological puzzles as "personal competences" instead of "study skills", "educational material" instead of "learning material," "pedagogical process" instead of "teaching and learning." or "valuable orientations formation" instead of "enhancing" or

"evincing values." Some Russian concepts are hard to identify in English; for example, the widespread Russian term образовательное пространство (literally, educational space) means "the area with unified learning conditions and assessment standards." It is commonly used with the adjective единое (unified) and applied as nation-wide or world-wide. Other terms that seem similar or synonymous in meaning to Russian educators include learning environment, educational environment, educational context, or learning context; these may occur in Russian translations of the same term, causing even more confusion because they have distinctly different meanings in English. Unfortunately, Russian translators in education have hardly ever checked the occurrence of a term using search tools.

Another problem is the translation of whole phrases or sentences. They are often unreadable even to Russian educators with good English, and especially destructive in titles, (e.g., "Anthropological Synthesis of the Methodological Bases of Pedagogical Activity's Research," "Integration of Didactic Units of Knowledge by Methods of Activity Approach in Training of Students of Higher Educational Institutions in Mathematics," or "To the Question about the Modern Technologies of the Construction of the 'Container' Model of Society: One Example of the Existence of the Religious Clothes in the Education Institutions." These are just random examples taken from Russian journals indexed in the e-Library, the Russian database of scholarly publications. I would not embarrass the authors or editors by giving direct references, understanding the lack of professional translators and poor funding of Russian pedagogical journals.

When an abstract is written in such "Russian English" with key words that are either non-occurring or confusing, the paper will hardly be noticed by international peers. The following single sentence belongs to the abstract of one of the previously cited titles: "On the basis of the conducted research it was revealed that application of the theory of integration of didactic units of knowledge and ways of activity in training of students of higher education institutions in mathematics significantly improves quality of the knowledge gained by the students as the main time is allocated for training in ability to solve mathematical problems in the context of integration of the actions corresponding to the process of the solution of these tasks."

The problem is rooted not in poor translation, but in the Russian tradition (occurring mainly in the arts, humanities, soft social sciences and education) of writing texts in obscure, wordy academese, which permeates not only traditionally formalized texts (e.g., legal) but also many texts in humanities and social sciences (Kolesnikova, 2009; Robotova, 2015, 2018). Certainly, Russians have not been the only ones who have fallen into the trap of wordiness and

excessive nominalization. As Bean (2011) wittily points out, writers get "infested with nominalization . . . through unsafe intercourse with bureaucrats, psychobabblers, and educational administrators" (p. 249). Obviously, educational administrators have been the source of this kind of infection worldwide. At least, this is what the unanimous agreement of Russian academics to Bean's statement invariably demonstrates when I quote him in my workshops.

The traditional view of academic writing as unintelligible to all but a few experts is also widely accepted not only by Russian educators. Graff (2000) argues that texts intentionally made more incomprehensible are less frequent, more peripheral, and make less impact on their fields, but some journal editors who are overworked and underpaid still accept them. As a result, some really important ideas have been made less central than others. This has been true of overworked and underpaid Russian journal editors, who would rather object to obscurely written papers but have to accept them in light of the Russian publishing tradition and respect for the authors' degrees. Russian scholars would argue that their papers are important because of the ideas but not the language and refer to their academic statuses as a proof.

The tradition of sticking to Russian terms in education has been so strong that translators often have followed the patterns of Russian discourse even when the papers are written by professionals or native speakers of English. An American colleague who teaches research writing in a Russian university complained how embarrassed she was when her article was edited by a Russian journal, and the proof was not sent to her for final approval before publication. The corrections turned her native academic English into patterns which she daily fights in her students' assignments. I felt similarly embarrassed when someone translated the title and abstract of my Russian paper into English without informing me. When I do it myself, I typically get two rather different texts, and titles may differ in syntax and wording because of terminological, not language differences. Ever since then, I have been asking Russian editors not to make any changes to my English titles and abstracts.

The impact of the tradition has also been noticed in texts written by Russians with good command of English because in writing they could not overcome it. For instance, in Popova and Beavitt's paper (2017), the Russian co-author's voice can be recognized in sentences like "In other words, one may speak about the absence of free choice in terms of the form of presentation of results of intellectual activity" (p. 57). This is a perfect example of a typically Russian collection of rhetorical faults like excessive nominalization, wordiness, multiple repetition of the preposition of, and words from spoken English, such as speak, look, or talk. Of course, the mastery of written academic English by multilingual scholars cannot compare to that of British or

American writers, but texts written in co-authorship with native speakers should be polished by the more proficient co-author. Sadly, texts written by Russian co-authors often remain unpolished as well, and collaborative projects effectively become separate pieces written in separate voices. Clarity does not depend on the national language, but as language has been considered secondary to research, polishing has rarely been practiced by Russian writers (Kolesnikova, 2009).

Russian researchers are not to be blamed for writing this way. As I previously noted (and as is demonstrated in Chapter 3), Russian students and scholars develop as writers individually, most often by imitating the patterns and styles they encounter in disciplinary texts, which result in an unnaturally elaborate manner not only among Russian (Kouprianov, 2011) but also among other international students (Hyland, 2007; Young, 2006). Day and Gastel (2016), note that Western scholars who developed their writing before the 1970s also "learned only to imitate the writing of the authors before them—with all its defects—thus establishing a system of error in perpetuity" (p. xvi). This "system of error in perpetuity" is what has to be overcome in Russia—and other geolinguistic regions—today.

To fight the perpetuation of a bad tradition, the Russian academic community needs to understand why this locally embedded tradition is inappropriate for international publications and why the globally accepted rhetorical and publishing tradition should be preferred. The validity of the comparative study I conducted was supported by my 15-year experience in editing and translating Russian scholarly papers in physics, aviation and space technology, medicine, history of science and education, and 20-year experience in teaching academic writing to students and researchers in both languages. The study was carried out at two universities, the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences and the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration. Research also included annual workshops and seminars for Ph.D.s, researchers, and academics at two leading national research universities in Moscow, HSE University and the MISiS Technical University, and workshops, regional schools, and seminars for academics and researchers at eight other federal universities and national research universities across Russia. Research results were published in Russian scholarly journals and my monograph Academic Writing Teaching Models: International Experience and National Practices (2018) and defended in my second doctoral dissertation (Russian doctor in education, 2019) Theory and Practice of Teaching Academic Writing in Western and Russian Universities.

The study (Korotkina, 2019b) involved critical discourse analysis of over 150 research papers in education and pedagogy, selected from 47 Russian

journals, all of which were currently included in the database of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Ministry of Science and Higher Education. The papers were analyzed alongside ten criteria formulated in terms of requirements for international publications. According to these criteria, the study identified ten major differences between the expectations of publications in English and typical Russian-language publications in the field of education:

1. Title and abstract

English: Titles and abstracts are considered of major importance; they should contain key words and present the focus of the paper clearly and concisely; abstracts should present research results and implications.

Russian: Titles have often been wordy, too general or ambiguous; abstracts have sometimes been too short, written formally before submission and only hinted at results.

2. Format and organization

English: Format requirements are normally strict; the length of the text and number of references depend on the subject and target audience of the journal; sections are required, each section and paragraph being explicitly organized.

Russian: Format requirements have sometimes been vague; papers can be too short or contain few references; texts have often been unstructured; no special requirements have been provided for the organization of information within sections or paragraphs.

3. Originality

English: All publications are required to be original.

Russian: The same papers or considerable parts of previously published research have been published in different journals.

4. Purpose and responsibility

English: The text is expected to present new knowledge to the discourse community, so editors normally rely on double-blind reviews by experts in the field who take on the responsibility.

Russian: The purpose of the text has commonly been seen as to report a publication to the institution and increase the number of an author's publications; editors have rarely required reviews from authors with degrees, and reviews for others have

been limited to formal recommendations from their tutors or colleagues, often written by the authors themselves.[5]

5. Focus

English: Content should be focused on the topic; the argument should be easy to follow.

Russian: Frequent deviations from the main topic may occur.

6. Support

English: Each argument should be supported by evidence or references; definitions should be provided in the beginning of the text.

Russian: Some statements may remain unsupported as self-evident; definitions can be omitted or appear in the middle of the text.

7. References

English: References are normally listed in alphabetical order without numeration; in journal publications, in-text references are given with authors' names and dates of publication.

Russian: References have been most often listed in numerical order according to their occurrence in the text; inside the text only numbers have been given (in-text references with names and dates were only allowed by the state standard in 2008 and have not yet widely spread).

8. Sources

English: Sources should be selected according to the topic and support the argument; paraphrase should provide critique and help keep the writer's voice.

Russian: Sources have sometimes been excessive or irrelevant; multiple direct quotations have been common; long quotations have not been marked by format (font, paragraph).

9. Style

English: The argument should be presented in a cohesive, functionally regular and persuasive manner that demonstrates respect for a non-specialist audience and other viewpoints.

---

5 Junk publications are not solely a Russian problem, but the publishing tradition makes them eligible and therefore appropriate. Double-blind or even peer reviews are only starting to be required by some editors.

Russian: Texts have often been wordy and full of academese (overloaded with terminology and formal phrases); some statements can be subjective or emotional.

10. Language

English: Language should be economical and easy-to-follow; nominalization and passive structures should be avoided; drafts are expected to be thoroughly polished.
Russian: Language has often been obscure with excessive nominalization, ambiguous impersonal structures and complicated, sometimes erroneous syntax; polishing the language has been considered insignificant.

However evident these differences may seem to the Russian eye and, at the same time, rough or exaggerated to the English, they provide a basis for analysis. Even anglophone researchers who obtain their writing skills explicitly in accordance with the requirements and expectations of the global academic discourse and practice writing under the supervision of professors who publish internationally have not always succeeded in meeting these requirements and expectations.

When Russian researchers succeed, their effort should therefore be valued highly. According to recent studies (Lovakov & Yudkevich, 2020; Polikhina, 2020), between 2012 and 2019 the number of Russian papers among top-cited world publications rose seven times, and not only the quantity, but the quality of research has risen. This means that even the first efforts undertaken in the last decade have brought positive results. To foster the quality of research publications further, the problems faced by Russian researchers need to be structured and ways of overcoming them sought—just like in medical treatment, when diagnoses are made to help, not to humiliate patients.

First and foremost, all the listed requirements refer to metalinguistic competences even when language and style are concerned because clarity, brevity, and objectivity are equally relevant in any language. The differences can be roughly divided into two categories depending on who is affected by or responsible for the changes to be made: the editors (e.g., 1, 2, 3 and 7) or the scholars, although most often both are implicated. Some of the problems refer to academic literacy and writing and can be overcome by introducing the appropriate courses in English or Russian into the Russian educational and publishing context.

The Russian tradition of republishing a single article in different journals and books has been well illustrated by the number of retracted papers when a Russian journal has accepted the international code of conduct. For instance,

Integration of Education had to retract six such papers just in 2014 after the journal started to be indexed in Scopus.

What seems especially striking from the point of view of publishing ethics is that Russian educators and pedagogues (and many in other disciplines) have considered this practice quite natural, explaining that a scholar cannot and should not create new ideas for every publication and has a right to make his or her ideas visible for the discourse community through as many publications as possible. If the publishers accept such papers, why not publish? The practice of retraction is new to Russian editors, and self-plagiarism has been a new concept to cope with. However, the retraction of plagiarized papers (unless they are officially accepted reprints) ought to become common practice among Russian publishers, although this policy will affect many prominent professors and academics—and not only in pedagogy and humanities, but also in other disciplines.

Another major problem is referencing. The tradition of listing bibliography entries in numerical order is still used in many journals and dissertations, which significantly impedes the reading of the paper because inside the text, figures do not signal the reference, and the list of references does not provide a clear view of the bibliography. This tradition also complicates the work of the writer, who needs to arrange the references so illogically; however, it has helped some writers to conceal their lack of knowledge or inappropriate use of sources. In 2008, the Russian state standard accepted the international practice of in-text references by name and date with the bibliography entries in alphabetical order and allowed it to be applied in dissertations. Many publishers and journals have accepted this format; whether they use the American Psychological Association (APA), Modern Languages Association (MLA), or the Russian format (the position of date, italics, punctuation, etc.) is not essential. What is important is the convenience for both the writer and the reader. Although numerical order (mostly with footnote referencing) is accepted in some international journals as well, the use of in-text references is a major salutary difference.

Direct quotations, some of which are too long or combined into one overlong sentence, are also a considerable problem in Russian non-STEM sciences. Sometimes the author's voice is hardly distinguishable from the cited sources. In my teaching practice, I make this fault explicit to my students by referring to Saint-Exupéry's The Little Prince, where the child drew a picture of a boa who swallowed an elephant. In the case of multiple direct citations, the boa is full of the undigested parts of various animals, which is even more disgusting. The metaphor works well, and students start avoiding direct quotations by paraphrase. Unfortunately, the international requirement to signal long quotations

(longer than two lines) by separate paragraphs in a smaller font has not been accepted yet by Russian journals; if it is, writers will have to work on their texts more thoroughly because other authors' text will become visible. Today, it is hard to see how much is quoted by noticing the quotation marks, which are often hard to notice due to the length of multiple quotations.

The listed faults along with excessive nominalization, wordiness, and the lack of drafting and polishing relate to the purpose of publication, which is most frequently described as adding more papers to the author's institutional report rather than addressing the discourse community.

Mastering Rhetorical Conventions: The Metalinguistic Approach

Teaching anglophone rhetoric in Russian can be used as an efficient framework for educating writers on a much larger scale regardless of their English proficiency. When Russian scholars accept this rhetoric, especially in non-STEM sciences, they can contribute to the development of their disciplines and communicate new knowledge more widely and effectively. This approach can help scholars not only in Russia, but also in post-Soviet spaces where Russian still remains the lingua franca of academic communication (e.g., Central Asian states). I would also emphasize that accepting anglophone rhetoric can and should rid the academic community in this vast geolinguistic area of obsolete writing and publishing traditions and improve knowledge communication both within and between countries.

The benefit of the metalinguistic approach to teaching writing is that rhetorical skills are transferable, especially if they are accepted as best suiting writers' goals. My seminars on writing for research publication purposes in Russian, which I conducted across the country, have shown that even elderly academics with multiple publications have accepted anglophone rhetoric and composition (composition is essential here) as useful new knowledge which ought to be applied not only to their writing, but also to their teaching. The latter has often been considered even more important by lecturers in disciplines.

Mastering academic discourse and the rhetorical conventions developed by anglophone experts in academic writing requires understanding how they function and why they function this way. And again, English as the language of a particular culture has not been the issue. Academic writing models and structures required in the global academic discourse were, indeed, developed by anglophone experts and writers, but they have been most convenient for multilingual scholars who need to communicate effectively regardless of their cultural backgrounds (Cargill & Burgess, 2017; Flowerdew, 2013; Lil-

lis & Curry, 2015). When a writer's argument is concise, cohesive, regular, and economical, it is easy to follow. The straightforward English tradition of focusing a text, widely illustrated by Kaplan's typology (Kaplan, 1966), appeared efficacious for global academic discourse, connecting researchers cross-culturally and cross-disciplinarily. As a result, academic English became no one's or, rather, everyone's language because of its functional simplicity and logic, and not because anglophone scholars just dominated in international publications.

Not only anglophone rhetorical conventions are transferable, but the methods of teaching rhetoric and composition. This means that other nations can follow them without having to invest in pioneering a totally new field of study. When I worked on my Russian manual Academic Writing: Process, Product and Practice (Korotkina, 2015), I followed the three aspects of rhetoric and composition: focus, organization, and mechanics. As mechanics involves language, I expected it to be the most difficult to present (because I would need many specific examples in Russian) but probably the shortest because it is meant to be used by native speakers of the language. In fact, mechanics appeared to be the biggest, the most difficult, and at the same time the most interesting part to write. Even now, my seminar titled "The Unknown Russian Syntax" (Korotkina, 2017) is invariably accepted as the discovery of an amazing truth about something the participants always thought they knew well. One such amazing fact is that there is no difference between English and Russian in sentence structures provided they are used properly, and no translator will ever spoil or misinterpret the texts provided similar principles of subject-verb connections, cohesion, or even punctuation—are followed by the authors. Thus, when I have created learning materials to develop particular academic writing skills, such as repetition of key words, parallelism, or topic sentences, I have had to use anglophone texts in translation because even the most brilliant Russian texts cannot be used as samples.

Changing cultural habits and traditions is hard, but in the case of academic writing we are changing not the natural native culture, but an artificially created, highly bureaucratic style and no less artificial and often illogical formal requirements inherited from the Soviet past. My extended practice, as well as that of my colleagues from the Russian EAP community, confirms the willingness of researchers and scholars to get free from the habitual use of that sort of writing. Smirnova and Shchemeleva (2015) have expressed major concern about the fact that teaching academic writing has been limited to EAP, while teaching it in Russian would be much more beneficial.

Teaching writing in the native tongue based on anglophone writing methodology has significantly alleviated the process of writing through easy-to-

use models and technologies, to which writers have willingly agreed. Teaching by flexible models is different from imitating samples, following artificial prescriptions or formal rules because it allows for multiple applications across disciplines and contexts. I totally agree with the experts who claim that written academic English is no culture's language, but a grapholect that should be mastered by all researchers, whose different cultures remain in another space beyond academic communication (Bhabha, 1994; Bizzel, 1999; Flowerdew, 2013; Kwan, 2010). Good examples are the structure of an introduction, topic sentences for paragraphs, or Leki's (1999) formula of a thesis statement: "Although A, B because C".

The advantage of models in rhetoric and composition is that they can be applied universally, like algebra (which Leki's (1999) formula shows), but they are not necessarily prescriptive. For instance, in more culturally embedded studies, style might vary or even dominate. In my seminars, I often ask participants to provide me with samples of their writing so that we can edit them. This activity always works well, allowing for collective practice and individual feedback; however, once it failed. The presented piece of writing was written in English by a professor in Japanese studies; it did not follow the anglophone rhetoric in Kaplan's (1966) terms but was developed in a contemplative, measured manner around a metaphor, making his academic text sound like Japanese poetry. The style matched the content so perfectly that all we could do was admire it. I believe no anglophone editor would dare make any changes to its supposedly flawed cohesion or excessive use of co-ordination. This unity of Russian authorship, well-written English, and the flavor of Japanese philosophy is a perfect example of deep understanding of other cultures which can be found in texts on arts and humanities. I was happy that the text was not translated, but originally written in English by the Russian professor, and I am sure it was enjoyed by a multicultural academic readership.

This example shows the benefits of writing directly in English, and researchers with good command of the language should certainly be taught English for Research Publication Purposes (ERPP), the recently designed branch of EAP that best suits their needs (Corcoran & Englander, 2016; Flowerdew, 2013; Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2014; Kwan, 2010). ERPP has been the core methodology applied and developed by Russian writing centers. Unfortunately, they rarely publish their research results for the reasons I mentioned earlier in this chapter, and I can only hope that the publish or perish pressure will urge them to share their experiences (Chapter 4). The problem, again, is not solely Russian: considering the developments in ERPP, Flowerdew (2013) has emphasized the need for publications in the

field and has claimed that "it is an area that offers unique challenges and opportunities for the ESP profession to demonstrate its value" (p. 316), to which I totally agree.

ERPP is not the focus of this paper; however, competencies developed by this methodology are essential for teaching writing for research publication purposes in any language. Flowerdew (2013) systematized them as command of schematic structure, command of discipline-specific citation language, and metadiscourse, which Kwan (2010) defined as "one's degree of commitment to statements made" (p. 57). Other publication-specific skills include communication with gatekeepers, ability to identify the target journal, and strategic management of research and publishing. Although some of these competencies, such as discipline specific citation language, could be considered in terms of ESP or writing in the disciplines (WID), others are transdisciplinary and could be taught within the frameworks of academic or information literacy.

To sum up, the most effective way to introduce a clear and systematic methodology for teaching writing for research publication purposes requires several conditions. First, ERPP should be incorporated into the work of Russian writing centers not only directly but also as a framework for developing programs in the national language. The experience of other experts should be used, but they should be educated in academic writing to properly understand the part they play in the newly established discipline. Writing centers should also help educate editors and publishers, who have generally been at a loss when dealing with particular texts, for the code of conduct prescribes but does not teach how to make abstracts informative or which particular criteria reviewers should apply.

All these activities should be promoted within the more general framework of academic literacy, which could serve as an umbrella for teaching rhetorical and publishing conventions across disciplines in both English and Russian—first and foremost in Russian. This approach could be effective in overcoming the differences between the anglophone and Russian traditions and facilitate the process of internationalizing education and science in Russia. A text written in Russian along with all the rhetorical and even syntactic models of anglophone writing is not only clearer, better organized, and better focused, but also takes less effort to translate, and no translator will pervert such a text. Writers who are taught to write this way do not need the academic literacy brokering or post-submission official journal brokering described by Lillis and Curry (2015) and thus can have their papers accepted by the gatekeepers worldwide. The first steps towards establishing this approach are being made by Russian EAP and academic writing practitioners recently united into the National Writing Centers Consortium.

Conclusions

The changes in international publishing and attitudes to multilingual scholars that have taken place in the last fifteen years have shown the decline of Phillipson's (1992) idea of linguistic imperialism. Many formerly peripheral (Canagarajah, 2002) academic communities have gained a more prominent position on the global stage. Russian scholars, being a large academic community with a long history of producing new knowledge for the world, cannot and should not stay at the periphery of international communication due to the mere lack of awareness of international rhetorical and publishing conventions.

Writing in English is not the sine qua non of publishing qualitative research results in highly-ranked international journals. A much more important condition is presenting these results in accordance with the expectations of other multilingual scholars, in the form of a well-structured, clearly written text with efficacious arguments supported by sufficient, reliable, and up-to-date evidence. This requires explicit rather than implicit knowledge of rhetorical skills taught in academic writing. Although writing as a discipline was mainly developed by anglophone experts, its global popularity and acceptance has been the result of decades-long research carried out in rhetoric and composition. In his book, Teaching and Researching Writing, Hyland (2016) emphasized the key role of academic writing in the lives of millions of people around the world, helping them succeed in their education and professional development, thus becoming a valid indicator of their quality of life.

The Russian academic community has been rapidly changing its attitudes towards the new discipline of academic writing. The discussion on academic writing pioneered by the journal Higher Education in Russia in 2011 started by discussing the term; since then, hundreds of Russian publications on the topic have appeared, and their number has grown rapidly. Researchers, educators, EAP professionals, and academics present their arguments, often contradictory, but no longer questioning the idea of academic writing or the necessity of introducing it into Russian education. There still have been misunderstandings and misinterpretations, but no more resistance. I can conclude that during the last five years the Russian academic community has definitely stepped onto the road of no returning.

Today, teachers of academic writing in Russian appear to be the professionals that Russian education needs first and foremost. Russian science and education need specific programs, both professional development and academic, which will work on a bilingual or even translingual basis (Dobrynina, 2019; Khalyapina & Shostak, 2019; Rasskazova et al., 2017) and merge di-

rective and non-directive approaches depending on the needs, qualifications, and abilities of the audience. The spread of EAP, ESP, and ERPP in Russia is certainly a good prospect, but while the majority of scholars and students cannot be taught in English, the development of similar methodologies in their native tongue remains the only option to obtain internationally accepted rhetorical skills. On the other hand, rhetorical and publishing conventions should be made explicit to Russian editors and publishers, who also rarely speak English. This could foster change in the national publishing tradition and improve the quality of national scholarly journals. Educators and university staff would be another important target group because introducing new writing programs into university curricula has largely depended on their understanding.

Rhetorical skills are interrelated with other cognitive skills, such as critical thinking, analysis, discussion, and reading skills. To introduce academic writing as a new discipline could only be effective if all these skills are incorporated into a unified system of teaching under the umbrella framework of academic literacy.

Discourse analysis of Russian texts in education has demonstrated that the language of publications by more isolated academic communities has been more vulnerable to faults like wordiness, nominalization, and syntactic incomprehensibility. Fields of study which have been more embedded in national, social, and cultural contexts will certainly need more time and effort to overcome their long isolation. The new traditions, however useful they may seem to the community at large, might be opposed by the scholars and academics who obtained their statuses in the old tradition. Overcoming their resistance may only be possible through negotiating and promoting the benefits of academic writing for Russian science and education. This work will require raising awareness of the status of academic writing as a discipline and opposing the perversion of the term academic writing by untrustworthy parties.

Developing academic writing and writing for research publication purposes in the Russian language under the umbrella of academic literacy is currently a great challenge for Russian university writing centers, but this challenge offers (paraphrasing Flowerdew (2013)) unique opportunities for Russian EAP and ESP professionals to demonstrate the value of their pioneering work. Publishing in the new field should be regarded as essential for informing the Russian academic community, editors, and educational policymakers about the centrality of academic writing in academic publishing and university education. I hope this book will contribute to a better understanding of the situation in the global community, especially U. S. experts in rhetoric and composition.

Last but not least, the metalinguistic approach to teaching academic writing could help develop programs for scholars and students not only in Russia but beyond. Russian has remained the lingua franca of international relations and academic discourse in many post-Soviet states, among which Central Asia has been the most significant geolinguistic region. Since 2018, collaboration between the academic writing and communication center of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration and the Kyrgyz State University first led to networking within the Kyrgyz Republic, and then started to emerge into a wider network connecting universities in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. I hope that the metalinguistic approach will help Central Asian university writing centers not only support writers in English and Russian, but also restore the statuses of their national languages in science and education.

Even as I was drawing these conclusions, I kept wondering if now I have a definite answer to the question I asked six years ago: is it an evolution or a revolution? However, one thing is certain today: the process has started and become irreversible. The Russian academic community is experiencing the emergence of academic writing in the country as the first coil of a huge spiral, which inevitably raises the dust of controversies, misconceptions, and oppositions. The dust will gradually disperse and give way to an accelerating progress. Evolution, it is.

References

Bakin, E. V. (2013). Academic writing center: Experience of establishing. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, (8/9), 112-116.

Bazanova, E. M. (2015). Laboratory of scholarly communications: Russian perspective. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, (8/9), 135-143.

Bazylev, V. N. (2014). *Akademicheskoye "pis'mo" (teoreticheskiy aspect) [Academic "writing" (theoretical aspect)]*. SGU Publishing House.

Bazylev, V. N. (2015). *Akademicheskoye "pis'mo" (metodicheskiy aspect) [Academic "writing" (methodological aspect)].* SGU Publishing House.

Bean, J. (2011). *Engaging ideas.* Jossey-Bass.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

Bizzel, P. (1999). Hybrid academic discourses: What, why, how. *Composition Studies*, *27*(2), 7-21.

Bollinger, K. M. (2016). Introducing Western writing theory and pedagogy to Russian students: The Writing and Communication Center at the New Economic School. In P. Zemliansky & K. St.Amant (Eds.). *Rethinking post-communist rhetoric: Perspectives on rhetoric, writing, and professional communication in post-Soviet spaces* (pp. 19-42). Lexington Books.

Butler, D. B., Trosclair, E., Zhou, Y., & Wei, M. (2014). Student and teacher perceptions of academic English writing in Russia. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *2*(2), 203-227.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Cargill, M., & Burgess, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Publishing research in English as an additional language: Practices, pathways and potentials*. University of Adelaide Press.

Corcoran, J. N., & Englander, K. (2016). A proposal for critical-pragmatic pedagogical approaches to English for research publication purposes. *Publications*, *4*(1), 6. http://www.mdpi.com/2304-6775/4/1/6/htm

Day, R. A., & Gastel, B. (2016). *How to write and publish a scientific paper* (8th ed.). Greenwood.

Dobrynina, O. L. (2015). Propaedeutics of errors in abstracts of papers written in Russian. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, 7, 42-50.

Dobrynina, O. L. (2019). Academic writing for research publication purposes. *Nepreryvnoye Obrazovaniye: XXI vek/Life-Long Learning: 21st Century*, *1*(25), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.15393/j5.art.2019.4485

Dunleavy, P. (2014). Poor citation practices are continuing to harm the humanities and social sciences. The London School of Economics and Political Science. *The LSE Impact blog*. http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2014/12/09/poor-citation-practices-humanities-and-social-sciences/

Dunn, W. N. (2011). *Public policy analysis: An introduction* (5th ed.). Longman.

Enos, T. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of rhetoric and composition: Communication from ancient times to the information age. Routledge.*

Fedotov, A. V., & Vasetskaya, N. O. (2013). Analysis of the effective machinery in motivation the publication activity of Russian scientists. In *Universitetskoye Upravleniye: praktika i analiz/University Management: Practice and Analysis* (pp. 60-68). Urals Federal University Press.

Flowerdew, J. (2013). English for research publication purposes. In B. Paltridge & S. Starfield (Eds.), *The handbook of English for specific purposes* (pp. 301-322). Wiley-Blackwell.

Gendina, N. I., Kolkova, N. I., Starodubova, G. A., & Ulenko, Y. V. (2006). *Formirovaniye informatsionnoy kul'tury lichnosti: Teoreticheskoye obosnovaniye i modelirovaniye soderzhaniya uchebnoy distsipliny* [*Developing informational culture of an individual: Theoretical basis and modeling the content of the discipline*]. Mezhregional'ny Tsentr Bibliotechnogo Sotrudnichestva [International Center of Library Collaboration].

Graff, G. (2000). Scholars and sound bites: The myth of academic difficulty. *PMLA*, *115*(5), 1041-1052.

Hyland, K. (2007). *Writing in the academy: Reputation, education and knowledge*. Institute of Education Press.

Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic discourse*. Continuum.

Hyland, K. (2011). Academic discourse. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *The Bloomsbury companion to discourse analysis*. Bloomsbury.

Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing*. Routledge.
Jarratt, S. (1991). *Rereading the sophists: Classical rhetoric refigured*. Southern Illinois University Press.
Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. *Language Learning*, *16*, 1-20.
Khalyapina, L. P., & Shostak, E. V. (2019). Plurilingual and translingual approaches as new trends in the theory of content and language integrated learning for technical university students. *PNRPU Linguistic and Pedagogy Bulletin*, *2*, 119-130.
Klyachko, T., & Mau, V. (2015). The future of universities. Article 2. Trends in Russia. *Social Sciences and Contemporary World.* (4). 5-25.
Kolesnikova, N. I. (2004). *Ot konspekta k dissertatsii [From Note-taking to dissertation].* Flinta.
Kolesnikova, N. I. (2009). *Lingvodidakticheskaya Kontseptsiya Formirovaniya Zhanrovoy Kompetentsii Uchashchikhsya v Sisteme Nepreryvnogo Yazykovogo Obrazovaniya [The linguodidactic concept of developing students' genre competence in integrated language learning].* Flinta.
Korotkina, I. (2013). Academic writing: On the way to conceptual unity. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, *3,* 136-142.
Korotkina, I. (2014). Academic writing in Russia: Evolution or revolution? Social Science Research Network, http://ssrn.com/abstract=2435130
Korotkina, I. (2015). *Akademicheskoye pis'mo: protsess, product i praktika [Academic writing: Process, product and practice].* Urait Publishing House.
Korotkina, I. (2017). The logic of an academic text: The unknown syntax. In Kirillova, O. V. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 6th International Conference "World-Class Scientific Publication – 2017: Best Practices in Preparation and Promotion of Publications" (pp. 60-65). Ural University Press. https://doi.org/10.24069/2017.978-5-7996-2227-5.09
Korotkina, I. (2018a). International studies of new literacy and problems of terminological nonconformity in Russian pedagogy. *Otechestvennaya i Zarubezhnaya Pedagogika/Pedagogy in Russia and Abroad, 3*(50), 132-152.
Korotkina, I. (2018b). *Modeli obucheniya akademicheskomu pis'mu: mezhdunarodny opyt i otechestvennaya praktika [Academic writing teaching models: International experience and national practices]*. Urait Publishing House.
Korotkina, I. (2018c). Russian scholarly publications in anglophone academic discourse: The clash of tyrannosaurs. *Integration of Education*, *22*(2), 311-323.
Korotkina, I. (2019a). Russian educational research papers in international publications: The urge for academic writing. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*. *Future Academy*, 2018. *XLVI*, 36. 309-318. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs(2357-1330).2018.9.2
Korotkina, I.B. (2019b). Teoriya I praktika obucheniya akademicheskomu pis'mu v zarubezhnykh I otechestvennykh universitetakh [Theory and practice of teaching academic writing in western and Russian universities] [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Institute for Strategy of Education Development of the Russian Academy of Education.

Kouprianov, A. (2011). Academic writing and academic form of life: Trying to adapt the course of academic writing in an unfriendly institutional milieu. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, (10), 30-38.
Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (2014). Writing for publication in multilingual contexts: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *13*, 1-4.
Kwan, B. S. C. (2010). An investigation of instruction in research publishing in doctoral programs: The Hong Kong case. *Higher Education*, *59*, 55-68.
Leki, I. (1999). *Academic writing: Exploring processes and strategies* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2010). *Academic writing in a global context: The politics and practices of publishing in English*. Routledge.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2015). The politics of English, language and uptake. *AILA Review*, *28*, 127-150.
Lovakov, A., & Yudkevich, M. M. (2021). The post-Soviet publication landscape for higher education research. *Higher Education, 81*(2), 273-299. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00541-2
Lynn, S. (2010). *Rhetoric and composition: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
Orlova, G. A. (2011). Practical analytics: Teaching discourse analysis through the university curriculum. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/ Higher Education in Russia*, *7*, 127-133.
Perlov, A. (2011). "What do we want and how do we explain it": Transformations of the tutorial on preparing a research project. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, 7, 133-140.
Petrashova, T. G. (2017). Evaluation of the effectiveness of EFL instruction throughout the English language program to provide conditions for internationalization of the university: Experience of an innovative technical university. *Language and Culture*, *38*, 269-284.
Phillipson R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism.* Oxford University Press.
Polikhina, N. A. (2020). Publication activity of academic staff in Russia: Results, trends, problems. *Science Governance and Scientometrics*, *15*(2), 196-222.
Popova, N. G., & Beavitt, T. A. (2017). English as a means of scientific communication: linguistic imperialism or interlingua? *Integratsiya Obrazovaniya/Integration of Education*, *21*(1), 54-70.
Rasskazova, T. P., Glukhanyuk, N. S., & Guzikova, M. O. (2017). The results of English teaching as a foreign language for academic staff in the artificial bilingualism environment. *The Education and Science Journal*, *8*(19), 188-203.
Robotova, A. S. (2011). Is it necessary to teach the academic work and academic writing? *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, 10, 47-54.
Robotova, A. S. (2015). Absurdities in pedagogical texts. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/ Higher Education in Russia*, *3*, 145-152.
Robotova, A. S. (2018). About pedagogy, its words, concepts and texts. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, *27*(7), 9-19.
Rostovtsev, A. A. (2017). The Russian and international practices of identification of

irresponsible journals and authors. *Science Editor and Publisher*, *2*(1), 30-37.
Ryan, L., & Zimmerelli, L. (2009). *The Bedford guide for writing tutors* (5th ed.). Bedford/St. Martin's.
Schleifer, R., Townsend, M. A., Tsiopos Wills, K. V., Aksakalova, O., Nemec Ignashev, D., & Venediktova, T. (2016). Under Lomonosov's watchful gaze: A case study of an early faculty development writing workshop in Russia. *Contrastive Linguistics*, (5), 297-309.
Senashenko, V. (2011). About academic writing and research competences. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, (8/9), 136-139.
Smirnova, N. V., & Shchemeleva, I. Y. (2015). Writing at the university level: American, European and Russian perspectives. *St.Petersburg State University Bulletin*, *9*(2), 185-196.
Smith, E. (2017). *Writing centers in multilingual settings: A workbook.* Samara University Press.
Squires, L. A. (2016). The NES writing and communication center: The case for student-oriented writing centers in Russia. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, 8/9, 66-73.
Stepanov, B. (2012). On the academic writing once again: Critique of the academic criticism. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii/Higher Education in Russia*, (7), 130-138.
Sternin, I. A. (2017). Kak uvazhat' sebya zastavit'? Ucheny-filolog razmyshlyayet o nabolevshem [How to make others respect us? A philologist's reflections on grave issues]. *Poisk [Search]*, 8. https://www.poisknews.ru/magazine/22732/
Sukharev, O. V. (2014). Disfunktsiya obrazovaniya i nauki v Rossii: traektoriya preodoleniya [Misfunction of education and science in Russia: The trajectory for overcoming]. *National Interests: Priorities and Security*, *1*(208), 2-17.
Swales, J. (1997). English as Tyrannosaurus Rex. *World Englishes, 16*, 373-382.
Young, A. (2006). *Teaching writing across the curriculum* (4th ed.). Pearson.
Zborovskij, G. E., & Ambarova, P. A. (2019). The dream of quality education: Contradictions in the development of educational communities in Russian universities. *Mir Rossii [The World of Russia]*, *2*, 98-124.
Zemliansky, P., & Goroshko, O. (2016). A survey of academic and professional writing in higher education in Russia and Ukraine. In P. Zemliansky & K. St.Amant. (Eds.), (2016). *Rethinking post-communist rhetoric: Perspectives on rhetoric, writing, and professional communication in post-Soviet spaces* (pp. 3-18). Lexington Books.